service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSS:

H. R. 6565. A bill to amend the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, to provide preference to certain widows of veterans in the purchase of surplus property; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H. R. 6566. A bill to amend section 101 of the National Security Act of 1947; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 6567. A bill to remove subsidy on exported cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 6568. A bill to authorize the appointment of three additional judges for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 6569. A bill to amend the Veterans Regulations to provide increased rates of compensation for certain veterans with specific service-incurred disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 6570. A bill to provide for the conversion of national banking associations into and their merger or consolidation with State banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 6571. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion conferred on the President by the Second Decontrol Act of 1947; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6572. A bill to authorize the granting of Federal aid with respect to the construction of toll bridges, highways, and tunnels; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 6573. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCOBLICK:

H. R. 6574. A bill granting income-tax exemptions for certain blood relatives supported by the taxpayer and for certain dependents under the age of 18 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 6575. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6576. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6577. A bill to establish a Fish and Wildlife Commission as an independent Government agency; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MACKINNON (by request):

H. R. 6578. A bill to provide for the payment of Federal unemployment taxes into the Federal unemployment account to be available for the administration of unemployment-compensation laws and public employment offices, and to return to the States the excess of such taxes over such administrative expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROHRBOUGH:

H. R. 6579. A bill providing for the construction of a Federal building at Mount Hope, W. Va.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

H. J. Res. 403. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release and satisfaction of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 595. Resolution to direct the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to recommend a national fuel policy; 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. COLMER:

H. R. 6580. A bill to authorize Joe Graham Post, No. 119, American Legion, upon certain conditions, to lease the lands conveyed to it by the act of June 15, 1933; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JACKSON of Washington:

H. R. 6581. A bill for the relief of Andrew L. Johnson and Charles W. Gunstone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 6582. A bill for the relief of Hedwig Pospischil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 6583. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to John Grey Owl; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. POAGE:

H. R. 6584. A bill for the relief of Mr. Sam Patterson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 6585. A bill for the relief of August Michela, infant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H. R. 6586. A bill for the relief of Karin Sofia Back; 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:

1928. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of members of the Provisional Committee for Democratic Rights, New York City, addressed to Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., Speaker, and Hon. SAM RAYBURN, minority leader to urge them to exert their influence to defeat the House Un-American Activities Committee's proposed legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1929. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mrs. Carl Ottman and 21 others, of Hot Springs, S. Dak., urging enactment of a program of universal military training as recommended by the President's Advisory Committee on Universal Training; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1930. By Mr. REED of Illinois: Petition of Leslie J. Funk, Elgin, Ill., consisting of 41 signatures, in support of H. R. 5213; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1931. By the SPEAKER: Petition of William A. Bloom and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Townsend plan, H. R. 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1932. Also, petition of Mrs. Cvinar and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1933. Also, petition of Barabara Minoff and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1934. Also, petition of Iwing Sosonsky and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1935. Also, petition of Allan K. Millman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the Mundt-Nixon bill, H. R. 5852; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1936. Also, petition of Ruth Turoff and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1937. Also, petition of Jack Safer and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1938. Also, petition of S. Schaeffer and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God, at this moment the Senators and the Representatives of the people of this Nation humbly implore Thy help and guidance. Make it a sacred moment, a moment when men are aware of their need of God, a moment when answers come and guidance is given. Often we pray for that which is already ours, neglected and unused. Sometimes we pray for that which can never be ours and sometimes for that which we must do for ourselves.

How many times we never pray at all, and then work ourselves to death to earn something that is ours for the asking.

Help us to understand that faith without works is dead and works without faith can never live. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 14, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 14, 1948, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1142. An act for the relief of Anna Pechnik;

S. 1620. An act to establish eligibility for burial in national cemeteries, and for other purposes; and

S. 1985. An act to amend the act entitled "Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act," approved July 19, 1940.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, communicated to the Senate the resolutions of the House adopted as a tribute to the memory of Hon. JOHN H. OVERTON, late a Senator from the State of Louisiana.

The message announced that the House had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. LEONARD W. HALL, Mr. LEA, and Mr. CHAPMAN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FELLOWS, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. CELLER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. REES, Mr. LOVE, and Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

SEVENTY-GROUP AIR FORCE—CORRECTION

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, during the debate on the so-called 70-group air force, I referred to what I called the estimate of the Secretary of the Air Force that Russia would go to war as soon as she had the atomic bomb. This statement was based on published reports which I had read and which I then thought fairly justified such an inference.

Later I learned that this was not the Secretary's belief, and, wanting above everything to be absolutely fair and truthful, I sent word to him that I would gladly try my best to give his statement on this matter the same prominence as was given to my original remark. In pursuance of my offer, he wrote me a letter, which I shall now read:

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, May 14, 1948.

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: It was distressing to read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 6 your statement attributing to me an estimate "that Russia will go to war on us as soon as she has the atomic bomb."

No such estimate having been in my mind at any time, I was concerned that I might have misspoken in the course of testimony before some committee of the Congress. A thorough check of all my prepared statements and the committee records fails to produce a record of any such estimate on my part. It has been and continues to be my belief that if we have an adequate and modern air force, its very existence would be the strongest possible deterrent to any attack being made on this country.

The absence of such an air force might constitute an invitation. The report of the estimate which you attribute to me places me in the category of the warmonger. Had I made such an estimate, you would have been correct in criticizing me for going beyond my area of responsibility.

If, in your opinion, the above comments are valid, it would be deeply appreciated if you would undertake to make such correction as is, in your judgment, warranted.

Sincerely,

W. STUART SYMINGTON.

Mr. President, I am glad to accept the statement as it stands and regret my error. I desire always to be completely fair and truthful to all men and particularly to an official for whom I have the respect which I hold for Secretary Symington.

INVESTIGATION OF THE CHARACTER AND LOYALTY OF OFFICIALS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 157)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of the Senate, which was read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
May 17, 1948.

HON. A. H. VANDENBERG,
President pro tempore,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On Saturday, May 15, 1948, during the recess of the Senate, the attached sealed message from the President of the United States addressed to the Senate of the United States was received by me at 2:02 o'clock p. m., which I am herewith delivering to you to be laid before the Senate at its meeting today.

Very sincerely,

CARL A. LOEFFLER,
Secretary.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, the enrolled bill (S. 1004) entitled "An act to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 so as to grant specific authority to the Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to require investigations by the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the character, associations, and loyalty of persons nominated for appointment, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to offices established by such act."

The bill under consideration would amend section 15 (e) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, by adding at the end thereof a provision which would authorize the Senate members of the Joint Committee to direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation to investigate the character, associations, and loyalty of any person appointed by the President under the act, whose appointment requires the advice and consent of the Senate, and would require the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to report to the Senate Committee in writing, setting forth the information developed by such investigation.

Under our form of government, the executive power is vested by the Constitution in the President. Other grants of power are made to the legislative and the judicial branches. As was said by the Supreme Court in the case of *Humphrey's Executor* v. *United States* (295 U. S. 602, 629)—

> The fundamental necessity of maintaining each of the three general departments of government entirely free from the control or coercive influence, direct or indirect, of either of the others has often been stressed and is hardly open to serious question. * * * The sound application of a principle that makes one master in his own house precludes him from imposing his control in the house of another who is master there.

S. 1004 is objectionable in that it would permit an unwarranted encroachment of the legislative upon the executive branch. Five Senators would be authorized to direct the Federal Bureau of Investigation, a bureau of the Department of Justice, to make investigations for them. The complete independence of the executive branch renders it imperative that the Executive have sole authority over the officers whom he appoints. Chief Justice Marshall said in *Marbury* v. *Madison* (1 Cranch 137, 164):

> By the Constitution of the United States, the President is invested with certain important political powers, in the exercise of which he is to use his own discretion, and is accountable only to his country in his political character, and to his own conscience. To aid him in the performance of these duties, he is authorized to appoint certain officers, who act by his authority, and in conformity with his orders. In such cases, their acts are his acts; and whatever opinion may be entertained of the manner in which Executive discretion may be used, still there exists and can exist no power to control that discretion.

Aside from the question of constitutionality, which I am advised is serious, I believe the bill is wholly unnecessary and unwise. It would authorize the Senate members of the joint committee to utilize a bureau of an executive department and direct its head to perform functions for the legislative branch, at the same time that he was performing similar functions as part of the executive branch, with the possibility of confusion and misunderstanding as to which branch controlled.

I fully recognize my obligation in exercising my constitutional duty of appointment to obtain the facts about any person nominated to serve as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Every facility of the executive branch, including the Federal Bureau of Investigation, will be used to obtain those facts. I am entitled to have placed before me all relevant information, including material which in the public interest should be maintained on a highly confidential basis.

The measure, furthermore, appears impractical because, as I am advised, investigations conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after the nomination of an individual has been publicly announced are not and cannot be as productive as those which are conducted on

a confidential basis prior to an announcement. Persons are always reluctant to disclose full information about an individual after his nomination has been sent to the Senate. The most reliable information is that which is obtained by the executive branch prior to nomination. This information is frequently of a category which cannot be made public without damage to the national interest. Although I have no desire to keep from Congress information which it should properly have, I must emphasize that the provisions of this bill are completely incompatible with the necessities of the operation of our Government and with the national security.

Accordingly, I cannot give my approval to the bill.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 15, 1948.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter from the Secretary of the Senate together with the message from the President of the United States and the bill will be printed and lie on the table.

SPECIAL REPORT ON OPERATIONS AND POLICIES OF INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND AND INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 4 (b) (6) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, there is transmitted herewith the first special report on the operations and policies of the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, covering the first 2 years of operations of these institutions.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 17, 1948.*

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 654)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(For text of President's message, see proceedings of the House of Representatives for Friday, May 14, 1948, on p. 5846.)

LONG-RANGE AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 2318) to provide for a coordinated agricultural program, and I submit a report (No. 1295) thereon. It is the so-called long-range agricultural bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill placed on the calendar.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to say that the bill is the result of the authorization and the directive given by this body last July to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to make a study of agricultural trends and problems in the United States, and to make such recommendations as would be necessary to carry on a productive and profitable agriculture in the future. The committee has worked intensively for the last 6 months on the bill. We are reporting unanimously a bill which, while it undoubtedly is not perfect, yet carries out largely the objectives which are requested in the President's message, and which were requested by the Senate of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill is the result of several months of intensive work by a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, of which I had the privilege of being chairman. The bill was introduced by the seven members of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], and myself. I want to say that I never worked with a more cooperative committee than the one whose members I have just named in holding the hearings and in the preparation of the bill. I also want to say that, while the bill was introduced by the members of the subcommittee, as that seemed the logical thing to do, yet the other six members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry are entitled to full credit for the assistance which we have had from them and the interest which has been shown by them and the work which has been done by them since the introduction of the bill.

As is well known, hearings were held on the bill and a great many revisions have been made in it. In fact, we are offering a substitute bill. We introduced the first bill as a basis for holding hearings, knowing full well that many changes would be required, but we knew that if we did not introduce a bill we would not secure the testimony in detail which was required to write a better bill. I wish to give full credit to the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who are not members of the subcommittee. They are the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. They have labored with us diligently and the bill is the result.

I believe the President is right in asking for early enactment of this type of legislation. There is not included in it the so-called food-allotment bill which I introduced myself, and which has been before this body now for the last 3 or 4 years. It was not felt by the committee that we could thoroughly go into this phase of the agricultural program at the present time, and above all else we did not want to jeopardize the enactment of a sound long-range price-support program and the adjustment of some of the agencies which deal with soil conservation at the national level. Therefore, Mr. President, I present the bill with the full unanimous approval of the members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry who were present when action was taken on it.

We have not made it a partisan matter. From the very start, and at the time we voted to report the bill, there were four members of each major political party present, and they voted unanimously. At no time has it been necessary to have a roll call within our own committee. Whenever differences of opinion arose we have discussed the matter directly before us and invariably agreed to the will of the majority.

The bill which we are now reporting, although it provides for revision of the parity formula, does not include the cost of hired labor in estimating the parity formula. Several of us thought that it should be included, and still think so. It is entirely possible that it will be included before the bill is enacted into law.

I shall not take any more time now, but I wish to express the hope on behalf of the committee—and I know the entire committee will agree with me—that we may have early action by this body on this bill. It must go to the House and receive consideration there. I understand that that body is waiting for the bill to come over there before taking action. Therefore I hope for early action on this long-range agricultural program. This is the time to act upon it, in my opinion. Carry-overs are low and prices to farmers are generally in good condition; and it seems to us a pretty good time to patch the roof while the sun is shining, and not wait until we get into the depths of a depression or crisis before undertaking to put long-range legislation into effect.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL ASSISTANT SECRETARIES OF STATE

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to continue the authorization for the appointment of two additional Assistant Secretaries of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

APPROVAL OF AGREEMENT RELATING TO RESOLUTION OF CONFLICTING CLAIMS TO GERMAN ENEMY ASSETS

A letter from the Under Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation approving an agreement relating to the resolution of conflicting claims to Germany enemy assets and authorizing the President to enter into the agreement or other agreements similar in character with certain countries (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LAWS PASSED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John and the Municipal Council of St. Croix, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

NICK SCALES, JR.

A letter from the Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, reporting, pursuant to law, the payment of the claim of Nick Scales, Jr., under the Federal Tort Claims Act, 1946; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

WAIVER OF 6 MONTHS' PREVIOUS SERVICE REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN SHIP RADIOTELEGRAPH OPERATORS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, making a statement and submitting recommendations of that Commission with regard to the present temporary power of the Commission to waive the 6 months' previous-service requirement for ship radiotelegraph operators of certain cargo ships imposed by section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended (47 U. S. C. 353 (b)); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL CEILINGS

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ended March 31, 1948 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, Modesto, Calif., favoring the enactment of legislation providing an adequate and balanced military strength; ordered to lie on the table.

A paper in the nature of a petition from Mrs. Reva Cooper Barse, of Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation providing local Federal jurisdiction over Indian affairs through the United States district courts, and the United States Supreme Court (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Lions Clubs of zone 2, district 12 W, of western Tennessee, assembled at Pilot Knob, Tenn., favoring the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of a steam plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of Delaware County, N. Y., protesting against the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of the proposed flood-control dam on the Charlotte River, in Davenport, N. Y.; to the Committee on Public Works.

A paper in the nature of a petition from the General Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church in thirty-third quadrennial session at Kansas City, Kans., signed by J. A. Charleston, chairman, and William P. Stevenson, secretary, requesting the Congress to adopt the President's civil-rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GOVERNMENT SUPPORT PRICE ON EGGS—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a petition signed by Walter Palda, Mrs. James Palda, Alfred Giva, and John Fischer, and sundry other citizens of Wyndmere and Lidgerwood, N. Dak., requesting a Government support price on eggs.

There being no objection, the petition was received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned farmers and poultry raisers, demand a Government support price on eggs, as the price today is 33 cents per dozen, current receipts.

WALTER PALDA,
MRS. JAMES PALDA,
ALFRED GIVA,
JOHN FISCHER

(And sundry other citizens of Wyndmere and Lidgerwood, N. Dak.).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

S. 1861. A bill to amend the act entitled "an act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, so as to provide promotions for temporary employees of the custodial service; with amendments (Rept. No. 1296); and

S. J. Res. 193. Joint resolution to grant free postage to members of the armed forces while confined for treatment in a military or naval hospital, and to veterans while being furnished hospital treatment or institutional care in institutions operated by or under contract with the Veterans' Administration; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1297).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2215. A bill to provide for research and control relating to diseases of the heart and circulation; with amendments (Rept. No. 1298).

By Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1390. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1314).

By Mr. BALL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 2237. A bill to increase certain benefits payable under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1315).

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

H. R. 5870. A bill to amend the act of May 16, 1946 (Public Law 383, 79th Cong.), as amended to provide increased allowances for the escorts of repatriated war dead; without amendment (Rept. No. 1303).

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

S. 2593. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Commonwealth of Virginia a right-of-way for public highway purposes in certain lands at Pungo, Va.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1301).

By Mr. GURNEY (for Mr. BRIDGES), from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2251. A bill to authorize the Army and Navy Union, United States of America, Department of Illinois, to construct a recreational park on the grounds of the United States Naval Hospital, United States Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1299).

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

S. 2592. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to return certain lands situated in Puerto Rico, in accordance with the terms of the conveyances to the United States Government, and final judgments in certain condemnation proceedings; without amendment (Rept. No. 1300).

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1413. A bill to authorize the State of Minnesota to condemn lands owned by the United States in the county of Cass, State of Minnesota, for fish propagation, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1304);

S. 2496. A bill to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described; with amendments (Rept. No. 1305);

S. 2548. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920, to permit the exercise of certain options on or before August 8, 1950; without amendment (Rept. No. 1306);

H. R. 4201. A bill to authorize payments to the public-school district or districts serving the Fort Peck project, Montana, for the education of dependents of persons engaged on that project; without amendment (Rept. No. 1307);

H. R. 4512. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to the State of Oklahoma for the use and benefit of the Northeastern State College, at Tahlequah, Okla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1308);

H. R. 4513. A bill to eliminate the requirement of oaths in certain land matters, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1309);

H. R. 4551. A bill to provide for the addition of certain surplus Government lands to the Cape Hatteras National Seashore Recreational Area project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1310);

H. R. 5155. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made by the Public Roads Administration and the National Park Service a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal between Great Falls, Md., and Cumberland, Md., and to report to the Congress upon the advisability and practicability of constructing thereon a parkway, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1311);

H. R. 5244. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to allow credit in connection with certain homestead entries for military or naval service rendered during World War II"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1312); and

H. R. 5839. A bill to authorize the conveyance to States, or political subdivisions, of roads leading to certain historical areas administered by the Department of the Interior, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1313).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 83. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Elizabeth Pickering Winn; without amendment (Rept. No. 1316);

S. 158. A bill for the relief of certain Basque aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1337);

S. 660. A bill for the relief of Peter Drozd; with amendments (Rept. No. 1339);

S. 709. A bill for the relief of Carlos Riggenbach; without amendment (Rept. No. 1317);

S. 765. A bill for the relief of Santiago Solabarrieta; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1322);

S. 933. A bill for the relief of Emanuel Carinos; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1338);

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of Hou Chung Chay; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1323);

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Kihei Matsuo; without amendment (Rept. No. 1318);

S. 1409. A bill for the relief of Markoto Iwamatsu; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1324);

S. 1606. A bill for the relief of Wladyslav Plywacki; without amendment (Rept. No. 1319);

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna V. Reyer, Alexander A. Reyer, and Vitaly A. Reyer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1320);

S. 1739. A bill to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Patricia Schwartz and Beatrice Schwartz; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1325);

S. 1964. A bill for the relief of Walter Werner Tech; without amendment (Rept. No. 1321);

S. 2059. A bill for the relief of Joyce Violet Angel; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1340);

S. 2349. A bill relating to the issuance of reentry permits to certain aliens; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1326);

H. R. 703. A bill for the relief of Leon Nikolaivich Volkov; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1327);

H. R. 892. A bill for the relief of Michel Ferapontow; without amendment (Rept. No. 1328);

H. R. 926. A bill for the relief of Doda Greenbaum (Brenner); without amendment (Rept. No. 1329);

H. R. 1916. A bill for the relief of Filiberto A. Bonaventura; without amendment (Rept. No. 1330);

H. R. 2218. A bill for the relief of Lawrence Edgar Edwards; without amendment (Rept. No. 1331);

H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of Thomas Camarda; without amendment (Rept. No. 1332);

H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of Dr. Timothy C. H. Liang and Dr. Esther Chang Liang; without amendment (Rept. No. 1333);

H. R. 3640. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Charlotte D. Wang, Harvey S. P. Wang, and Arthur Y. P. Wang; without amendment (Rept. No. 1334);

H. R. 4443. A bill for the relief of Jacob Cohen; without amendment (Rept. No. 1335);

H. R. 4484. A bill for the relief of Theodore Loetsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1336); and

H. R. 5310. A bill to authorize the admission into the United States of persons of races indigenous to Siam, and to make them racially eligible for naturalization; without amendment (Rept. No. 1341).

ADMINISTRATION OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE COMMITTEE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report an original bill, to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 1302) thereon.

There being no objection, the report was received and the bill (S. 2688) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

EXTENSION OF TERMS OF OFFICE OF PRESENT MEMBERS OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably without amendment the bill (S. 2589) to provide for extension of the terms of office of the present members of the Atomic Energy Commission, and I submit a report (No. 1342) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and printed, and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I now ask unanimous consent that the report may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, through the Senate members thereof, to whom was referred S. 2589, a bill to extend the time of the expiration date of the terms of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission from August 1, 1948, to June 30, 1950, report the bill back to the Senate with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The atomic-energy program was developed during World War II as a military project for the production of atomic weapons. They were successfully produced under military direction as a result of the unprecedented coordination of the highest degree of scientific, engineering, and industrial skills ever mobilized.

In the process, startling and revolutionary scientific discoveries were made which suggested unlimited future possibilities for research and development in the field of social and humanitarian benefits. Complete emphasis, however, was placed on the development of a weapon and these other discoveries or possibilities were laid aside, at the time, for future investigation, research, and development in a peaceful atmosphere.

With the end of the war the problem of how to handle atomic energy for the good of mankind became paramount. It was universally agreed that the bomb must be secured, if possible, against international use in war, and this principle became a major consideration in all domestic approaches or suggestions to the problem. It also became a special and intensive problem of the United Nations within which a special Atomic Energy Commission was immediately set up with specific terms of reference directed toward a solution of this problem.

Meanwhile, the Congress commenced immediate studies for the purpose of passing proper legislation for the control and for the advancement and development of the limitless possibilities of this science. A special committee of the Senate and the Military Affairs Committee of the House over a period of months devoted time and held extensive hearings which eventually resulted in the passage of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, approved by the President on August 1, 1946.

In considering the original legislation, the Congress, and eminent citizens who testified, recognized the pioneering nature of the project; the revolutionary power of the bomb; the perils of unrestricted tampering with the dangerous products of atomic fission and the possibilities of new and unforeseen dislocations in industry and social fields. The fact that there was no historical experience for guidance, when considered with other factors, indicated that any legislation and any program undoubtedly would be subject to future change as a result of mature experience.

In section 1 (A) of the act, it is clearly stated as follows:

"The effect of the use of atomic energy for civilian purposes upon the social, economic, and political structures of today cannot be determined. It is a field in which unknown factors are involved."

The declaration continues:

"Therefore, any legislation will necessarily be subject to revision from time to time. It is reasonable to anticipate, however, that tapping this new source of energy will cause profound changes in our present way of life."

In section 1 (B) (5), the law further states:

"A program of administration which will be consistent with the foregoing policies and with international arrangements made by the United States, and which will enable the Congress to be currently informed so as to take further legislative action as may hereafter be appropriate."

The report from the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy, which accompanied S. 1717, states:

"It is recognized that many unforeseeable developments may arise in this field requiring changes in the legislation from time to time."

The Congress recognized that under the provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, which placed this vast enterprise in the hands of a commission to operate, there was being created the greatest administrative monopoly with the most far-reaching power ever set up in this country; but there was no other course. The authority of this commission is greater than any other commission or bureau either heretofore or presently established in government. It ramifies throughout industry, management, labor, and natural resources. Its authority extends into the international field of atomic energy. Because of the secrecy necessary to preserve the knowledge essential to the production of atomic weapons the operation of this vast setup is clothed with restrictions and mandates for security, and the opportunity for public examination and evaluation of its progress and of the impact of its activities upon our normal peacetime or even potential wartime economy are nonexistent. This situation is unique in administrative policy of our Nation. It places solemn responsibility upon your joint committee.

The Atomic Energy Commission is presently operating on an annual basis of over $600,000,000 in cash and $300,000,000 in contract authorizations. It has unlimited discretion in the types and kinds of goods and raw materials it buys; it has complete control over the extent to which private enterprise may venture in this field; it pre-empts patents; it has full authority over all phases of production and activity in atomic energy; it has, subject to certain responsibilities of periodic direction by the President, complete discretion and control over the production of atomic weapons; it can make foreign contracts and arrangements; it can contract with State and local governments; it operates municipalities, is the landlord, and subsidizes many local services traditionally within the province of private enterprise; it has the duty of extensive participation in the fields of public health; it is authorized to participate and is participating in agricultural and industrial research and development and may give or withhold its aid in its discretion. Its broad powers enable it to establish and maintain countless programs which are not clearly defined. It employs, either directly or through its operating contractors, over 55,000 people, who with their families probably total 200,000; it has discretionary authority over the release or the withholding of information affecting the program.

The Atomic Energy Commission, because of the nature of its duties and the extent of its power, can exercise decisive control over the destiny of our Nation and the lives of our people.

The Congress, under the Atomic Energy Act, and in consideration of the inherent dangers and problems involved, deemed these broad powers essential for the protection of the public and in order to prevent, if possible, the devastating use of atomic weapons in war. In addition, these powers have been deemed initially essential in order that we may make the greatest progress and maintain our preeminence in the advancement of the science of atomic energy. Your commit-

tee refers to these powers, therefore, to illustrate the magnitude of the social and economic area within which atomic energy operates and to emphasize that its growth and integration into the American system of individual free enterprise must be carefully measured and that hasty decisions as to a permanent administrative pattern are unwarranted and unwise.

Because of the unprecedented monopolistic control of atomic energy set up in the Government through the Commission, the Congress, in section 15 of the act, created the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy composed of nine Members of each House. This committee has a responsibility to "make continuing studies of the activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and of problems relating to the development, use, and control of atomic energy."

This section further provides that—

"The Commission shall keep the joint committee fully and currently informed with respect to the Commission's activities."

It was intended that by setting up such a joint committee, necessary secrecy of the project could be preserved, but at the same time a responsible body of Congress would be constantly kept informed so that it would be able, from time to time, to make such recommendations for legislation affecting the policy and operation of the atomic-energy program, and to make such reports as might be indicated in the public interest.

Although the law went into effect on August 1, 1946, the President did not appoint the members of the Commission until October 28, 1946, and the General Manager was not appointed until December 30, 1946. The transfer of the affairs of the Manhattan District (which was the wartime agency in charge of this project) to the Commission occurred on January 1, 1947. The nominations were sent to the Senate by the President on January 20, 1947, and thereafter beginning on January 27, a substantial portion of the time of the Commissioners and the General Manager was devoted to hearings on the question of the confirmation of their nominations until their confirmation on the 9th of April 1947. The first terms of the Commissioners were fixed by law for expiration 2 years after August 1, 1946, which was the effective date of the act.

In fixing the term of office for the first Commissioners at 2 years after the effective date of the act, it was the purpose of the Congress to provide at least a 2-year period for examination and observation of the program. The legislative intent to provide an initial 2-year term was predicated upon the sound reasoning that in an undertaking of this magnitude a minimum of 2 years would be necessary before any valid evaluation of the administrative policies could be made. These terms all expire on August 1, 1948. Since the Commission was not confirmed until the 9th day of April 1947 and from a practical standpoint has had uninterrupted and unquestioned security in the performance of its duties only since that time, it is obvious that there has been but 1 year for the reliable formulation of programs and for the observation and study instead of the 2-year period wisely contemplated by the law.

The transition from the military operation to eventual full control by the Atomic Energy Commission was accompanied by many dislocations and uncertainties. Following the confirmation of the Commissioners, they and the joint committee undertook the coordination of their respective duties; on the one hand, the Commission went forward with plans for the development of their administrative policies under the act and, on the other, the joint committee began to inform itself and receive information as to the entire situation and the proposals for future development.

As noted before, the necessary activities of the Commission ramify throughout the general economy and the national policy of our Nation. It is a pioneering venture of a new, vast, and startling nature; there was no history or experience of a similar peacetime operation upon which the Commission or the joint committee could rely. In this year that has passed some programs have been set up and many policies considered, some of which have been adopted; many have remained under consideration without determination; others have been rejected. There has been some reorientation of attitude in connection with the setting up and expansion of these policies and programs. Not only have problems of personnel, science, industry, and labor been confronted, but many questions involving the interpretation of the act and the powers and responsibilities of the Commission have arisen.

Many of the key members of the Commission's staff have been employed in recent months in connection with the establishment of new policies and new administrative approaches. Many of the Commission's policies are in the process of formulation. Many of the plans of the Commission are on the drafting table. These are conditions to be reasonably expected. Fairness to the Commission dictates that additional time be allowed for the Commission to develop more definitely its administrative policies in order to justify conclusion as to the final direction of this program.

The Commission has just announced the recent test of an atomic weapon which is the culmination of researches and plans begun 3 to 4 years ago. The results of such progressive developments cannot now be adequately or properly evaluated as to their long-range effect upon the national needs.

In the field of patents, while the law sets up a framework for establishing a program for patent acquisition and compensation, no such program has as yet been finally established in this field hitherto sacred to the individual.

Recent events have shown that labor-management disputes in vital installations have threatened continuity of operation. In one instance a settlement was had 2 hours after the so-called dead line for a walk-out. At the time of filing this report, this same installation is again in the throes of a labor dispute and is presently operating as a result of injunction proceedings instituted under the Taft-Hartley Act. The effective period of that injunction is rapidly running out. The joint committee is determined that labor-management policies be reliably established so that continuity of operation can be assured in these vital plants. The joint committee has held hearings on this subject, but no satisfactory formula was presented or developed. The joint committee has asked the Atomic Energy Commission to provide it with its plans for the accomplishment of this purpose. The joint committee is aware that the Atomic Energy Commission is also vitally interested in the accomplishment of this purpose, but the Commission has not as yet developed its specific proposals for the reliable solution of this problem.

The Commission recently has begun to put into effect a changing theory of sectional operation of the program which is in the nature of decentralization. This method of operation may have much to recommend it but only experience can demonstrate whether or not it is a progressive move.

While many advisory groups have been set up by law and by the Commission, to give it advice and suggestions as to the development of pertinent phases of the atomic energy program, it is to be noted that the joint committee has received few reports of these advisory groups and, therefore, is in no position to reliably gage either the extent of these recommendations or the degree to which such recommendations have been accepted and put into effect or held in abeyance, or rejected, by the Commission.

In a number of areas the joint committee has requested, from the Commission and other vital coordinating agencies, information, conclusions, and recommendations which will aid in evaluating the national program and its operation. Information has not as yet been furnished to the joint committee enabling it to fully comprehend or determine long-range goals of production and operation policies of the Commission. This reference is not made by way of criticism but merely to indicate that the composite circumstances involved in our public affairs and within our economy create a certain indefiniteness that needs time and the unfolding of events before long-range policies can be fully justified.

It is to be noted that the Military Liaison Committee, the vital link between the defense establishments and the Atomic Energy Commission, has undergone a reorganization within very recent weeks. What the beneficial results of this action may be cannot be presently evaluated.

Due to the nature of the Commission's operation, its budgetary and accounting problems are ramified and very extensive. The accounting situation has been more complicated because of the fact that under previous wartime operation of this project necessitating complete secrecy, utmost speed, etc., standardized accounting procedures were not in effect; therefore, historic detailed costs are not fully available. A satisfactory system has not yet been set up. This fact is recognized by the Appropriations Committees of the Congress as well as by the Commission itself in its most recent report of February 2, 1948.

It is to be noted that, in addition to strict scientific and production activities of the Commission, it is involved, under existing policies, in the operation of cities and towns within the project. The problems of such operations are under serious consideration, both by the Commission and by the joint committee. Complicated problems of jurisdiction, of administrative authority, of voting rights, including prerogatives attendant upon residence, town management, court jurisdiction, heavy subsidies, schooling, public utilities, and other problems, demand careful and more mature experience and examination before any final policies with respect thereto can be adopted by the Congress or by the Commission.

A vital section of the efficient and progressive advancement of atomic science is the reactor program. Recently a basic change in the operation of this program has been decided upon and certain preliminary steps to effectuate this change have been undertaken. The operation of this proposed program will be and must be continuously under the most careful observation for a substantial period of time. Only experience can evaluate this move.

The importance of establishing satisfactory and adequate personnel programs in the operation of this project is evident. The necessity for security cannot be disputed. Policies for assuring the personnel security of the project under conditions of fairness to individuals but at the same time protecting inviolate the rights of the public and the integrity of this national venture, have been and still are in a state of study and trial. The Commission has been searching for a final formula and the joint committee has been concerned with the necessity that a reliable formula be established.

The unsettled international situation has a direct effect upon the pattern of our atomic energy program. Had a satisfactory system of international control been established certain provisions of the Atomic Energy Act, in due time, would have automatically become void and many vital powers of the Commission would have been transferred to an international agency. It is now conceded, however, after nearly 2 years of exhaustive effort in the United Nations, that satisfactory

universal agreement for reliable international control of atomic energy is presently impossible. Only time and maturing events will enable us to determine the permanent direction of our administrative policies in this field.

It is important to emphasize that these matters which have been referred to are conditions which suggest the formative nature of our atomic energy program and by no means indicate a lack of progress. Further, they must not be interpreted as a criticism of the Commission or as evidence that the joint committee lacks confidence in the present Commission. Since the confirmation of the Commissioners on April 9, 1947, very definite progress has been made in our atomic energy program. This fact is encouraging but would in no way justify any hasty conclusions based upon insufficient knowledge as to the advisability of any particular permanent administrative pattern in this gigantic but infant national venture.

On January 30, 1948, your joint committee filed a unanimous report to each House of the Congress and, clearly recognizing the present inadequacy of the cumulative information and the definite need for continued examination before a final conclusion of any kind could be drawn about the long-range administration of this program, stated:

"As a legislative committee, it does not feel that it should at this time draw any final conclusions respecting the operation of this program or the administrative policies in effect. Sufficient time has not elapsed to warrant conclusions of this kind. This is not to be construed either as an attitude of hostility or an attitude of approval, but on the contrary expresses an attitude on the part of the committee to objectively evaluate the various phases of the program as a result of more mature opportunity."

The passage of this bill will immediately give assurance of uninterrupted continuity in office for 2 years and 2 months following the date of this report during which the present Commission can continue without disruption or without the necessity of reappointment. Any programs and policies now under way can be observed and brought into substantial operation; it will give approximately 2 years more for the over-all evaluation of the atomic energy program and its theory of operation. It will insure continuity and confidence and it will give assurance of continuity of operation and program upon which all employees, contractors, and consultants, may rely.

The joint committee strongly emphasizes to the Congress that in the performance of its duty it has conducted, and intends to conduct, its business relating to atomic energy and to the Atomic Energy Commission on a totally nonpolitical basis. The joint committee unequivocally declares its determination to support the best and most progressive atomic-energy program which can be developed to maintain our preeminence in this field. The committee has been guided, at all times, by one paramount principle and that is to maintain a course of conduct which will best serve to build confidence in, acceptance of, and support for a sound and vigorous atomic-energy program. This is essential for the safety of the United States and for the peace of the world. It is in furtherance of this principle that your committee considered this legislation.

Your committee therefore recommends that the bill do pass.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—HOWARD HUGHES INVESTIGATION—MINORITY VIEWS (PT. 3A OF REPT. NO. 440)

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, under a previous order of the Senate, Members of the minority of the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program were granted until the 15th of May to file their views on the report concerning the Howard Hughes investigation. Due to the unfortunate circumstances which prevailed on Friday, I did not ask unanimous consent that the time be extended until today, as I intended, and the time has now actually expired. However, at this time I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. McGRATH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], and myself, to file minority views.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the minority views will be received and printed.

AIRCRAFT INVESTIGATION—MAJORITY VIEWS (PT. 3B OF REPT. NO. 440)

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, from the Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program, I ask unanimous consent to file a report on the aircraft investigation containing the majority views. I should like to file it at the same time the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] files the minority views.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the report will be received and printed.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on May 14, 1948, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2287) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TAFT, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Henry R. O'Brien, and several other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

John L. Lewis, Jr., and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Edward J. Driscoll, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service;

Sylvia Ginsberg, and sundry other candidates for appointment in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service; and

Fonda L. Dickson, to be dietitian (equivalent to the Army rank of major) in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

(Mr. CORDON introduced Senate bill 2675, to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BALL:

S. 2676. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey a certain parcel of land in St. Louis County, Minn., to the University of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2677. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the Postal Service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945, with respect to clerks in air mail field railway post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2678. A bill granting exemption from income tax in the case of retirement pensions and annuities of governmental employees; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2679. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine the amounts due to and render judgment upon the claims of the employees of the Alaska Railroad for overtime work performed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 2680. A bill to enhance further the security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information concerning the cryptographic systems and the communication intelligence activities of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services

By Mr. TAYLOR:

S. 2681. A bill for the relief of Charles Jeszua Kratka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. TAYLOR also introduced Senate bill 2682, to prohibit the segregation of persons in the public schools of the District of Columbia on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 2683. A bill declaring certain Crow Indians to be competent members of the Crow Tribe; and

S. 2684. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to Frederick Knows Gun a patent in fee to certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WILEY (for Mr. McCARRAN):

S. 2685. A bill for the relief of the city of Reno, Nev.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS:

S. 2686. A bill to establish the Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration, to provide for the rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 2687. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth and Lawrence Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original bill (S. 2688) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to sec. 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, which was ordered to be placed on the calendar, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2689. A bill for the relief of Rozalia Venczel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 2690. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 2691. A bill authorizing the transfer to the United States Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, by the War Assets Administration of a portion of Fort Brown at Brownsville, Tex., and adjacent border area, without exchange of funds or reim-

bursement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAIN (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. J. Res. 216. Joint resolution to authorize the cancellation and release and satisfaction of an agreement dated December 31, 1923, entered into between the port of Seattle and the United States of America, represented by the United States Shipping Board, acting through the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRESERVATION OF AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP FOR CERTAIN PUERTO RICANS

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the purpose of saving for certain citizens of Puerto Rico who find it necessary to leave Puerto Rico and be in foreign lands for a period of more than 5 years the citizenship which was conferred upon them by this Government in 1917.

In connection therewith I request that a brief statement which I have prepared relating to this subject be printed in the RECORD.

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

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2675) to amend the Organic Act of Puerto Rico, introduced by Mr. CORDON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The statement submitted by Mr. CORDON was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, I am introducing for consideration by the Senate a bill which would prevent certain American citizens in Puerto Rico from losing their citizenship. Under section 404 (c) of the Nationality Act of 1940, a person who has become a national by naturalization loses his nationality by residing continuously for 5 years in any foreign state, with certain exceptions.

As you know, Mr. President, the United States acquired Puerto Rico as a result of the Spanish-American War. In 1900 the Congress gave the island a temporary civil government. This was under the terms of the Foraker Act.

Thus, all inhabitants who were Spanish subjects on April 11, 1899, and who continued to reside in Puerto Rico were declared to be citizens of Puerto Rico unless they elected to preserve their allegiance to the Spanish Crown. Under the Organic Act given to Puerto Rico in 1917, these people were declared citizens of the United States.

So we see that all Puerto Rico American citizens who were Spanish subjects on April 11, 1899, acquired citizenship in 1917 by process of collective naturalization. These people are naturalized American citizens within the concepts of the law.

I find it difficult to believe that when Congress enacted the Nationality Act of 1940, it intended to take away the citizenship, which it was so generous in giving, from Puerto Ricans affected by the law—those who found it necessary to reside in a foreign country for five continuous years.

We know, Mr. President, that Puerto Rico's vast population is splashing over the sides of the tiny island. By and large, Puerto Rico is poor in opportunity. Many in the island—mostly of the middle class—have found that because of their bilingual skills, Spanish and English, there are attractive employment and business opportunities within countries in Latin America.

The Nationality Act of 1940 requires that Puerto Ricans who gained citizenship by the process of collective naturalization, which I have described, must return to American soil once within each 5-year period if they are to remain full-fledged Americans within the meaning of the law. These people are Americans, and they wish to remain so, and they do return from foreign lands so as to preserve their status, but oftentimes at great hardship, financially and otherwise. It seems unrealistic and arbitrary, Mr. President, that they be required to do so.

The Eightieth Congress has been generous to Puerto Rico. It has given them the first measure of greater self-government since 1917. It gave them the first change in the Organic Act. New Deal controlled Congresses, with all of their liberal claims, failed to take a single step toward granting more liberal home rule for Puerto Rico.

In November, Puerto Rico for the first time will elect a governor. This was made possible by an act of this Congress during its first session. The senior Senator from Nebraska has pending before this body a bill which would permit the Puerto Rico Legislature to fix the salaries of public officials in the island.

We are giving these people greater responsibility at home. In 1917 we made them citizens of the United States. If they are to be citizens at all, let us make them full citizens.

PROHIBITION OF SEGREGATION IN DISTRICT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I believe racial segregation to be a part of the trappings of one of the most viciously un-American activities being practiced in America today, the denial of full civil rights to a large segment of our population. I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill, a companion measure to House bill 4688, introduced by Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York, which would direct the District of Columbia Board of Education to permit no segregation of persons in the public schools of the District of Columbia because of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry.

Mr. President, the recent action of Dr. William Jansen, New York superintendent of schools, in canceling a trip to Washington by 51 outstanding New York school boys, has pointed out the problem anew. Those boys had been selected because they were outstanding in safety patrol work. Four of their number were Negroes. Superintendent Jansen found that, if he took his boys to the Nation's Capital, they would be subjected to segregation.

They could not eat in the same public restaurants. They could not be put up at the same hotels. He apparently decided that it would not be an inspiring demonstration in American democracy, and so the trip was canceled.

Dr. Jansen's decision was the only one possible for any official who believes that the Constitution and American principles mean what they say.

I should like to make it possible for Americans to hold their heads high and act like Americans at least in their Nation's Capital. Further I should like to make this possible throughout our great land, but surely we must start in the show place of the United States—at the very seat of our Government.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2682) to prohibit the segregation of persons in the public schools of the District of Columbia on account of race, color, creed, national origin, or ancestry, introduced by Mr. TAYLOR, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF IMMIGRATION SYSTEM

Mr. REVERCOMB submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 236), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 137, of the Eightieth Congress, agreed to July 26, 1947 (providing for a full and complete investigation of our entire immigration system), is hereby continued until March 1, 1949, and the limit of expenditures under such resolution is hereby increased by $50,000.

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENT

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed, as follows:

On page 7, line 18, to strike out "$195,084,400" and insert "$198,384,400."

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MOORE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4071) to amend sections 301 (k) and 304 (a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

CONTRACT SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1944—AMENDMENT

Mr. ECTON (for himself and Mr. FULBRIGHT) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 5040) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, to provide that claims under section 17 must be filed within 6 months to be allowable, to stop further accrual of such claims, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PROTECTION OF LIFE AND PROPERTY, ETC., IN MIDDLE RIO GRANDE VALLEY, N. MEX.—AMENDMENT

Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 2571) to authorize the protection of life and property, water conservation, and the comprehensive reclamation of land in the Middle Rio Grande Valley in New Mexico, by flood control, irrigation, sediment detention, drainage, and other activities; to provide for the financial rehabilitation of the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, and for other purposes which was referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. GURNEY, and by unanimous consent the Committee on Armed Services was discharged from the

further consideration of the bill (S. 2433) to except the Panama Railroad Company from the Federal Tort Claims Act, and it was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained consent to be absent from the Senate for the remainder of the week.

Mr. BARKLEY, by request, asked and obtained consent that Mr. O'DANIEL be excused from attendance on the Senate for approximately 10 days.

MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works to sit and hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

He also asked and obtained consent for the Committee on Finance, considering the oleomargarine tax repeal, to sit and hold hearings during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to hold a meeting during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. SALTONSTALL asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services to hold hearings during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

FREE JUDGES AND FREE PEOPLES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Free Judges and Free Peoples," delivered by him before the Ohio State Bar Association, at Toledo, Ohio, May 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PALESTINE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BREWSTER

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on the subject of Palestine, at St. Louis, Mo., on May 16, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

OIL, GUNS, AND HONOR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHAVEZ

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Oil, Guns, and Honor," delivered by him to the Fighters for a Free Palestine, Madison Square Garden, New York City, May 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

SALUTE TO THE JEWISH STATE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the Salute to the Jewish State by the American Committee of Jewish Writers, Artists, and Scientists, at the Polo Grounds, New York, May 15, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

UTAH REFLECTED IN HER SONS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Utah Reflected in Her Sons," broadcast by him over the facilities of Station KSL, Salt Lake City, Utah, May 11, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN EDUCATION—ADDRESS BY MRS. EUGENE MEYER

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Equal Opportunity in Education," delivered by Mrs. Eugene Meyer, of the Washington Post, at the Conference on Human Rights: Civil and Cultural, at Howard University, Washington, D. C., May 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY INCREASE FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES — EDITORIAL FROM FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Justified Pay Raise," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES LANDHOLDINGS—EDITORIAL FROM THE FORT WORTH STAR-TELEGRAM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "United States Landholdings," published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram of April 13, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDRESS BY HENRY A. WALLACE

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the national defense delivered by Hon. Henry A. Wallace, March 19, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIAL TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE CLINTON P. ANDERSON

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial tribute to Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson, from the Washington Post of May 14, 1948, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENT'S "OFF RECORD" REMARKS TO NEWSPAPER EDITORS AND PUBLISHERS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by V. Y. Dallman, editor of the Illinois State Register, of Springfield, Ill., commenting on a recent address delivered by the President at a dinner of newspaper publishers and editors, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECOGNITION OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE

[Mr. BREWSTER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial on the recognition of the State of Israel, from the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, May 16, 1948; which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVIL-SERVICE APPOINTMENTS OF HANDICAPPED PERSONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4236) to amend the Civil Service Act to remove certain discrimination with respect to the appointment of persons having any physical handicap to positions in the classified civil service, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. LANGER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. CHAVEZ conferees on the part of the Senate.

RULES FOR PREVENTION OF COLLISIONS ON CERTAIN INLAND WATERS, ETC.—CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF BILL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 200, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill H. R. 3350, an act relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes, the Clerk of the House is authorized and directed to make the following corrections:

Strike out in lines 5 and 9, page 12, of the engrossed bill, the words "Secretary of War" and insert "Secretary of the Army."

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate concur in the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, at the earliest possible opportunity I intend to renew my motion to recall from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs the bill relating to statehood for Hawaii. In the meantime I hope Members of the Senate will familiarize themselves with this situation as fully as possible.

Toward this end I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Evening Star of Friday, May 14, entitled "While Hawaii Waits"; also an article entitled "Time Fast Running Out for Hawaiian Statehood," written by Secretary of the Interior J. A. Krug, and published in the Washington Star of May 16, 1948; also an editorial entitled "Investigating Hawaii," published in this morning's Washington Post.

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

[From the Washington Evening Star of May 14, 1948]

WHILE HAWAII WAITS

Senator KNOWLAND's resolution to discharge the Senate Public Lands Committee from further consideration of the Hawaiian statehood bill should be approved. There is no legitimate reason for keeping that bill bottled up another year in committee, while another delightful junket to the islands is arranged. The people of Hawaii have met every test for statehood. They are overwhelmingly in favor of it. They have been investigated, as to their fitness, inside and out. The House has passed the bill. The two political parties have favored statehood under conditions which have been met. It is probable that if the bill reached the Senate floor Hawaii would become a State now.

That is the principle at stake in the Knowland resolution. Every fair-minded citizen will concede the wisdom of the power over legislation which is vested in congressional committees. It is only when a committee's use of this power raises serious questions of justice and right that it is ever questioned. And on those rare occasions when it is, the record and the facts should decide the issue.

A House investigating committee visited the islands in 1935, was favorably impressed, but recommended another investigation of the statehood issue by a joint committee. A joint committee visited the islands 2 years later, was favorably inclined but recommended a plebiscite so the people themselves could make a decision. The 1940 plebiscite favored

statehood by 2 to 1. The war delayed further progress, but a House subcommittee, visiting the islands in 1946, unanimously recommended immediate statehood. The bill was kept in the House committee another year, but the House approved it last spring.

Senator CORDON, of Oregon, visited the islands for the Senate Public Lands Committee, heard the testimony of more than 200 witnesses, and last March made a report recommending immediate statehood. In April the committee decided to get the views of people living in continental United States. The testimony it received was overwhelmingly favorable. But it has decided to defer the bill's report. What for? While members of the committee make another journey to the islands this summer.

There are arguments against statehood. They are not particularly convincing, but they deserve to be heard. The place for them now is on the Senate floor, not the cloakrooms. If the bill is to be defeated after debate, that is one thing. But it is highly unjust to the people of Hawaii and prejudicial to our own interests as a Nation to keep delaying a test that should come now, especially when the delay is based on the pretense that the committee is looking for some information that it does not now possess.

The Knowland resolution deserves approval because in simple justice the question of Hawaiian statehood should come before the Senate now.

[From the Washington Sunday Star of May 16, 1948]

TIME FAST RUNNING OUT FOR HAWAIIAN STATEHOOD—SECRETARY KRUG WONDERS IF, LIKE BANQUO'S GHOST, THE FORTY-NINTH STATE QUESTION WILL PLAGUE NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

(By J. A. Krug, Secretary of the Interior)

(The Department of the Interior has administrative supervision over the Territorial possessions of the United States. Secretary Krug favors statehood not only for Hawaii but also for Alaska.)

Is the plea of Hawaiian statehood, like Banquo's ghost, to return again and again to plague a troubled national conscience? In a world filled with constant attack against the institutions of democratic government, can we afford to turn down this plea and leave the integrity of our Territorial policy open to doubt and challenge?

The answers to these questions now rest solely with the United States Senate—and unless the Senate acts promptly and favorably upon a measure already passed by the House of Representatives, statehood will be denied to a long-patient people for at least two more years, and our Government will be doing more than any alien subversive force to undermine our prestige in the islands.

Up to now, the whole of the Senate has had no opportunity for action on the admission of Hawaii into the Union as the forty-ninth State. The bill for statehood (known as H. Res. 49) has been languishing in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This committee by a vote of 7 to 5, finally tabled the bill after several previous delays. The reason given for the committee's action: The need for further on-the-scene investigation.

Surely, the long record shows conclusively that there is no further need to investigate the fitness of the Hawaiian people for statehood. Since 1935, five congressional committees have inquired into every conceivable facet of the statehood question. In 1938, a joint committee found the Hawaiian people qualified for admission, but postponed action in view of the rising crisis in the Pacific. The committee, however, recommended the holding of a plebiscite which, in 1940, resulted in a 2-to-1 vote for statehood. In these exhaustive congressional inquiries, more than 550 witnesses filled more than 3,000 pages of testimony—so overwhelmingly supporting admission that the committees of 1946 and 1947 unanimously recommended legislation granting immediate statehood.

HOUSE ACTED PROMPTLY

On January 3, 1947, the opening day of the Eightieth Congress, the Hawaiian Delegate, JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, introduced the pending resolution, authorizing immediate admission of Hawaii and action came swiftly in the House of Representatives. Within 4 days, the House committee opened its inquiry. On March 22, it unanimously recommended immediate passage of H. R. 49, and on June 30 the House approved the legislation, 197 to 133.

On the Senate side, it was originally anticipated that the full Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs would visit the islands some time during November or December for an on-the-spot investigation, but these plans were canceled with the call for the special session of the Eightieth Congress to consider the emergency legislation (1) for aid to European recovery, and (2) for control of the mounting inflation crisis at home.

Consequently, Chairman CORDON, of the Senate subcommittee, was directed to make his own investigation in behalf of the full committee, in which he was most capably assisted by Judge Carl E. Wimberly, of the Circuit Court of the Second Judicial District of the State of Oregon.

On March 15 Senator CORDON reported exhaustively and eloquently in behalf of statehood, urging immediate approval by the full committee of the Senate, of H. R. 49. However, the full committee felt it best to order an additional subcommittee hearing in Washington to offer opportunity for any last-minute opinion that might wish to present itself from the mainland of the United States.

NO OPPONENTS SHOWED

On April 15 this hearing was held in Washington, and no appearance was entered by any opponent of Hawaiian statehood. On the same date the Gallup poll, in its third national survey on the subject, reported that the American people favored admission of Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State by more than 4 to 1. The tally showed: For statehood, 66 percent; against, 15 percent; no opinion, 19 percent.

Certainly on the record up to this point, there was no apparent reason for further delay. But if Hawaiian hopes were high, they were dashed when, on April 19 and again on May 4, the full committee held closed sessions without any action, and finally, on May 7, when it voted against recommending statehood at this time, announcing that it wanted time to make another on-the-spot investigation.

One of the ardent champions of statehood, Senator KNOWLAND (Republican, of California), at once introduced a motion to force the bill out of the committee, and upon the success of this motion, and subsequent favorable action by the Senate, rests the hopes of statehood in this session. I am well aware of the crushing pressure of other legislative business. But I also know that national security rests upon moral as well as economic and military strength, and I join the many Americans who feel that the good faith of the Government will be compromised by further delay.

Often in the past, the political and economic justifications for Hawaiian statehood have failed to receive their proper attention—understandably so because of the predominant interest in the strategic military value of the islands and in their attraction as the paradise of the Pacific.

In view of their underlying importance in fixing our national mind upon the unforgettable objective of statehood, I believe that some of the basic findings of the recent congressional inquiries, as they concern the political and economic justifications for statehood, can profitably be summarized here.

The political-social background. The inquiries show that the Hawaiian people not only have evidenced great enthusiasm for complete self-government, but also have demonstrated more than sufficient competence in handling their own affairs within the limited means given them. The record shows that about 40 percent of the eligible voting population registers and goes to the polls in local elections, as against United States average of 42 percent—a comparison highly favorable to the Hawaiian people, considering that they cannot vote for President or Governor, and that all of their judges and magistrates, as well as numerous other officials at the local level, are not elected but appointed.

RACIAL ARGUMENT

Because of the diverse origins of the present population of Hawaii, one of the shopworn arguments against statehood has been the fear that racial groups in the islands would vote strictly along racial lines. By racial groups, those advancing this argument usually mean only the citizens of Japanese birth or descent, and an accompanying fear has been that the Japanese would constantly strive to create racial discord and thereby prepare a fertile field for subversive activities.

Established electoral practices in the islands have shown that bloc voting by racial groups has presented no problem whatsoever. There is no justifiable reason to fear that it would present any future obstacle to the achievement of a government free from inordinate racial pressures. Moreover, it is now conceded by military intelligence agencies of our Government, that not one single act of espionage or sabotage was committed by any resident of the islands of Japanese birth or descent, either before or after Pearl Harbor.

Another often-expressed argument has to do with the fear that communism was making sufficient gains in the islands as to affect their economic and political well-being. Indeed, I am informed that this was a prevalent fear among the opponents of statehood in the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. But here again, Senator CORDON's report serves to reassure any doubtful and laggard soul. It shows quite clearly that the allegations of Communist activities and the threats of communism, are no different in Hawaii than they are in the United States.

FISCAL RECORD GOOD

The economic background. The fiscal policies of the islands and the general economic condition, now and for years past, completely demonstrate a fitness for statehood. There is need to quote only a few typical statistics: Hawaii pays more in Federal taxes than 14 States of the Union and the percentage of individuals filing income-tax returns exceeds that in 26 States. The assessed value of real estate in the islands is greater than that of any State at the time of admission into the Union, with the exception of Oklahoma. Commerce between Hawaii and continental United States, from 1935 to 1940, was exceeded only by the trade between the United States and the largest of foreign nations. Obviously, economically, as well as politically, Hawaii has earned its long overdue dividend of statehood.

Fourteen times since 1900—when the Congress passed the Hawaiian Organic Act creating a Territorial government in the traditional American pattern, directly implying eventual statehood after meeting the fair requirements of a tutelage in self-government—the Hawaiian Legislature, elected by the people of the islands, has requested Congress to redeem its pledge and admit Hawaii into the Union. The historical way of evolution from Territory to statehood has been followed faithfully since the inception of this Government. As we built the Nation

and the Thirteen Colonies westward to the Pacific, we kept faith with those who pushed back the frontiers, settled the land and built the cities, established and made permanent the institutions of free government. Let us keep faith now with those who have established and made permanent our free way of life far out in the Pacific.

As the whole record shows, Hawaii statehood has not been a partisan issue, and as the member of a Democratic President's Cabinet, specifically charged with the Federal Government's relations with Hawaii, I readily and wholeheartedly offer as my own argument these last two paragraphs from Senator CORDON's excellent report to the Senate:

"Hawaii has met the requirements for statehood. It is the chairman's opinion that the Territory has served a satisfactory pupilage in the limited self-government permitted by the organic act. It is able and ready to accept the social, political, and economic responsibilities of State government as well as the advantages.

"As a State, it could more effectively manage its own affairs and contribute to the welfare of the Nation. As a Nation, the United States, by granting statehood to Hawaii at this juncture in history, could demonstrate to the world that it means what it says and practices what it urges when advocating true democracy for all peoples."

To this, I would like to add just one final thought. Liberation has become a much misused word—but the United States demonstrated that liberation of the Philippines meant not only that, but also actual, working independence. That's what the people of the Philippines, by demonstrable action, wanted. The Hawaiian people, by demonstrable action, have long wanted statehood. If we are to give it to them this year—and we owe it to them—time is fast running out.

[From the Washington Post of May 17, 1948]

INVESTIGATING HAWAII

What hope remains for Hawaiian statehood legislation in this session of Congress is embodied in the Knowland resolution scheduled to be brought up this week on the Senate floor. Senator KNOWLAND proposes to discharge the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs from further consideration of the statehood enabling bill and place it before the Senate as a whole. This cannot be considered a slight to the committee, for it had 10 months in which to act after the House passed the companion bill last summer. Members of the committee had a chance to conduct an on-the-spot study thir winter if they had wished; the one member who did go to Hawaii as a subcommittee, Senator CORDON, returned with a warm endorsement of statehood now.

Senators should take a lively interest in the resolution if for no other reason than that the pledge of statehood was contained in the 1944 platforms of both major political parties. The 7 to 5 decision of the committee to delay action in favor of another investigation amounts to a negation of that pledge and, if allowed to stand, would make futile the good work of the House. Moreover, the close vote by which the committee turned down the statehood bill emphasizes the desirability of bringing the matter to the attention of the entire Senate.

As compelling a statement as we have seen of the justification for Hawaiian statehood now comes from Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, himself the executive of a disfranchised Territory:

"Hawaii is the finest example under the flag of the welding of alien peoples of diverse racial strain into Americans. America is above all else an idea. * * * I do not know how we can better manifest our faith in that idea and aid in its spread than by admitting to statehood a community of Americans who have more than met every test and who are peculiarly and strikingly the embodiment of that idea."

What Governor Gruening says applies with particular relevance to the suggestion of another investigation, this time on the subject of communism in the islands. Hawaii already has been surfeited with investigations. There is no reason to believe that communism is any more prevalent in Hawaii than anywhere else in the American Union; indeed, conditions in Hawaii are such as to discourage its growth. This much, however, is certain: further delay in granting residents of Hawaii the rights promised them on annexation 50 years ago would give the Communists an excellent sounding board. For what purpose does territoryship exist if not to prepare such communities for full-fledged membership in the Union?

COUNTING OF ELECTORAL VOTE

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the Herald News of Fall River, Mass., there appeared recently an editorial entitled "Every Vote Would Count," which describes the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 200, which is the constitutional amendment to count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote in electing a President and Vice President of the United States. This measure has been favorably reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee, and unanimously by the House Judiciary Committee. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

"EVERY VOTE WOULD COUNT"

This time it looks as if Congress would get around to action which will change the method of electing a President. Every 4 years, when the complicated procedure leading up to the vote of the Electoral College has been followed, criticism of the system has been general. Voters protested that they had no direct voice in the choice, and that minorities of the citizens were entirely disregarded. But in a short time after the elections, the protest has died out, and nothing has been done to change the situation.

Now a proposal has been advanced by Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., of Massachusetts which has gained the approval of the Senate Judiciary Committee and has inspired a similar measure for the House committee. It would make possible the crediting of the votes of all parties in determining which candidate had the strongest support throughout the Nation. For example, if one candidate had won two-thirds of the popular vote in a State, two-thirds of the number of electors for that State would be counted for him, while one-third of the number would be divided among the other candidates, according to the relative vote each had secured. At present, the candidate who had two-thirds of the vote would be given the full number of the State's electors, and the one-third of the vote would not be represented.

Present action by Congress, if it should accept such a proposal, would be a recommendation for an amendment to the Constitution, which would have to win the support of three-fourths of the States.

NOMINATION OF JESS LARSON TO BE WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in connection with the consideration of the nomination of Jess Larson to be War Assets Administrator I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a biographical sketch of the nominee.

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

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JESS LARSON

Born June 22, 1904, Mill Creek, Indian Territory.

Educated public schools, Missouri, Military Academy, Mexico, Mo., and University of Oklahoma. Completed 3 years arts and sciences and 1 year law at University of Oklahoma, 1926.

Assumed active management of family business consisting of ranching, dairying, and creamery enterprises in southwestern Oklahoma with headquarters at Chickasha, Okla. Continued until May 1929 when father's health was restored and he again assumed active control of business.

Elected mayor of Chickasha, Okla., and served from June 1929 to June 1933. Continued study of law in offices of Barefoot & Carmichael at Chickasha, Okla., during period in which he was serving as mayor.

Elected president of Oklahoma Municipal League, 1931 and 1932.

From 1933 until January 1, 1935, again assumed the management of family business as indicated above.

Admitted to Oklahoma State bar in January 1935.

Appointed secretary to the commissioners of the land office of the State of Oklahoma in February 1935.

In this capacity, actively managed and supervised all of the operations of the land department of the State of Oklahoma, consisting of approximately $200,000,000 in assets divided between land, oil holdings, farm mortgages, State, municipal, and Government bonds. Refinanced approximately $35,000,000 in farm mortgages between 1935 and 1939, resulting in a reduction in delinquencies of mortgages held by the State from approximately 95 percent delinquent down to 21 percent delinquent. Organized and supervised sale of foreclosed and original grant land held by the State to the extent of approximately 300,000 acres ranging in size from 40 acres to 3,000 acres.

From January 1, 1939, to September 16, 1940, engaged in the private practice of law in Oklahoma City, representing contractors and dealers in municipal securities. Also advised and assisted E. W. Marland, former Governor of the State of Oklahoma and president of the Marland Oil Co., in the liquidation of oil holdings and real estate.

Inducted into the Federal service with the Oklahoma National Guard, Forty-fifth Infantry Division, on September 16, 1940, and promoted from rank of major to lieutenant colonel.

Served as executive officer to Gen. Raymond S. McLain, division Artillery commander, until January 1942.

In January 1942 assumed command of One Hundred and Sixtieth Field Artillery Battalion, Forty-fifth Infantry Division, and went overseas with this unit in May 1943.

Landed in north Africa and participated in landings on Sicily in July 1943.

Landed with the unit at Salerno on September 8, 1943. Wounded in combat at the crossing of the Volturno River in Italy in November 1943.

Evacuated to United States and assigned as instructor in the Field Artillery school at Fort Sill, Okla., in January 1944. Later advanced to head of department of tactics of the Field Artillery school.

Promoted to colonel in October 1944.

Ordered to duty with the Chief of Staff, War Department, Washington, D. C., July 7, 1945.

Assigned to committee created by section V of the National Defense Act to reorganize the National Guard and the Organized Reserve Corps.

Participated in such reorganization until July 1946; then transferred to duty with War

Assets Administration and assigned as assistant general counsel.

Assistant general counsel, War Assets Administration, from July 1946 to December 1946, at which time was appointed general counsel, War Assets Administration.

Served as general counsel from that date until November 13, 1947, when President made appointment as Associate Administrator, War Assets Administration.

Was separated from active duty with the Department of the Army on the same date that he was sworn in as Associate Administrator, War Assets Administration.

Became acting Administrator, War Assets Administration, upon the effective date of Maj. Gen. Robert M. Littlejohn's resignation, November 28, 1947.

Appointed Administrator, War Assets Administration, by Presidential order, December 20, 1947.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I also ask permission to have printed as a part of my remarks a list containing a few of the many surplus war properties which have been approved recently for either sale or lease by the War Assets Administration. This list embraces only projects which have been approved for disposition during the past few months. The total value of such projects is approximately $75,000,000.

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

PARTIAL LIST OF WAR SURPLUS PROPERTIES APPROVED FOR SALE OR LEASE BY JESS LARSON, WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR

Sale of Jayhawk Ordnance Works, Galena, Kans., to Spencer Chemical Co., Kansas City, Mo., for $11,000,000. Approved May 12, 1948.

Sale of Malleable Iron Casting Plant located at Ashtabula, Ohio, to Lake City Malleable, Inc., for $1,600,000. Approved April 5, 1948.

Sale of Basic Magnesium Plant, Henderson, Nev., to the State of Nevada, for $24,000,000. approved April 1, 1948.

Sale of two marine turbine manufacturing plants to the Navy for $9,023,561. Approved March 31, 1948.

Sale of iron ore concentration facilities at Iron Mountain, Mo., to the Ozark Ore Co. for $340,000. Approved March 17, 1948.

Sale of Ozark Ordnance Works located at El Dorado, Ark., to the Lion Oil Co. for $10,500,000. Approved March 3, 1948.

Sale of surplus oil terminal at Jacksonville, Fla., to Navy Department for $268,664. Approved February 27, 1948.

Sale of drop hammer steel forging facilities at Harvey, Ill., to the Wyman-Gordon Co. for $2,671,025.11. Approved February 27, 1948.

Sale of surplus iron and steel foundry at Watervliet, N. Y., to Adirondack Foundries & Steel, Inc., for $257,000. Approved February 27, 1948.

Sale of Texas City, Tex., aviation gasoline plant to Republic Oil Refining Co. for $2,300,000. Approved February 24, 1948.

Sale of surplus United States Navy storehouse at New Windsor, N. Y., to Reconstruction Finance Corporation for $175,000. Approved February 16, 1948.

Sales of surplus blast furnace, located at Ironton, Utah, to Kaiser-Frazer Corp. for $1,150,000. Approved February 5, 1948.

Sale of dolomite quarry at Wingdale, N. Y., to the D. H. Litter Co., Inc., of New York, for $275,000. Approved January 23, 1948.

Sale of aircraft plant at Bristol, Pa., to the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., for $861,000, approved January 14, 1948.

Sale of partially completed electric furnace steel plant at Newport, Ky., to the International Detrola Corp., Detroit, Mich., for $1,350,000. Approved January 16, 1948.

Sale of Ozark Chemical Defense Corp., of Tulsa, Okla., to the Ozark-Mahoning Co., for $670,000. Approved January 16, 1948.

Sale of brick factory building located at Trenton, N. J., to the Daunt Corp., Brooklyn, N. Y., for $200,000. Approved January 14, 1948.

Sale of surplus unit of Douglas Aircraft Co., Inc., located at Long Beach, Calif., to county of Los Angeles, for $162,500. Approved January 9, 1948.

Sale of Kollmorgan Optical Corp., plant, located at Brooklyn, N. Y., to the New York State Institute of Applied Arts and Sciences, for $135,000. Approved January 9, 1948.

Sale of carbon-black plant at Seagraves, Tex., to the Columbian Carbon Co. for $1,420,000. Approved January 6, 1948.

Sale of milling plant located at Fredericksburg, Mo., to the St. Louis Smelting & Refining Co. for $210,000. Approved January 5, 1948.

Sale of feed recovery facilities located at Trenton, Mich., to the Trenton Chemical Co. for $75,000. Approved January 5, 1948.

Sale of fruit dehydrating plant located at Visalia, Calif., to John C. Kazanjian, of Visalia, for $22,000. Approved December 19, 1947.

Sale of a portion of the surplus Wright Aeronautical Corp. plant located at Lockland, Ohio, to the Electric Auto-Lite Co., Toledo, Ohio, for $8,400,000. Approved December 18,1947.

Ten-year lease of the Government-owned blast furnace and byproduct plant in Gadsden, Ala., to the Republic Steel Corp., Cleveland, Ohio, at a minimum guaranteed rental of $15,000 monthly for the first 3 months and $20,000 monthly, thereafter, during the life of the lease. Approved January 9, 1948.

Lease of portions of surplus magnesium plant at Spokane, Wash., to the Chromium Mining & Smelting Co. of Chicago for 5 years, with annual rentals of 2 to 6 percent, on plant valuation of $9,999,170 with such rental percentage graduated upward during the 5-year lease period. Approved February 26, 1948.

REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before we enter upon a discussion of the unfinished business, which is the civil-functions appropriation bill, I wish to make a brief comment upon an international occurrence of great importance not only to the people involved but, I believe, to the world. I refer to the creation and the present existence of the Republic of Israel, recognized first by the Government of the United States, which I think was an appropriate priority in regard to the recognition of this new member of the family of nations.

All of us are familiar with the tragic story involving the history of Palestine and the Jewish people. We are familiar with the historical conquest of that little country and of that great people, including the Roman Empire's overrunning of Palestine and the final dispersal of the Jewish people. During all these centuries, no matter where the Jew has found his home, he has in his heart held closely the ambition and the desire that ultimately there might be created in Palestine a free nation to which the Jews might resort—not all of them, of course, because no one is optimistic enough to feel that even a majority of the Jews of the world will ever live in this new republic; but it has been the historical ambition of the Jewish people that the seat of their ancient existence, their birthplace, from which they were expelled by brutal force, should ultimately become a free nation.

It is unnecessary to recount the efforts which have been made in that direction, the sacrifices and the tragedies which have followed the Jewish people from the time of their dispersal until this hour. It is unnecessary to recount the heartaches which have accompanied the efforts to establish a free, independent nation in Palestine. It is unnecessary to recount any of the mistakes which may have been made either by the Jewish people or by their friends, in or out of public office, in the effort to establish a free nation in Palestine.

When the United Nations was created, I think it was the sentiment of a vast majority of those who were familiar with the subject and the situation that the United Nations should act in such a way and render such a decision as to create a new nation which might itself become a member of the United Nations and be heard in its own defense on any proposal or any condition in which it might be concerned. Personally, I had hoped that all of Palestine might become a free nation, to be occupied and inhabited by the people of every race and every religion who might desire to remain there or to go to this new nation as a home.

The United Nations, through its proper commission, recommended the partition of Palestine, giving the Jews a certain portion of it, which was to be allotted to them for the establishment of a free, independent nation. They accepted that decision of the United Nations. I am sure that all of us had hoped that the decision of the United Nations would be recognized by all interests involved—the Arab and the Jew and non-Arab and non-Jew—who not only are concerned with the reestablishment of a home in Palestine for the Jew, but who are dedicated to the proposition that self-determination by any people is a worthy ambition for their consummation.

Unfortunately, this decision has not been accepted with the degree of cooperation and tolerance which we had a right to expect; and this is a rather strange situation, in a sense, because the amount of land involved is so infinitesimal, when compared to the total area of the world or when compared to the area of the territory occupied by the Arabs, which is so large in proportion to the area of the land involved in Palestine that it seems rather difficult to understand, certainly from any territorial viewpoint, why the Arabs oppose the creation of this small nation along the Mediterranean, to which the Jewish people may repair for citizenship and cooperation and development.

It seems to me that the creation of this nation, even under the difficulties and turmoil with which it is now surrounded, is a vindication of the United Nations. I feel confident that the recognition of this new nation by the Government of the United States is likewise a vindication of the decision of the United Nations in the partitioning of Palestine between the Jews and the Arabs.

Notwithstanding present difficulties, I sincerely hope that through the interposition of the United Nations, there

may be brought about peace in the Middle East between the Jew and the Arab, that there may be a strengthening of the new nation which has just started out upon its tempestuous career; that all the world will recognize the justice of the decision of the United Nations and the justice of our recognition of this new nation in the Middle East, and that ultimately, without further bloodshed or further fanaticism or further appeal to prejudice of any sort, this new nation among the nations of the world may find a place at the council table of the United Nations, that it may find welcome among all the other nations of the world, and that in a very short time the other nations of the world will acknowledge and recognize the creation and existence and the right to creation and existence of the new Republic of Israel.

Mr. President, I read the proclamation setting up the new government for the Republic of Israel. It seems to me so fair, so tolerant, and so broad-minded, recognizing the right of all peoples within the territory, regardless of race, creed, or ancestry, to enjoy liberty and freedom under the flag of the new Republic, that I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the proclamation creating the new Republic of Israel, in order that we may embalm in the RECORD of our proceedings this historic document.

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

The land of Israel was the birthplace of the Jewish people.

Here their spiritual, religious, and national identity was formed. Here they achieved independence and created a culture of national and universal significance. Here they wrote and gave the Bible to the world.

Exiled from Palestine, the Jewish people remained faithful to it in all the countries of their dispersion, never ceasing to pray and hope for their return and restoration of their national freedom.

Impelled by this historic association, Jews strove throughout the centuries to go back to the land of their fathers and regain statehood. In recent decades they returned in their masses. They reclaimed a wilderness, revived their language, built cities and villages, and established a vigorous and ever-growing community, with its own economic and cultural life. They sought peace, yet were ever prepared to defend themselves. They brought blessings of progress to all inhabitants of the country.

In the year 1897 the First Zionist Congress, inspired by Theodore Herzl's vision of a Jewish state, proclaimed the right of the Jewish people to a national revival in their own country.

This right was acknowledged by the Balfour Declaration of November 2, 1917, and reaffirmed by the mandate of the League of Nations, which gave explicit international recognition to the historic connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and their right to reconstitute their national home.

The Nazi holocaust which engulfed millions of Jews in Europe proved anew the urgency of the reestablishment of the Jewish state, which would solve the problem of Jewish homelessness by opening the gates to all Jews and lifting the Jewish people to equality in the family of nations.

Survivors of the European catastrophe, as well as Jews from other lands, claiming their right to a life of dignity, freedom, and labor, and undeterred by hazards, hardships, and obstacles, have tried unceasingly to enter Palestine.

In the Second World War, the Jewish people in Palestine made a full contribution in the struggle of freedom-loving nations against the Nazi evil. The sacrifices of their soldiers and efforts of their workers gained them title to rank with the people who founded the United Nations. On November 29, 1947, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution for reestablishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine and called upon inhabitants of the country to take such steps as may be necessary on their part to put the plan into effect.

This recognition by the United Nations of the right of the Jewish people to establish their independent state may not be revoked. It is, moreover, the self-evident right of the Jewish people to be a nation, as all other nations, in its own sovereign state.

Accordingly we, the members of the National Council, representing the Jewish people in Palestine and the Zionist movement of the world met together in solemn assembly by virtue of the natural and historic right of Jewish people and of resolution of the General Assembly of the United Nations:

Hereby proclaim the establishment of the Jewish state in Palestine, to be called Israel.

We hereby declare that as from the termination of the mandate at midnight this night of the 14th to 15th of May 1948 and until the setting up of duly elected bodies of the state in accordance with a constitution to be drawn up by a constituent assembly not later than the 1st day of October 1948, the present National Council shall act as the Provisional State Council and its executive organ, the National Administration, shall constitute the Provisional Government of the State of Israel.

The state of Israel will promote the development of the country for the benefit of all its inhabitants; will be based on precepts of liberty, justice, and peace taught by the Hebrew prophets; will uphold the full social and political equality of all its citizens without distinction of race, creed, or sex; will guarantee full freedom of conscience, worship, education, and culture; will safeguard the sanctity and inviolability of shrines and holy places of all religions; and will dedicate itself to the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

The state of Israel will be ready to cooperate with the organs and representatives of the United Nations in the implementations of the resolution of November 29, 1947, and will take steps to bring about an economic union over the whole of Palestine.

We appeal to the United Nations to assist the Jewish people in the building of its state and admit Israel into the family of nations.

In the midst of wanton aggression we call upon the Arab inhabitants of the state of Israel to return to the ways of peace and play their part in the development of the state, with full and equal citizenship and due representation in all its bodies and institutions, provisional or permanent.

We offer peace and amity to all neighboring states and their peoples, and invite them to cooperate with the independent Jewish nation for the common good of all. The state of Israel is ready to contribute its full share to the peaceful progress and reconstitution of the Middle East.

Our call goes out to the Jewish people all over the world to rally to our side in the task of immigration and development and to stand by us in the great struggle for the fulfillment of the dream of generations—the redemption of Israel.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement on the same subject issued on Saturday last by the distinguished President pro tempore, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

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

The prompt recognition of the provisional government as the de facto authority in the new state of Israel is the logical and proper step following the termination of the British mandate. It takes account of the reality that no other authority can fill what otherwise would be a cruel and dangerous vacuum in this area of Palestine. It responds to a basic decision of the United Nations taken at our instance. It is positive action after many months of critical and unhappy indecision. If the present course of the United States is followed by other governments, I am unable to believe that the parties in controversy cannot be successfully summoned to the bar of the United Nations in behalf of an urgent truce. The restoration of law and order and an environment of peace is indispensable to the best evolution for all concerned.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in the views expressed concerning the recognition by the United States of the state of Israel.

The state of Israel is now a reality. This significant development, after years of constant effort and suspense, should mark a turning point in the struggle of an oppressed people for just recognition of their rights and of their claims.

But more remains to be done than formal recognition of the existence of the state of Israel. Having taken the lead in according this recognition, the United States should pursue every effort consistent with our position among the family of nations to assist in the consummation of plans for the fulfillment of the destiny of the new state.

Last February 11 I addressed the United States Senate on the question of Palestine and at that time urged that the arms embargo—then and now—in effect against the Jewish inhabitants of that unfortunate country was indefensible and should be lifted promptly.

Historic events have transpired since that time. Tragic events that have brought bloodshed and death to the sacred places where once the Prince of Peace taught his lessons of good will to all. The termination of the British mandate over Palestine, and withdrawal of the troops which have maintained whatever peace there was throughout that area in recent months, have paved the way for establishment by the Jewish people of the homeland for which millions throughout the world have prayed.

Today that homeland, Israel, stands as an accomplished fact. Our own country, which in November took the lead toward bringing about the recommendation for partition by the General Assembly, now again has been the first to recognize the new state of Israel. But, the United States, after giving its sanction to partition, denied the Jewish people of Palestine access to the armaments and munitions without which they could hardly be expected to defend themselves against the aggression which everyone knew would follow any attempts to set up a separate Jewish state. So today, with that separate state estab-

lished, and in the face of all-out attacks from the air as well as by ground forces, our Nation strangely, and contradictorily, still denies the Jewish armed forces access to weapons and other military supplies. Yet these are available to their enemies from sources within the United Nations.

Let us be consistent. Our international policy should be in accord with realities. We cannot continue to welcome the new Jewish state with one hand, while with the other we hold her off from obtaining the means of defense which alone will permit her to win through this critical period of her existence. Israel deserves an opportunity to prove her ability to stand among the nations of the world as a free and sovereign state.

Let us, also, cooperate to the utmost in having Israel admitted as a member of the United Nations. In this way we will give further evidence of our readiness and willingness to aid a sovereign people in its announced plan to achieve lasting peace with the freedom-loving nations of the world.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in expressing the profound gratification of many of those who have appreciated the significance of the developments in the Middle East, in the prompt action by our Government in being the first to recognize this new state. It is born under auspices that no other state in the history of mankind has ever enjoyed, as a result of the considered conclusion of the United Nations, representing far more than two-thirds of the opinion of mankind, practically all the nations of the world outside those with large Moslem populations, in pronouncing partition as the solution of the Palestinian problem, and defining the boundaries of the state which has come into being, associated with our Government.

There were delays and variations in policy which have very greatly injured apparently our prestige in the United Nations, but at the same time expressing I think what is the strong support of many Americans for the action of our Government.

In this connection I was privileged to read the discussions yesterday in connection with the recognition of Russia, by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and the care and attention which was given to that problem at that time. I trust that there will be further clarification of the considerations which have led to this recognition, which, in my judgment, is amply justified, and also of the implications of the recommendation in the assigning of representatives to the new state that shall be selected with due regard for the very delicate problems presented. Moreover, I trust there will be an immediate lifting of the embargo upon the shipment of arms, in order that this new state may be able now to defend itself against the obvious acts of aggression which have been notified by the Government of Egypt to the Security Council of the United Nations.

I think it is anomalous and somewhat regrettable that the Government of Egypt, which was unable to raise a hand in defense of its own independence, or in association with the Allies during the late World War, should now find it expedient to use its armed forces for the invasion of Palestine, as it is said in their statement, "in order to subdue terroristic bands." The methods adopted for the subduing of terroristic bands, consisting apparently of the bombing from the air of the open city of Tel Aviv, are very curious methods to adopt, and I trust that the Security Council of the United Nations, under the agreements and under the Charter will see fit very promptly to take cognizance of actions of this character, and to take appropriate measures to see that such action by members of the United Nations shall not be permitted further to destroy the prestige of the United Nations, which has already suffered very greatly as a result of the somewhat tortuous course pursued in dealing with the Palestinian problem, which has so long challenged the statesmanship of all the world.

I am grateful for what has been done, and I trust it means that now, in the language of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the other nations of the world may see fit to follow the present policy of the United States, without deviation, and, by that method, restore somewhat the prestige of the United Nations as an instrument of preserving peace, and also contribute to the stability of this new state that has been born, which, in my judgment, may once again send to all the world a message of peace and good will, if the plain mandates of the United Nations and the Charter are now applied to this very delicate problem.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I rise to join other Senators in hailing the establishment of the new state in Palestine, the state of Israel. Its establishment has a tremendous world-wide significance and is likely to have a world-wide impact, the effect of which is hard to comprehend at the present time. I very thoroughly agree with the well-chosen remarks which have been expressed by those who have preceded me.

As I view this event from an over-all standpoint, it provides the United States and the other nations of the world with a great challenge. Upon the outcome of our ability and the world's ability, as expressed through the United Nations, to meet this challenge may depend ultimate peace for mankind. It is not my purpose unduly to express satisfaction in what appears to be a reversal of the policy of our national administration, although I do take such satisfaction; and I am very glad to note that the realities of conditions as they exist finally have been recognized. This seems to me to be a time to consider what we as a nation should do now where Palestine and the United Nations are concerned.

Mr. President, I said this situation constitutes a distinct challenge. It is a challenge to us now that our Government has reversed itself and made a decision, to pursue that decision, and to abide by it regardless of obstacles or consequences. It is a challenge to us to fulfill our own obligations where the United Nations is concerned and to see to it that, insofar as we have a responsibility to the United Nations, that responsibility shall be met in full. And it is a challenge to the United Nations to see that its machinery is made to function as effectively as possible to meet crises of this particular kind.

Much has to be done by the United Nations, much has to be done by ourselves, to insure that, out of the effort which is now being undertaken in Palestine, partition and a permanent state will be finally realized in perpetuity. Several of the steps yet to be taken by us have been mentioned, namely, the lifting of the arms embargo, the giving of as full recognition as we can give to the new state of Israel, and the realistic expression of the full sympathy which is ours toward a people struggling to be free and independent, a people who, like ourselves, have great democratic concepts imbedded deeply in their philosophy of life. They deserve our sympathy just as far as we can extend it; they deserve our moral support just as far as we can give such support; and they deserve every other appropriate kind of support which we can provide to help bring out of the present crisis the assurance that the state which has now become a reality shall live in perpetuity.

I join the rejoicing at the present time; but in the midst of rejoicing and in the midst of the satisfaction which we can take as the result of an eventuality which has followed seeming failure on our part and on the part of the United Nations to act effectively in the past, much remains to be done, and much is involved which should give us pause in contemplation of consequences which may ensue and of mighty problems which lie ahead. The struggle in Palestine is not finished; the outcome still hangs in the balance. We cannot anticipate with certainty at the present time what the ultimate results will be. We can hope; we can have faith; and we do have hope and faith. But unless the new state has the moral support of ourselves and of the United Nations in such a manner that the United Nations, through the instrumentality of the Security Council and the other available United Nations' machinery, may take appropriate and effective action; unless we are determined to see that the problem is met squarely and that the result is to be, as it should be, the complete and ultimately successful establishment of the state of Israel in Palestine, may not be realized.

Therefore, Mr. President, in closing, I repeat that it remains for us as a Nation to accept this new challenge, with which we are now faced; to stand steadfast on the decision to recognize the State of Israel; to exercise the moral influence which should be ours; and, through its exercise, to obtain through the instrumentality of the United Nations, the results and the ultimate success for which we hope and pray and which should be obtained.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I was pleased to hear the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] add his remarks to those of

the Senator from Kentucky. The matter of the recognition of Palestine comes with a great deal of satisfaction to me and, I know, to the Senator from Maine. I think we were the first advocates of that move. As the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] has said, there is much more to be done. I hope that now that we have made the decision we will stick to it and see that it is carried out.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, on last Saturday, following the recognition of the new Jewish state by the United States, the Senator from Illinois issued a statement to the press. I now ask unanimous consent that the statement issued at that time be incorporated in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

The dramatic announcement by President Truman of the recognition by the United States of the new Jewish state of Israel will strike a responsive chord in the hearts of freemen all over the world.

By the President's bold and statesmanlike act, the new Jewish state starts life under the most favorable auspices. The greatest nation in the world has given its sanction to the creation of the newest nation.

The recognition of Israel is doubly gratifying to me because throughout my public career I have struggled side by side with all men of good will in America who have worked to create a homeland for the Jews in Palestine.

The American people, remembering that their own aspiration for freedom was achieved only through force of arms, have a deep sympathy for those who now carry the banner of Israel on high.

Good morals require us to lend our material help to free nations menaced by aggression. Now that the new Jewish state has achieved recognition, and the British mandate has ended, the time has come to remove the embargo on the shipment of arms to that country.

The caliber of the men who now constitute the leaders of Israel guarantees a just and wise administration of that nation. I am satisfied that their actions in the troubled months which lie ahead will amply justify the confidence placed in them by the President of the United States and the American people.

DEATH OF FATHER FLANAGAN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is with profound sadness that I rise at this time to call attention to the Senate of the death on Saturday of Msgr. Edward J. Flanagan.

Father Flanagan was one of Nebraska's best loved citizens. He was likewise one of its most famous residents, being known the world over as the founder and developer of Boys Town.

His untimely death came in the line of duty. He died in an American military hospital in Berlin while traveling abroad to help the United States Army in the development of youth facilities in occupied areas. It was his second major trip overseas in such a capacity. A similar visit had been made by him last year in Japan and the Far East.

No word I express here today could compare with the living monument which will perpetuate the name of Father Flanagan. Boys Town, which he founded in 1917 on $90 and a burning conviction that there is no such thing as a bad boy, has grown and flourished. I doubt if there is another institution like it. Today it is one of the unique institutions of its kind in the world. It has become a vast enterprise, and in very recent years several million dollars have gone into the expansion and improvement of both the physical plant and the service to homeless youth which represent the modern Boys Town, a separate incorporated community.

The 5,000 boys who have been renewed in their belief in mankind and prepared for life during the 32 years of Father Flanagan's endeavors among them will be an ever-spreading leaven in the life of our Nation. The total benefits can never be computed.

Through his remarkable capacity, backed by his faith in God and in the soundness of the American boy, Father Flanagan overcame many obstacles in the development of his idea.

Boys Town now covers a thriving 160-acre area, on which are dormitories, business offices, grade and high schools, and other buildings. Not only are the boys cared for in a material way, but under Father Flanagan's wise policy they are trained for citizenship. They govern themselves, through a mayor and six commissioners elected every 6 months among themselves.

In Boys Town democracy rules supreme. There is no difference in treatment because of race, religion, or color. The boys are taught standard school subjects, to prepare them for successful careers. Many of them have gone to college.

As evidence of the esteem in which Father Flanagan and his achievements were held in Nebraska, he served for 10 years as president of the Omaha Welfare Board, and was accorded many honors by the citizenry, including that of Omaha's "first citizen" award by Post No. 1 of the American Legion in Omaha and the humanitarian award of the Variety Clubs of America.

In these times, when juvenile delinquency has attained such proportions throughout the world, it is fitting indeed that we pay tribute to and acclaim to all our people the achievements of Father Flanagan. Truly the world is a better world for his having lived in it. The procedures he developed in the handling of boys will be employed by others to the benefit of all youth fortunate enough to come under their beneficent influence.

All of this occurred because in the heart of this priest was a desire to help his fellow man. But Father Flanagan had more than the desire to act; he had the unique gift of leadership, and the ability to transmit his enthusiasm into the hearts of others.

Father Flanagan now has concluded his part in the task of establishing and developing Boys Town, but Father Flanagan's spirit will live as long as the hearts of men respond with compassion and generosity to prolong and expand the program for orphaned youth to which Father Flanagan gave his life.

He was a living example of the true American spirit in the highest and best form.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to join with my esteemed colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] in the very splendid statement he has made with reference to our mutual friend, the late Father Flanagan.

It was my privilege to know Father Flanagan very intimately for the past 30 years. He started his work for boys, as my colleague has just said, in 1917. I became a resident of Omaha during 1918, and immediately learned of the fine work Father Flanagan was doing, and became personally acquainted with him. I was a member of many civic boards in the city of Omaha with Father Flanagan, so I know intimately of the devout interest he took in the kind of work to which he devoted his life. I endorse everything my colleague has said with reference to this great man. My State, yes, and the Nation, have lost one of their great men. The work he has done will remain always as a monument to his memory.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senators from Nebraska in the fine tribute they have paid Father Flanagan. During the time I was Governor of my State he came to North Dakota and visited what we called at that time the State Industrial School, to which delinquent children were sent. Father Flanagan spent over a week interviewing the boys then in the school, and asking the authorities of our State to send certain of the boys to Boys Town, in Nebraska. Later Father Flanagan appeared before various congressional committees, and in my opinion made a fine contribution in behalf of finding a solution of the problem of juvenile delinquency.

The death of Father Flanagan comes as a very great loss not only to the State of Nebraska, but to the entire Nation.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, South Dakota is a neighbor of Nebraska, and as one of the representatives in the Senate of the citizens of my State, I join with my colleagues from Nebraska and North Dakota who have so eloquently expressed the thoughts of the people in our area regarding the good work done by Father Flanagan. All those residing in that area know about his devotion to the task of lifting boys to a higher level of life, and we feel that in Boys Town there is a living memorial to the work Father Flanagan has done. It furnishes a goal which many other communities could well seek to reach, for we know of the great work he has done for the young citizens, not only of our area but of the whole United States.

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5524) making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes.

Mr. GURNEY obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

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

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

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

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Ball	Hatch	Moore
Barkley	Hawkes	Morse
Brewster	Hayden	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brooks	Hill	Reed
Buck	Hoey	Revercomb
Butler	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Cain	Jenner	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Connally	Kem	Taft
Cooper	Kilgore	Taylor
Cordon	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lodge	Tydings
Dworshak	Lucas	Vandenberg
Eastland	McFarland	Watkins
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Martin	Wilson
Green	Maybank	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN] is absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business attending the funeral of the Honorable John H. Overton.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is absent because of illness.

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. MCGRATH] are members of the committee on the part of the Senate attending the funeral of the late Senator John H. Overton, of Louisiana, and are therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. UMSTEAD], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, we have now before us the civil-functions bill for the Department of the Army. It is quite evident that we cannot conclude the subject this afternoon, for the reason that we are awaiting the return of Senators attending the funeral in Louisiana of our late colleague and great friend, Senator OVERTON. They will not return until tomorrow. Nevertheless, this afternoon I wish to make the opening remarks on the bill. It is a very important measure. In view of the size of the appropriation, $708,000,000, it must receive serious consideration.

I invite the attention of Senators present in the Chamber at the moment to the book in which the hearings are printed. It contains 1,430 pages, with the index. The committee held hearings for longer than 2 weeks. The bill was reported to the Senate from the Committee on Appropriations by vote of 16 to 3.

In presenting House bill 5524, the so-called civil-functions appropriations bill, to the Senate, I should like to take a few minutes to explain briefly what the bill contains and to outline the reasons why the Senate Appropriations Committee by an overwhelming majority has recommended its passage.

The civil functions of the Army Department are varied in nature and are administered by several branches of the Army. The Corps of Engineers carries on river and harbor and flood-control work; the Quartermaster Corps has responsibility for burial of the war dead and maintains the United States Soldiers' Home; the Signal Corps operates and maintains our Alaskan communications system; and the Army Department, through General Mehaffey, maintains and operates the Panama Canal. All these are considered civil functions of the Army Department, and this bill provides the funds with which these functions are carried out.

The Budget Bureau requested that Congress appropriate $737,804,300 for Army Department civil functions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949. The House reduced this request to $606,558,766 and the Senate committee has raised the House figure to $708,586,666. The bill in its present form is below the budget request to the extent of $29,217,634. For comparison, the present bill appropriates $206,462,754 more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year.

Since the river and harbor and flood-control work carried on by the Corps of Engineers represents by far the largest percentage of the total expenditures for civil functions, it is that portion of the appropriation bill with which I want to deal in some detail.

River-and-harbor and flood-control projects come before the Appropriations Committees after they have been authorized by the Public Works Committees of Congress. Prior to such authorizations studies must have been requested by Congress. The projects in the bill now before you have been conceived and brought along thus far as a result of prior congressional action. These projects have survived a rigorous screening process. In the first place, there must be reason for the authorization for the initial study, and subsequent to such authorization these projects must run the gantlet of engineering consideration, feasibility and economics, local support, interagency concurrence, State approval, and favorable congressional action. After such projects are authorized, they are added to the backlog of projects which the Chief of Engineers has before him when he makes out his budget requests for a fiscal year.

The Corps of Engineers is a decentralized organization, with skilled engineers on the ground where the projects are located. In making up his annual budget, the Chief of Engineers calls for recommendations from his field officers. These recommendations are scrutinized carefully by the Chief of Engineers in his own office, and each project is put through, anew, the test of economic justification, to be sure that the rising benefits have more than kept pace with the rising costs. The optimum engineering construction rate is decided upon; and finally, subsequent to all these analyses, the projects are presented to the Bureau of the Budget. In his presentation of his budget to the Bureau of the Budget, the Chief of Engineers again runs the gantlet of economic necessity, possible postponement, immediate need, and so forth. The projects included in the bill now before the Senate are those which have successfully completed this administrative obstacle course.

Navigation projects are in the nondeferrable category because they actually serve one of the vital transportation needs of this country. It is interesting to note that during the last years of the recent war, great impetus was given to the construction and utilization of large and deep-draft tankers and freighters to provide more expeditious and economical transportation of foreign and coastwise cargoes. Likewise, similar progress was made in the development of large river towboats and cargo barges for similar transportation of cargoes on the rivers.

For example, before the war, the typical tanker had a draft when fully loaded of 27 feet, while our present-day fleet of T-2 tankers draws over 30 feet when loaded to capacity of 140,000 barrels—which is half again as great a load as prewar tankers carried. Bigger ships need deeper channels.

The American-flag fleet has grown from 12,000,000 deadweight tons in 1939 to 41,000,000 tons in 1947. Similarly, river tows have increased tremendously in size. While before the war the value of commodities carried in one river tow rarely exceeded $200,000, today million-dollar tows are common. Larger barges and bigger tows demand better local facilities.

All the while these tremendous advances were being made in the various types of cargo-carrying vessels, the development of navigation projects to keep pace therewith was halted by the war. Furthermore, even the maintenance of existing facilities was drastically curtailed throughout the war years. We finally took cognizance of the lag in waterway improvements, and passed the 1945 and 1946 River and Harbor Authorization Acts. Having done that, it would be foolhardy and inconsistent to fail to appropriate the implementing funds.

It is significant to note that the 1938 appropriation act, before the war, for the improvement of river and harbor projects amounted to $91,000,000. The amount the Senate committee recommends for that purpose during the fiscal year 1949

is $113,000,000—or only slightly more than we appropriated 10 years ago when domestic, foreign, and coastwise water traffic was much less than it is today. In 1938 the Engineering News-Record index for construction stood at 235. Today it stands at 440; construction costs have nearly doubled. That means that in order to accomplish the same volume of work that was done 10 years ago, we should appropriate about $180,000,000. Actually we are proposing the appropriation of only $113,000,000.

The committee believes that reasonable progress should be made toward meeting the widespread public demand for the accomplishment of work on the backlog of improved water transportation facilities that play such an important part in our present-day economy.

For many days the subcommittee had before it literally hundreds of individuals and groups representing communities large and small, spread over the entire country; 1,430 pages of hearings were taken. For the most part, they represented logical and convincing justifications for their needs. The total value of the river and harbor improvements which were recommended to our subcommittee over and above those included in the House version of the bill is $105,000,000. The subcommittee carefully scrutinized and analyzed every item presented to it; and of that $105,000,000 we added only $38,000,000 to the House version of the bill, making a total of $113,000,000 for river and harbor construction.

This civil functions appropriation bill has been characterized by some persons as a stupendous pork barrel. In a sense, I agree. I believe it is a pork barrel which will put pork chops and bacon and roast pork on millions of dinner tables all over the United States. I am in favor of that. I am in favor of any program that will help to increase our production of food and other agricultural products. There are a number of ways to stimulate agriculture temporarily and to obtain large production records for a few years, but all stop-gap measures inevitably cause serious depletion of and permanent injury to our land resources. The only way to be sure that our present efforts to help feed the world do not invite the ghost of hunger at home is for us to move rapidly toward the greatest possible conservation and preservation of our land and toward a higher permanent level of agriculture.

The projects in this bill, and particularly the flood control program contained in it, aid agriculture directly in four significant and distinct ways.

The first is the direct prevention of loss of crops and livestock which comes about when swirling flood waters engulf and destroy hundreds of thousands of acres of growing crops and pastures. Not only has the cost which has gone into such crops in the way of seed and planting and cultivation been lost forever, but the food values and industrial raw materials represented by them are lost, and employment opportunities inherent in the growing crops are wiped out forever. The disruptions caused by these losses as they spread throughout our economy are staggering to the imagination, and are fully understood only by specialized agricultural economists. However, many of us know from our own experience and observation, as well as from the vivid comments of our friends and neighbors who have been flooded out, that the economic loss and suffering to farmers are very real.

Flood control also makes it possible to grow crops where the hazard of overflow is otherwise so great that farmers are unable to risk the losses from flooding. There are hundreds of thousands, and probably millions, of acres of rich river bottomlands which now are unused and are wasting away as brush lands or are put only to a relatively unproductive type of use, simply because they are endangered by annual or more frequent inundation. Proper flood control removes this hazard from these fertile lands, and will make it possible to add these areas to our resources of rich, crop-producing lands. Here, again, the influence of greater agricultural prosperity on our entire economy and national life is extremely widespread and important. Thousands of prosperous farming communities throughout our entire Nation are convincing testimony that a sound and expanding agriculture is the backbone of our democracy.

In addition to lands subject to frequent flooding, our great country has many millions of acres of fertile land which is totally useless because it lacks adequate drainage. Our flood-control program includes many projects for the improvement of stream channels and major drainage courses in order to provide means for rainwater and snow melt to more rapidly find their way to the larger streams and eventually to the oceans. As these projects are built, it becomes feasible for drainage districts and individuals to provide the lateral drains and ditches for drying up the swampy areas and, in turn, this makes it possible to bring these lands into production.

The civil-works program also includes a number of multiple-purpose reservoir projects which include important irrigation features. In the western part of the country, practically the entire agricultural economy depends on irrigation and the only way to expand agriculture is through better conservation and use of the limited water supply which nature provides. Merely as examples of the projects in this bill which will benefit agriculture through irrigation, I cite the Folsom, Pine Flat, and Isabella Reservoirs in California and the McNary Reservoir in Oregon and Washington.

Destiny has forced upon the United States the mantle of leadership for freedom-loving peoples throughout the world. As a Nation, we have recognized our obligation in this respect and the Congress recently passed the Economic Cooperation Act which is designed to to help stabilize the economies of friendly foreign nations. To get a balanced perspective on what we are doing for foreign countries as compared to what we propose to do in this civil-functions bill for our own economy, I think some comparisons might be helpful.

As you know, Mr. President, the bill we are currently considering came out of committee with a thumping 16 to 3 majority. The three Senators who opposed this bill in committee and who have filed a minority report are recommending that the amount in the bill be scaled down $200,000,000. In that connection I think it is significant to note that under ECA it is contemplated that during the first 12 months we will spend for coal production equipment in foreign countries the sum of $49,100,000; for petroleum production equipment we will spend $42,400,000; for steel manufacturing equipment, $28,300,000; for electrical equipment, $43,300,000; and for freight cars, $53,000,000.

So, Mr. President, we are going to spend $216,100,000 to help develop the natural and industrial resources of foreign countries and yet there are those who contend that we should cut this bill down by about an equal amount. This call to aid foreign countries, in my opinion, makes it mandatory now that we proceed apace, not only for the protection of our own priceless natural resources, but quickly push this program which will make it possible for us to continue to expand our ability to produce in order also to meet these foreign demands.

I believe in the purposes of the Economic Cooperation Act, and I cast my vote for the program enthusiastically. However, to think that we can be permanently helpful to foreign countries, not to say anything of ourselves, if we neglect to protect our own resources is sheer madness, and Mr. President, this is a bill to protect our resources, as a few facts and figures will prove beyond the shadow of a doubt, in my opinion.

The total estimated reduction in damages to date from the operation of completed, and partially completed, flood-control projects amounts to approximately $4,500,000,000. Four billion five hundred million dollars has been saved so far by projects heretofore completed. Of this amount, $4,000,000,000 is credited to flood prevention in the lower Mississippi Valley since the initiation of that project. The remaining benefits creditable to flood-control projects cover a much shorter period since the general flood-control program was placed in operation subsequent to the 1936 Flood Control Act and only very few projects were placed in operation during war years.

It is estimated that the projects in the appropriation bill as passed by the House will, when completed, provide annual benefits estimated at $205,710,000 of which $141,230,000 are flood-control benefits and $40,950,000 power benefits; the remaining $23,530,000 represent other benefits.

It is estimated that the projects in the appropriation bill as reported by the Senate committee will, when completed, provide annual benefits estimated at $218,760,000, of which $149,530,000 are flood-control benefits; $42,670,000 are power benefits; and the remaining $26,560,000 are other benefits, although in the Senate bill many projects will be completed much sooner, and, therefore, benefits will come earlier.

As an example of benefits obtained by the reduction of flood damages, the following information is given concerning the operation of projects in the Ohio

River Basin during the April 1948 flood. The total reductions in estimated damages credited to the operation of flood-control reservoirs in the Ohio River Basin during the April 1948 flood have been estimated at $31,900,000, of which $30,960,000 was obtained along the main stem of the Ohio River from Pittsburgh to Maysville, Ky., and reductions in damages in the amount of $940,000 accrued on tributary basins.

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

Mr. GURNEY. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator is speaking of appropriations and of benefits to the Nation as a whole. I wonder if he has any figures showing what percentage of the appropriations will be repaid by the various political subdivisions where the projects are constructed. I believe practically every project carries a repayment feature. Is that correct?

Mr. GURNEY. Irrigation projects fall in that category.

Mr. YOUNG. I know that many of the Army projects do, too, under the pending bill.

Mr. GURNEY. That is correct.

Mr. YOUNG. Does the Senator have any idea as to what percentage of repayment there is on the average projects under the jurisdiction of the Army engineers?

Mr. GURNEY. As the Senator knows, the irrigation projects generally come under the Bureau of Reclamation. The percentage of repayment on Corps of Engineers projects, whether flood-control or rivers and harbors, is generally small as compared with projects under the Bureau of Reclamation.

Mr. YOUNG. But there is rather a large repayment provision made in connection with their projects.

Mr. GURNEY. Similarly, proceeding with the story of the Ohio River project units, local protection works in the Ohio River Basin prevented damage estimated at $15,875,000, of which $14,815,000 accrued to urban areas along the main stem of the Ohio River, $320,000 to urban areas on tributary basins, and $740,000 to rural areas along tributary basins. The total reduction in damages in the Ohio River Basin, the one basin during the current flood attributed to the operation of completed, or partially completed, flood-control projects, therefore, total $47,775,000.

I desire to comment briefly on the hydroelectric power-generating feature of some of the projects included in this bill. At the present time, Mr. President, the entire country, with a few exceptions, is operating on a reserve power generating capacity which is dangerously low and which a few years ago would have been considered foolhardy. By interconnections and other interim arrangements it has been possible to keep our power supply intact without compulsory curtailment of use except in critical situations, such as the recent California drought.

We are now engaged in revitalizing our national preparedness program, and one of the basic parts of such a program must be the construction of hydroelectric power projects such as are included in this bill. Everyone knows the vital part which our great power pools from hydroelectric power projects played in aluminum production and aircraft manufacture during the recent war. Less spectacular, but nonetheless important, is the part which the electric power industry, supplemented by hydroelectric power projects, performed in the war effort throughout the entire country. Should another emergency arise, we shall need more electric power than ever before. But we shall not have it unless we start now to tap the power potentialities of the streams of our own United States, as contemplated by this bill.

Mr. President, those who are opposing this bill are basing their opposition on a plea for economy. I can see no economy in an angry river gone berserk, sweeping away forever millions of dollars' worth of property. I can see no economy in an unproductive swamp or an arid plain. I can see no economy in a half-developed navigation system. I can see no economy in a still-born power-development program. In short, Mr. President, I can see no economy in failing rapidly to develop and protect our natural resources.

The large majority of the Senate Committee on Appropriations considers this bill as an investment that will bring dividends far and above the sacrifice necessary to make the appropriation now. Dividends will come in the form of decreased suffering by flooded-out families and industries, increased returns in the form of agricultural production, increased numbers of farm homes, increased use of hydroelectric power that will obviate the use of irreplaceable petroleum needed now for generating electricity by Diesel engines, which, all together, are necessary in the defense of the United States and will go a long way toward increasing our defense potential.

Speaking for 16 of 19 members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I heartily recommend that House bill 5524 be passed in the form recommended by the committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and I send to the desk and ask to have stated a motion to recommit the bill, with instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the motion for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I move that the bill (H. R. 5524, the Civil Functions Appropriation bill) be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with the following instructions, namely:

(a) The aggregate items included in the bill shall be reduced by not less than $200,000,000 from the sums presently included.

(b) That the Army engineers be instructed to apply the remaining sums to the projects which they deem to be most important both as to rivers and harbors and flood control, and that their selections and recommendations be based on—

1. Urgency;
2. Long-range importance;
3. Projects which can be completed with reasonable appropriations; and
4. Projects where the State or municipality bears a portion of the expense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit, with instructions, offered by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], for himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gurney	Millikin
Ball	Hatch	Moore
Barkley	Hawkes	Morse
Brewster	Hayden	O'Conor
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Pepper
Brooks	Hill	Reed
Buck	Hoey	Revercomb
Butler	Holland	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Ives	Saltonstall
Cain	Jenner	Smith
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Sparkman
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Connally	Kem	Taft
Cooper	Kilgore	Taylor
Cordon	Knowland	Thomas, Okla.
Donnell	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Downey	Lodge	Tydings
Dworshak	Lucas	Vandenberg
Eastland	McFarland	Watkins
Ecton	McKellar	Wherry
Ferguson	McMahon	Wiley
Fulbright	Magnuson	Williams
George	Martin	Wilson
Green	Maybank	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], on behalf of himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to recommit H. R. 5524 with instructions.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, with a sane and rational administration the minority of the Appropriations Committee who filed the minority views have no difference of opinion. Concerning the overlapping, the waste, the extravagance in four or five of these programs we do have a serious difference of opinion.

The three members who have been mentioned filed minority views, which have been printed. We have compiled additional views of the minority, which I shall not take the time of the Senate now to read, but I ask that the additional views of the minority be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the additional views were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF THE MINORITY ON THE ARMY CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATIONS BILL FOR 1949

I. INTRODUCTION

You are being asked today to pass on H. R. 5524, the Army civil functions appropriation bill for 1949. This bill, as it now stands, envisions the largest appropriations for public-works projects ever contained in such a measure. It would require total appropriations of $708,586,666, which is $102,027,900 higher than the House recommendation of $606,558,766 and only $29,217,634 lower than the budget estimate of $737,804,300.

As reported by the Senate committee, this bill is $206,462,754 higher than the appropriation for these projects last year, and is $400,772,131 higher than the $307,814,535 appropriated for the bill in the prewar peak year of 1940.

As you know, this measure has not received the unanimous support of the Senate Appropriations Committee. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire, the junior Senator from Michigan, and the junior Senator from Kansas raised emphatic protests to reporting the bill as it now stands, believing as we did that such an unwarranted spending authority at this time for these purposes would be not only uneconomical but extremely unwise.

You have before you the minority report on this subject. Of course, we could have maintained a silence on the presentation of the bill, but we deemed it only fair to apprise you of the dangerous consequences should this bill be passed in its present form.

Only 3 months ago the Congress of the United States went on record as supporting a recommended $2,000,000,000 reduction in the President's budget estimates for the coming fiscal year over and above an additional $800,000,000 reduction in contemplated supplementals for the current fiscal year. At the time of adoption this was admitted to be a conservative reduction based on a balanced appraisal of our need for economy and the necessity for large-scale domestic and international commitments. Accordingly, the joint committee on the legislative budget concluded that the $2,000,000,000 reduction in 1949 appropriation requests was not only possible of accomplishment, but was necessary to the continued success of our economy.

II. ACTION ON THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET TO DATE

Let us look for a moment at what has occurred since. It was recognized that practically 75 percent of the President's budget embraced such items as the interest on the public debt, appropriations for the Military Establishment, and for veterans' benefits. Consequently, from the remaining 25 percent, or approximately $8,200,000,000, must come the vast bulk of the cuts which will total the $2,000,000,000 estimated appropriations reduction. The bills reported in some House or Senate action embrace a total budget estimate of about $7,000,000,000. To date the latest action on these bills in either the House or the Senate indicates a total appropriation of $6,600,000,000. This means that so far we have a gross possible reduction in the budget estimates of about $400,000,000. If we are to continue at the present rate for the remaining items in the original budget estimate which are susceptible to substantial reduction, then the Congress will have accomplished an over-all reduction in appropriations of only about $500,000,000. In other words, we will not only have failed to accomplish the promised reduction, but we will have gone on record as violating the very spirit of our pledge.

III. TAX REDUCTION IMPERILED

Let us not lose sight of the fact that this body by a vote of 77 to 10 enacted a tax-reduction bill of $4,800,000,000. This action was premised, in part, upon a reduction of spending in accordance with the legislative budget target. Take heed, gentlemen, that you are not now unwittingly committing yourselves to restoration of higher taxes as you vote to restore excessive appropriations contained in the pending bill.

IV. PUBLIC WORKS SHOULD BE LIMITED

It was recognized from the very outset that this particular bill was one which provided more flexibility, more possibility of reductions from the budget estimates than perhaps any other measure which will be presented to the Congress this year. We took cognizance of this in the report of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget when we told the people of our country that "large-scale expansion and acceleration of public-works projects shall be limited to such projects as are deemed urgently necessary to the public interest." We also realized that every dollar spent unnecessarily at this present time was an additional puff to the inflationary balloon which economists have labeled our most formidable domestic foe at the present time.

Almost daily we are faced with new demands for additional appropriations. Only the other day we passed the supplemental bill for national defense which totaled $3,224,000,000. A short time ago we passed an authorization for the European recovery program measure involving other billions. Both of these bills were passed in recognition of the grave international situation. The argument has been raised that if we can afford to appropriate such large sums for international aid, then surely the American people are entitled to such appropriations of funds as are contained in this public-works bill. The fallacy in such an argument is readily discernible. It is an argument that insists all appropriations are inherently alike; that we merely appropriate money and that we do not appropriate for differing purposes.

We understand that certain of these flood-control projects, among others, are necessary for the protection of the lives and livelihood of American citizens. We have no intention nor desire to deprive the American people of such of these projects as may be demonstrably of vital necessity. The Corps of Engineers would have us believe that all of the measures contained in this bill are of utmost importance at this present time. On the face of it, this is an absurdity.

We of the minority of the committee have outlined our recommendations to the Senate in a frank minority report. This includes a recommendation that the present bill be reduced by not less than $200,000,000 and that the Army engineers be instructed to apply the remaining sums to the projects based particularly on urgency and long-range importance. Following are some of the reasons why we believe that this particular measure should be recommitted with appropriate instructions to the Senate Appropriations Committee for its resubmittal.

V. COMPARISONS WITH PREWAR APPROPRIATIONS

Our economic studies show that the prewar peak of rivers, harbors, and flood-control spending was reached in the 1940 fiscal year. In that year the Engineers obligated approximately $265,000,000. This included some lingering expenditures under the "make work" relief programs initiated during the thirties.

This bill, as reported by the majority of the Appropriations Committee, would allow for the spending of $634,000,000 for the same purposes as we spent $265,000,000 just 9 years ago. In short, it is proposed that we spend almost $2,400 in 1949 for every $1,000 spent in 1940, the peak prewar year. It is patently obvious that 1949 represents a tremendous period of prosperity as compared with the dying days of WPAism which existed in 1940.

VI. MINORITY RECOMMENDATION NO DANGER TO EXISTING SYSTEM

The proposal of the minority to cut $200,000,000 from this bill would in no way endanger funds for adequate maintenance and operation. Appropriations for maintenance and operation of our rivers, harbors, and canals will be more than ample to cover all deferred maintenance costs and meet increased costs of labor and materials. On the lower Mississippi the bill, as offered by the Appropriations Committee, provides $14,000,000 for maintenance. This is the amount requested by the Engineers and the minority does not propose to reduce it.

Figures prepared by the Army engineers show that maintenance and operation costs of rivers and harbors averaged about $45,000,000 per year in the prewar period. In the postwar period, costs were about $50,000,000 in 1946 and 1947. The House appropriation provides for $73,000,000 and the Senate bill provides for $79,000,000.

Let us repeat: It is not contemplated that allowances for maintaining and operating the present system of river, harbor, and flood-control works will be affected by the minority proposal to recommit this measure.

VII. CONSTRUCTION COSTS ACCOUNT FOR GROWTH

The big expansion in the budget of the Army engineers comes in the amounts set up for new construction. In 1940 construction expenditures on rivers, harbors, and flood control in the United States amounted to slightly over $200,000,000 yearly. The bill before us carries funds for almost $530,000,000 in construction or over two and one-half times the amount spent in the prewar years.

It is the contention of the minority that construction funds can be reduced by $200,000,000 without in any way jeopardizing the national security or the national welfare. In fact, to allow this bill to pass in its present form would seriously weaken our efforts to remain strong financially.

The minority proposes to reduce construction appropriations for 1949 to a level of approximately $330,000,000. This is a most reasonable proposal. It remains almost $18,000,000 more than was appropriated for construction in the current year and $130,000,000 more than the level of 1940.

SELECTION OF PROJECTS

The majority report accompanying Senate Concurrent Resolution 42 providing for the 1949 legislative budget stated, "Large-scale expansion and acceleration of public-works projects should be limited to such projects as are deemed urgently necessary to the public interest." The minority opposing the record-breaking level of construction appropriations in this bill has called attention to the importance of this principle. It is our firm conviction that the wisdom of this principle should be crystal clear to all. This bill contains an abundance of ill-considered and wholly unnecessary projects. Let us cite a few examples.

The bill contains an appropriation of $2,128,000 for construction of a ship canal between San Francisco and Sacramento, Calif. The project, when completed, will cost the Federal Government over $13,000,000 and local sources will provide additional large sums. But less than 100 miles south of Sacramento lies a ship canal to Stockton on the San Joaquin River. The Senate hearings on this bill contain testimony that present traffic tonnages hardly justify the existence of the Stockton port, to say nothing of justification for another and duplicate facility at Sacramento.

It is estimated that the proposed Tennessee-Tombigbee waterway will cost the Federal Government over a hundred and thirty-six million. This bill contains the first construction appropriation for this purpose, in the amount of $1,500,000. It is a new appropriation. It is not an essential appropriation at this time. The project is a direct duplication of the Mississippi River development, paralleling the Mississippi River on the east. It cannot be completed for many years; the engineers' program sets up appropriations running as high as $26,000,000 per year and even at that level the project will not be finished by 1954.

A $96,000,000 improvement project is proposed for an important river system in Georgia and Florida. The entire project includes a series of locks and dams and power development as well as navigation improvement. The President, himself, only recommended an appropriation of $5,067,000 for 1949 construction on this project. The House reduced this to $2,000,000, but the Senate Appropriations Committee has now provided for $6,000,000—almost one million

more than the inflationary appropriation level recommended by the President.

Over 40 percent of the total appropriation for construction in the bill will go to a few large multiple-purpose projects in which generation of power is a major element. The bulk of these projects are in the initial stages of construction. The funds are being spent for construction of access roads, preparation of sites, construction of housing facilities for employees, removal of undergrowth in reservoir areas.

It has been argued that the critical shortages of electric power facing this country today and forecast for the future make it essential that these projects be completed at the earliest possible moment. Those who offer this argument, however, fail to point out that power will not come from these projects until 1953 or 1954 at the earliest and then only in a small trickle.

Large hydroelectric projects cannot be constructed quickly. If we need electric power for national defense purposes in the near future, we must seek other ways of securing that power. We are in danger of deluding ourselves as to our available power for national defense purposes if we rely upon completion of the hydroelectric projects contained in this bill for that purpose.

HEAVY FUTURE COSTS INEVITABLE

We are confronted with the prospect of appropriations to the Corps of Engineers in the amount of at least $1,000,000,000 per year. The program is one which is only just getting started.

In a special analysis of the construction program prepared by the Corps of Engineers, it was shown that one-quarter of the projects for which appropriations are now being made are only in the planning stage. Of the projects under construction 41 percent of the construction funds are being applied to projects which are less than 20 percent complete. Only 20 percent of the construction funds in this bill are being applied to projects which are over 80 percent complete. In other words, we are spending twice as much on new projects as we are spending to complete projects.

The Enginers' 6-year program for river, harbor, and flood-control construction is itself a warning of heavy future costs.

The total estimated cost of all current rivers, harbors, and flood-control projects, excluding the lower Mississippi and the Sacramento, is set at $7,500,000,000. Of this amount we have appropriated not quite one-third—$2,400,000,000 to date. This bill carries about $475,000,000 of new construction for these purposes. However, under the Engineers' program, by 1952 construction allocations will mount to $844,000,000 per year.

In all probability appropriations requested of future sessions of Congress will total over $1,000,000,000 per year when we include costs of maintenance, operation, construction, and maintenance on the lower Mississippi, and construction and maintenance costs on projects to be authorized in future years.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The economic facts are all against making these expenditures during the fiscal year 1949. In the light of the circumstances surrounding this measure, the minority proposes the only sensible step in the legislative process that can be taken: Send the bill back to committee with instructions that it be cut down to proper size and require the Army engineers to approach the problem realistically and tell us which projects are really needed for the economic and social well-being of this Nation.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], spoke at great length upon the care which had been exercised in the making up of the bill. He made a very fine presentation. The only trouble is that most of it was not so. Let me give the Senate a concrete illustration. The Senate increased the House figures $102,000,000. The House had made a cut of about $106,000,000, as I recall, under the budget figures, and with a straight face the Army engineers came before the committee—I heard them—and claimed that every item in that $106,000,000 was of equal importance; that they could make no distinctions and that this work had to go forward as a whole. Let me read from the minority views to show what we thought of their attitude, and our position, we believe, is justified by the record:

It is astonishing to us that the Army engineers requested complete restoration of every dollar of the House cuts. Good and bad, important and inconsequential, large and small, the Army engineers submitted their requests to the committee—and offered their justifications with a straight face.

It is incredible that any group of professional men, particularly engineers, would fail to distinguish between the various classes of projects and disregard the relative importance of both the individual project value and the completion-time element. Some of these projects will require years to be completed. Others ought not to be undertaken at all. Yet the Army engineers put them all in the same category.

That is the feeling, Mr. President, of the minority, as expressed in the minority views.

I received a very interesting lettter from a ranking engineer official of one of the most important railroads in the United States, and I shall read a paragraph from that letter as follows:

I am in complete agreement with the minority report signed by Senator BRIDGES, Senator FERGUSON, and yourself, and can endorse the comment at the bottom of page 4 under the heading "The astonishing attitude of the Army engineers"—

The writer proceeds—

notwitl standing the fact that I am not astonished at all. May I suggest that under present conditions an appropriation of a fixed amount of money might well be made, with the instruction that this money be used on projects deemed to be the most important both as to rivers and harbors and flood control, particularly the latter, which is intended to safeguard life and property, based on the order of importance as stated at the end of the minority report.

Mr. President, we do not want to stop this program. When I say "we" I mean the minority. We do want a safe program, a rational program, a reasonable program which has regard for the ability of the American citizen to pay taxes, and not to waste his money. We set forth a formula at the end of our minority views, and suggested that the bill be recommitted to the Appropriations Committee and that the committee be instructed to reduce the total amount by $200,000,000, which, Mr. President, will still leave a sum equal to that being used during the current fiscal year, and which is the largest amount of money that has ever been devoted to any similar purposes in any 1 year. Then we made the suggestion—and I call the Senate's attention to this language:

That the Army engineers be instructed to apply the remaining sums to the projects which they deem to be most important both as to rivers and harbors and flood control, and that their selections and recommendations—

These are the instructions we propose to give the Army engineers—

and that their selections and recommendations to be based on—

1. Urgency;
2. Long-range importance;
3. Projects which can be completed with reasonable appropriations; and
4. Projects where the State or municipality bears a portion of the expense.

Mr. President, it is our best judgment that, with money in the sum of $25,000,000 in excess of the $415,000,000 present appropriation, which would be available even with a reduction of $200,000,000, every urgent program or project, every project where the city or State participates, every project that can be completed by a reasonable appropriation, can be taken care of no matter where it is located, and still leave enough money to carry on in a reasonable way the program as a whole. That is our position. We think it is supported overwhelmingly by the judgment of the country.

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

Mr. REED. May I inquire of the Senator from Florida whether he wants to talk about the pending bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, indeed. I am going to ask the Senator a question, if I may.

Mr. REED. I shall be delighted to have the Senator ask me a question.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the pending motion made only on behalf of the three members of the committee signing the minority views?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. There are in all 21 members of the Appropriations Committee. Does that mean that the other 18 members of the committee concur in the majority recommendation?

Mr. REED. I think there were 19 Senators who voted. Sixteen voted to report the bill as it was, or as it is, and the three Senators whose names are signed to the minority views dissented, and filed minority views.

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

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. PEPPER. I notice from the minority recommendations on page 5 of the minority views that the motion is that the aggregate of items included in the bill shall be reduced by not less than $200,000,000 from the sums presently included, and that the Army engineers be instructed to observe certain standards. The minority is not making any recommendations, is it, as to what projects should be deleted or what items should be reduced?

Mr. REED. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. The minority proposes, does it not, that that function shall be delegated to the Army engineers.

Mr. REED. I have almost entirely lost confidence in the integrity and intelligence of the Corps of Army Engineers. Still they are the agency through which we must carry on this work. The members of the minority who filed their views are not making any suggestions either

with respect to rivers and harbors or flood-control work, in connection with a single project.

Mr. PEPPER. I am exceedingly sorry to hear the Senator make the statement he has just made about the Army engineers. I hope that upon reflection he will find it possible to soften his statement, because I have observed, in the almost 12 years I have been a Member of the Senate, that no agency of the Government of the United States is more generally esteemed, more highly respected, or which enjoys more fully the confidence of the Congress and the country, than does the Engineer Corps of the United States Army.

Mr. REED. Of course I do not agree with that assumption by the Senator from Florida.

Let me come to the question of the amount of money involved, and what should have been involved.

On January 14 of this year President Truman said:

> I have urged consumers to restrict their purchases of scarce products. The Federal Government is deferring many public works projects and following procurement policies designed to minimize the effect on price increases.

In February of this year the Joint Legislative Budget Committee of the two Houses filed a report which was unanimously adopted by the Senate, and on a yea-and-nay vote in the House by an overwhelming majority. That report recommended the reduction of the President's Budget by $2,000,000,000, and gave as the reason for such reduction that it was "the highest peacetime budget that has ever been submitted for congressional consideration." The committee also stated:

> For the same reason, large-scale expansion and acceleration of public works projects should be limited to such projects as are deemed urgently necessary to the public interest.

That report was signed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who made the report for the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. It was signed by the Senator from New Hampshire. It was signed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER]. It was signed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. It was signed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], as well as by several distinguished minority members; namely, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR].

That promise was a promise of the majority party. We have a majority in this Chamber, as well as in the House. The joint committee was composed of the chairmen and the ranking members of the Committee on Finance of the Senate, the Ways and Means Committee of the House, and of the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses. It pledged the people of this country, on the faith of the majority party, at least, that we would reduce appropriations by $2,000,000,000. That action was supported by the statement of the President.

Last Friday there was published the report of the Joint Congressional Economic Committee on the price situation, based upon a prolonged study by the regional subcommittee. This is what the report had to say about public works:

> Public works should be deferred wherever possible, unless they contribute to the output of food or other scarce goods.

Mr. President, we can go further than that. Every economist in the country, whether he be an extreme left-winger, or an extreme right-wing conservative, would say that at this period in our economic history, with prices greatly inflated, with labor scarce, and materials high, with every effect which might make for a run-away inflation, we should not pass a bill of this character, which is the most wasteful, most extravagant, and most unnecessary bill I have encountered in my service in the Senate. It flies in the face not only of the promises of the Republican Party, but of all sound economics. That is what we are dealing with. It is not a light matter. The Senators who signed the report with me are not penurious. We try to approach these questions in a broad way. But this bill offends every sense of public intelligence and sound economics.

Was the Republican Party in earnest when it made the promise to the people back in February, signed by the leaders of both Houses, or was that merely a smoke-screen to deceive or mislead the people of the country? At the rate we are going, instead of reducing appropriations by $2,000,000,000 under the President's budget, we shall reduce appropriations by less than $400,000,000. The professional staff of the Appropriations Committee, under my direction, have checked the reductions which have been made up to this time, and have calculated what further can be done. As late as this morning, when a final check was made, none of us could see any reasonable chance that the reduction in the President's budget will be as much as $400,000,000—certainly not materially greater than $400,000,000—instead of $2,000,000,000. I am sorry that my good friends of the minority are not present today. They have gone on a sad mission, to attend the funeral of the late Senator Overton, of Louisiana. That will defer the vote, by agreement, until they return. I shall make a few further observations, and then yield the floor.

I am sorry the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] is not present in the Chamber at the moment. I have checked a great many reports of the Army engineers, and detected their utter absurdity when they undertake to justify expenditures by making a report of benefits which they claim will result from the various projects. I have never seen one of such reports that could be accepted at its face value.

I have talked with Senators of longer service than my own. What I have said applies to the Army engineers and their recommendations, under pressure, for the past 15 years to spend more and more money. I asked one veteran Senator of excellent judgment, "Were the Army engineers always like this?" This was after a yea-and-nay vote in the Senate had defeated one of the fantastic proposals which they had endorsed and urged. That Senator said to me, "No; they were not always like this. There was a time when one could take an Army engineers' report at face value and almost without criticism; but that has changed. For the last 15 years they have been under pressure to spend money, and they have gradually come over to a policy of finding all the ways they can to spend money in the name of river-and-harbor or flood-control or other projects." Mr. President, that observation is in line with my own observations.

For example, the Tennessee-Tombigbee project, which is as fantastic a transportation proposition as anyone ever conceived of, has been kicked out of congressional committees and has been defeated in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and yet Colonel Feringa, who appeared before the committee and whose testimony is reported in the volume of committee hearings, had the nerve to endorse it. The Army engineers also recommend the Beaver-Mahoning Canal, a project which the Senate defeated by a vote of 50 to 15, as I recall. The Army engineers also approve the Florida ship canal. I am not sure whether they have approved the Passamaquody project. But certainly they have approved practically all the other such projects. Of course, they might be pardoned for doing so, because as a result of all the projects they have undertaken a considerable amount of money has been spent, and that has occurred during a time when the spending of money, regardless of consequences, has been a policy, and has been regarded as a virtue. I shall return to that subject later.

Mr. President, I am prepared to yield the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before the Senator yields the floor, will he yield to me for a question?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. In order that some of us may better understand what the minority of the committee are attempting to do in this connection—and I should like to say that no one has a higher regard than I have for the ability of the junior Senator from Kansas and the research he has made—I should like to ask one or two questions. I happen to serve on the same committee with the Senator, and I deeply appreciate at all times his judgment, and I am fully aware of the fact that he is very careful with statistics. So I realize that we should look searchingly into the minority views.

For that reason I should like to ask the distinguished Senator about a statement on page 5 of the minority views, where the minority conclude their recommendations by stating:

> (a) The aggregate of items included in the bill shall be reduced by not less than $200,000,000 from the sums presently included.

I should like to ask the distinguished Senator—if this question fits in with the debate at this point; otherwise I shall wait—why they arrived at that figure. Does it represent the sum total of appro-

priations for projects which the Senator feels should not be developed this year, or could the projects which already are under way be continued on, let us say, the same basis as that of last year, if the proposed $200,000,000 reductions were made? Will the Senator give us as much information about the facts of that matter as he can, so as to indicate why the $200,000,000 reduction should be made?

Mr. REED. I am happy to accommodate my good friend the Senator from Nebraska. If he will turn to page 3 of the minority views, he will find there a table giving the amounts of money that have been expended on rivers and harbors and flood-control projects from the year 1939 to the year 1948, inclusive.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. REED. That figure varies, as we see by referring to the table or chart, because it covers all expenditures, including, as the Senator from South Dakota has described, cemeterial expenses and various other expenses which are included under the expenses for the civil functions of the War Department, but do not relate to rivers and harbors or flood control. The minority members undertake to deal with those two factors, which are the largest and most important.

On page 3 of the minority views the Senator from Nebraska will observe that the largest amount of money given for those purposes in any 1 year is the amount given for the current fiscal year, which is $415,928,525. The comparable figure in the majority report on the bill is $640,253,200.

So I say to the Senator from Nebraska that we of the minority conclude that if the Congress now appropriates for this purpose an amount equal to the amount made available during the present year, when this work has been going forward faster than ever before, and at a rate as high as the economy of the country will stand, that will be sufficient, and therefore we shall be able to make the recommended reduction of $200,000,000.

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

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask one more question on this point. I understand what the Senator has just said in answer to the question I asked, but he has not fully answered my question.

I wish to know this: If we deduct $200,000,000 from the proposed appropriations, will that permit the continuation of all the projects which have been started during the past fiscal year; or will the $200,000,000 reduction, if it is made, mean that some of the projects already started will have to fold up? Can the Senator answer my question from that point of view? I am interested in separating the new projects from the old ones. I understand that provision for 59 new projects has been written into this bill. But aside from the point of view of the national economy, inflationary trends, and so forth, I should like to know what impact would be caused on the projects already started if the Senate were to take favorable action on the proposed $200,000,000 reduction.

Mr. REED. I am glad to give the Senator that information. For the present fiscal year, $415,928,525 is available for flood control and for rivers and harbors. If we deduct $200,000,000 from the figure the Senate committee has approved, which is $640,253,200, that will leave approximately $44,000,000, which is $25,000,000 more than is being used on the projects now under construction.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator say that would leave ample funds for continuing the work on all the projects which now are under construction, so that the reduction would not interfere with the continuation of projects which already have been authorized, and for which contracts have been let, and on which construction has been started?

Mr. REED. That would depend. I do not wish to make a categorical answer of "Yes" to the question, because I do not trust the intelligence of the Army engineers. If the program suggested by us were intelligently administered and if the Army engineers were careful in their selection of projects, then my answer would be, "Yes." But let me call attention to the fact that the figure just given was for 59 new projects which have been added to the proposed program. My understanding is that 42 new projects were added to the program, and provision for them was written into this bill, although they were not included in the President's budget. Of those 42, 14 were added in the House and 28 were added in the Senate committee. That shows how carelessly this bill was drawn, Mr. President. I repeat that there are 42 new projects not included in the President's budget.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Did I correctly understand the Senator from Kansas to say a little while ago that he had no confidence in the intelligence——

Mr. REED. Or the integrity.

Mr. CONNALLY. No confidence in the intelligence or integrity of the Army engineers?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yet do I further correctly understand the Senator to propose, by this motion, that the Congress turn over to the Army engineers the expenditure of $538,735,550, without any check thereon by the Congress at all?

Mr. REED. I would not. But, Mr. President, I would not leave as much money as the Senator suggests.

Mr. CONNALLY. I took off $200,000,000.

Mr. REED. Very well, $536,000,000.

Mr. CONNALLY. Five hundred and thirty-eight million dollars. The appropriation is for an agency of the Government. I may say I do not agree with the Senator's estimate of the Army engineers. It is an agency of the Government in whose integrity and intelligence the Senator has no confidence, and yet he is willing to turn over to that agency discretion to spend $538,000,000 a year. He is not willing to trust the Senate and the House with the expenditure of that fund.

Mr. REED. All the projects they could possibly include, or that are in the program now, have been passed on by Congress in a rather general way, so the assumption by the Senator from Texas that there is no congressional control would be entirely erroneous.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not want to belabor the Senator.

Mr. REED. The Senator from Kansas does not mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. But by his amendment the Senator would turn the whole thing over to the Army engineers.

Mr. REED. That is where it is now, largely.

Mr. CONNALLY. Well, largely; but it is not there, under the pending bill. I am simply amazed to hear the Senator stand on the floor of the Senate and make the admission that he wants to turn over $538,000,000 to be expended in the discretion of an agency in which he has no confidence as to its integrity or intelligence. What confidence has the Senator then in the Army engineers?

Mr. REED. The instructions given under the motion to recommit, if agreed to, would constitute an order to consider certain factors in the order of their importance. It is the first time any instruction of the kind has ever been given. Last year in the Senate we held up a similar bill, for a second look by the Army engineers, but without any instruction, without any formula for setting a valuation upon the different ways of doing the work or the different factors that should be considered. That is partially the basis of my judgment of the Army engineers. The sum total of their second look was precisely nothing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say one further word, and then I am through. If the Senator, though, has no confidence in their integrity, why does he want to vest them with all this authority?

Mr. REED. I do not propose to give them any additional authority. I am putting certain limitations upon them, as to the basis on which the money shall be spent.

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

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations, and of the Civil Functions Subcommittee, I confess I do not understand what approach the subcommittee is directed to make to this problem, should the Senator's motion to recommit prevail? First, the motion is to recommit with instructions to reduce the amount $200,000,000. There is no amount set except as a ceiling. The committee would have no instruction as to what amount to report. I assume the committee is expected to reach some over-all amount by applying the yardstick which is mentioned in the motion, which is that the Army engineers be instructed to apply the remaining sums to the projects which they deem to be most important, both as to improvements in rivers and harbors and as to flood control, the other selections and recommendations to be based on (1) urgency, (2) long-range importance, (3) projects which can be completed with reasonable

appropriations, and (4) projects in which the State or municipality bears a portion of the expense. Is it the thought of the sponsors of the motion that if the bill be recommitted the subcommittee shall themselves first reach an over-all figure at least $200,000,000 less than the present bill, and, having reached that figure, shall arbitrarily call in the Army engineers and say, "This is the money. Now, apply this sum to the projects which you deem most important," and so forth? Is that the thought of the sponsors of the motion?

Mr. REED. I think that is substantially a fair statement.

Mr. CORDON. Assuming then that the bill is recommitted and the subcommittee has reached this arbitrary figure, that it has called in the Army engineers and said, "You determine how to apply this money," and assuming that the Army engineers bring back their judgment on that, what then is the committee to do? Is it to substitute the judgment of the Army engineers for the judgment of the subcommittee without more ado—merely take it and say, "That is it"?

Mr. REED. No.

Mr. CORDON. What is it to do?

Mr. REED. It is to exercise its very best judgment based on the information before it. The Senator from Oregon knows that the Army engineers have sat with the subcommittee and with the full committee all through the sessions.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. REED. They were present when we marked up the bill and when we were getting ready to report it. They are accustomed to being questioned, they are accustomed to offering advice and making suggestions. The Senator from Oregon is very well aware that there is nothing new or novel about it. The only thing that could be considered new or novel about it is that finally we have come to the place where there is a definite formula offered and where for the first time such a formula, by which the selection of projects should be based, is made available.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator from Kansas will yield further, the Senator from Oregon is confused about it, frankly. What do the sponsors expect the subcommittee to do? Here are four yardsticks—urgency, long-range importance, projects which can be completed with reasonable appropriations, which I assume means within 1 year, and projects in which the local government participates. Is the subcommittee to apply those several yardsticks one after the other in some order? Just what does the Senator expect the subcommittee to do?

Mr. REED. Recommendations will be requested. The subcommittee may sit 2 weeks, as we sat 2 weeks drafting the report. I expect to be on the subcommittee. The Senator from Oregon and the Senator from New Hampshire will also be on it. We do not anticipate any great difficulty in arriving at a very much more sane and rational conclusion than that which is included in the pending bill.

Mr. CORDON. Am I right, then, in concluding it is the Senator's view—and, I assume, that of his cosponsors—that the present bill is simply $200,000,000 too high?

Mr. REED. That is correct.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator would reduce it $200,000,000 and start all over anew to work it out, in order to comply with the Senator's view?

Mr. REED. That is what we would have to do; yes.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator in mind, for instance, any single projects in all this vast group that he would point out as being projects to be cut out or reduced, or anything else?

Mr. REED. That may be an assumption of the Senator from Oregon, but it is not a correct statement.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon asked it as a question, rather than as an assumption.

Mr. REED. No recommendations are made in the report. That does not mean that the committee has no idea of what should be done with a smaller amount of money.

Mr. CORDON. Does the Senator from Kansas expect during the debate to make any specific recommendations beyond those contained in the motion?

Mr. REED. He does not. I hope neither the Senator from Nebraska nor the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] will waste any sympathy. We shall do the best we can.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Following up the question which I asked regarding the $200,000,000, I now understand how the distinguished Senator arrives at the $200,000,000. The motion is that the bill be recommitted, and if the $200,000,000 reduction is approved then there is a further recommendation that the Army engineers be instructed to apply the remaining sums to the projects which they deem to be the most important in connection with river and harbor improvements, and so forth. I cannot help asking the question once more. There must be a different approach, for this reason, that some projects have already been authorized. I do not wish to favor any motion which would send back to the committee this bill with instructions to the Army engineers to set aside any project which may have been authorized and which has already been started. I can conceive that there are certain projects which have not been started; I can conceive of projects upon which not a dollar has been spent; but arbitrarily to take $200,000,000 and give the Army engineers further instructions that they are to prorate the balance of the money, which would include appropriating for authorized projects already started, and possibly projects not yet started, does not appeal to me as being proper. It seems to me we are undoing what has been done on a program already started or already contracted for. Am I correct?

Mr. REED. The Senator is not correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Would the Senator care to try to eliminate the confusion from my mind?

Mr. REED. In the first place, I ask the Senator from Nebraska this question: Where do we get the projects which finally come before the committee? They are all passed on by the Army engineers and included in their reports. The Bureau of the Budget decides upon the amount of money——

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

Mr. REED. Not at this time. I am endeavoring to describe the process for the benefit of the Senator from Nebraska.

The next step is in the Bureau of the Budget. It takes the projects recommended by the Army engineers and makes up the budget. The budget then comes to the Congress, and Congress takes the third and last look at it. All projects must have the sanction of the Army engineers before they go to the Bureau of the Budget, and in most cases before they are considered by Congress they must have the saction of the Budget. But there were 42 exceptions.

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

Mr. REED. I should like to finish answering the question of the Senator from Nebraska before I yield. The Senator has a legitimate worry, if he has anything. I am trying to assure him that it is not anything. When I have finished I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from California.

We have $415,000,000 this fiscal year, if we take the amount suggested by the minority, which public sentiment in the United States overwhelmingly has approved. We have so many projects under construction. Certainly if all we desired to do were to carry on the projects now under way with $415,000,000, we could do it with $440,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. That is the very point I wanted to bring to the attention of the Senator. Let us consider the Harlan County Dam in Nebraska——

Mr. REED. Yes. I helped to get more money for that project last year than would have been obtained otherwise.

Mr. WHERRY. Now we are mutually agreed. If the sum of $200,000,000 were deducted from the $738,000,000, would the Harlan County Dam project still remain intact, or would there be some question about what would happen in the final analysis?

Mr. REED. The recommendations made by the Army engineers under the smaller sum would have to be approved by Congress.

Mr. WHERRY. If it were taken off we could argue about it; but it is already there. That is the reason I asked the distinguished Senator what the impact would be if the money were deducted, project by project, up to $200,000,000.

Mr. REED. More money would be made available for the fiscal year 1949 than is available for the current fiscal year. If that is what has worried the Senator, there would be $200,000,000 more than there is at this time. I did not intend to say that every single project included in the present program is an urgent or a reasonable one. There are too many projects for any man who tries to be careful in his statements to state the cost. But, Mr. President, the Army engineers will submit a report to the committee, if the motion be agreed

to, and then the committee and the Senate must approve the projects.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I want to make two or three comments, and then, later, on my own time, more fully discuss the remarks of the Senator from Kansas. When he outlined the procedure which was followed, I assume he started out with the reports of the Army engineers. Of course, none of the projects are acted on by the Army engineers until they have first been authorized by the Congress of the United States. At least the Congress has some responsibility in having authorized the projects. Then the project passes through a general series of hearings of one kind or another, which the able Senator has mentioned. But, frankly, I join with the able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] in expressing great wonderment as to how my colleague from Kansas can, with a straight face, tell the Senate of the United States that the matter should be put into the hands of the Army engineers when, at the same time, he publicly says that he has no confidence in either their intelligence or their integrity. Certainly if I felt that way about them I could not feel that it was consistent in the slightest degree to say we should then accept their recommendations in connection with the expenditure of $500,000,000. I merely want to say for the record at this time, if the Senator will permit me, that I do not join with him in his views regarding the Army engineers. On the contrary, I have found them to be a hard-working, conscientious, and able group of public servants, without parallel, I think, in the Federal Government.

Mr. REED. I am glad the Senator from California interrupted me. I have a telegram from his State which I should like to read, because it illustrates precisely an important point which is involved in the whole subject. The telegram reached me a day or two ago. It is from Stockton, Calif., dated May 13, 1948, and is addressed to me. It reads as follows:

We congratulate you on your minority report on the civil functions Army appropriations bill and assure you of our whole-hearted concurrence therein. Permit us to point out a flagrant example of an appropriation with heavy political support but very little merit.

The Sacramento rivers and harbors project is recommended for an added appropriation of $2,128,000 by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. This project was approved in 1946. Nothing has been heretofore appropriated for it. It has only a cost benefit ratio of 1 to 1.1 on 1940 estimates. The area is already adequately served by seven operating ports. This all-Federal money project would compete with and reduce the revenue of existing ports jointly constructed by community and Federal money.

We have a special interest in our opposition because we are one of those ports which our citizens paid one-half of the cost of. We are still operating at a deficit and would be pushed further in the red if the Government spent its money now to build another port where the field is not yet large enough for the ports now operating. When the time comes that available freight will justify the proposed new project we will withdraw our opposition and urge construction but that time is still in the future.

STOCKTON PORT DISTRICT,
By MARTEL D. WILSON,
Chairman, Port Commission.

The point I wish to make—and I am glad the Senator from California interrupted me—is that I think Calvin Coolidge is quoted as saying that the Federal Government should never make an expenditure in any community from which the community benefited unless the community contributed a share of the expense of the cost. Though I cannot vouch for his having made the remark, it is one of the soundest statements on the subject I could think of. If we made every community bear a part of the cost of these projects from which they profit and benefit, then we would have some kind of a yardstick by which appropriations of money would be limited.

What impressed me when this telegram came was that it cited a case, if I interpreted the Senator from California correctly, where six or seven of the cities have constructed ports half the cost of which they paid. Now we come to one the entire cost of which is to be carried by the Federal Government.

Mr. KNOWLAND and Mr. GURNEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What the Senator has stated is simply not the fact, if I may say so to the able Senator. The fact of the matter is that both the local government and the State of California are making contributions on this particular project, so when the Senator picks out that one particular example he selects one which does not sustain his argument.

Mr. REED. All I know is what the telegram says.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. If I may interrupt at this point, in a general way, all projects for rivers and harbors and flood control are operated by the Corps of Engineers under general rules, first, that lands and rights-of-way must be provided without cost to the United States, as well as terminal facilities and spoil areas. Second, the United States must be held free from all damages resulting from the construction. Third, cash contributions are required if the benefits are local rather than national. Those are the rules governing river and harbor construction work.

As to flood control, lands and rights-of-way must be made available without cost to the United States. Second, the costs of highway bridges, and road relocations, are borne by local interests. Third, the projects must be maintained and operated by local interests. Fourth, the United States must be held free from damages.

So far as the project at Sacramento is concerned, full information was given the subcommittee at some length as to the State and local contribution on the Sacramento project, and the Senator can find the information very quickly by referring to the hearings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Kansas will permit me at that point merely to correct the record, he will find on page 234 of the hearings that the city of Sacramento has provided for a bond issue of some $3,750,000, and the State of California has contributed another $750,000. So his example, I reiterate, was not a very good one.

Mr. REED. I again say that I rely wholly on the telegram. I said in the first instance that I had no knowledge of the circumstances myself.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. How did the committee arrive at the figure of $200,000,000?

Mr. REED. The minority?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes.

Mr. REED. Probably from the fact that the money presently available for expenditure this year is $415,000,000, and we are getting along pretty well, making more progress than we ever made before in any one year.

Now the House of Representatives comes along and pushes the figure up about $100,000,000, and the Senate committee comes along and pushes it up another $100,000,000. So if we cut off $200,000,000, we will still have $25,000,000 more than we have available this year.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me on what theory the House raised the appropriation $100,000,000?

Mr. REED. I cannot.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me on what theory the Senate committee raised it?

Mr. REED. The Senate committee raised it because it wanted to.

Mr. LUCAS. Surely there must have been some evidence presented.

Mr. REED. I have not said a thing on the floor of the Senate I did not say in the committee, except that I have said it in a louder voice and at greater length. I told the committee I would oppose the appropriation. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] told the committee the same thing, as did the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. LUCAS. It is more or less an arbitrary cut, is it not?

Mr. REED. I do not think it is arbitrary. When we have a program—as we have—and are carrying it out reasonably well—as we are—with $415,000,000, and are in a period of inflation, with high labor costs, scarcity of materials, and all the factors that go to make inflation, when we should not spend money for things of the kind proposed, the committee reports a bill of the most outrageous nature ever presented. It is contrary to the budget submitted by the President, contrary to what our own legislative budget committee recommended when it pledged the majority to cut the appropriations $2,000,000,000, contrary to the expressed views of the Economic Council, and contrary to all common sense.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to say to the Senator from Kansas that I am inclined to be very sympathetic toward what the

minority of the committee is doing in the way of trying to save $200,000,000, because we have heard economy preached over and over in the Senate and in the House. My good friends on the other side of the aisle have been telling the country what they were going to do in the way of saving money.

Mr. REED. Six or eight of them signed a report to that effect.

Mr. LUCAS. I think that is true. But I do not like to cast a vote on a proposal to make an arbitrary cut of $200,000,000 unless there is some basis for it, some facts to support it, and something which would acquaint the Senate and the country with the real reason for it. In other words, if a project should be eliminated, it seems to me we should have a few facts along that line.

Mr. REED. I think the Senator from Illinois would agree with the Senator from Kansas that if the minority, which has very strong convictions on the subject, undertook to designate the particular projects to be eliminated, they would lose their case before they could possibly present it to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. They will probably lose it if they do not.

Mr. REED. We have gone at the task in the only way I know how to undertake it. All these projects must first come from the Army engineers; secondly, they must go to the Budget; third, they come to the Congress and are considered in the committee of the House, then in the committee of the Senate.

We are taking the finished product of the Senate committee, which is $225,000,000 in excess of the money being spent on this program for the current fiscal year, and the minority of the committee, so far as I can speak for the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from New Hampshire, said, "We are getting on pretty well this year, and are making all the progress we could hope to make in view of all the conditions and real dangers confronting the country; therefore, we will submit minority views and give our very best judgment as a basis on which to work, which would provide a figure $25,000,000 in excess of what is available this year."

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may ask him a question?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator realizes, as of course we all do after looking at the chart on the easel before us, that since the war years we have increased the Army civil functions appropriations quite rapidly, jumping from $100,000,000 in 1945 to $350,000,000 in 1946, and $506,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

Mr. REED. That is inclusive of all expenses.

Mr. GURNEY. Yes. The Senator realizes that we have increased the amount during several years prior to this year, and that means in part the providing of money to begin numerous projects. I want to ask the Senator if he has considered that when we start a project it always begins in a small way; and, in order efficiently to carry on the work, appropriations for each individual project must be made in larger amounts for each succeeding annual requirement, in order to obtain the construction and operation efficiency that is needful; that it requires a larger amount in the second year than it does in the first, and requires a larger amount in the third year than it does in the second. The Senator understands that necessary increase, I am sure. The reason for it is because the heavy machinery is brought in and set up during the first few years, and then after the machinery is in operation it is necessary to proceed rapidly in order to keep the cost of moving, let us say, a yard of dirt down to a reasonable figure in order to save money. Therefore does the Senator not think that in starting these projects the Congress should make appropriations to keep going the schedule of operation for each year, and in order to proceed with the schedule on these larger projects did not Congress last year, and the year before, authorize the construction and say that it would make the appropriations in optimum amounts.

Mr. REED. It did. The Senate committee this year proposes a superoptimum amount.

Mr. GURNEY. No, I wish to say to the Senator that the new projects put in the bill are not nearly so large as the Senator may have indicated in his address to the Senate this afternoon. The total new projects, for instance, that were put in the bill by the House and by the full Senate committee do not total anywhere near $200,000,000.

Mr. REED. I did not say the new projects totaled $200,000,000.

Mr. GURNEY. No. They total only about $32,000,000, I may advise the Senator.

Mr. REED. Let me say to the Senator from South Dakota, of whom I am very fond—we work in close cooperation; we sit together in the Senate—that I do not have any question but that the problem can be worked out without any considerable amount of trouble if the Army engineers will deal intelligently with it, and if the Senate committee will make an earnest effort to cut the amount back to what would be a reasonable, indeed, what would be a liberal sum, in the light of the circumstances which face the country.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. This morning I called the Army engineers and asked them about the problem that would be theirs if appropriations were cut back as is suggested and if the job of apportioning the cuts among the many worth-while projects involved were turned over to them. They told me that, in their opinion, there is not a single questionable item contained in the whole appropriation bill, every one of the items having been authorized by the Congress and carefully studied by the engineers. They hoped that the problem would not be sent back to them, for them to make the decision as to which project should be cut and which should not be cut.

May I ask the Senator from Kansas how, in his opinion, a cut can be made, for example, in the appropriation for a project in North Dakota? In our State we have the largest earth-filled dam in the world under construction. While it will produce about three times as much electricity as is now being produced in North Dakota, at the present time its primary purpose is flood control for the Mississippi and Missouri River Valleys. I think the Senator will recall that last year about $500,000,000 damages resulted from floods on the Missouri River alone, according to reliable estimates. The appropriation for the project to which I refer, the Garrison Dam, is $28,900,000. In the opinion of the Army engineers, in order to provide for the cheapest possible construction, they should have about $30,000,000 to carry on work on this one important project this year. How, in the name of economy, can money be saved by disrupting the whole construction program where a contract has already been let, and a large force of workers is on hand at the present time? Would the money be taken away from this project, the necessity for which has been amply demonstrated repeatedly and which is now under construction?

Then again two small appropriations are made for projects in North Dakota with respect to which there are local contributions. If the necessary appropriations were made, the two projects could be finished this year. Those projects include repayment features. It seems to me that, in the interest of economy, appropriations should be made so that the two projects can be completed. I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Kansas respecting where a cut should be made in those proposed appropriations?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I lost my confidence in the Army engineers because of their statements made in the hearings. The Chief of Army Engineers made a statement in reply to the Senator from Michigan as well as to the Senator from Kansas which made me lose confidence in him. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] asked General Wheeler:

> Do you consider that these are really essential items under that philosophy?

General Wheeler replied:

> I so consider them.

The Senator from Michigan then asked:

> That applies to all projects included in your plans for which you are asking funds to be restored?

General Wheeler, Chief of Army Engineeds, said:

> Yes.

No man in so important a position, charged with the responsibility of spending the taxpayers' money, is entitled to any confidence from anyone when he takes a position of that kind.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Perhaps their actions right now would not meet with the approval of the Senator from Kansas, but I do believe the Army engineers made a remarkable record during the last war.

By way of further information, I asked the Army engineers this morning the question: At the present rate of appropriations how long would it take to complete the Pick-Sloan plan for devel-

opment of the Missouri Valley at the rate possible under this bill providing $738,000,000 for all civil functions of the Corps of Engineers? I was told it would take another 9.6 years to complete it, if appropriations were made annually at the rate set up in this bill.

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I may suggest that every economist whom I know, whether he be left wing or right wing, is in favor of cutting down on public works when private construction is active, and the moment private construction lets up, then to go ahead with the public works. They are all agreed as to what the effect would be on the general economy and inflation if there were piled on top of a full private economy construction program a tremendous expenditure of public money. From an over-all economic standpoint there can be no justification for increasing public works when there is a general boom in private construction. And if we are going to take a national viewpoint we ought to cut down public programs now. When there is a general boom in private construction, if public works are dropped for a time it will make no difference, so far as I can see, to the general ultimate welfare of the country. This is the time to cut down on public works. I venture to say that if that policy should be pursued over the next 10 years, and if we should increase public construction correspondingly in times of depression, or lack of private activity, we would get through just as soon with the Pick-Sloan plan and all other plans as we would by trying to force them now, which would result in a general increase in all costs, a general increase in the price of every kind of material for which there is competition, a competition for labor and materials which would seriously embarrass the country and might bring about a condition where we could no longer proceed with any public works.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of addressing an inquiry to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Ohio as to how far he carries his theory which is, if I understood him correctly, that there should be in effect a suspension of public works during a period of high industrial activity, to be resumed when other activities, private activities, slough off? Does the distinguished Senator from Ohio carry that view to the extent that he believes there should be a suspension of public works and of reclamation projects?

Mr. TAFT. No, obviously that is impossible. It is a question of degree. It is a question of letting up on public works when there is a boom, and going ahead with public works when there is a depression. That is not my theory. That is the theory of every economist and every person who has ever dealt with the subject of public works as a method of generally trying to bring about some kind of a balance in the economy. Of course, we do not cut out public works. There are some things that are essential to be done this year and next year. Of course, there is a program to be carried out, but the program should not be constantly increased. This year the President's program alone has increased all public works from $2,000,000,000 in the current fiscal year to $2,800,000,000 for the fiscal year 1949. I say that instead of increasing the $2,000,000,000, it should be decreased.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to point out to the able Senator from Ohio what I am sure he knows, that in a great many of the States, particularly in the great western area of the country, there is a serious shortage of power. There is a marked shortage of irrigated lands for farming purposes. The shortage of power has actually resulted in closing down factories which, in turn, has decreased the productivity of the Nation. I think the able Senator from Ohio would be the first to admit that one of the ways of defeating inflation is to increase the productivity of the country.

Mr. TAFT. I quite agree with the Senator that the so-called public works projects which ought to have priority are those which increase the production of the people of the United States in various degrees. There is no question about that; and that is probably a good justification for going ahead with some such works in times of general private prosperity. But I do not believe we can find many works in the civil functions program which have anything to do with increasing the productivity of the country. Take the whole question of flood control. Important as it is, nevertheless we have waited a great many years, and another year or two would make no vital difference in the production of the country.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. I do not know that the Senator from Ohio was in the Chamber when I made a statement as to the savings which were made in the Ohio River Valley during the current flood season, because of money previously expended for flood protection works in that valley. The savings total $47,775,000 for the current flood period, in the April flood of 1948.

The point I wished to bring to the attention of the Senator from Ohio was the fact that in other areas of the country which have not had the benefit of appropriations for flood control works in prior years, the people must still live under conditions of recurring annual floods, and some which come more often.

That was the picture which was presented to the subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations time and time again in 1,430 pages. Representatives from many areas of the country said, "We have the same problem which appears in the Ohio River Valley, where this year almost $50,000,000 was saved in flood damage, and we would like to have the same opportunity in our valley."

Mr. TAFT. May I say——

Mr. GURNEY. I have not yielded. I am making an observation.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. GURNEY. No. I asked the Senator from Michigan to yield to me for an observation.

Mr. TAFT. I thought the Senator asked me a question.

Mr. GURNEY. Continuing my observation with respect to the statements which were made to the subcommittee, we find that flood damage is recurrent in many basins—in the Missouri River, the Mississippi, the Arkansas, and the Red River. A similar condition prevails in California. That is why the full Committee on Appropriations recommended this bill by a vote of 16 to 3. We feel that by spending this money we can make annual savings in every river valley in the country which will be comparable to the fine savings which are now being realized annually in the Ohio River Basin.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wholly deny the guess estimates as to what would have happened in the way of flood damage if there had not been flood walls. It is utterly impossible to make reliable estimates in that field. We have had floods for 160 years. Whether we do certain work this year or next year is not a vital question; but whether we exceed the budget by $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 this year is a vital question.

The program which I would follow in connection with public works would accomplish all the flood-control work—and perhaps more—in the next 5 or 6 years that would be accomplished under the program of the committee. But to say that the program is absolutely essential and must be done now instead of 1 year later or 2 years later is an utter misconception of the importance of these projects.

We have had many such projects in the Ohio River. There are others that we want. There are many Ohio items in this program. I am perfectly willing to take a chance with the committee. Some of them will be eliminated. I think it is to the national interest that some of the works in this bill in all States should be eliminated and postponed. Of course, each one is a good thing in itself. Each program we are undertaking is a good thing in itself. Appropriations of $13,000,000,000 for the Army, and of $7,000,000,000 for foreign relief are essential programs. The only point is that we cannot do it all at once, and hope that this country can go on with any reasonable stability. We cannot accomplish these things all at once without increasing the prices of everything the people of the country must buy. We cannot add $7,000,000,000 worth of houses in a year to all the other programs and still hope that finally we shall be able to prevent inflation.

The difficulty with the situation is that we are trying to do more than even this country can do. Wherever we can cut down in every phase of this activity we ought to make reductions. I was in favor of reducing the foreign-relief program. I am in favor of reducing this program. I am in favor of holding the Army and Navy down as much as we can hold them down.

As an over-all proposition, if we want a sound fiscal policy in this country, if we want to avoid inflation, and if we are to balance the budget, we must say, "Yes; each one of these programs is a great thing in itself, but it must be fitted into the whole national picture." The field of public works is one place where expenditures can be cut down. It is a most unpopular thing to do, politically, perhaps the most unwise thing that could be done; and, yet, it is absolutely the soundest and the only proper approach for anyone who has an over-all interest in the fiscal welfare of the United States and its people.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Michigan the same question I asked the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

The argument that it is unwise at this time to increase our appropriations for public works is certainly debatable. I think I have been on the short end of that argument all year, and I think my record is consistent. I have tried to economize; but it seems that every time appropriations for rivers and harbors are under consideration, that is the very time that we should start to economize.

We can pass bills for public housing and bills to increase Federal aid to education; we can pass European relief legislation, and that is all right. That is needed. I do not know whether it is true or not. I tried to find out. Not more than an hour ago I asked Mr. Dewey, the head of the staff of the so-called watch-dog committee, how much money was to be appropriated under ERP for the very purposes for which we are appropriating money here—not that I want in any way to sabotage ERP, because that legislation has been passed; but unless the figures have been corrected, it is my understanding that the figure is in the neighborhood of $300,000,000. That is all right. We did not have an opportunity to discuss a single project to be undertaken in Europe. We simply passed the bill. That is all right. We can approve appropriations of $9,333,000,000; but when it comes to passing an appropriation in which I am vitally interested, and which involves the production of food, we must do something else.

I think we could debate that question all day and all week and not get anywhere, because there is a great deal of hypocrisy involved in defending the position many Senators have taken on the question of inflation, considering the appropriations for which they have voted. Let us be frank. What I want to do is to get back to the realities.

If Senators are serious about recommitting the bill, the motion requires that $200,000,000 be lopped off this appropriation. I wish to pay my respects to the minority Members, and especially to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I know that he is very sincere.

I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan a question. How is the $200,000,000 arrived at? It seems to me futile to say merely that we are going to take $200,000,000 off the appropriation. The argument is made that it is proposed to appropriate approximately the same amount of money this year as was appropriated last year. Costs have increased considerably since last year. How do we know that projects which have been approved and authorized, and are now under construction, will be continued? That is a very simple question. I think it behooves the minority to itemize, project by project, the $200,000,000 which they feel can safely be taken from this appropriation. The argument about the engineers and the budget, and who says this or that, is one thing; but to recommit the bill in accordance with the motion, which would permit the engineers to say what projects should be continued, is an entirely different thing.

Congress has already authorized these projects and has made appropriations for their construction. I think the only practical way to proceed is as follows: If the minority members of the committee are sincere in wishing to have $200,000,000 cut off from this appropriation, then it is not enough simply to say, "Let us make the appropriation this year equal the appropriation of last year," because I should like to know what the costs last year were, as compared with the costs this year. I think the projects should be itemized, project by project, up to an amount which will represent a reduction in the neighborhood of $200,000,000, so that those of us who wish to economize may vote intelligently on what reductions should be made, rather than simply take a lump-sum figure out of the air.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wish to state to the Senator that if he had the responsibility for arriving at an over-all budget figure, he would have to consider all the proposed programs before the Government, and he would have to say, finally, "We can only afford $500,000,000 for flood-control works," or something of that sort. In effect, that is what we are trying to do. We are trying to make an intelligent approach to this matter.

In the case of the European recovery program, I proposed to the Congress that we make a reduction of $300,000,000. Those who opposed that proposal asked, "How do you arrive at that figure?" Of course, Mr. President, we arrive at such figures arbitrarily, on the basis of our views as to what the country can afford.

Taxes have been reduced. The estimate of governmental receipts is between $44,000,000,000 and $47,000,000,000, and the estimate of expenditures is between $37,000,000,000 and $39,000,000,000. According to the budget figures, it is estimated that the excess of receipts will amount to approximately $4,500,000,000. According to the legislative budget, approximately half that amount, or not less than $2,600,000,000, must be applied to the public debt. So, Mr. President, sooner or later the Government will have to come to the point of saying, "We can spend only so much this year on public works, in view of the fact that in addition to all other expenditures, we must make expenditures on the European recovery program and in the battle against the spread of communism." It seems to me that someone must consider the over-all picture. So I think it is perfectly foolish to inquire, "How do you arrive at this particular figure or that particular figure?"

The figure presented is an over-all estimate as to how we can keep our expenditures within the amount of money we have to spend.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. With much of what the Senator from Ohio has said, I agree; but with some of it I totally disagree. I do not see that the European recovery program appropriations are at all in the same category with the appropriations under the Flood Control Act. The European recovery program is an entirely new program, and only estimates can be made regarding its cost. I assume that at the time when that program was formulated and presented to the Congress, those in charge of preparing it did not even know what would be spent on it.

But the Senator from Michigan knows that these projects for flood control and rivers and harbors have been carefully considered, item by item, first by the subcommittee and later by the full committee, and they have determined what they think the expenditures should be. I think it behooves the minority members of the committee to state—and to justify—project by project, the items it thinks do not need to be built this year. When that is done, I think we can reasonably and intelligently vote on this issue. But until that is done, merely to say, "We are going to cut off $200,000,000 in the interest of the national economy," to my mind, is being penny-wise and pound-foolish, because under such a procedure it might be necessary to terminate projects which actually had been begun, and such action would result in great losses under contracts which already had been let, and in connection with which work had been started; and it might be that such losses would be greater than the amount of the proposed savings.

I submit to the Senator from Ohio that these appropriations are quite different from appropriations for a new program on which only estimates can be made. In this case, we are dealing with a program which has been appropriated for year after year, so that the amounts of past expenditures are known and can be used in connection with drawing up a program for the future.

Although I wish to do everything within my power to keep the Federal

Government's expenditures within a budget which can be sustained by our country—in fact, if there is any Senator who has been criticized, it has been the junior Senator from Nebraska, because he has tried to make the Government economize—yet here is a matter which must be approached from a practical point of view. However, that is not done. The question of economy is not to be considered in connection with this matter any more than it is in connection with the European recovery program; but if we wish to reduce these appropriations $200,000,000, each and every item that is to be dropped from the program should be considered, and the dropping of it should be justified, just as every item which is placed in the program in the first place is justified before the committee. I submit that is the only practical way to approach a vote on the question of making a reduction of $200,000,000 in these appropriations and then letting the Army engineers say for what projects the money remaining should be spent.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REED. Before the Senator from Nebraska takes his seat, I wish to point out that the statement represents as wide a departure from common sense and sound legislative procedure as I have ever heard.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the Senator refer to my statement?

Mr. REED. Yes. It represents as wide a departure from common sense and sound legislative practice as I have ever heard.

When Congress is making appropriations under a new program, of course the appropriations must be more or less arbitrary, based upon estimates. But for continuing programs, for which appropriations are made year after year, the common procedure is to say, "How much was used for this purpose last year, and how much will be needed this year, and how much will be needed next year?"

What the Senator from Nebraska has been talking about and criticizing is the commonest legislative practice there is.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I think that statement should have an answer. Not only am I amazed, but I am somewhat bewildered by the remarks made by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Kansas. The reason I am is that in view of all the experience the Senator from Kansas has had I think it is utterly futile for him to suggest that the Appropriations Committee should attack this problem backward, for that is exactly what is now proposed. The Senator from Kansas knows that if he is not in favor of the Tombigbee project, which is included in the program now presented to us, even though that project has not yet been begun, there is some sense in asking that that project be eliminated from the program if Senators are opposed to it.

But I submit to the Senate there never has been anything further from sound practice or common sense than a proposal simply to lop off $200,000,000 without any justification, but merely by way of taking that figure out of thin air, and then saying to the Army engineers, "You are to spend the remainder of the money as you think best, without regard to what Congress has done in the past."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, is this my speech? I thought I had the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am sorry to have interrupted the Senator. I hope that in his speech he will answer that question, because the answer to it is not to be found by a consideration of the question of the national economy. Of course the question of the national economy is ever before us; but in arriving at the answer to the question, the practical thing to ask is, "How is the proposed $200,000,000 reduction arrived at, and how do those who propose that reduction justify the elimination of the projects which will have to be eliminated if such a reduction is made?" Believe me, Mr. President, although some may say it is not good common sense to ask such a question, nevertheless the projects which have been authorized and are being constructed today are the ones which I wish to see continued, and I shall vote to see that they are continued. Once projects have been authorized and construction has begun, they should be continued, and the money of the Government should be used for that purpose, in preference to using the Government's money for the purpose of starting new projects, with the result that projects already begun would be brought to a standstill, thus causing a loss which probably would exceed the proposed $200,000,000 saving.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not want to take the Senator's time, and I probably should say this in my own time, but I should like to comment in a word or two on the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio, who quotes divers and sundry economists who favor suspending all public works, or most public works, until there is a depression and widespread unemployment.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Not "most public works." I said, to let up on the program, to treat it gently.

Mr. BARKLEY. I refer to the general proposition the Senator laid down, based on the opinions of economists. I have great respect for economists, but I do not necessarily follow their theory in everything. The theory contemplates that public works are to be undertaken as a means of furnishing work to people who are out of work. That is not involved in flood-control appropriations. We are not undertaking to inaugurate flood control in order to give people work. We grant that people are at work in this country. But floods occur regardless of depressions and prosperity. Floods may be just as damaging and just as harmful in the height of employment and the very height of prosperity as they are in days of depression.

In the meantime the damages we seek to prevent are recurring every year. The figures on the chart show that in 10 years, even with the appropriation now contained in the bill, we shall have appropriated $3,626,000,000, an average of $362,000,000 a year. That average includes the great slump in appropriations in 1944, 1945, and other years, when they were at the minimum. In the case of a Nation-wide flood-control program authorized by the Congress of the United States, which stated that the Congress accepted it as a national obligation, certainly an average of $362,000,000 a year over a period of 10 years is not an excessive expenditure in order to protect life and property in this country.

Floods are just as devastating and just as harmful in one year as in another, regardless of whether we are in a state of prosperity or in a depression. So I do not accept the theory that we ought now to cut down the appropriation because everybody is at work and we are in a prosperous season. That may be a good time to expend the money, because when depressions come the Treasury will likewise feel the impact of unemployment and lack of prosperity in reduced revenues and income. So I did not want the moment to pass without expressing my disagreement with the over-all theory of the Senator from Ohio, which may be good in some particulars and with respect to some expenditures, but which I do not think is applicable to flood control.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I do not want to take the time of the Senator because later I may make remarks upon the subject before the Senate, but I should like to point out, following the remarks of the able Senator from Kentucky, that the $3,626,000,000 spent in 10 years, making an average of $362,000,000 a year for flood control, not only covers flood control but also covers improvements to rivers and harbors. It is the over-all picture, as I see it, for all appropriations, covering not only the flood control that has been spoken of, but the great improvement of waterways and harbors, which are so necessary to the maintenance of the Nation's commerce.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am glad to accept the correction made by the Senator from West Virginia. While I did refer to flood-control matters, because floods create great damage every year, the amount to which I refer does include all river and harbor improvements as well as flood-control appropriations.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan further yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I am apprised that not only does the figure on the chart cover flood control for the 10 years, and the improvement of rivers and harbors, but it also covers maintenance of the Panama Canal, as well as the Quartermaster's Department of the Army, in a large part of its work.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, if I may add, it covers 11 years, not 10.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Can the Senator tell me the estimated cost of all authorized river and harbor and flood-control projects now?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. The flood-control unappropriated monetary authorization is $1,443,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. No; I meant the authorization of total cost of all the projects which have been authorized now for flood control and improvement of rivers and harbors.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is in excess of $7,500,000,000 in round figures.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, what I wanted to suggest is that whether the $7,500,000,000 is spent all in equal parts over all the program, or whether it is spent, as I suggest, by letting up in times of prosperity and increasing in times of depression, we shall get through with that $7,500,000,000 just as soon, as I see it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The figures on the chart indicate clearly that in cases of national emergency, for instance, the appropriations were slowed down. We figure the same thing is true now. Many things have happened since the budget was made up last fall by the engineers and by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I only want to suggest that I am just as much for flood control as is the Senator from Kentucky. He and I live in the Ohio Valley, and I do not want him to think I am not just as strong for that program as anyone else. I only want to point out that a program of $7,500,000,000 is not going to be completed for quite a long time, probably 10 years. Additional authorizations will come along. I do not know what the whole cost will be. I suggest that in the long run the interests of the country will be better served by following the general program of less expenditures for public works in busy times, and more, consideraly more, in times of depression.

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GURNEY addressed the Chair.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. I wanted to say that the figure I used a moment ago as an average, $362,000,000, was based on a 10-year period. Looking at the chart again, I see it is 11 years. The average for the 11 years is only $330,000,000, which is less than the appropriation for either 1948, 1947, 1946, or 1943. The $330,000,000 average for 11 years is certainly not an outrageous expenditure on an obligation that Congress overwhelmingly owes to the American people.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GURNEY].

Mr. GURNEY. A few minutes ago, the question was asked as to the total amount of projects authorized by Congress, for which the engineers have furnished estimates of cost. I would say that, should we appropriate the amount of money provided in the bill, recommended by the majority of the Appropriations Committee, on flood control, there will still be unappropriated-for projects in the amount of $1,083,516,575.

That refers to flood control generally. Flood control on the Mississippi River and its tributaries amounts to $393,576,-319. Rivers and harbors improvements amount to $1,775,082,600. Putting them all together, paying out the money recommended in the bill, there is a total for authorized projects, rivers and harbors, flood control, and flood control on the Mississippi River, of $3,252,175,494, which is very much less than the $700,-000,000 which has been mentioned.

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

Mr. GURNEY. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. What about the Pick-Sloan plan? That alone will require $3,500,000,000. It may not be authorized, but it has been spoken of by the Senator from North Dakota and has been generally approved as a plan.

Mr. GURNEY. These figures include all the money for the Army engineers for all the projects on the main stem of the river. They include all the large dams. The $3,500,000,000 figure includes a number of dams to be built by the Bureau of Reclamation away up on the tributaries, there being more than 100 projects. They have not yet been studied or surveyed. It amounts to an estimate of what the Bureau of Reclamation will require. These other figures include all the dams to be constructed by the Army engineers on the Missouri River.

Mr. TAFT. Has the Senator included the flood-control plans suggested by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]? I think they amount to half a billion dollars.

Mr. PEPPER. Oh, no.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator asked with reference to the authorized projects.

Mr. FERGUSON. This is only the remainder of all those which are authorized.

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

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

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in regard to what was said by the able Senator, the principle of concentrating on public works in periods of unemployment is obviously a sound principle, but only with respect to those public works which can be properly postponed until some such contingency as unemployment may occur. But the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] mentioned the flood-control authorization. In those cases I dare say an investigation will disclose that there will be an immeasurably greater loss sustained by not spending the money than by spending it to control floods and prevent their recurrence.

The total authorization requested for the complete program in Florida is approximately $208,000,000. An official source determined that the State of Florida had losses in one season last year amounting to $59,000,000. The Governor of the State estimates $100,000,000 in 1 year. That does not embrace the total loss sustained by the people. So, postponing flood control at some place must increase the damage to the citizenry from something which they are powerless to prevent but which Congress, by wise expenditures, can prevent when the program is carried out.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. With regard to the total estimated cost of $972,113,000, I should like to say that in 1 year alone there was a loss in the valley of $500,000,000. In my own State the loss will amount to more than $35,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] asked a question, but he is temporarily absent from the floor, and I shall not attempt to answer it at this time.

I wish to speak briefly on behalf of the motion to recommit the Army Civil Functions appropriations bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The failures of this bill to take into account the best interests of the national economy and the fiscal condition of the United States have been discussed in the minority views on the bill and in previous remarks on the motion to recommit.

Let me say with the other signatories of the minority views that I have been astonished by the indiscriminate manner in which the Army engineers have made their requests for restoration of every dollar of House cuts in this appropriation. Let me say further that I have been astonished by the manner in which the committee majority has acceded to those requests.

It is evident that the majority has been influenced by the long parade of witnesses who have come before them. I must say that I have been astonished as well by that parade and disturbed by its course. More than 300 witnesses appeared or were represented before the committee, exclusive of the War Department engineers and Members of Congress. I can recall only one who appeared to protest what is cynically but universally known as this great "pork barrel" bill.

I think the RECORD should show that V. G. Kemp appeared and testified. His testimony will be found at page 1020 of the hearings.

There undoubtedly were other opposition witnesses, but I recall this one because of the apologetic manner in which he made his presentation, as though apologies were necessary in an appearance on behalf of governmental economy.

The minority views call particular attention to the increase in the Senate bill over the House appropriation, amounting to $102,000,000. They call attention also to a significant table showing the financial history of civil-works appropriations, a history of ever-mounting expenditures.

I should like to comment on one aspect of these appropriations, and of the present bill in particular, which was touched

upon by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. In so doing, I would take as my text the old fable of the camel's nose. It is a fable which I am sure is familiar to each Member of the Senate, although its moral may be sometimes forgotten.

There are included in this bill 63 new projects; that is, items for which there has previously been no appropriation for construction. It is true that the appropriation for these items is only $41,451,300. But let me call attention to the fact that the construction undertaking contemplated within that figure implies a commitment to complete works which have an estimated cost of $756,326,400. In other words, we actually are appropriating here only approximately one-twentieth of what will be the ultimate charge to the Government.

To be sure, Mr. President, there will be involved no legal commitment to complete those projects. But in candor we must recognize that once a project is undertaken there is scant room or even economy to turn back at a midpoint of construction, unless it is to be abandoned and stand as a monument to indiscretion.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. CORDON. I want to say that I am in entire agreement with the Senator from Michigan in his last statement. If there is one thing upon which the Congress should have its mind fixed, it is that if it makes an appropriation for any expenditure on these projects it should have in mind that it must make the ultimate expenditure. Otherwise it would amount to utter waste. I absolutely agree that several projects will require the amounts of money which the Senator has suggested. I differ from the Senator, however, with respect to those projects with reference to which commitments are not now being made. Such commitments were made when Congress authorized the projects.

If the Senator will indulge me for a moment further, I think it would be wise for Congress to review the whole program of flood control, river and harbor improvements, and reclamation; but that review should be a considered review, and the policy, once adopted, a considered policy. Until we do that, it seems to me we are shooting in the dark, unless we take the findings of a committee which has spent uncounted hours and weeks in an attempt to provide annual appropriations for the projects which, according to the evidence, seem to be the ones which should have attention now.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the extent of existing civil-works plans, as pointed out by the junior Senator from Kansas, bears reemphasis. They amount to something over $5,000,000,000. With the inclusion of the new projects contemplated in this bill as it lies before the Senate, annual appropriations in the future can certainly be expected to exceed a billion dollars.

Mr. President, these are matters which are not readily apparent, but I am greatly concerned about these hidden commitments which our Government has undertaken.

I have recently had occasion to take issue with the Bureau of the Budget on the manner in which the budget document as a whole is prepared. I do not feel that it presents with sufficient clarity the real obligations for future expenditure on the part of the Government.

But I must confess that the responsibility, however much a revised budget document might assist by calling attention to our outstanding obligations, lies with the Congress. It is we who have been lax in failing to heed the fact that an obligation does not necessarily expire with an appropriation. There are many other obligations, as through authorizations, deferred expenditures, and tacit commitments. They are staggering in their cumulative impact. They demand that we pause and examine every appropriation measure for its future implications.

I have just said that I have recently had occasion to take issue with the Budget Bureau in a different, although related, matter. The Bureau is a favorite target for all of us who would be considered economy-minded. This Congress is on record as believing its current budget report to be inflated. But I want to call attention to what this bill does with those budget recommendations for civil-works construction, as they were submitted by the President.

On the whole, the bill reduces the budget estimates for rivers and harbors and flood control general expenses by $22,915,800. But it includes construction appropriations on 42 different items which were not included in the President's budget. They amount to $29,983,300. Those projects, incidentally, will have an ultimate cost of $439,754,000, if they are completed.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, is that merely by observing the budget recommendations, as far as those 42 projects are concerned, it would have been possible to reduce the budget figure by $52,899,100, or almost 10 percent.

Mr. President, I am not protesting the wisdom or value of civil-works projects generally, or expenditures for any necessary Federal projects, for that matter. The test is one of necessity, and in this case engineering and economic necessity.

I am protesting in this manner, however, the steady and ever-mounting reliance upon the Federal Government for expenditures.

We think this appropriation is one which, by its nature, is particularly capable of reduction. To avoid any impression that we are registering a mere hollow and hackneyed appeal for economy, we have set up what we believe to be a proper and reasonable goal—$200,000,000 less than the figures presently included.

We have recommended a specific formula by which the Army engineers may, in exercise of discretion and conscientious judgment, present us with a program corresponding to that goal.

We ask that the flood-control and rivers-and-harbors projects be classified and given priority ratings, which would be based on urgency, long-range importance, completion with reasonable appropriations, and local sharing of expense.

We believe these to be entirely reasonable recommendations which do not jeopardize any demonstrable needs of the Nation.

The amounts involved may appear insignificant in comparison with other fiscal undertakings of this Congress. They may seem unworthy of the attention we have sought to focus upon them.

There is involved in this particular area, however, a significant challenge to this body's sense of responsibility in the future course of Government spending policy. There is involved a test of the Members' courage to meet that responsibility head-on, with conviction and foresight.

The Nation's economic and social welfare demand there be no evasion on the issue this appropriation presents. The results of this test will be read not alone by interested constituents of this day, but by future generations, who will bear the burden or enjoy the wisdom of the policy that will be laid down here.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Nebraska is in the Chamber at the present time, and I desire to answer his questions, because from the questions which were asked and the remarks made I take it that each Senator feels the responsibility to say to his constituents, if he votes to send the bill back to the committee, "I voted to send it back, and I realized that would mean taking dollars out of the appropriation from projects assigned to our State."

Mr. President, the question is a fair one. It is a political question.

The Army engineers have been mentioned in the debate; we have heard them praised, heard the statement that in wartime they did a great job. I remember one war project looked into by the War Investigating Committee. It was the Canol project, involving the expenditure of $146,000,000. What was it for? No one has been able to find out yet. It has been a total loss to the United States Government.

I have seen the work of the engineers in Central America. In fact, I traveled by mule, airplane, jeep, or automobile, and in some places on foot, over the whole highway that was built there. I saw that these engineers, while the Nation was fighting a great war and the taxpayers were giving of their money to prosecute it, were building roads parallel with those constructed by the highway departments.

Oh, yes; we are aware of many things the engineers have done, but what I want them to do in this case is to say, within a budget, that certain projects are the most urgent and important, and can be completed for the benefit of the American people with the least possible expenditure of money.

Why did the Congress in 1946 pass a Reorganization Act and include a provision for a legislative budget? I think I

know why that was inserted. It was because we felt that the time had come in the United States when we could not trust the executive branch of the Government on the question of budgets. It was spending too much money; it was taking the substance of the people of America; and so the Congress said, "The elected representatives of the people in both Houses should at the beginning of each year declare what they think the over-all total budget should be." They said that the budget this year should be reduced $2,000,000,000.

Where do we get the figure $200,000,000? We believed that was a commitment to the people of the United States, and that if we took from the $738,735,550 the sum of $200,000,000, we would have left about $25,000,000 more than the appropriation for last year. Then we should be able to get along with a little more than we had last year and complete the job we had undertaken.

Permit me to read from page 1396 of the hearings, as follows:

ANALYSIS OF RIVERS AND HARBORS AND FLOOD CONTROL CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

Attached are the tables on river, harbor, and flood-control construction projects in the civil functions bill which Senator BRIDGES requested and which have been studied. (Attached are two recapitulation tables—tables A and B.)

The tables indicate that a large part of the 1949 construction funds approved by the House are applied to projects which are in the initial stages of construction.

This is illustrated by the following table:

	Percent of total 1949 allotment	
	River and harbor projects	Flood-control projects
Status of projects receiving 1949 construction funds as of June 30, 1948:		
Less than 10 percent complete	32.1	15.6
10 to 19.9 percent complete	1.2	24.4
20 to 29.9 percent complete	7.4	13.6
30 to 39.9 percent complete		16.5
40 to 49.9 percent complete	4.2	7.4
50 to 59.9 percent complete	15.6	11.6
60 to 69.9 percent complete	11.9	3.4
70 to 79.9 percent complete	13.9	4.3
80 to 89.9 percent complete	6.5	.9
90 to 99.9 percent complete	7.2	2.3
Total	100.0	100.0

Analysis also shows that projects in the initial stages are granted a larger proportion of funds, relative to their total cost, than projects nearing completion. This is a measure of the speed-up occurring in the program.

Also attached is table C, a summary for the years 1939 through 1949 (estimated) of appropriations and expenditures for civil functions.

Following that appears table A, "Recapitulation of flood control, general, projects by degree of completion," which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE A.—*Recapitulation of flood control, general, projects by degree of completion*

	Total estimated Federal cost	Allotments to date, June 30, 1948	House approved	Balance to complete
Projects under planning appropriation only	$601, 845, 400	$6, 644, 100	$3, 000, 000	$592, 807, 300
Projects less than 10 percent completed	669, 308, 300	31, 979, 300	47, 642, 400	589, 686, 600
Projects between 10 and 19.9 percent completed	503, 955, 300	72, 822, 600	74, 901, 300	356, 231, 400
Projects between 20 and 29.9 percent completed	238, 348, 700	54, 834, 200	41, 600, 000	141, 914, 500
Projects between 30 and 39.9 percent completed	543, 431, 300	180, 901, 200	50, 453, 600	311, 945, 500
Projects between 40 and 49.9 percent completed	86, 274, 000	36, 963, 400	22, 668, 200	26, 642, 400
Projects between 50 and 59.9 percent completed	133, 025, 400	74, 883, 200	35, 353, 700	22, 788, 500
Projects between 60 and 69.9 percent completed	33, 368, 400	21, 631, 400	10, 388, 800	1, 348, 200
Projects between 70 and 79.9 percent completed	75, 361, 800	58, 056, 700	13, 102, 900	4, 202, 200
Projects between 80 and 89.9 percent completed	21, 968, 500	18, 765, 700	2, 871, 800	331, 000
Projects between 90 and 99.9 percent completed	279, 882, 300	264, 751, 900	7, 254, 300	7, 876, 100
Total under construction	2, 584, 924, 000	815, 589, 600	306, 237, 000	1, 462, 966, 400
Total planning and under construction	3, 186, 769, 400	822, 233, 700	309, 237, 000	2, 055, 773, 700

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we who are Members of the Appropriations Committee know what happened last year respecting reclamation. We realize last year we appropriated more for reclamation than had ever been appropriated before. Last year Congress was generous. But we found that the Department of the Interior notified their men to speed up, prior to January 1, 1949, the spending of the money Congress had provided. Then we discovered that we had to appropriate in a deficiency measure about $30,000,000 more. We understand what goes on.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is now on his feet, so apparently he is of the opinion that I have not answered his question. It is impossible to stand here and tell the Senate that if $200,000,000 is taken from the appropriation, one of the Senator's dams in Nebraska will lose so many thousands or so many millions of dollars. But we do say that if there is in the Senator's State a project which is urgent which is demanded, which can be completed within a reasonable time, that project should have the consideration of the Army engineers and the Appropriations Committee, and if the project is one which comes within the category we have laid down it should not be cut one cent.

On the other hand, if there is a project in the Senator's State which has just been begun, or which does not come within the category we have laid down, if it is all pork and all in the barrel, then the Senator can expect that such a project will be cut down by the rule, by the policy we are trying to enunciate, and then he will find that the citizens of his State will lose so much pork out of their own back yard. I think that is a fair way to state the situation.

Mr. President, we should be willing to sit down again with the Army engineers and discuss the situation. I assume that when the engineers received the budget figures the President said to them, "Here are the number of dollars you can have. Apply some rule to the projects before you. Find what are the necessary projects, and what their order of priority is, whether one, two, three, or four, or further on down the line."

The Congress should act in the same way. We should say, "Here are $738,335,550 less $200,000,000. We want you, the Engineers, to restudy the situation and come to the Appropriations Committee with priorities respecting projects. Tell us what you think is the most urgent project. If one of the projects before you is such as the Canol project which was undertaken during the war, or a project such as building a parallel road in Central America, put that project at the foot of the list." Then when we give consideration to the whole subject we will see what should be done respecting each project, and if we find that a project in which the Senator from Nebraska is interested, or a project in which the Senator from Michigan is interested is similar in its nature to the Canol project it ought to be placed at the bottom of the list. On the other hand, if there is a project in the Senator's State of Nebraska, for instance, which is a No. 1 priority project, appropriation should be made for it.

Mr. President, we are not against making appropriations for flood control or for rivers and harbors. But we are now facing a situation of urgency such as that which we faced last fall when Congress was called into session. At that time there was talk of a Marshall plan, of an ERP. The budget for that plan was made up prior to the time Congress assembled. Since then we have found need existing for making other appropriations. We have found it necessary to make appropriation for a 70-group air force. We have found that other large expenditures must be made. We have found it necessary to provide appropriations for Greece, for China, and for other countries throughout the world. So now I hear Senators say on the floor and in the cloakrooms, "Oh, if we give so much to Europe, if we make appropriations for other countries of the world, we cannot deny the dollars asked of us from the people back home." But, just so surely as we are here today, if we adopt such a policy, and do not take a stand for economy when it is needed, then the old saying, "It is the last straw that breaks the camel's back," will come true so far as our country is concerned. We have made appropriations because we believed them to be necessary. We have believed that certain priorities existed for which we should make appropriations.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate today to reexamine the pending bill. Let us be fair with the people. Let us not place on them "the last straw which breaks the camel's back." If America should faint, if America should falter, if America should become unable to maintain a stable economy we know what the result will be.

In the present instance it is proposed to save $200,000,000. Many other millions of dollars can be saved by Congress. We are reviewing the subject of ERP.

It may be that in ERP we can find places where some millions of dollars can be saved the taxpayers. Let us review the situation in the light of what we said in February of the present year, that, as conscientious legislators, we would reduce the budget $2,000,000,000. So far as Michigan is concerned, I will accept whatever reduction will apply to her, whatever it may be, in order that we may have a stronger America.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Michigan mentioned a few minutes ago in his statement that there should come out of the appropriation bill that which I believe he said is pure pork.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has been quoted in the newspapers as referring to the bill as a "pork-barrel bill." Will the Senator from Michigan oblige the Senator from Oregon with his definition of pork?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I shall be glad to.

From the early history of the country, certain appropriations in Congress—the present as well as in previous Congresses—have had a political significance. In election years, and, yes, even in other years, a political significance attaches to them. If a State is asking for something and the chambers of commerce and the labor unions apply political pressure, Senators from the State feel the appropriation should be made.

Some questions have been asked today to this effect: "How does it affect the Senator's State? How does it affect my State?" For example, with respect to the Soo, $500,000 for a generator plant was eliminated from the appropriation. It would have been a very pleasant thing to have been able to go back to Michigan and say, "I was able to get every appropriation asked for." That would sound well in my home State. But the people should say, "What about the over-all situation of America? If you got everything we wanted, did every other State get everything the people of that State wanted?"

I am surprised that the Senator from Oregon asks me for a definition of "pork barrel."

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator, before he closes his discussion, identify the pork in this bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not going to say that $100,000, for example, in connection with one of the projects in the Senator's State is pork. But I conscientiously believe we can take $200,000,000 from this appropriation and still have a great deal of fat left. A hog is probably the fattest animal there is. We can take that much fat out of the pork and still have a program with a great deal of money in it during this election year.

Mr. CORDON. Will there be any pork?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; there will be some pork. We cannot squeeze all the fat out of the pork.

Mr. CORDON. Has the Senator any idea what amount of appropriation we could make if we eliminated all the pork?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am saying that we ought to take $200,000,000 out.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator says that that would still leave some pork.

Mr. FERGUSON. It would still leave some pork. We cannot eliminate it all.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will further indulge the Senator from Oregon, the committee tried to work out this program item by item, on a sound basis. I agree with the Senator from Michigan that discretion must be used. I can see how honest men can disagree as to what the amounts should be. I do not agree with the Senator that the figures represented by these projects fall within his definition of "pork." I do not know of a single river and harbor or flood-control project which has not been presented to another committee than the Appropriations Committee, prior to its coming to the Appropriations Committee, and at a time when we could not squeeze an ounce of fat off the hog, because that committee was not making the appropriation. Having passed the scrutiny of that committee, it was authorized, with a full description of the costs and the benefits. Then the various items went before the Bureau of the Budget for consideration, prior to the time they came to the Appropriations Committees. They went first to the Appropriations Committee of the House, and then to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, where they were subjected to further scrutiny.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps the Senator can answer my question, too. I should like to make an observation along the same line.

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is easy to declaim against pork-barrel legislation, especially legislation which we ourselves oppose, and desire to condemn with some odious reference. The term "pork barrel" has had an odious connotation in the legislative history of the country, because it applied to appropriations with respect to which there was logrolling and back-scratching. One Member of the House or Senate would say to other Members, "Vote for my project and I will vote for yours." But I think no one can claim that such an indictment can be leveled against this legislation. There has been no collusion among Senators, and I am sure the same statement can be made with respect to Members of the House. There has been no logrolling or back-scratching. These projects were presented to the committee by engineers and by citizens of the communities involved. Occasionally they were accompanied by their Senator. That was true in my case, and it was true of my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. We went before the committees, and the engineers and others were examined on the merits of the proposals, disconnected from any other proposals, and wholly disconnected from any proposal by another Senator. So I do not think it is fair to designate this bill, or any part of it, as a "pork barrel" bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am sure the Senator would concede, whether there was back-scratching or not, that there certainly were some itchy backs.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know about that; but if any of them were scratched, in the sense I am talking about, I do not know whose they were.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Can the Senator answer my question for the RECORD? I am still searching for light.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is searching for an answer as to how many dollars would be taken from the appropriation for a certain dam.

Mr. WHERRY. No; that is not the question. If the Senator intimates for one moment that I am interested in any "pork barrel" proposals, I shall produce the record.

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am not intimating such a thing.

Mr. WHERRY. How does the Senator justify the reduction of $200,000,000? I am asking this question seriously.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thought I answered that question.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator certainly has not. Neither has the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. What I want to know is this: If we take $200,000,000 from the $738,000,000, will there be any projects which have been authorized which will be out of funds and unable to continue to operate during the current year? I asked the Senator from Kansas the same question, and he launched into a great oration about how the engineers would do this, and the committee would do that. So he has not answered the question. I am asking the Senator from Michigan the same question. If we can eliminate waste in government, it is all right to select a figure of $2,000,000 or $200,000,000. Certainly my record shows that I am in favor of economy. I do not believe that the Senator from Michigan has won any more blue ribbons than I have in that field. I am willing to compare my record with his on the votes of last fall. I can produce the record if the Senator wishes. If there is "pork" in this bill, then there is "pork" in some of the other things for which we voted.

But I am asking a very practical question. How are we going to take $200,000,000 from the $738,000,000 without justifying it project by project, and determining which projects shall be eliminated? Where would that leave the construction program which has already been started, and which we financed last year to the extent of $415,000,000, I believe? Until those questions can be answered, I say that this approach is entirely impracticable.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me answer the Senator's question.

Mr. WHERRY. I hope the Senator can answer it. I have tried all afternoon to get an answer.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 136 of the hearings the Senator from Michigan was asking some questions.

Colonel FERINGA. The total authorization, not the total plan, for flood control, general, Senator Ferguson, is $2,294,045,000. The total appropriation to date is $1,005,272,825, leaving a backlog of authorization not appropriated for of $1,288,772,175.

That is for flood control, general. To that should be added flood control, Mississippi.

Senator FERGUSON. How much is Mississippi?

Colonel FERINGA. For flood control, Mississippi, the total estimated Federal cost is $1,026,609,500, of which $579,533,181 has been appropriated to date.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, does the Senator think that answers my question?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; but I ask the Senator to wait until I finish giving the answer. Projects involving a great amount of money have been authorized. The engineers said that a certain amount of money will be needed this year and will be used this year, and they recommended all these figures.

Mr. WHERRY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are simply asking them to cut down the total by $200,000,000, and to tell us what projects should be completed and how much money should be appropriated for each one of them.

Mr. WHERRY. That does not answer the question. I supposed I had made myself clear.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator did not, so far as I am concerned, if what I have stated does not answer his question.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand what the long-range program is. I know what the President recommended. I know what the Army engineers have advised, and so does the committee which has studied this matter. The members of the committee understand all that, I am sure.

But the Senator from Michigan has joined in a motion which has been made by the minority of the committee, and that motion is that this measure be sent back to the committee and that the Army engineers be authorized to reduce the program by $200,000,000, and to prorate the remaining amount which they think should be used for the development of the rest of the program, and to outline the remaining items on a priority basis.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I say that motion comes to us backward, and I say that the proposed $200,000,000 reduction was simply taken out of the air, and has not been justified. If this is pork-barrel legislation, the Senator should do what the Senator from Oregon has suggested, namely, point out what parts of it represent "pork barrel" legislation, so that we can eliminate those parts.

In other words, I feel that the minority of the committee, which has taken on its shoulders the burden of maintaining the position that $200,000,000 can be eliminated from these appropriations, should justify that proposal. I think we have a right to know what projects the minority members think should be eliminated.

So I am asking them to point out what items and what projects can be eliminated, up to $200,000,000 of reduction. That is the way I think we should proceed, and I think that should be done.

The Senator has said that some new projects could be begun this year because more money is available. But when I asked him what projects which had not been begun last year should be begun this year, he could not answer. I do not think the Senator can answer the question unless he shows, as a result of a detailed study, how up to $200,000,000 can be eliminated from these appropriations as a result of eliminating one project here and another project there.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the trouble is that the Senator from Nebraska wants the motion to be stated in the following way: Here are so many projects; here is where so many thousands of dollars can be eliminated from the appropriation for each project; and when we get through, we will have reduced the total by $200,000,000.

Mr. WHERRY. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what the Senator from Nebraska is proposing.

Mr. WHERRY. No, Mr. President. If the Senator will further yield, let me state that he is misinterpreting my remarks. I do not say he is doing so willfully, but certainly he is misinterpreting them.

The motion which has been submitted by the minority members of the committee provides that $200,000,000 be eliminated from the total appropriations for these purposes, and that the bill be sent back to the committee, and that the Army engineers be permitted to say what projects should be constructed this year, and be permitted to list them on a priority basis.

It is my contention that we should have more information than we now have. Of course, it is all right for the minority members of the committee to talk about a proposed reduction of $200,000,000, if they believe in their own minds that $200,000,000 can be eliminated from the program. But I am seeking light on this subject. Unless we know where the remaining appropriations will be used in connection with this program, I think we have a right to ask the Senator and the other minority members of the committee to submit to us a list of the projects which they believe do not need to be constructed this year. In other words, there are many projects which have not yet been commenced.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are 62 of them.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well. Perhaps the Senator from Michigan feels that they do not need to be started now. Let me point out that the Senator from Michigan does not need to apply my suggestion only to Nebraska.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that.

Mr. WHERRY. There are many projects on the Missouri River that are just as important as the projects in Nebraska, no doubt. But I should like to know where we shall find ourselves if the proposed $200,000,000 reduction is made.

Mr. FERGUSON. The figures show that after the reduction we shall have as much to spend this year as we did last year, and $25,000,000 more.

Mr. WHERRY. But will the Senator guarantee that if the proposed reduction is made, the projects which already have begun will be continued or completed? Of course, costs have increased, and there are many other aspects of this matter which might cause the program this year to be entirely different from the program of last year or the program of next year, I do not believe the Senator can guarantee that if the proposed reduction of $200,000,000 is made, all the projects now under way will be continued on a sound basis.

Mr. FERGUSON. Of course not.

Mr. WHERRY. So I think the committee should say, "We believe this project is wasteful and we believe that project is unnecessary," and so forth; and it should list the projects which in its opinion can properly be eliminated, with the result that the total amount saved will be $200,000,000. When that is done, if the bill is recommitted, we shall have constructively shown what should necessarily be done. Otherwise, the $200,000,000 figure is merely taken out of thin air, and represents just so mucn talk about the economy of the country. Of course all of us are in favor of preserving and safeguarding the economy of the country, but such talk does not prove constructively what can be done in the way of making reductions in appropriations without causing great waste as a result of stoppages. It seems to me that the program we approve should at least provide for a continuation on the basis of the program of last year. Until I receive such information, I, for one, cannot vote intelligently on the question of making the proposed $200,000,000 reduction.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. REED. It is possible that the suggestion of the minority members of the committee can be amplified a little before we give up as hopeless the Senator from Nebraska. Here is my suggestion: That the Army engineers be instructed to state the remaining projects which they deem to be the most important, both in the category of rivers and harbors and the category of flood control. Of course, if we had stopped there, we would have conferred on the Army engineers the authority to which the Senator has referred. However, we did not stop there, although the Senator from Nebraska seems to assume that we did. But we also said that the Army engineers should make their selection and should present their recommendations. Those recommendations are to be made to the committee, and, of course, the committee will scrutinize the recommendations and will report on them to the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. There is nothing in the minority views to that effect.

Mr. REED. I am perfectly willing to change the motion, so far as that is concerned, and I am sure the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]

also will be willing to do so. The minority members of the committee did not have in mind that the action of the Army engineers in making their selections and recommendations would be final. The only way to proceed in this matter, Mr. President, is to have the only body through which we can work—the Army engineers—make its selections and recommendations after we instruct them what they are to consider. That is all the authority we have given them. We have not given them a particle more authority than they now have or than they have been exercising through the years. This is the only way we can properly proceed.

So before I give up my good friend the Senator from Nebraska as hopeless, I hope he will listen to what I have stated in the way of a suggestion.

Perhaps we are at fault for not writing more definitely into our suggestion a statement that the selections and recommendations of the Army engineers will be only selections and recommendations, and that, of course, the final action will be taken by the Congress.

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

Mr. REED. I do not have the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Senator from Michigan yielded the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I yield the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sure the Senator from Kansas can answer my question.

I note in the report three appropriation items for planning reservoirs in Vermont. One item is for $35,000, one is for $10,000, and one is for $15,000. Those items are for increases, the totals being $75,000 for the Ball Mountain Reservoir, $35,000 for the North Hartland Reservoir, and $40,000 for the Townshend Reservoir.

Does the Senator recall who requested those appropriations?

Mr. REED. I do not.

Mr. AIKEN. Did anyone from the State of Vermont appear and request those appropriations?

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senator from Vermont and to the Senate that early in the hearings before the subcommittee on the appropriations for the civil functions of the War Department, I declared, relative to the general policy on the basis of which this bill would be reported, that I was not going to make a nuisance of myself in the subcommittee by quarreling over these items, but that in view of the way the subcommittee was starting out, the result would be a completely indefensible bill, and I said that I would not attempt to defend such a bill on the floor of the Senate. I said I would not be responsible for any part of it, and that if that kind of bill came from the committee, I would oppose it on the floor; and therefore I did not follow the rest of the items as closely as I might have done.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator does not recall anyone from Vermont who appeared, asking for the three reservoirs, does he?

Mr. REED. I am sorry, I cannot answer that.

Mr. AIKEN. I am not aware that any such request was made by the government of my State, or even by individuals from the State.

Mr. REED. Perhaps the Senator from South Dakota could furnish the answer, if he were here. I cannot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas yield the floor?

Mr. REED. I am very happy to yield.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, on page 2 of the minority views, I find certain language, and I want to ask a question in regard to it. It says:

> The action of the committee majority is totally inconsistent with the will of Congress as overwhelmingly expressed in the resolution finally adopted on February 27, 1948, establishing the legislative budget for the fiscal year 1949. This resolution set an expenditure ceiling of $37,200,000,000 which would be accomplished by requiring a reduction of $2,000,000,000 in new 1949 appropriations proposed in the President's budget. Inherent in the recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget for such an appropriations reduction was a determination that public works should be curtailed during this period of high prosperity and that only those projects which were essential should be constructed during the forthcoming fiscal year.

Then, among the points that were finally recommended by the joint committee, I find, on page 3, the following:

> (5) For the same reason, large-scale expansion and acceleration of public works projects should be limited to such projects as are deemed urgently necessary to the public interest.

I want to ask the Senator, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, whether every one of the projects making up the $738,000,000 total was considered urgently necessary to the public interest.

Mr. REED. Not by the Senator from Kansas. But they must have been considered urgently necessary by the committee, at least by Senators signing the report, if they gave any weight whatever to the recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget; which I doubt.

Let me say to my fellow Republicans on this side of the aisle that the only thing which will keep the Republican Party from being defeated in the fall elections, as a result of this bill and the failure of the Republican Party to observe the commitment it gave the country through its budget committee, signed by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and two other Republicans, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], together with the House Members, is that the President of the United States is making a poorer record in that respect than the Republican Party is making in the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask a question?

Mr. SMITH. I should like to ask just one more question.

Mr. AIKEN. I have one more question.

Mr. SMITH. Following up my point, there is, on page 3, a table entitled "Annual Appropriations, Civil Functions, Department of the Army," the figures covering the years 1939 to 1949. The table indicates, as brought out in the discussion and as shown by the chart which is before us, an estimate for 1949 of $738,735,550. Even if we deduct the $200,000,000, as suggested by the minority, we would still have a figure substantially above the next highest figure I find in the 10-year period, namely, the figure of $506,355,012 in 1948. We would have $538,000,000 which is the highest figure on record, even deducting $200,000,000. What I am asking it, Has the committee considered the word "urgent" in applying figures this year to all the projects? It is difficult for me to understand how we can, even deducting the $200,000,000, have a figure higher than any previous figure, and why, also, everything is so urgent that it must be done this year.

Let me merely say that from my own State of New Jersey I made a request for the consideration of a certain project. I am perfectly willing, as coming from that State, to take a chance that my project would be considered by the Army and probably would be taken care of, because it has to do with the Port of New York, certain channels, and things of that sort. But I know that my State would much prefer to have us take an attitude of over-all economy at this critical time rather than insist that these things be done in my own State. I think I would speak for many others, if we all could get together on that basis. That is my reason for making the suggestion.

Mr. REED. I may say to the Senator from New Jersey that within the last 2 weeks I have been overwhelmed with letters and telegrams from different States. Naturally, all the telegrams and letters I receive on the subject approve the views of the minority of the Appropriations Committe. But I want to say again to my fellow Republicans, the only thing that would save the Republican Party from a disastrous and overwhelming defeat in the fall election, on this bill alone, would be that the President of the United States has confronted us with great competition in advocating large expenditures. I have never seen a political party, including my own, so completely disregard a promise made to the country within 3 months after it was made. I at least was in good faith, Mr. President, when I voted to approve the legislative budget commitment to the country, to reduce the appropriations $2,000,000,000, or at least to make the best effort we could. I am a member of the Appropriations Committee, and as such, a member of the Joint Committee on the Legislative Budget. But senior members of the majority party, from the Senate, the House, and the Finance Committee, as well as from the Committee on Ways and Means, signed that report. They are all honorable men. I do not think they were trying to deceive the country, but I think in this bill we have completely disregarded the pledge that we made. It is to me a shame and a disgrace.

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

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the Senator will yield to the Chair a moment, the Chair did not know the Senator from Michigan was yielding the floor. According to the schedule previously arranged, the Senator from North Dakota was to be recognized following the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. REED. I am glad to yield.

Mr. YOUNG obtained the floor.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield a moment, so that I may ask one more question of the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming the Army engineers were given the authority, are they adequately staffed to carry on a $700,000,000 project this year?

Mr. REED. I cannot answer that. They are, generally speaking, adequately staffed. The Corps of Engineers may call upon engineers employed in civil life, when necessary.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I am opposing the motion made by the Senator from Kansas to recommit, for three major reasons. First, I do not believe our Nation can longer afford the tremendous yearly damage caused by floods to cities, roads, and bridges, the loss of soil fertility due to soil erosion, or the damage to agriculture in general. Second, I am opposed to it because I believe it is unreasonable to ask the Army engineers to apply arbitrarily an appropriation cut of $200,000,000 among the many worth while, well-justified projects provided for in this bill, which I believe 47 of the 48 Governors of the United States have requested. Third, I do not believe the appropriation of $738,000,000 for this essential work will go any further, with today's inflated currency, than did appropriations for similar work made previous to the war.

Mr. President, these appropriations are for different purposes in various areas in the United States. In one area a project may involve harbors; in another area, water storage with irrigation benefits; in another area, navigation; in another area, the prevention of damage to cities; in another, the development of electric-power output with the tremendous benefits this will have in the industrial development of an area, important in our national defense and in the bringing of electricity to thousands of farm homes through REA.

Benefits to be derived from the development of the Missouri River Valley alone, to cite but one area which will gain immeasurably from funds to be invested under this bill, will total an estimated $65,000,000 annually after the work is completed. There will be $30,000,000 in direct annual benefits on the average; $9,000,000 due to conservation of water, including pollution abatement; $9,000,000 due to navigation; $17,000,000 due to the development of electric power.

In the Midwest, the "bread basket" of the United States, there is another problem. It will be recalled that only a few years ago there was a serious drought, the most serious one in the history of the United States. All we are requesting now is that we may store some of the floodwaters in order to irrigate land in the future and so stabilize our agricultural economy in the Midwest. There have been serious flood damages there. Last year the estimated damage, including such intangible but vitally important wealth as topsoil, in the Missouri Valley alone was $500,000,000. Property destruction amounted to more than $150,000,000. In my small State the Missouri River caused damage estimated at $500,000 in that one year alone. Total damage in 1 year alone was estimated at $25,000,000. In one instance, in the Red River Valley, there was $10,000,000 damage to roads and bridges. The Federal Government is now rebuilding many of them on a 100-percent Federal matching basis. The flood-control projects which this bill will help build will help halt this annual waste of wealth by curbing these floods. In the long run, they will mean a tremendous direct saving to the Federal Treasury, and an even greater saving in national wealth and resources. To reduce the work will be to delay and reduce the benefits.

It has been stated that the fortunes of the Republican Party depend on whether these appropriations are made. I should like to read a letter from the vice president and general manager of one of the greatest industries in the entire Midwest. He requested that I withhold the name of the person to whom the letter is addressed, but said that I could read the letter. The writer of the letter is the vice president and general manager of the Deere & Webber Co., manufacturers of farm machinery. The letter is as follows:

We have your letter of the 19th in connection with appropriations for the Army's civil functions, viz, river, harbor, and flood-control work.

Like every other businessman and taxpayer, I am in favor of doing everything we can to minimize waste, but I am afraid that I am not in a position to agree with you without knowing a good deal more about what the appropriations are for.

Millions of dollars of damage is done each year by floods and our topsoil is being rapidly dissipated by damaging floods. One of the most essential jobs that we have to do, unless we are going to be penny-wise and pound-foolish is to carry out the Missouri River development program of dams and flood control and do everything we can to put a stop to the damage and waste that is taking place every spring all through the Missouri River Valley.

A good many of us have a real stake in the Northwest—

Mr. President, I believe the person who wrote this letter represents a firm which pays more than $10,000,000 a year in income taxes.

The letter continues as follows:

and the one thing that we ought to work for is completion of this program under the direction of the Bureau of Land Reclamation and the Army engineers.

I have personally taken the time to visit some of these projects, such as the Garrison Dam, and I am strongly in favor of the appropriations necessary to carry on this program at a reasonable rate. We cannot do it by the process of fits and jerks and it should be a job calling for steady progressive completion of this work.

I am going to write to the Senate Appropriations Committee, but unfortunately I do not think my letters are going to support the position which you are taking because I do not think that in this case it is a tenable one.

Furthermore, I do not think that you can label a program that is already years behind insofar as the conservation of our land resources is concerned, a "pork barrel" project.

Mr. President, I reiterate that this letter comes from the largest industrialist in the entire Midwest.

At this point in my remarks I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Fargo Forum, Fargo, N. Dak., dated May 9, 1948. The headline is "Floods along Sheyenne may soon be stopped." I would not at this late hour detain the Senate by reading it, but I think the editorial better points out the benefits derived by a State from a water project than I could otherwise tell it.

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

FLOODS ALONG SHEYENNE MAY SOON BE STOPPED

Plans that are now on paper or in the process of construction should put an end to any future flood conditions similar to those now existing along the Sheyenne River.

The Sheyenne flood is not a dramatic or exciting proposition, such as the huge Mississippi River floods, which sometimes take hundreds of lives and do millions of dollars worth of damage in big cities.

The Sheyenne flood is just a lot of water moving slowly across open countryside, on the face of it inconveniencing just a few farmers and travelers.

That, at least, is what it would look like to a disinterested observer. But those flood waters will probably cost several individual farmers along the Sheyenne upwards of $20,000 to $30,000 each. That sounds like a lot of money, but look at a couple of examples:

One farmer along the Sheyenne plans to put his section of land into wheat. His prospective yield—before the flood—is conservatively 20 bushels to the acre, or 12,800 bushels. And at $2 a bushel that's $25,600. Along comes a flood on May 9, washes out a field already seeded; the field won't dry out in time to reseed it to wheat, so it will have to be summer-fallowed or put into some short-season and not very profitable crop such as millet. There goes most of the farmer's $25,600 riding the crest of the Sheyenne flood.

His neighbor planted 100 acres to flax. At a yield of 10 bushels to the acre he could look for a return of $6,000 at the Government support price of $6 a bushel—only to see that, too, washed down river with the flood.

That innocent looking Sheyenne flood is certainly an expensive proposition to these individuals. And no one likes to see his neighbors take that kind of a beating.

So the thing to do is to put the plans that are on paper into reality. One part of the Sheyenne flood-control project is in the construction stage, the Baldhill Dam above Valley City. Inability to get steel has delayed expected completion from next year until 1950. But after one more spring the Sheyenne flood threat will be greatly reduced.

The other part of the cure—the part that should completely eliminate flood possibilities—is just started on a tough road through Congress. It is the proposal of the Army engineers to give a face-lifting treatment to the Sheyenne River channel from Horace to the mouth, 42 river miles away. The engineers propose to clear the banks and the channel of trees and other obstructions to flow; in some places to eliminate big horseshoe bends by cutting a new channel across the narrow end of the horseshoe and thereby speed up the flow.

The proposal has been approved by the engineer's board of review in Washington. Now it goes to Congress for authorization and a Federal appropriation of $600,000. The farmers along the river would have to put up $100,000 of their own to secure rights-of-way, relocate roads and bridges. The farmers along the Sheyenne have already given the engineers assurances that they would go along with the local participation funds after the Federal appropriations are secured.

It's too bad plans can't be transferred from paper to reality more quickly and cheaply, but this year's flood may speed congressional action to end the Sheyenne flood menace.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks two telegrams in connection with the same subject.

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

CAVALIER, N. DAK., *April 27, 1948.*

MILTON YOUNG,
United States Senator:

Pembina County now experiencing one of worst floods in history. Estimate at least one-half million dollars damage to roads and bridges; total disaster cannot be estimated. Need quick action by Congress for financial aid, also priorities for materials to make roads passable. Large part of county still under water; request immediate action and support.

PEMBINA COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
By NORVAL W. HODGSON,
County Auditor.

GRAND FORKS, N. DAK., *April 26, 1948.*

MILTON R. YOUNG,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

At a joint meeting of the boards of county commissioners of Grand Forks County, Traill County, Walsh County, Pembina County, and Cavalier County, held on the 26th day of April, 1948, the following resolution was adopted:

"United States Senator MILTON R. YOUNG.

"United States Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

"United States Representative WILLIAM LEMKE.

"United States Representative CHARLES ROBERTSON.

"Whereas it is understood that the President of the United States has declared the North Dakota side of the Red River Valley an emergency disaster district;

"Whereas tremendous damage has been done to State, county, and township roads, bridges, and culverts therein, involving the need of vast expenditures therein;

"Now, therefore, we request an emergency appropriation from Congress of $25,000,000, or as much thereof as is necessary, at once for assistance to State, counties, and townships herein."

W. E. BLOCK,
Chairman, Grand Fork County.
T. A. MEAGER,
Chairman, Walsh County.
MANDLEY O. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Trail County.
A. F. HALL,
Chairman, Pembina County.
ANDY JOHNSON,
Chairman, Cavalier County.
JAMES P. KENNEDY,
North Dakota State Highway Department, Grand Forks Division.

PROCEDURE IN SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION UNDER IMMIGRATION ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3566) to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. REVERCOMB. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. WILEY, Mr. REVERCOMB, and Mr. EASTLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I wish to insert in the RECORD two letters which I have received, among scores of others, relative to Hawaiian statehood. I shall take only a few minutes at this time to say again that the vote taken the other day by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs was not a vote against statehood for Hawaii, because I am firmly convinced that a majority of the committee is in favor of statehood for Hawaii, whenever the committee has an opportunity to check into certain movements that seem to be of more than usual interest at this time. Moreover I wish it distinctly understood that the action taken by the committee was not for the purpose of giving the members of the committee an opportunity to make an additional trip to Hawaii. The answer may be obtained even without having the committee make a trip to Hawaii, if the committee members are satisfied with what is developed. If possible, we shall try to have the committee's report in such shape that if the Congress is called for a continuing session later on, it will be possible for action on this question to be taken at that time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the body of the RECORD and as a part of my remarks, several letters reflecting the opinion, apparently, of a substantial body of the more thoughtful citizens of Hawaii, showing the grave danger there would be in granting statehood to Hawaii at this time.

The first is from a prominent attorney there. He calls particular attention to the fact that a grant of statehood is final and irrevocable. If we do grant statehood now, we cannot change our minds and repeal or amend the bill later on.

The second letter is from a very prominent Democratic leader in the Territory. He has asked me to keep his name confidential for fear of political reprisals, but I assure you, Mr. President, he is well-known and highly regarded and has been honored by his party in the past with selection as a candidate for at least one important political office. I am sure he speaks from the heart and in all sincerity. As a good Democrat, he was probably deeply concerned with the results of the recent Democratic Territorial convention when the ILWU, Harry Bridges' Hawaiian subsidiary, took over control of his party in the Territory.

Mr. President, I present these two letters for insertion in the body of the RECORD immediately following my remarks, together with an article appearing in the May issue of Plain Talk, entitled "Red Wedge in Hawaii."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator, who is chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, if he will not agree with me that, barring another session of the Congress of the United States, the only way Hawaii can get statehood at this session of the Congress is by withdrawing the bill from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, since the committee has determined not to let it out at this session of the Congress? As a practical matter, the bill was passed by the House of Representatives last year, and it has been in the Senator's committee since last July. My question is: If we do not pass it at this session of the Congress, barring a special session, the whole legislative process will be dead and we must start all over again?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished Senator from California that I have no way of knowing what action the Senate of the United States would take upon the statehood bill if it were on the floor today. I cannot answer that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matters presented by the Senator from Nebraska will be printed in the RECORD.

The matters referred to are as follows:

HONOLULU, HAWAII, *May 10, 1948.*

Senator HUGH BUTLER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BUTLER: The members of your committee who refused to report out the statehood bill are deserving of the ineffable thanks of this community. A great burden has been lifted from the minds and shoulders of those of us who want to retain Hawaii in its present status.

It must have been a long and trying experience that you gentlemen had to endure.

Should a committee come down here to investigate statehood, may I suggest that certain people be permitted to tell their opinions privately, as one who has not lived here could have little idea of the effect that opposition to statehood would produce on those who have the courage to come out and speak the truth. There are so many different branches of the human race here that it is impossible to explain opposition without incurring the enmity of many people here. At the outbreak of the war the Roberts committee was here. Prominent citizens were asked to testify to that committee and were assured that their statements were confidential and would not be revealed under any circumstances. Soon after the committee's report the testimony was furnished to the Star-Bulletin, which is Farrington's paper, and they printed certain statements made by prominent people verbatim. A great deal of it was not complimentary to the Japanese and resulted in producing hatred for those individuals who had been betrayed into testifying by the assurance that it would be a secret document.

The Japanese are the largest racial unit here and can elect and defeat any person they choose. As I said to you in a former letter, they are a splendid people, but very touchy on any question that would involve their race and their standing in the community publicly. I have been told by certain Japanese that it is the intention of those people to put the white man where they think he belongs.

If our President is good enough to appoint our Supreme Court, certainly any man we elect to that position is competent to appoint our judges and our governor.

There is not a Senator or a Representative in either House of Congress who would vote for statehood for Hawaii if the true situation were known to them.

My thanks goes to you.

Confidentially yours.

HONOLULU, T. H., *March 10, 1948.*

Re statehood for Hawaii.

Hon. HUGH BUTLER,
United States Senator, Nebraska,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your last letter concerning the statehood for Hawaii bill was received by me some time ago. Since that time much has transpired.

As you know, Senator CORDON, chairman of the subcommittee, came to Hawaii, but as yet has not made public his report and recommendations.

I met Senator CORDON while he was here and followed his activities very closely. He seemed very sincere in his endeavors, but the fact still remains that he was wined, dined, and hula-danced by the statehood group which is functioning on a $200,000 lobby appropriation to put the pending bill through Congress at this session. During his entire stay here, he was seldom if ever out of their clutches.

There are hundreds of people in the Territory who are opposed to statehood, but because of fear of reprisals, both political and economic, they must remain inarticulate. These people are looking to you as chairman of the committee to hold the fort. They are of the opinion that you, as chairman of the committee, should come to the Territory and, without any fanfare, banquets, dances, dinners, or parties, see and explore the situation as it is.

As chairman of the committee, we urge that you exert your senatorial prerogative in this respect, and under no circumstances yield to the pressure group which would have this bill rushed through the Senate without you having first visited the Territory to see for yourself and gain first-hand knowledge of the situation.

There are many, many angles to be considered when statehood for Hawaii is under discussion. An over-all and important factor to be remembered is, that any action granting statehood to Hawaii will be final and irrevocable. The statehood bill is not like other legislation of the Congress which might be repealed at a subsequent session. Once statehood is granted, regardless of whatever harm may flow therefrom, it can never be remedied. It is a most serious matter affecting the lives of many people in the Territory and of equal importance, affecting the lives of millions of people on the mainland. No one favoring statehood for Hawaii has called to the attention of the Congress any particular benefit statehood would bring to the 48 States now in the Union. The attitude of the proponents of statehood has been a most selfish one with little, if any, regard to the rights of minorities.

I am enclosing two important pamphlets which every Senator on your committee should have, and I am hoping to place one of each in the hands of every Member of the United States Senate.

You will find upon reading these that there is ample justification for postponing future consideration of the statehood bill until matters therein discussed have been clarified.

I sincerely trust that under no consideration will you yield to the suggestion of allowing this bill to come to a vote, until you, as chairman of the committee, have visited Hawaii and seen for yourself, so that you may know of your own knowledge the situation which exists here.

It is very likely that I may be in Washington sometime in April or May, and if I am, I shall certainly call upon you to discuss this pending legislation and will present a written brief to you against statehood at the present time for Hawaii.

Sincerely yours.

[From Plain Talk magazine for May 1948]

RED WEDGE IN HAWAII

(By Victor Lasky)

Red fleet submarines operating off American bases in the Pacific have led to speculation as to whether there will be another Pearl Harbor—with the invading dive bombers or fifth column "torpedoes" this time being supplied by Soviet Russia. Hawaii, hub of this Nation's defenses and crossroads of the air in the vast Pacific area, which now includes the supersecret atomic test base in the Eniwetok atoll, has once again assumed a key role in United States military strategy.

This is why Soviet spies have taken such a keen interest in Hawaii. With Eniwetok carefully guarded, and the atomic doings there completely unpublicized, Russian agents rely on Honolulu—rest area for atomic personnel—as a source of information. An unguarded slip of the lip by an Eniwetok-based soldier or sailor in a downtown gin-mill may give the Soviet intelligence all it wants to know. Honolulu also serves as the center of the Communist courier system in the Pacific, as it lies midway between the United States and Red China. Chinese Reds constantly filter through, and so do American Communists.

As matters stand today, Russian agents could cripple Hawaii in a matter of days. All that it would take to deal a paralyzing blow to the Paradise of the Pacific—as the travel folders call it—is a strike of certain key workers along the water front. It has been estimated that a walk-out of 50 truck drivers and a few hundred longshoremen would do it. And the Communist Party controls the bulk of unionized workers in the Territory, through Harry Bridges' International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union (ILWU), a catch-all outfit taking in everyone from cooks to plantation workers and now boasting some 30,000 members.

With Hawaii paralyzed, the Nation's first line of defense strung through the Pacific in a series of former Japanese-mandated islands could be cut off from food and equipment for long periods. And another war could start—as did the last—with the enemy scoring heavily. These facts are known to Territorial officials. Gov. Ingram M. Stainback has turned them over to Washington. But the situation, fraught with peril for all Americans, has been obscured for the general public which still likes to think of Hawaii in terms of a year-round vacation land.

The islands have been anything but a vacation-land to the Soviet high command. For nearly a quarter of a century Moscow has displayed an unwavering interest in Hawaii's defenses and polyglot population. Today Hawaii bristles with military establishments and naval bases destined to play an important role in the event of another war. At the same time—much to Moscow's satisfaction—the islands are seething with labor agitation. Behind the unrest are the activities of the tightly-knit Communist battalions and of Harry Bridges, a key figure in the Kremlin's Pacific plans.

Harry Bridges will show his hand on or after June 15. It is on that day that the ILWU contracts with the west coast shipping magnates run out. And Bridges, whose heart belongs to Stalin, has made it clear he is not interested in an early settlement. Bridges has other plans, which he has broadcast in his bylined column in the Dispatcher, ILWU publication. They are to sabotage all efforts of the nations participating in the recovery program for Europe and China as a means of combating communism.

"During the coming months," Bridges wrote recently, "our longshoremen are going to be faced with more demands from workers overseas asking that we refuse to load arms and materials aboard American and foreign vessels that are destined to be used against workers in other countries to smash their strikes and struggles against reactionary employers, landlords, and governments."

This is the man who controls the union which controls Hawaii. For Hawaiians another west coast shipping strike would mean starvation, unless Bridges permits food shipments to the islands. Since the islands no longer grow their own food, they rely on the mainland for supplies. Bridges learned this during the 1946 shipping strike. And significantly, the Hawaiian ILWU has purchased large quantities of foodstuffs so that its own members can eat—while others starve—in the event of a strike.

MECCA FOR SOVIETEERS

Hawaii has long been a mecca for assorted Russian agents, who did not come for a vacation. Moscow first sought to gain a foothold in the Military Establishment as far back as 1925. Two American soldiers stationed at Schofield Barracks were court-martialed on charges of having organized a cell of the Young Communist League (which today is called the American Youth for Democracy, a main prop of the Henry A. Wallace movement). Pvt. Paul Crouch was sentenced to 40 years, a term later cut to 3 years, at Alcatraz military prison. The 26-year term of Corp. Walter Trumbull was later cut to 1 year. Ten other soldiers, who had been induced to join the YCL, were dishonorably discharged and returned home.

Testimony presented by Army Intelligence officers showed that Crouch and Trumbull had been in contact with Comintern headquarters in Moscow. Both later turned up as minor Communist functionaries in the States. Crouch presently is a party organizer in the South. Another Communist who had been stationed at Schofield Barracks was George Pershing. Pershing, who claims to be a second cousin of Gen. John J. Pershing, was court-martialed and imprisoned in 1924 for 2 years on charges of robbery, grand larceny, and housebreaking. The facts behind the charges were never made public. But Pershing later insisted that all he did was to set fire to a disorderly house in Honolulu. In 1940 he turned up as the American Labor Party candidate for Congress from Westchester County, N. Y.

In the 1920's a revolutionary seaman, Richard Krebs (Jan Valtin), was dispatched to the islands by Albert Walter, a German in charge of Comintern maritime activities. "It was easy for me to see that the existence of a Communist stronghold in the port of Honolulu would be a big step toward covering the whole Pacific Ocean with a network of Communist contacts," Valtin wrote later in Out of the Night. Following his explorations, the pace of Communist propaganda in Hawaii was stepped up greatly. The propaganda line, dictated in Moscow, stressed racial issues in a territory where many races have managed to get along fairly well together.

One leading Soviet agent to visit Honolulu was Nicholas Dozenberg, one of the founders of the American Communist Party and the first business manager of the Daily Worker. The Latvian-born Dozenberg disappeared from Communist circles some 20 years ago and, as it turned out later, was impressed into Soviet Military Intelligence. As the representative of an American photography concern, Dozenberg roamed Europe and the Orient. On one occasion he even traveled in King Carol's private plane to photograph Budapest's defense fortifications from the air. He showed up in the Philip-

pines, as the representative of Bell & Howell, in 1938, and more than once bobbed up in Hawaii.

The man chiefly responsible, however, for the promotion of the Communist cause in Hawaii is the indefatigable Jack Hall, who directed the local ILWU organizing campaign. Hall, who later became a member of the Honolulu Police Commission, is a leader of district 13 of the Communist Party, Hawaiian section.

Although the American Federation of Labor has functioned on the islands for nearly 30 years, it has never got very far, except for unionizing carpenters, printers, and other select crafts. It took the Communist Party a decade before it was able to enroll some 30,000 Hawaiian workers into the all-embracing ILWU. Workers in more than 150 industries and occupations were signed up. Hall himself is under 99-year suspension from the Sailors Union of the Pacific, an A. F. of L. affiliate headed by the anti-Communist, Harry Lundeberg, for conspiring to bring it into the Communist fold.

THE PHONY PATRIOTS

Army Intelligence, through the twenties and thirties, was not too concerned with Communist activities. There was a bigger problem involved in Japanese espionage, since more than 30 percent of the Hawaiian populace was of Japanese origin. As it turned out, the Japanese proved to be overwhelmingly loyal to the United States. There were no acts of sabotage committed on the islands during the war.

Prior to Hitler's invasion of Russia in June 1941, the bulk of defeatist, antiwar propaganda stemmed from the Communists in district 13. They used the black-outs to distribute leaflets assailing American preparedness and President Roosevelt as a warmonger. When the lights were switched on following one black-out, leaflets were discovered reading: "Stop this blackout of liberties, peace, democracy. Black-out the warmongers. This time the Yanks are not coming."

Some idea of what American authorities may face in another war can be gathered from a study of this period. The Communists promoted strikes along the water front, anything to deter aid to the Allies. A 10-month-long strike of longshoremen was staged at Kauai. When ships bearing munitions were detoured to Port Allen, Jack Hall insisted that the longshoremen there strike despite the fact that they had a contract.

"We took a real beating," later wrote Ichiro Izuka, former president of local 1-35, ILWU, who was expelled from the Communist Party. "We lost nearly a year's wages, and our families suffered. This is the first time I seriously doubted the Communist plan for helping the laboring men of Hawaii." But that did not faze the comrades. They had succeeded in aiding the Nazis, as directed by Moscow.

It was about this time that the authorities began to investigate Communist activities. Arrests of Communists followed. Izuka himself was picked up and put in solitary confinement for a week. But the authorities learned little from the disciplined comrades—and then came June 22, 1941, the attack on the Soviet Union, and the comrades changed their tune. Now everything was directed toward winning the war. Harry Bridges became a 100-percent patriot in the pages of The Dispatcher. Gone were such sentiments as, "It's just an imperialist war, anyhow," which Bridges had been insisting. And the Daily Worker declared: "Anything that interferes with production of needed war supplies—whether as a result of strikes or of delays by the employers—can only help Hitler and weaken the defense of the United States."

The Hawaiian comrades also became superpatriotic. They organized the Honolulu Labor Canteen, out-USOing the USO, but with another object in view. Their aim was to infiltrate and propagandize the multitudes of servicemen streaming through the islands on their way to the Pacific fighting fronts. For many GIs the canteen was a welcome haven from the downtown honky-tonks. There were always interesting magazines, including New Masses, around. And there was an adequate supply of females—in girl-short Honolulu—who seemed to know a lot about world affairs. The canteen also ran what were tagged "coke-confabs" at which interesting topics, such as Russia and labor, were discussed from the party-line view. This "patriotic" venture paid off with the GI demobilization demonstrations.

During the war the comrades also concentrated on a project known as Community Discussion Groups. A similar strategy was used in Canada to ensnare professional workers and intellectuals in behalf of Soviet atomic espionage under the guise of discussions. The groups were directed by Dr. John Reinecke, a former instructor at the University of Hawaii, and a Communist. They attracted teachers, several school principals, welfare workers, and some scientific personnel from Pearl Harbor and other defense establishments. Most of these people did not know what was behind the interesting discussions. A few who showed "promise" learned later when they were asked to join the Communist Party.

"WHY OCCUPY HAWAII?"

Somewhere in the extensive files of the Kremlin there is a report on how Jack Hall and his Honolulu comrades scored heavily in favor of Soviet Russia as soon as Moscow had begun to prepare for world war III. The report gives the low-down on the so-called GI demonstrations for speedy demobilization which began in late 1945. After Hall got through with demonstrations, they had succeeded in effectively crippling America's armed forces.

These demonstrations also showed, for those who would see, the real trend of Soviet foreign policy shortly after VJ-day. Slogans raised at the demonstrations, once they were under Communist control, ranged from "Why occupy Hawaii?" to "Get our troops out of China."

The boys from the Ozarks and the Bronx, of course, did not know they were being used by Communist conspirators. Their "beefs" were based on justified resentments against "chicken" details, spit-and-polish discipline, and the realization that it would take some time before they could get home. These spontaneous seeds were nurtured in the ILWU's Honolulu labor canteen, whose guiding spirit was Jack Hall. There Communists in uniform, meeting with local conspirators, received the directives from New York headquarters, which converted the legitimate protests into attacks on the State Department and American foreign policy. New York headquarters at the time was being advised by the mysterious Gerhart Eisler, Kremlin agent in the United States.

The Daily Worker, making no secret of Communist policy, blared at the time, "Bring the boys home." A typical headline in the Worker read "Soldiers kept in Caribbean area to help United Fruit Co.'s profits." A typical story read: "Behind GI protests all over the world at delays in home shipments was a growing political suspicion that a shift in United States foreign policy had taken place somewhere along the line." This now-familiar technique of crying "Thief! Thief!" was almost totally ignored by American observers in those blissful days still laden with the good-will aroma of Potsdam.

From the Honolulu canteen the party line spread to the demonstrations in the downtown district. There a T-4, David Livingston, declared: "We are here because there seems to be a foreign policy developing which requires one hell of a big army. It's about time we said, 'Yes, let's occupy enemy countries, but not friendly countries.'" The crowd was not informed, however, that Livingston was a Communist and a leader of American Youth for Democracy. Livingston was subsequently arrested, warned, and released. Currently he is business agent of the Communist-led local 65, Wholesale and Warehouse Workers (CIO), in New York. Before the Nazi attack on Russia, local 65 branded the war as an imperialist venture, and fought against lend-lease and preparedness measures, but after Russia was invaded, the local changed its position overnight.

Starting from Honolulu, the political line caught on in GI demostrations in China, Paris, Rome, and Frankfurt. Their global proportions admittedly embarrassed our State Department in its relations with the Soviets on the eve of the first major postwar diplomatic clash at the London Conference. Letters and resolutions—which followed a single pattern belying the claim of their being spontaneous reactions of typical GIs—flowed from the demonstrations to newspapers and Congressmen back home. Then, the politicians, too, demanded speedy demobilization. And while the comrades stirred up the GIs, whose only consideration was to get back home, Moscow kept details of its own demobilization a deep Red secret.

Jack Hall came out in the open, following the arrest in Honolulu of four members of the Marine Corps for participating in the demonstrations. Hall announced that the CIO would stage a 24-hour waterfront stoppage in protest. The stoppage never came off, but it indicated clearly to Army Intelligence who was behind the demobilization crisis.

FISHING IN LABOR WATERS

The party was now reactivated for industrial work and the comrades went to town with the ILWU organizational drive. The labor canteen gave birth to the Hawaii Association for Civic Unity, a front group consisting of liberals who did not suspect its Communist sponsorship. The issue of statehood for Hawaii was made a party-line affair, with the comrades insisting that the Big Five companies, which largely dominate the industrial and agricultural life of the islands, opposed statehood. The argument against the Big Five was picked up by the ILWU which produced a glossy pamphlet extolling the virtues of statehood. As a result, the cause of statehood is suffering.

The rise of the Communist-powered ILWU in the islands proved a blow to the Big Five. Using every type of propaganda, including racist (designed to convince the Japanese-Americans their lot was an unhappy one under American rule), ILWU organizers—well financed by the San Francisco home office—found the pickings easy. During the war the Army had forbidden labor organizing. Workers were frozen to their jobs. Wages were controlled. Prices were going up. And Japanese-American soldiers, returning home, began to assert their rights as Americans. They refused menial jobs. They wanted a better standard of living. And on the sugar and pineapple plantations the workers were restless, resentful. Resentments spilled over following VJ-day, when the lid on labor organizing was off, and the Communists were quick to seize upon the justified grievances of the laborers and exploit these for their own ends.

By the thousands workers in various industries joined the ILWU, shepherded by Jack Hall. Despite his record, Hall was made a police commissioner by Governor Stainback, a progressive-minded official who believed in giving to labor representation in all important Territorial agencies. For Hall not only represented the most powerful labor group in the islands, but he was the spokesman for the Political Action Committee, which last year upset Hawaiian political life by helping elect 15 Democrats to the lower house of the legislature.

Governor Stainback dismissed Hall as a police commissioner when the ILWU leader

assailed a judge who had ruled against the union during the sugar plantation strike. Governor Stainback insisted that while the judge may have been wrong, Hall should have appealed the ruling rather than intemperately create contempt for the courts which he, as a commissioner, had sworn to uphold.

ENTER COMMISSAR BRIDGES

The organizers for the A. F. of L. did not wake up to the situation until it was too late. Harry Bridges, sporting a flower-patterned aloha shirt, visited the islands to view the work of his henchmen. The disastrous 79-day sugar strike of 1946, coupled with the west-coast shipping strike, made Bridges realize he was kingpin. He learned that he had the power to stop Hawaiians from eating if he wanted to—and one day he may want to. That day, some observers fear, may not be far off.

Although the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that Bridges is not a member of the Communist Party, his former wife, Agnes, has testified that he is. Last year he was caught leaving an apartment at 340 West Fifty-sixth Street, New York, at which a top-flight Communist parley had been held. William Z. Foster, national chairman of the party, and other Communist leaders, had attended. The parley took place during a maritime strike. Bridges is reputed to be a great favorite in Kremlin circles. His strategy in the 1934 San Francisco general strike has been taught as a model for future action in Moscow's Lenin school.

Last year Chu Hsueh Fan, president of the pro-Communist Chinese Association of Labor, visited the Honolulu offices of the ILWU on his way back from a meeting of the Kremlin-directed World Federation of Trade Unions in Prague. The meeting was also significant in view of the belief that Harry Bridges has organized illegal armament traffic between the United States and Red China ports, by way of Honolulu.

It is no secret that well-trained agitators have come out by the hundreds from the Pan-Pacific University in Vladivostok and a Communist school at 121 Haight Street, San Francisco. At Vladivostok, Japanese, Filipinos, Portuguese, and Spanish half-castes have been schooled for special missions throughout the Pacific with Hawaii as the main objective for their Stalinist tactics.

Bridges has never been known to deviate from the Communist line, whether it be a false patriotism or a militant defeatism. Currently he is belligerent. He wasn't so when Russia was in the war. He was opposed to strikes then. Neither is he belligerent about loading Soviet ships during strikes. Frank P. Foisie, president of the Waterfront Employers Association has reported:

"The Soviet Consul in San Francisco called me one day and asked the association to permit work on a Soviet ship that was in port during a longshoremen's strike. He said that the ILWU already had agreed to let its men load this ship and he wanted the employers to give them the same permission. I told him, 'Hell, no.' "

The Bridges followers have also been active among the Hawaiian tuna fishermen. Local 150 of the ILWU is a small group consisting of 150 fishermen, but it plays an important role insofar as they can get around to areas where others would ordinarily be viewed with suspicion. The Japanese also used fishermen for their espionage prior to Pearl Harbor. High Japanese naval officers, posing as fishermen, photographed naval installations from every angle. Their work paid off on December 7, 1941.

Currently Harry Bridges, and the Communists, are attempting to organize an independent Hawaiian Islands Federation of Labor, which would include independent and A. F. of L. unions.

Bridges has his tentacles reaching throughout the Pacific and the Caribbean. He has organized sugar workers in Cuba, longshoremen in Panama. His agents are now in Alaska where there is a minute labor movement. Labor sources report that Germain Bulcke, an ILWU second vice president, was sent there to organize some 250 longshoremen. Bulcke's expenses were $1,000 a month, an inordinate sum considering the number of longshoremen. But it is a small figure compared to the importance of having a Communist machine in America's nearest approach to Russia. A fifth column in Alaska would paralyze that Territory more readily in the event of war. Also operating in Alaska is Jeff Kiber, secretary-treasurer of the CIO Fishing and Allied Workers Union. Kiber is making inroads in the Alaskan fishing fleet.

There are those who take a whistling-in-the-dark attitude toward Bridges' threat to Hawaii, believing that in the event of war Hawaiian labor would be loyal to the United States. This is true, but a small group of disciplined fanatics, operating from within a labor organization, could throw out of gear the islands' defense machinery when the zero hour comes. What happened at Bogota may very well be a portent of the next Pearl Harbor.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, it is nearly 5 o'clock. Apparently the Senate has concluded its work for the day. I now move that the Senate recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 18, 1948, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 17 (legislative day of May 10), 1948:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, now Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to India and Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Nepal, to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as the representative of the United States of America in the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East established by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations March 28, 1947.

Ralph H. Ackerman, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Dominican Republic.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Samuel Hamilton Kaufman, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. John Bright, deceased.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Claude P. Stephens, of Kentucky, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Kentucky. (Mr. Stephens is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 31, 1948.)

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

A. Miles Pratt, of New Orleans, La., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 20, with headquarters at New Orleans, La. (Reappointment.)

Paul R. Leake, of Woodland, Calif., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif. (Reappointment.)

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

William L. Alison, Minter, Ala., in place of B. L. Youngblood, retired.

ALASKA

Clarence S. Hollingsworth, College, Alaska, in place of C. E. Bunnell, retired.

CALIFORNIA

William H. Lambert, Eureka, Calif., in place of N. A. MacMillan, resigned.

William Howard O'Brien, Hollister, Calif., in place of E. F. O'Donnell, deceased.

Howard T. Mitchell, Kenwood, Calif., in place of N. S. Wilson, resigned.

Blanche I. Dunn, Los Alamitos, Calif., in place of L. R. Cloud, transferred.

Margaret S. Cooper, McKittrick, Calif., in place of M. O. Quandt, resigned.

COLORADO

Dean S. Hainey, Ridgway, Colo., in place of G. C. Huffnagle, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Frank J. Barboni, North Haven, Conn., in place of C. W. Thompson, resigned.

FLORIDA

Loyd C. Olive, Bartow, Fla., in place of T. W. Gary, deceased.

Alice S. Given, Windermere, Fla., in place of E. S. Maddock, retired.

ILLINOIS

Harry A. Osman, Cypress, Ill., in place of M. E. Osman, resigned.

Lester A. Binder, Hinckley, Ill., in place of H. J. Price, transferred.

INDIANA

Frank C. Kettring, South Bend, Ind., in place of B. J. McCaffery, resigned.

IOWA

James W. Klaus, Earlville, Iowa, in place of G. E. Faust, transferred.

KANSAS

Ralph W. Smullins, Burr Oak, Kans., in place of E. J. Callahan, resigned.

Charles G. Persinger, Canton, Kans, in place of Ralph Ganson, resigned.

Leslie A. Leochner, Ludell, Kans., in place of A. W. Howland, transferred.

Patrick J. Jolly, Scammon, Kans., in place of D. P. McCormick, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Ernest C. Runyon, Belfry, Ky., in place of K. S. Keesee, removed.

MARYLAND

Ruby C. Williams, Prince Frederick, Md., in place of L. M. King, retired.

MICHIGAN

John E. Dooley, Linden, Mich., in place of J. E. Hogan, resigned.

William P. Kerekes, Lowell, Mich., in place of F. J. Hosley, resigned.

Lovatus A. Butler, Milan, Mich., in place of W. R. Mason, resigned.

Robert M. Engemann, Rothbury, Mich., in place of Christina Meyers, deceased.

Max P. Frederick, Sandusky, Mich., in place of Horace Parrish, resigned.

Henry A. Gready, Walled Lake, Mich., in place of W. J. Wheeler, resigned.

Frank M. Fortelka, Wellston, Mich., in place of Mae Dust, resigned.

MINNESOTA

Edward J. Bach, Lismore, Minn., in place of A. M. Ebert, declined.

Elias B. Scofield, Newport, Minn., in place of Jeannette Schilling, resigned.

MISSISSIPPI

Josephine R. Brown, Bolton, Miss., in place of I. A. Lacey, resigned.

Nola W. Long, Whitfield, Miss., in place of M. S. Farish, resigned.

MISSOURI

Paul R. Viles, Pineville, Mo., in place of L. D. Smith, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

William J. Pricolo, Emerson, N. J., in place of F. E. Schmidt, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Donna A. Klepper, Jal, N. Mex., in place of H. A. Childers, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Claude A. Dry, Misenheimer, N. C., in place of M. C. Peeler, resigned.

OHIO

Edsel F. Rowland, Williamsfield, Ohio, in place of L. W. Spellman, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

William E. Powers, McCurtain, Okla., in place of Mike Craig, transferred.

OREGON

Ivan A. Blagg, Grass Valley, Oreg., in place of J. M. Hogue, resigned.

Opal F. Maphet, Murphy, Oreg., in place of Connie Hanner, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

J. Albert Vail, Chester Springs, Pa., in place of K. H. Vail, deceased.

Malcolm A. Young, Monroeton, Pa., in place of E. J. Roof, resigned.

Frank W. Thomas, Skytop, Pa., in place of Thornton Raney, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Harry G. Cushman, Conway, S. C., in place of M. G. Andersen, resigned.

TEXAS

Arlie Farrington, Alba, Tex., in place of J. C. McKenzie, resigned.

Guy Miller Mann, Malone, Tex., in place of A. H. Worley, retired.

VIRGINIA

George H. Sonafrank, Nokesville, Va., in place of D. E. Earhart, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Northa Morrison, Mallory, W. Va., in place of W. H. Baker, resigned.

Vincent A. Johnson, Man, W Va., in place of Dewey Ellis, removed.

WISCONSIN

Henry W. Seiler, Baileys Harbor, Wis., in place of E. R. Hanson, removed.

James W. Johnson, Chaseburg, Wis., in place of Sam Johnson, deceased.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY AND THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, who are scheduled for graduation on June 8, 1948, for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Army and Regular Air Force of the United States, under the provisions of section 506, Officer-Personnel Act of 1947. Date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force:

REGULAR ARMY

Howard Edward Adams
Harry Thomas Adkins, Jr.
Albert Feleciano Alfonso
Reuben Livingston Anderson, Jr.
Louis Leland Anthis
David Wesley Armstrong
Joel David Aron
Neil Rice Ayer
William Reid Bandeen
James William Barnett, Jr.
Hayden Julian Bayer
Walter Beinke
Daniel Randall Beirne
John Bellinger Bellinger, Jr.
Sidney Bryan Berry, Jr.
Edward Hiltner Bertram, Jr.
Eugene Stanton Bierer
James Arthur Blakeslee
Raymond Urban Bloom
Charles Arthur Borg, Jr.
Keith Alden Boss
Thomas Willard Bowen
Walker Syer Bradshaw
Joseph Key Bratton
John William Brennan
Harry Augustine Buckley, Jr.
William Claiborne Buckner
William Curoe Burns
William Edmund Byers
William Burns Caldwell
Edward Francis Callanan
Francis Paul Cancelliere
Jack Lee Capps
Leslie Dillon Carter, Jr.
Donald Albert Cerow
Lewis Chandler
John Howell Chitty, Jr.
Lake George Churchill, Jr.
Joseph Phillip Cimo
Thomas Ryan Clark
Carter Weldon Clarke, Jr.
Sam Grady Cockerham
Roger Frankland Conover
William Loch Cook II
Richmond James Cooper
Thomas Bledsoe Cormack
Charles Lanham Crouch
Robert Hamilton Cushing
Philip Stevens Day, Jr.
Donald Edward Deehan
James Webster Dingeman
John Joseph Doody
Joseph Pembroke Dorsey
Mercer McConnico Doty
Lee Thomas Doyle
Raymond Cameron Drury, Jr.
John Spier Egbert
Duane Lee Emerson
Wallace Owens Enderle
Robert Richard Finnegan
Eugene Calvin Fleming, Jr.
Ashby Minor Foote, Jr.
Eugene Priest Forrester
Charles Nelson French, Jr.
James Clyde Fry, Jr.
Pierce Horatio Gaver, Jr.
Lowell Burke Genebach, Jr.
Robert Elwood Graf
Stephen Murray Griffith
James Burnus Hall
Robert Francis Hallahan
John Duncan Hamilton
Richard Stanley Harsh
George William Hartnell
Louis William Haskell, Jr.
Jay Allan Hatch
Thomas William Hazard, Jr.
Jess Byrd Hendricks, Jr.
Joseph Shindler Herbets
Hugh French Thomason Hoffman, Jr.
Sam Cromwell Holliday
James Frank Hooker, Jr.
Charles Samuel Horn
Lawrence Vinton Hoyt
Wallace Henley Hubbard
John Bell Hughes, Jr.
Douglas Theodore Huie
Rufus Johnston Hyman
Benedict Ralph Jacobellis
James Lloyd Jones
J. Wesley Jones, Jr.
Louis Raymond Jones
Rees Jones
Thomas Tytherleigh Jones
William Mason Kaula
John Patrick Kean
Jesse Tompkins Kelsey
Joseph Mortimer Kiernan, Jr.
Robert Lee Kirwan
Edward Thomas Klett, Jr.
Oscar Frederick Kochtitzky, Jr.
Harvey Robinson Livesay, Jr.
Norman Bertram Lovejoy
James Edgar Macklin, Jr.
David Saltonstall Mallett
John Calvin Maple
Walter Frank Marcinie
Robert Wiley Marshall
Frank Lee McClaflin
Don Stuart McClelland
James Gordon McCay
John Joachim McCuen
John Winn McEnery
Charles Frederick McGee
Donald Charles McGraw
Houston Moore McMurray
David William McNeely
Garland Ray McSpadden
Gerald William Medsger
Walter Edwin Meinzen
Joseph Henry Meyer
Jack Rowland Miller
John McKenna Milton
Edwin Blakely Nelson
John Martin Nelson
Kenneth William Olson
John Luke Osteen, Jr.
Alfred Arthur Pabst
Donald Flint Packard
William Ashbrook Patch
Edwin Dennis Patterson
Ralph Winston Pearson
Harrison Perry
Hugh Wiston Perry
Robert James Petersen
Walter William Plummer, Jr.
Kenneth Irving Preßsman
Saul Martin Resnick
James Warren Richardson, Jr.
Claron Atherton Robertson, Jr.
Lem Frank Robinson, Jr.
Norman Leander Robinson, Jr.
Tenney Kutz Ross
Edwin A. Rudd
James Cornelius Ruddell, Jr.
Kenneth Edward Ruddy
William Thomas Ryan
Arnold Melville Sargeant, Jr.
William Francis Schless
Walter Burns Schlotterbeck
Carl Walter Schmidt
Willard Warren Scott, Jr.
Merle Gardner Sheffield
Charles Harwood Shook
William Alvin Shuster II
Harwell Fitzhugh Smith, Jr.
Donn Albert Starry
Harry John Sternburg
Charles Henry Sunder
George Alvis Swearengen
Edward Parry Sykes, Jr.
J. Robert Taylor
William Gwyn Thomas, Jr.
Frederick Edwin Tibbetts III
William Harrison Travis
James Gates Tuthill
Thomas Burdick Tyree
Elmer Cornelius Vreeland, Jr.
John Baker Wadsworth, Jr.
John Garnett Waggener
Fred Emerson Wagoner, Jr.
James Frederick Walk
Lyle Edward Walter
Robert Marion Ward
Thomas Allen Ware, Jr.
Richard Lauren Warren
John Elliott Watkins
Kenneth Eugene Webber, Jr.
Richard Glenn Weber
Edward Ansel White
Ennis Clement Whitehead, Jr.
Robert Allison Whitfield
Arthur Langley Whitley
Philip McIlvaine Whitney, Jr.
William Wallace Whitson
Glenn Castle Wilhide, Jr.
Walworth Forman Williams
Andrew Benedict Witko

REGULAR AIR FORCE

James Rodgers Allen
Andrew Broadus Anderson, Jr.
Carl Andrew Anderson
Russell Conwell Ball, Jr.
Kenneth Hawthorne Barber
Arthur deRohan Barondes
Carey Bishop Barrineau
Raymond Oscar Barton, Jr.
Richard Parks Berry
Waldo Emmerson Bertoni
Harry Moody Bettis, Jr.
Arnold Webb Braswell
Jay Richard Brill
John Joseph Buckley, Jr.
Theodore Bruce Buechler
William Claude Burrows
Blaine Raymond Butler, Jr.
Fred Isaac Chanatry

Charles Eads Coons
John Francis Creed
William J. Crosby
Richard Dickson Cudahy
Robert Carroll Davis
Daniel De Foe
Walter Albert della Chiesa
John Francis Dent, Jr.
Sims Gerald Dildy
Benjamin Joseph Di Loreto
William Pinkerton Dougherty
Benjamin Wynn Eakins
George Martin Edwards, Jr.
John Arnold Edwards
Clarence Couch Elebash
David Draper Garrison
Patteson Gilliam
Harold Sherwood Gillogly
Joseph Eugene Gorrell
Warren Reed Graves
William Comstock Hayden
Wilho Richard Heikkinen
Joseph William Huey
Samuel Fuqua Hurt
Floyd Allan Johnston
Jay Silverman Josephs
John Kastris, Jr.
Donal Denis Kavanagh
Alfred Henry Kerth, Jr.
Donald Charles Kipfer
Edward Anderton Kritzer
George Adelbert La Pointe
George Newton Leitner
Vincent Paul Lewando
Louis LoConte, Jr.
W. Grim Locke
Denman Murray Long
William Henry Lynch
William Meredith Lyon
Gaylord MacCartney
William James Madden
Nasor John Mansour, Jr.
Robert Couth Mathis
William Thornton McGinness
Francis William McInerney, Jr.
James Clifford McManaway, Jr.
Richard Lee Miner
Otis Corcoran Moore
Rhonel Earl Morgan
William Donald Mounger
James Allen Muehlenweg
Morton Claire Mumma III
William Charles Ocker
William Thomas O'Connell, Jr.
Robert Edwin Pater
Jack Francis Peppers
Thomas Albert Phillips, Jr.
John Charles Pickering
Robert Murray Pomeroy
Jacob Bernard Pompan
Philip Steven Porter
Alton Harold Quanbeck
Donald Hood Reynolds
Evan William Rosencrans
George Warren Rutter
James Gage Sandman
Rodman Saville
Louis Wellington Schalk
Irving Bernard Schoenberg
Edward Leigh Scott
Richard James Seguin
Ivan Morange Selig
James Cole Shively, Jr.
Richard Ingram Skinner
Charles Peter Skouras, Jr.
William Young Smith
Arthur Snyder, Jr.
Richard Neil Stein
Henry Barthold Stelling, Jr.
Donald Brunhoff Swenholt
Michael Joseph Tashjian
Stanley Edward Thevenet
George Selby Thomas
Robert Armes Van Arsdall
James Alward Van Fleet, Jr.
Walton Vernon Waller
Paul Elwood Weaver
Samuel White, Jr.
Francis Marion Williams
Odell Wynne Williamson, Jr.
John Kesson Withers
Charles Anderson Wurster
Stewart Young

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of June 1948:

Hugh D. Adair, Jr.	Ben A. Moore, Jr.
Richard T. F. Ambrogi	Richard C. Morrow
George T. Balzer	Merrill L. Norton
Robert R. Carson	Keith O'Keefe
Leamon R. Cooke	Orlo C. Paciulli, Jr.
Robert R. Dickey III	John M. Perkins
Lucius V. diLorenzo	Robert D. Reem
Edward F. Duncan	Jack W. Robbins
Richard N. Hall 2d	Edwin M. Rudzis
Henry C. Hamilton, Jr.	Roy K. Russell
	Richard D. Schneider
Dean B. Hansen	Robert N. Smith
Lee R. Howard	James W. Strother
Charles J. Kelly	Robert G. Tobin, Jr.
Floyd M. McCurdy, Jr.	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Roger C. Bliss	William J. McMordie
Leonard E. Brock	James R. Martin
Robert T. Broili	Roy D. Monnie
Ramon L. Burke	Dean O. Powell
LeRoy T. Carter	Ben R. Schmidt
Homer Fults	Robert G. Whitman
Andrew Khourie	Fred I. Woodworth, Jr.

Joseph G. Power (civilian college graduate) to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy.

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Herbert L. Baker	Howard D. Graessle II
Philip S. Birnbaum, Jr.	Wayne C. Hall, Jr.
Charles Bultzo	Jerry D. Harshman
John L. Dixon	Theodore R. Howell
Albert H. Gallaher	Jack H. McDonald

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Frances J. Bombriant	Virginia R. Mussen
Ruth L. Brenner	Cecile R. Normandin
Eleanor M. Budinsky	Mary E. H. O'Brien
Frances S. Czegely	Kathleen J. O'Kane
Helen Daroska	Jean B. Pieczarka
Barbara Ellis	Marie L. Rios
Norma J. Geho	Dorothy L. Rowe
Ruth L. Grass	Margaret Russell
Julie E. Kell	Sara A. Sims
Helen A. Kenyon	Edith A. Smith
Elise M. Lovely	Mary R. Thames
Elizabeth M. McLaughlin	Evelyn M. Vejvoda
	Gloria J. Vesper

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named midshipmen to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Lewis H. Cameron	John E. Rudder
Elisha G. Cloud	Nicholas M. Trapnell, Jr.
William G. Crocker	
Loren T. Erickson	William F. Trisler
Mack R. McClure	James R. Young
Sherman L. Prosser	

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps:

Simon I. Degulis, a citizen of New York.

Joseph P. B. Franklin, a citizen of New Jersey.

James R. Gallman, Jr., a citizen of Texas.

Philip J. Garm, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Jack E. Harlan, a citizen of California.

James E. Harrell, a citizen of Texas.

Francis R. Hittinger, Jr., a citizen of Virginia.

Floyd G. Hudson, a citizen of Virginia.

Arthur R. Mansfield, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.

Edwin A. Pollock, Jr., a citizen of Virginia.

Jack L. Selk, a citizen of California.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 17, 1948

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Almighty God, may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, our Strength and our Redeemer. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

By unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of Friday, May 14, 1948, was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. ALLEN of California, from May 17 to May 21, 1948.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials.

Accordingly the House stood in recess, to meet at the call of the Speaker.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM

May 17, 1948

Prelude, sacred selections (11:30 to 12)---- United States Navy Orchestra
Presiding officer---------- The Speaker
Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
Invocation---------- The Chaplain
Dr. James Shera Montgomery
Solo: Lead, Kindly Light (Dykes)--------
Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, Representative from the State of Tennessee
At the piano---- Musician John Wigent
Scripture reading and prayer-- The Chaplain
Roll of deceased Members-------- The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Devotional silence.
Address-- Hon. EVERETT DIRKSEN, Representative from the State of Illinois
Solo: Going Down the Valley (Fillmore)---
Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT, Representative from the State of Pennsylvania
At the piano---- Musician John Wigent
Address---- Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, Representative from the State of Indiana
Taps---------- Musician Frank Scimonelli
Benediction---------- The Chaplain

MEMORIAL SERVICES

The SPEAKER presided.

INVOCATION

The CHAPLAIN. *Lord, Thou hast been our dwelling place in all generations. Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hast formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. For a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night. So teach us to number our days, that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. And let the beauty of the Lord our God be upon us.* Amen.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, we have again been saddened since the printing of the program for the memorial exercises today by the passing of our distinguished colleague in the other Chamber, the Honorable JOHN OVERTON, of Lou-

isiana. As you know, the flags are still at half-mast in his memory.

In deference to the wishes of the members of his family, the paying of tribute to him is being deferred until this occasion a year hence, when it is hoped they can be with us.

VOCAL SOLO

Hon. J. PERCY PRIEST, accompanied by Musician John Wigent, sang Lead, Kindly Light.

SCRIPTURE READING AND PRAYER

The CHAPLAIN:

Oh, yet we trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill,
To pangs of nature, sins of will,
Defects of doubt, and taints of blood;

That nothing walks with aimless feet;
That not one life shall be destroy'd,
Or cast as rubbish to the void,
When God hath made the pile complete;

That not a worm is cloven in vain;
That not a moth with vain desire
Is shrivell'd in a fruitless fire,
Or but subserves another's gain.

Behold, we know not anything;
I can but trust that good shall fall
At last—far off—at last, to all,
And every winter change to spring.

So runs my dream: but what am I?
An infant crying in the night:
An infant crying for the light:
And with no language but a cry.

I falter where I firmly trod,
And, falling with my weight of cares
Upon the great world's altar-stairs
That slope thro' darkness up to God,

I stretch lame hands of faith, and grope,
And gather dust and chaff, and call
To what I feel is Lord of all,
And faintly trust the larger hope.

The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil: for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies: Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me.

In my Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.

And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

And yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

Eternal God, our Father, Thou who art ever present to guide and to comfort, increase the faith and hopes which we feel in the temples of our souls. By these tokens grant that at the last we may merit the "Well done, good and faithful servant." We thank Thee for the voice that comes across the centuries to the hearts of all in sorrow: "Be of good cheer." Be Thou the bread of life for our hunger and the water of life for our thirst. Thy servants whom we remember today rest from their labors, and their works do follow them. The souls of the righteous are in the hands of God. In the sight of the unwise they seemed to die, but they are at peace. Vouchsafe unto us the peace and rest which flow from Thy holy presence. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name.

Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, in earth as it is in heaven.

Give us this day our daily bread.

And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors.

And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever.

Amen.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, at this time I should like to read a fitting memorial entitled "The Other Unknown Soldier" by Stanley Kimmel.

THE OTHER UNKNOWN SOLDIER

(By Stanley Kimmel)

Move over, Buddy—
Yeah, it's me, the other unknown soldier.
You didn't think I'd get here, did you?
But I made it.
Yeah, it took a long time,
But I made it.
Say, Buddy, how is it out here,
Out here in Arlington?
Yeah, I been here before,
But not like this.
I was a kid,
My folks brought me to see you.
It was summer,
June, I think;
There was trees and flowers,
And a clear sky—
Just like today, Buddy.
We'd come to Washington,
From a small town out West,
To see the sights;
My folks never travel'd much,
Too poor—
Guess it was the only trip
They ever took.
But me! I'm like you, Buddy,
I been places! Seen things!
I was at Kasserine Pass, Sicily, Anzio, Cassino,
Then Normandy beach head, the Battle of the Hedgerows, and St. Lo,
Yeah, and the Battle of the Bulge, and the Ardennes.
I was at Owen Stanley Mountains, too,
Then Buna, Attu, the Solomons, and Saipan,
Yeah, and Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Leyte, Luzon—
Sure—I'll skip it—
Didn't mean to disturb you,
Talkin' like this.

* * * * *

Listen! Them's footsteps, ain't they?
Some other folks bringin' their kid to see us.
Hope we never have to make room for him.
Sure—I'll skip it—
Didn't mean to disturb you—
Ain't crowdin' you, am I, Buddy?

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. Alney E. Chaffee, reading clerk of the House of Representatives, read the following roll:

SENATOR

THEODORE GILMORE BILBO, a Senator from the State of Mississippi: Born October 13, 1877; teacher; farmer; lawyer; attended Peabody College at Nashville, Tenn., Vanderbilt University, and the University of Michigan; member of the State senate, 1908–12; Lieutenant Governor, 1912–16; Governor, 1916–20 and 1928–32; elected to the United States Senate in 1934, 1940, and 1946; died August 21, 1947.

REPRESENTATIVES

FRED BRADLEY, Eleventh Congressional District of Michigan: Born April 12, 1898; lawyer, businessman, legislator; elected to the Sixty-sixth and four succeeding Congresses; died May 24, 1947.

JOSEPH JEFFERSON MANSFIELD, Ninth Congressional District of Texas: Born February 9, 1861; farmer, lawyer, editor; organized and served as second lieutenant, first lieutenant, and captain in the National Guard of Texas, 1886; prosecuting attorney, mayor, Eagle Lake, Tex., 1888–89; prosecuting attorney, Colorado County, 1892–96; ex officio county superintendent of schools, 1896–1900; judge, Colorado County, 1896–1916; elected to the Sixty-fifth and 15 succeeding Congresses; died July 12, 1947.

CHARLES L. GIFFORD, Ninth Congressional District of Massachusetts: Born March 15, 1871; teacher, realtor, agriculturalist; member State house of representatives, 1912–13; State senator, 1914–19; elected to the Seventieth and 10 succeeding Congresses; died August 23, 1947.

RAYMOND SMILEY SPRINGER, Tenth Congressional District of Indiana: Born April 26, 1882; lawyer, judge; attended Earlham College, Richmond, Ind., and Butler University; graduated from the Indiana Law School in 1904; attorney Fayette County, 1908–14; judge of the thirty-seventh judicial circuit of Indiana, 1916–22; captain of infantry in First World War, 1918; lieutenant colonel, Officers Reserve Corps; elected to the Seventy-sixth and four succeeding Congresses; died August 28, 1947.

PATRICK HENRY DREWRY, Fourth Congressional District of Virginia: Born May 24, 1875; lawyer, banker; attended McCabe's University School, Randolph-Macon College, and the University of Virginia; member of the State senate, 1912–20; delegate to the Democratic State conventions, 1912, 1916, 1920, and 1924; delegate to the Democratic National Convention, 1916; chairman of the Economy and Efficiency Commission of Virginia, 1916–18; chairman of the State advisory board, 1919; member of the Democratic National Congressional Committee, 1923–47, and chairman, 1935–47; ranking member, Committee on Naval Affairs and ranking minority member, Committee on Armed Services; elected to the Sixty-sixth and 14 succeeding Congresses; died December 21, 1947.

JOHN MARSHALL ROBSION, Ninth Congressional District of Kentucky: Born January 2, 1875; teacher, lawyer, banker; attended National Northern University, Ada, Ohio, and Holbrook College, Knoxville, Tenn.; graduated from the National Normal University, Lebanon, Ohio, and Centre College, Danville, Ky.; delegate to the Republican National Convention at Chicago, 1916; elected to the Sixty-sixth and five succeeding Congresses; Member of the United States Senate, under

appointment, from January 9, 1930, to November 30, 1930; again elected to the Seventy-fourth and six succeeding Congresses; died February 17, 1948.

ORVILLE ZIMMERMAN, Tenth Congressional District of Missouri: Born December 31, 1880; lawyer; attended Mayfield-Smith Academy at Marble Hill; graduated from State College at Cape Girardeau, 1904, and from the University of Missouri, 1911; served in the United States Army as a private during the First World War; member board of regents, State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo., since 1933; elected to the Seventy-fourth and five succeeding Congresses; died April 7, 1948.

Mrs. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum, and aided by Edward H. Funston III, a page of the House of Representatives, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

DEVOTIONAL SILENCE

There followed a period of devotional silence, during which the Members stood.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

ADDRESS OF HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this is very peculiarly our own day. It is our day for personal communion with those who but a short while before were with us in the confraternity of public service.

This is the day on which we pay gracious testimony and loving tribute to those who are now gathered in the democracy of death and who were with us a short while ago. If they could come into the doors of the Chamber this day with what warmth and affection we would greet them.

There would be Senator BILBO and FRED BRADLEY, Judge MANSFIELD and CHARLIE GIFFORD, RAY SPRINGER and PAT DREWRY, Uncle JOHN ROBSION and ORV ZIMMERMAN, whom we more affectionately called ZIM. Somehow there is a strange selectivity in the democracy of transition for no two of those who have departed from us come from the same State. If I were to characterize each by a single word I would say of Senator BILBO that he was a man of deep and abiding conviction; of JOHN OVERTON I would say that in his great heart was a rich and complete devotion; of FRED BRADLEY I would say there was determination and moral robustness; of Judge MANSFIELD I would say that there was about him a spiritual grace which radiated like a strange and lifting aura in all the years that I knew him; of CHARLIE GIFFORD I would say that in his capacious heart was a love so great that it matched the waves of the Atlantic which beat upon the shores of his native Cape Cod. In the heart and in the manner of RAY SPRINGER was meekness and humility that shone as an iridescent light. PAT DREWRY was a living exemplification of Browning's fascinating lines devoted to sweetness and light. Of ORV ZIMMERMAN it could be said that in his heart was an exuberant hope for this country and his fellow men which was lustrous like June sunshine. Of Uncle JOHN ROBSION, I could always detect a fundamental faith as rugged and redoubtable as the hills of his native Kentucky.

And so in this intensely personal communion today we shall live with them intimately again and take thought and inspiration from their divine personalities that will continue to linger long in this Chamber.

While the spirit of remembrance and the mood of memory is upon us, I think today of a very simple and entrancing story in the Scripture. It is the story of an obscure and nameless woman who brought an alabaster box of precious ointment with which to annoint the Master. To me it is so simple, so compelling, and so appropriate for this occasion.

I am sure you will remember that the Man of Galilee was going to go to the home of Simon the leper in the village of Bethany for a visit and for a meal. How strange that seems to us. Who among us would think of going to the house of a leper to dine and to visit? But Jesus did so and, as I said, Simon the leper lived in Bethany.

It was my privilege to visit the village of Bethany in 1945. What a memorable and historic place it really is. You will recall that Lazarus lived there together with his sisters Mary and Martha. It was on the roadway which leads from Bethany that Martha encountered the Master and from a heavy heart and a disconcert of spirit complained of the fact that Mary had not made the household ready for the coming of the Galilean. And after He had listened patiently to her He said so humbly, "But one thing is needful." And that, of course, was the need of the spirit. It was in this selfsame village then of Bethany where Simon lived, and while he and the Master were at meat, as the Scripture records, there came this unbidden guest. It was a woman. The only characterization we have of her is that she was a sinner. We know little else about her.

Was she tall and stately or was she, perhaps, short statured and robust? We do not know, for the Gospels are silent on this. Did she wear fashionable raiment or was she dressed in ordinary clothing? This we do not know. Did she have dark, lustrous hair and black snapping eyes? Or did she have golden hair which caught the sunshine of the desert? Did she have blue sparkling eyes like those colorful little flowers that grow in profusion on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho? Was her voice harsh or was it soft and melodious? All this we do not know. The record says she was a sinner.

And how simply she came to where the Master was visiting with the leper. There were no press conferences, no press releases, no society column, no eloquent speeches. The record simply says that she came.

How simple it all is. It is so much like the approach in the story of the Good Samaritan who found a man wounded and groaning by the roadside and when the Good Samaritan heard his cry of distress the Scripture says "He came where he was." It was so simple and so forthright. The coming of the nameless woman to the Master was equally simple.

She brought with her an alabaster box of precious ointment. She stood behind the Man of Galilee, who was doubtless sitting or kneeling at His repast. It was the posture of humility. She washed His feet with her tears. She dried them with her tresses and then from the alabaster box she took the precious ointment of spikenard and annointed Him. I presume we would call it perfume.

There was no conversation. There was no record. There were no remarks to be examined. We have only the record of this simple and humble ministration.

The disciples were there. The Book says they were indignant. I can well imagine that scene. I can particularly imagine Peter, who must have been there, frowning. He was such a sturdy and forthright soul and so practical. The anointing of the Master with precious perfume offended the practical sense of the disciples. Quickly they translated it into an equation of their own. This ointment might well bring 300 pence and the money could be used for alms and for charity.

That argument has such a familiar ring today. How often have Members of this body been chided, especially during wartime, for going abroad to inspect the progresses of our arms and to observe conditions the better to discharge their responsibilities. How often we were confronted with the argument that the gasoline and the expenses involved might have been put to better and more useful purpose. It was the very kind of an argument that the disciples used long ago as they saw the ministrations of this humble woman.

The Master must have listened earnestly to the argument and to the conversation and then, with simplicity and logic which is like majesty itself, He suddenly said, "Why trouble ye this woman. She hath wrought a good work upon me."

How simple, how compelling, how persuasive that was. He simply said, "She hath wrought a good work upon me." A little later He then said the things that have such rich appeal on this memorial occasion. Very simply did He say that what she had done would be told as a memorial unto her wherever the gospel might be preached.

How simple and compelling is this story because it is the unadorned story of a kindly deed, a very humble service; and there is the promise that it would be a memorial and would reecho down the corridors of time until the end of earth as a memorial to an obscure unnamed woman.

As I think of our departed colleagues today who are gathered in the endless land of dreamless sleep, they, too, brought to their task here an alabaster box of precious ointment consisting of their talent, their love, their affection and devotion, and their abiding desire to serve their people, their colleagues, and their country.

They brought with them the perfume of humble service and these are the services that will live to adorn and to enshrine their memories.

The speeches which we make so quickly, die upon the vesper breeze. The votes on which we and they are recorded will soon be forgotten. It is the human, the humane and kindly little services which are unherald, unsung, and unacclaimed which will be so long remembered on the tablets of the mind and the heart.

There is an amazing immortality about a kindly service, a good deed, a humble ministration. In all parts of the land there will be people who will long remember them for these little things which may seem unimportant to us in the hurly-burly of a controversial atmosphere.

How many veterans they must have helped not only in the recent conflict but in World War I in securing expeditious hospitalization. For this there are no headlines. How many refugees in the old countries and the kinfolks of those refugees in this country they must have helped in securing visas that they might be lifted from the tyrannies of the Old World. For this there is no acclaim. How many aged and indigent persons back home they must have helped and to whom they provided comfort in endeavoring to secure more adequate pensions and assistance. The song of unuttered joy for this will be written on gracious human hearts. How many snarls they must have untangled where folks back home were having difficulty with railroad retirement pensions and social-security benefits. How many fathers and mothers they must have helped in finding the last resting place of some son enshrined in glory on some far-off battlefield. How many fathers and mothers, wives and sweethearts they must have aided in locating kin somewhere abroad in this huge world. How many businessmen they must have helped in finding their way through the labyrinth of a bewildering government. All these and a thousand more are the humble services which marked each day of their service in this body. And because these were the human and humane things they appeal to the heart and will be long remembered. The letters which they have written over the years by the hundreds to bring comfort and reassurance to humble people back home will be passed from hand to hand long after they had departed. These will bring strange luster to the countenance of people as they show these letters and say, "I got a letter from my Congressman." Yes, these are the things that will live long and be enshrined upon the pulsing tablets of love and memory.

Let us go back for a moment to what the Master said to the disciples when they showed their indignation of the ministrations of this unnamed woman sinner. He said simply "She hath wrought a good work upon Me." It was objective. It was somebody to somebody. It is the important thing in this compelling story. It is the mark of real service.

Their services were so intensely objective because they were rendered to people, to us, to country, to humble folks who looked upon them as their liaison agents with the Government.

As I think of this quality of objectivity a number of favorite examples come to mind.

One of my favorite characters, who was rather contemporary because he passed on only 30 years ago, was Maj. Gen. William Crawford Gorgas of the United States Army. He was one of that little group who back in the days when the construction of the Panama Canal was in progress was persuaded that the Canal could not be built unless yellow fever and malaria were first conquered. So insistent was he in his viewpoint that it offended the construction superintendent on the Canal and he insisted on the dismissal of Gorgas. The letter of dismissal was already on the desk of the President of the United States but wiser counsels prevailed and it was never consummated. William Crawford Gorgas continued to serve until the malarial-bearing mosquito and yellow fever had been conquered. How little we hear about it. How little acclaim he really received, and yet it was this humble service which had so much to do with the completion of a Federal project for the linking of two great oceans.

The services of General Gorgas did not stop here. He served the people of Peru and other South American countries in conquering plagues and increasing longevity. Even as age was coming upon him he went to The Rand in far-off Africa to subdue the influenza germ. It is no wonder that when he died in London in 1919 a vast concourse of people lined the streets on the occasion of the memorial parade in his honor and when the riderless white horse went by they bowed in reverence and respect to the memory of a truly noble man whose nobility consisted of humble service for the welfare of all mankind.

Some years ago I saw a six-line squib in one of the Washington newspapers announcing the death of Dr. Joseph Goldberger. Perhaps it meant little to many people, but it meant a great deal to me, because I had followed the career of this seemingly obscure man, who was a member of the staff of the United States Public Health Service. It was he who was assigned to explore and find the remedy for that dreaded disease known as pellagra, which had invaded the Southland and not only had taken a great toll of life but enervated and devitalized thousands of people so that they could not carry on their normal pursuits. It was to this problem that Dr. Joseph Goldberger addressed himself. The record of his service is thrilling and dramatic even though it appears so commonplace. He visited hospitals and asylums, orphanages and prison schools, and groups in his relentless pursuit of this awful disease. He imperiled his own life freely and willingly in order to find the cause.

The record shows him in a pullman car at Spartanburg, S. C., consuming capsules made from the offal of persons in the last stages of pellagra. He made capsules of the scales which came from their gaunt and haggard bodies to test the effect upon himself. At long last he found the cause. It was a vitamin deficiency, and from this a remedy was soon prescribed. There were no headlines for Joseph Goldberger, no gilded books were written about him. There were no demonstrations to acclaim him. His was the humble service of the commonplace, but gratitude for that service will ring down the vistas of time and come as a song of joy from the hearts of the afflicted. He received but six lines in the current press when the soul took flight.

I think also of the humble service rendered by a New Hampshire soldier during the Civil War whose name is unknown to me. Evidently he must have enjoyed a furlough and when he returned to the hills of his native New Hampshire he had time to fashion his own tombstone, possibly because of a premonition of death. On one side of that stone were carved the essential vital statistics and on the other side this self-written epitaph, "This side of my tombstone I dedicate to freedom and union. May they survive and endure forever." Here was a man rendering humble service to this country in an hour of crisis and it will be remembered into the eternity.

Yes; there was objectivity about their service here and it so well illustrates that simple but compelling sentiment which the Master uttered when He said, "She hath wrought a good work upon Me.

They have wrought a good work upon us, upon their kinsmen and their constituency, upon their country and the world. They have wrought a good work and it will be remembered.

The intimate and personal character of this memorial service today is possible because it is the remembrance of the living to those who are now gone. It would fail in its purpose if it did not quicken our spirits. It must enrich us and do something for our own perspective, our behavior, and our viewpoint. What then shall we draw from it all as we stand on the very shadow of their lingering spirits and enjoy the communion of memorial fellowship with them?

Is it not possible that we too—all of us—have come here with our alabaster box of precious ointment consisting of the talents with which we have been endowed, the love which we bear for our fellowmen, the interest which we have in world welfare and the devotion which we entertain for this our blessed country to be used for the enhancement and progress of our country and the restoration of peace of mind and tranquillity of soul to a restive and tumultuous world.

This perfume of talent we can use if we will to soften the asperities and the severities of life, to modify the hates with which we are often confronted and to so soften our own conduct that it will be as a great spiritual wave and moral force for the Nation and for the world. As we use it lavishly and diligently we cannot help but spill the precious and fragrant perfume of our own talents upon our colleagues and upon everyone with whom we come in contact.

Suppose that for a single month we made a diligent effort to make certain

that in our disagreement we would never be captious; that in our differences on principle we would never show petulance; that in resolutely following our own abiding convictions on matters of fundamental policy they would never be tainted by acrimony. Suppose we made a diligent effort to exemplify the humility and meekness and forbearance which marked their service, what a great moral force it would become in softening the dissidences of life and clarifying fundamental viewpoints. All this would redound so richly to the welfare of the world and of our own country.

When all is said and done, my friends, the problems, the questions, and the challenges with which we are confronted from day to day and year to year can scarcely be met by the lawbook and the statute book. So little of what we might formally inscribe upon the legislative parchments will actually meet the challenges of this turbulent era because the problems come from the spirit and the crisis is essentially moral.

You will agree that on so many hands one finds defeatism, but can we reduce anything to the common denominator of words and language that will meet it. How shall we best solve the group antagonisms which are, after all, a matter of heart and soul? How shall we best meet the moral fatigue which one finds in many places and which is the pardonable and inevitable result of a conflict which tugged at the whole human fabric of the world? How shall we meet the frustrations which are also one of the bitter inheritances of conflict? The prophet Haggai in the Old Testament summed it up in a single phrase when he wrote on the parchments of the Scripture long ago, "Ye looked for much, and, lo, it came to little." It is the best definition of the frustrated spirit I have ever encountered in the literature of mankind.

But frustration and defeatism and moral fatigue and social cleavages and group antagonisms must all be met if we are to achieve that unity of purpose and action so indispensable to the progress of our country and of the world.

I humbly doubt that the answer—the real answer—can be found in legislative words. We must reach into the citadel of the spirit to find the solutions and we have access to the citadel only in proportion as the heart and the soul finds solid moral ground. In proportion as we can bring this approach to our problems we shall again find sweetness and serenity in our national life which will carry us to levels never attained before in any time or generation. This we can find in our sweet and personal communion with their happy memories today. Let me add one more thing to this simple testimony of remembrance. In the Old Testament is the story of Ezekiel released from captivity who was commanded by the Lord to look upon the Valley of Dried Bones. From an anxious heart he asked the Lord whether they could live again. He was bidden to command, and soon with a great clattering roar these bones assembled into skeletons. He asked whether they could be clothed with flesh and was bidden to command and, lo, they were clothed with flesh. He asked whether they could live again and was told to command the four winds to breathe into this great lifeless host the very breath of life, and, behold, it stood there as a living army.

One of the old versions, as I remember, then carries this simple admonition from the Lord. To Ezekiel He said that those in the Valley of Dried Bones were like an ancient people and that they were lost and dead and without hope. Then he said He would make them a people once more.

He did not say that He would make them two people or a divided people or a cloven people or a turbulent people. He said he would make them a people united in spirit and in effort.

As I survey the contemporary scene, is there anything so important as a restoration of common purpose, of domestic tranquillity, and of happy labor in the cause of an ideal which we call the American dream?

And so, my friends, in this blessed communion with our own let me say in the language of Peter, let us strive for this great goal for which mankind yearns "until we find the day star rising in our hearts." That is the day star of hope and promise for a new glory and a new greatness for ourselves and for the whole world. And so in sweet remembrance we lay upon their divine lingering personalities the memorial laurel of the living to the dead.

SOLO

Hon. HARVE TIBBOTT, accompanied by Musician John Wigent, sang Going Down the Valley.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN, a Representative from the State of Indiana, delivered the following address:

ADDRESS BY HON. RAY J. MADDEN

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, during the last year divine providence visited the Congress and called seven of our Members to their final home. Today we raise our thoughts in reverent memory to those who were selected and answered the call of their Maker. They have given the last full measure of their devotion that we may continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty and peace. They served their country in this Chamber and they have carried on the good fight for justice under law in our beloved land.

It is natural that in such an hour as this when we commemorate our departed fellow Members, that we look upon the work which they were doing when interrupted by the angel of death. The result of their labors is a precious heritage handed on to us. The work of making a nation's laws is a supremely heavy responsibility that taxes human resources and strength to the fullest. Our absent colleagues understood this well. Were it not so, some of them would still be with us today. The arduous and devastating burdens of congressional war work cost an unprecedented toll of our Members during this most critical period in our Nation's history. These Members were war casualties the same as were the boys in uniform who fell on the battlefield, in the air, and on the seas. But they were willing to make the sacrifice of their time and strength because they understood the sacred import of their legislative work.

To forge the legislation of a people is in a sense a participation in the divine plan of the Almighty, who rules both men and nations. Just laws are fashioned by men, duly elected by their people, but those laws have their source and power in God and we legislators are but His instruments. Great then must be our sense of duty to the Omnipotent Lawgiver and close must be our cooperation with Him in making laws that are in perfect agreement with the norm of right reason and of moral equity and justice. Today we feel confident that the Supreme Legislator has written a blessed finis to the work of those whom we honor at these exercises. During their years of service in this House they cooperated well with Him in legislating for the best interests of His children, the citizens of this Republic.

There is no test of a man's ability in any department of public life more severe than service in the National House of Representatives; there is no place where so little deference is paid to reputation previously acquired, or to eminence won outside; no place where so little consideration is shown for the feelings or the failures of beginners. What a man gains in this Chamber he gains by sheer force of his own character, and if he loses and falls back he must expect no mercy, and will receive no sympathy. It is a field in which the survival of the strongest is the recognized rule, and where no pretense can deceive and no glamour can mislead. Here the real man is discovered, his worth is impartially weighed, his rank is irreversibly decreed. On this day of retrospect and reflection, we can say that our absent brothers stood this test with grandeur. They survived criticism and nobly carried the rewards of success and praise. They took to heart the eternal truths of liberty, obeyed them as the commands of Providence, and accepted the human race as the judge of their fidelity.

Ordinarily we think of Benjamin Franklin as basking in the constant admiration of his countrymen. The fact is that he withstood enough vituperation to reduce many a modern legislator to quivering panic. It was charged that he not only approved the Stamp Act, but framed it; there was talk of setting fire to his house. He saw his oldest friends turn against him; he was scorned in England and distrusted at home—until, just as suddenly he was acclaimed a hero. In 1772 Franklin wrote a letter to his old friend Joseph Galloway, with whom he had shared a resounding political defeat a few years before.

The letter read:

> We must not in the course of public life expect immediate approbation and immediate grateful acknowledgement of our services. But let us persevere through abuse and even injury. The internal satisfaction of a good conscience is always present, and time will do us justice in the minds of the people, even of those at present the most prejudiced against us.

Just as the soldier in the line of fire draws inspiration and courage from the love of country burning fiercely in the breasts of his fallen comrades, so do we feel a firmer conviction to carry on without fear or favor as we ponder on the patriotic devotion of those whose memories we revere here today. They indeed have taught us the lesson of true patriotism. Because of their example, we see in love of country a great virtue which is annexed to justice itself. Patriotism is a sincere love and reverence for our country based on a real sense of justice; it is the return of a debt for all that our country has done for us; for all that we have received from it—our citizenship, our freedom, our education, our opportunities, both spiritual and temporal. For all this we owe more than a deep and heartfelt gratitude; we owe our country our love, reverence, obedience, our loyalty, and, if necessary, our life itself. This is the meaning of true patriotism. This is the sacred significance of our flag which today waves silently over the graves of our departed colleagues of this honorable assembly.

There is another and even more profound significance in our meeting here today on this solemn occasion. We lay aside for a time the manifold tasks and labors which go into the making of our Nation's laws. There is a pause in the daily debate and in the interchange of views which at times express different and contrary opinions and convictions. We temporarily halt appropriation of the sums that we deem necessary to produce the greatest possible benefit for our people and for the peoples of other countries who stand in dire need and danger of losing both life and liberty.

In many parts of the world the freedom of the individual has been set back by centuries. There the idea survives that the individual is the creature of the state—that he exists for the state—that he has no rights except what the state gives him and can take away. America has been a living revolt against that pagan idea ever since freedom's greatest document was written and guaranteed that "All men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights and that among these rights are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Today we join together in reconsecrating our lives and our abilities to that noble work for which Congress has been dedicated by the founding fathers since the beginning of this Republic. They were men of faith, men who felt a deep sense of responsibility to the God of nations and of peoples. They were men whose relations toward God were not unlike those of children toward their father—love tempered with awe, and obedience joined with a healthy fear of merited punishment. Convictions such as these have been expressed in this Chamber countless times since the infancy of our country. The pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are replete with sane and sober reflections on the absolute necessity of unswerving loyalty to the divine law which guides all men in general and legislators in particular. Under this moral law our Nation has grown great and has prospered. Today we rededicate ourselves to those same sacred convictions, to that same eternal moral law. We do so, well aware that without this faith in God and in His unchangeable moral law, all our efforts here are vain and purposeless.

Without this faith upon what would we hope?

Without this faith our very presence here at this solemn memorial service would be meaningless.

Without this faith why should we labor and sacrifice for others?

Without this faith the brotherhood of man would be reduced to a soft and sentimental altruism.

Without this faith we might logically revert to the level of the unthinking brute creation and let selfishness and fear and blood and rapine be our only law.

Without this faith we would let force and suspicion and hate determine our relations with our fellow men.

Such is the inevitable effect of a philosophy of life without faith in God. Such godlessness would indeed have been anathema to our founding fathers and to the men who since 1789 have sat in the House of Representatives.

In a short time we shall again take up the work of yesterday. Let not the new resolve which this memorial hour affords pass away. They who have left us during the past year have already received their reward from the hands of a just and merciful Judge, before whom each of us will one day stand. We know that He has dealt with them in accord with His great mercy. "Blessed are ye who do the will of My Father." Blessed—happy shall you be. A heaped-up happiness of unending duration. That is the true immortality. That is the true end of man. Every other kind of immortality is but a mockery.

Monuments will decay, buildings will disappear, portraits fade, and words written and spoken are soon forgotten or lost in dusty tomes. But the deeds of men do live after them—not for a few passing years but for all eternity because they are written imperishably in the Book of Life held in the hands of the Angel of God. True immortality of men is unending life with their Creator. May the immortal souls of our fellow Congressmen whom we memorialize today, enjoy forever the reward of blissful rest and peace.

TAPS

Musician Frank Scimonelli sounded taps.

BENEDICTION

The Chaplain pronounced the following benediction:

Now unto Him who is able to keep you from falling and represent you faultless before the presence of His glory with great joy, unto the only wise God, our Saviour, the glory and majesty both now and forever. Amen.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess, at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m., the Speaker called the House to order.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 502, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Members, the Chair declares the House adjourned until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 18, 1948, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1557. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 801 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1558. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a recommendation for amendment of section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1559. A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ending March 31, 1948; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1560. A letter from the Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report of a claim paid by the bank in the case of Nick Scales, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. ALLEN of ILLINOIS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 350. Resolution to authorize and direct the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation of the action of the Department of State with respect to the claim of George B. Soto against the Government of Guatemala; without amendment (Rept. No. 1960). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 597. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6096, a bill to provide for making available the Government-owned alcohol plants at Muscatine, Iowa, Kansas City, Mo., and Omaha, Nebr., for the production of products from agricultural commodities in the furtherance of authorized programs of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1961). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 598. Resolution providing for consideration of S. 2256, an act relating to the meat-inspection service of the Department of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1962). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 599. Resolution providing for consideration of H. R. 6208, a bill to provide for the collection and publication of statistical information by the Bureau of the Census; without amendment (Rept. No. 1963). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. S. 2288. An act to amend the Lanham Act so as to permit the sale of certain permanent war housing thereunder to veterans at a purchase price not in excess of the cost of construction; without amendment (Rept. No. 1964). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 3907. A bill to authorize construction of buildings for the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance; without amendment (Rept. No. 1965). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 6127. A bill to authorize the allocation of funds to Grant County, Ind., for payment of one-half the cost of a certain bridge across the Mississinewa River in Grant County, Ind., and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1966). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 6587. A bill to promote effectual utilization of the fishery resources of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. R. 6588. A bill to authorize payments to public-school district or districts serving the Hungry Horse Dam, Mont., area; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6589. A bill to authorize the interment in adjoining graves in national cemeteries of certain parents and their children; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. BENNETT of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 404. Joint resolution authorizing the erection in the District of Columbia of a statue of Simon Bolivar; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress with respect to the methods by which international security and world peace may be attained through the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 600. Resolution to provide for the expenses of carrying out House Resolution 595; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 6590. A bill for the relief of Isom Puckett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6591. A bill for the relief of Zdzislaw Seidl and Mrs. Margit Seidl; 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:

1939. By Mr. WELCH: Resolution No. 7444, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging Hon. Jesse M. Donaldson, Postmaster General of the United States, to give consideration to the issuance of a special postage stamp sometime during the California centennial of 1948, 1949, and 1950 appropriately to commemorate the 21 missions of California; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1940. Also, Resolution No. 7445, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, urging the Senate of the United States to take early and favorable action with respect to H. R. 49 to the end that the Territory of Hawaii may be admitted to the Union as the forty-ninth State; to the Committee on Public Lands.

1941. Also, Resolution No. 7424, passed by the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, giving full endorsement to, and memorializing the Congress of the United States to give early passage to H. R. 5004; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1942. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the President's civil-rights program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1943. Also, petition of Edmund C. Fletcher, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to impeachment of the Honorable Sterling Hutcheson, judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, for gross misbehavior in office; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1944. Also, petition of Milton Grunberg and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of the Mundt-Nixon bill; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1945. Also, petition of Maurice Goldberg and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1946. Also, petition of A. S. Dannenauny and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1947. Also, petition of F. Hollander and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1948. Also, petition of Olga Blattman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1949. Also, petition of J. Gayron and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1950. Also, petition of Rose Ridman and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to defeat of legislation titled "The Subversive Activities Control Act"; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

1951. By Mr. EATON: Joint resolution of Mr. Hess, New Jersey State legislator, memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation which will retain unto the States control over service, operations, and rates of any railroad which has been reorganized under the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 18, 1948

(Legislative day of Monday, May 10, 1948)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, in the midst of great activity today we ask Thee to remind us often of Thine invisible presence, that out of confused issues may come simplicity of plan; out of fear may come confidence; out of hurry may come the willingness to wait; out of frustration, rest and power.

This we ask in Thine own name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 17, 1948, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3219) to authorize the Federal Works Administrator or officials of the Federal Works Agency duly authorized by him to appoint special policemen for duty upon Federal property under the jurisdiction of the Federal Works Agency, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 1878. An act to amend the immigration laws to deny admission to the United States of persons who may be coming here for the purpose of engaging in activities which will endanger the public safety of the United States;

H. R. 3510. An act to authorize the construction, protection, operation, and maintenance of a public airport in the Territory of Alaska; and

H. R. 5193. An act to amend the Nationality Act of 1940.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 3350) relating to the rules for the prevention of collisions on certain inland waters of the United States and on the western rivers, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

NOMINATION OF JESS LARSON TO BE WAR ASSETS ADMINISTRATOR

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The parliamentary situation is as follows: Under the order of Thursday, May 13, 1948, as modified on May 14, the nomination of Jess Larson, of Oklahoma, to be War Assets Administrator is before the Senate in executive session, and the question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] to recommit the nomination to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

Under the order, a vote will be taken on the motion of the Senator from Maryland at 1 o'clock today, and the intervening time is to be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the motion, and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr.