Floyd R. Robertson, Harviell.
Leanora R. Condit, Hayti.
Walter H. Bruens, Hermann.
Lola E. Frohse, High Ridge.
Charles H. Boemler, House Springs.
Tom J. Molloy, Joplin.
Carl E. Schreiner, Lamar.
Aubrey M. Gooch, Meadville.
Doris N. Cornine, Nelson.
Sylvester Welch, Parnell.
Desmond Earl Todd, Pevely.
T. Ray Gourley, Phillipsburg.
Paul R. Viles, Pineville.
Jacob E. Fry, Stover.
Mildred F. Parsons, Syracuse.
Billie B. Cooper, Windsor.
Donald H. Lockman, Winona.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Rodney B. Wright, Brookline.
Walter E. Hill, Fitzwilliam Depot.
James H. O'Connell, Fremont.
Joseph E. Hurley, Wilton.

NEW YORK

John L. Barrett, Minetto.

OKLAHOMA

Phil Lee Brown, Cherokee.
Alfred V. Koehler, Manchester.
Glenn H. Newell, Nash.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harry E. Grim, Boyertown.
Clarence R. Tobin, Cresson.
Wilma S. Walker, Emeigh.
Woodrow W. S. Lehr, Fogelsville.
Michael J. Pagani, New Galilee.
George H. Davis, Saxonburg.
Robert A. Lanzendorfer, Twin Rocks.

TENNESSEE

Russell E. Rankin, Union City.

WASHINGTON

Esther L. Coleman, Harper.
Virgel M. Newman, Kingston.
Gladys M. Pearson, Olalla.
Lawrence C. Tompkins, Suquamish.

WISCONSIN

Oswald L. Weber, Cedarburg.
James W. Johnson, Chaseburg.
Robert W. Howard, Cornell.
Clarence Keith Hammond, De Soto.
Ruby C. Bahr, Fairchild.
Claude A. Thomas, Forest Junction.
Hugo J. Quast, Granton.
Hazel M. Pfeil, Granville.
Rudolph C. Trauba, Greenville.
Leone C. Mader, Gresham.
Donald L. Schulz, Irma.
Robert S. Grogan, Kaukauna.
Edwin L. Saykally, Lake Tomahawk.
Joan T. Sullivan, Ojibwa.
August E. Mecikalski, Pelican Lake.
John H. Hennessey, Roberts.
Otis M. Rude, Viroqua.
Otis L. Holman, Westby.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 13, 1949

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

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

O Saviour divine, who wilt bow the head upon the cross and pass beneath the shadow of pain and dying, we lift our souls to Thee who in all meekness and lowliness hath given us a pledge of life eternal.

We would not mourn as those who have no hope of the morning, but as watchers on the mountain we would wait for the dawn and rejoice in the coming glory of the future. We rejoice to see the beauty of God in the patience, the purity and tenderness of Jesus the Christ. In Him is the seal of victory over the powers of darkness and human oppression. O fill our hearts with such peace that we shall be ashamed to murmur and complain, and unto the Lord of glory be eternal praises. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1209) entitled "An act to amend the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948"; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. VANDENBERG, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

SALE OF PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2440) to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the sale of what are ordinarily known as the green towns, Greenbelt, Md., near Washington, Greenhills near Cincinnati, and Greendale, a suburb of Milwaukee, Wis.

The bill provides that veterans' cooperatives shall have priority in the purchase of these properties. It also provides that tenants in possession may join the cooperatives on the same terms and conditions as required of other purchasers. The sale may be either a negotiated sale or a sale as a result of competitive bidding.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It could be either?

Mr. SPENCE. There are several veterans' cooperatives that have been organized and, I understand, are able to purchase these properties. They are very anxious to have the opportunity to make the bid immediately.

The terms provide that at least 10 percent of the purchase price must be paid at the time of the sale; deferred payments bear 4 percent interest, and the amortization period is 25 years.

The bill was reported out of the Committee on Banking and Currency without a dissenting vote, and I am sure that there will be no opposition to it here.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell us what the total loss to the Government has been in these properties?

Mr. SPENCE. What the total loss will be?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much did we lose on them?

Mr. SPENCE. I believe the whole project cost about $40,000,000. What they are going to obtain, I do not know.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. McGREGOR. I wonder if the gentleman will tell us if it is mandatory that these properties be sold by competitive bids.

Mr. SPENCE. No; the matter is left to the discretion of the Public Housing Commissioner.

Mr. McGREGOR. It is possible to transfer the properties under negotiated contracts without competitive bids; is that right?

Mr. SPENCE. That is a request that some of the veterans' cooperatives have made. They wanted an opportunity to buy on negotiated sales. Should it develop that two or more organizations negotiate for the sale they must submit sealed bids. I think it is a good thing for the Government to get rid of these properties.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think it is the perfect end of a noble experiment.

Mr. SPENCE. I believe this is the best way in which we can dispose of them; it gives the veterans preference; it will mean more housing. I hope that the bill will pass and the properties will be disposed of at an early date and Government obligations with respect thereto will cease.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I understand the Federal Government has spent $40,000,000 on these three projects.

Mr. SPENCE. Yes.

Mr. RICH. That was a pretty big deal for someone to make handling Government funds. Suppose a cooperative is formed and they say, "Now, we can get that proposition for a fraction of what it cost the Federal Government"; suppose further that someone else is willing to pay 20 or 30 percent more for the property; how will the Government be protected to get the better price? How will that be determined by those handing it out?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not know how we are going to dispose of them unless we entrust the disposition to somebody. This is the only way I know of in which it can be done.

Mr. RICH. Does the bill provide that they may be sold without advertising?

Mr. SPENCE. No; they must be sold after appraisal by disinterested appraisers employed by the Public Housing Commissioner or at cost, whichever is least. Mr. Charles P. Taft is very much interested in one of these projects. He represents a cooperative and is very anxious that it be sold immediately. A veterans' cooperative in Milwaukee, Wis., is very anxious to purchase the project there.

Mr. RICH. Will the authorities do their best to get every dollar they can to

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

help relieve this great deficit that these projects helped to get us into?

Mr. SPENCE. If they did not they would be recreant to their trust, and I assume they will not be.

Mr. RICH. What I want to know is, are they going to try to do it?

Mr. SPENCE. They tell me that they are.

Mr. RICH. That is all I wanted to know.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say for the consolation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that these properties cannot be exported.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky and his committee in making this report. The veterans of Wisconsin are especially interested in this project in Mr. DAVIS' district. It seems to me it is a blessing to the veterans.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I wish to correct the statement made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]; it is not in my district, although it is in Milwaukee County. I do, however, wish to express my appreciation to the chairman and other members of this committee for their practical action in this matter, and to express my belief that it represents a fine way for the Government to get out of the real-estate business. It will do a lot of good to the veterans of Wisconsin.

Mr. SPENCE. I thank the gentleman; I hope that will be the result.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3709, as amended, of the Revised Statutes of the United States, or any other provision of law, the Public Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized, by means of negotiated sale or sales and without competitive bidding or public advertising, to sell and convey, at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert selected by the Commissioner and subject to such terms and conditions as he may determine to be in the best public interest, to such purchaser or purchasers as he deems to be responsible, all right, title, and interest of the United States in or to all or any part of the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio (including improved and unimproved lands, war housing constructed on lands of or adjacent to said suburban resettlement projects, and personal property used in connection with said projects or housing): *Provided*, That the Public Housing Commissioner shall, during such period as he deems to be reasonable, give a first preference in such negotiated sale or sales to cooperative, or mutual corporations or other nonprofit organizations, including veteran and nonveteran members or where shares of stock are held by veterans and/or veteran organizations, and may sell to such corporations or organizations at fair market value (as determined by him on the basis stated above) or at cost (as determined by him, including the apportioned cost of structures, lands, appurtenances, and personal property transferred, together with the apportioned share of the cost of all utilities and other facilities provided for and common to the project of which any property being sold is a part), whichever is lower: *And provided further*, That in the event the Commissioner shall not have been able to dispose of any one or all of said properties, or any part or parts thereof, by negotiated sale as authorized herein within a period of 6 months after the effective day of this act, he may sell and convey any such unsold project or part thereof to the highest responsible bidder at a public competitive sale upon such terms and after such advertisement as said Commissioner may deem in the public interest, or otherwise dispose of such projects or any part thereof in accordance with other applicable legislation.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3709, as amended, the revised Statutes of the United States, or any other provision of law, the Public Housing Commissioner is hereby authorized, by means of negotiated sale or sales and without competitive bidding or public advertising, to sell and convey, at fair market value as determined by him on the basis of an appraisal made by an independent real-estate expert selected by the Commissioner and subject to such terms and conditions as he may determine to be in the best public interest, to such purchaser or purchasers as he deems to be responsible, all right, title, and interest of the United States in or to all or any part of the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Md.; Greendale, Wis.; and Greenhills, Ohio (including improved and unimproved lands, war housing constructed on lands of or adjacent to said surburban resettlement projects, and personal property used in connection with said projects or housing): *Provided*, That the Public Housing Commissioner shall, during such period as he deems to be reasonable, give a first preference in such negotiated sale or sales to veteran groups organized on a nonprofit basis (provided that any such group shall accept as a member of its organization, on the same terms, subject to the same conditions, and with the same privileges and responsibilities, required of and extended to other members of the group, any tenant occupying a project on the date of its acquisition hereunder by such group, and provided further that any such group shall extend an opportunity to such tenants to so become members for such period as the Commissioner shall deem appropriate), and may sell to such groups at fair market value (as determined by him on the basis stated above) or at cost (as determined by him, including the apportioned cost of structures, lands, appurtenances, and personal property transferred, together with the apportioned share of the cost of all utilities and other facilities provided for and common to the project of which any property being sold is a part), whichever is lower except, however, that in the event two or more such groups desire to purchase any such project they shall be required to submit sealed bids therefor and the award shall be made on the basis of the highest acceptable monetary return to the Government: *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall preclude the Public Housing Commissioner from selling and conveying any such project or part thereof to the highest responsible bidder at a public competitive sale upon such terms and after such advertisement as said Commissioner may deem in the public interest, or from otherwise disposing of such projects or any part thereof in accordance with other applicable legislation: *And provided further*, That in the event of a sale other than for cash, the Commissioner shall require a down payment of at least 10 percent of the total purchase price, the balance to be amortized over a period of not more than 25 years, the unpaid balance to bear interest at the rate of 4 percent and the payment of any unpaid balance to be secured by a first mortgage or deed of trust against the properties sold."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I am quite happy that H. R. 2440 has passed the House. This bill directly affects a large number of the residents of my district, and under the provisions of this measure it is now possible for the veterans' group and the tenants of Greenhills, Ohio, to purchase this project and be relieved of the uncertainty which has been hanging over their heads for quite a long time. It is also very appropriate that just about a half an hour before the passage of this bill I had the pleasure of being in the company of Mr. R. D. Matthews and Miss McAfee, teachers at the Greenhills High School, and a group of 32 of their students who are visiting the Nation's Capital.

I am glad that my colleagues have seen fit to pass this bill and I know that the minds of a lot of my constituents will be set at ease when the same bill passes the Senate and is signed by the President.

Only today I received a letter from one of my constituents who was actively working to bring about complete cooperation between the residents of Greenhills and the veterans' group, which were anxiously awaiting the action of the House. In this letter my friend, Mr. Marty Eagan, informed me that as a result of my several letters to the two groups interested in Greenhills they had held meetings on last Saturday and Sunday and arrived at an amicable settlement of all the differences—hence, I am proud to say that the people of my district now present a united front in their efforts to provide proper housing for themselves and our veterans. With this united front these groups can go forward and purchase this project and immediately start new construction which is very necessary at this time in order to alleviate the housing shortage.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend to the House the great appreciation of my constituents in approving this measure.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky and his committee have done a very conscientious job in amending H. R. 2440, the measure to authorize the Public Housing Commissioner to sell the suburban resettlement projects known as Greenbelt, Greendale,

and Greenhills, without regard to provisions of law requiring competitive bidding or public advertising.

One of the projects, Greendale, is located in my congressional district and I have repeatedly urged that careful deliberation be given this measure. I have asked that the bill include the following provisions:

(a) A true market value.

(b) Due consideration for tenants, veteran and nonveteran, particularly in exorbitant rent increases and unfair evictions.

(c) A provision for negotiating a term sale if and when a cash disposition should not be feasible.

While I have at no time opposed the sale of these housing projects, it is my firm conviction that everyone who is interested, especially the present tenants, should be given all possible consideration. In a letter received just this morning from one of the Greendale residents, I was urged to support legislation which would give a tenant's cooperative corporation priority in the purchase of Greendale from the Government through negotiated sale, wherein such cooperative corporation shall be controlled by the tenants and in which all the residents of Greendale would be eligible. Further, first priority for the purchase of the individual units should be afforded to the present occupants of these developments.

It is my understanding that it was the intention of the original planners of these developments, that when the Government would feel free to dispose of them, they would be turned over to a nonprofit corporation formed from the tenants of that project. I believe the present measure, as amended, gives the Public Housing Commissioner such authority and therefore feel that the legislation is not controversial.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor may have permission to sit in public hearings today and tomorrow during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1949

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 222) making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue for 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 222, with Mr. BRYSON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Obviously a quorum is not present. The Clerk will call the roll.

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

[Roll No. 76]

Allen, La.	Garmatz	Nixon
Andrews	Gilmer	Passman
Bailey	Hall, Leonard W.	Patman
Barden	Harden	Poulson
Baring	Hedrick	Powell
Bland	Heller	Rains
Buckley, N. Y.	Herter	Regan
Bulwinkle	Hill	Sasscer
Burke	Hobbs	Scott, Hardie
Burnside	Hoeven	Scott, Hugh D., Jr.
Byrne, N. Y.	Hoffman, Ill.	Simpson, Pa.
Celler	Javits	Smith, Ohio
Chiperfield	Jennings	Smith, Va.
Clevenger	Jones, Ala.	Staggers
Cox	Kearney	Stigler
Davenport	Kearns	Stockman
Davis, Tenn.	Kee	Thomas, N. J.
Dawson	Kennedy	Thompson
DeGraffenried	Kirwan	Vursell
Dingell	Kunkel	Walsh
Dollinger	Lane	Whitaker
Douglas	LeCompte	White, Idaho
Elliott	Lucas	Wickersham
Ellsworth	McConnell	Willis
Elston	McDonough	Withrow
Fernandez	Morrison	Wolcott
Frazier	Morton	Wood
Fugate	Multer	
Gamble		

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BRYSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 222, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 347 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The Committee will resume its sitting.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I need.

Mr. Chairman, the item which is now before the committee involves a considerable amount of money. The resolution is of an urgent nature and the amount recommended for appropriation is $595,890,000 for the Veterans' Administration.

The matter came to the attention of the committee only yesterday afternoon, following which hearings were held, resulting in this resolution. The appropriation is needed to supplement the amount currently available for the fiscal year 1949 for readjustment benefits.

It was testified that the present fund for this purpose would be completely exhausted at the end of the first 3 weeks of this month or around the 20th of April. Public Laws 411 and 512 of the Eightieth Congress increased the unit cost of subsistence allowance payable to veterans for educational and training purposes. The original Budget estimate for the fiscal year 1949 was amended by House Document No. 673 of the Eightieth Congress, second session, and reflected a preliminary estimate of these increased costs; however, it is now apparent that the amended estimate did not fully recognize the increasing cost which will result from these laws. In addition to the increased unit cost the enrollment increased above the enrollment previously estimated very much.

The three major categories in which the Veterans' Administration needs additional money follow:

First. Education and training: (a) Tuition fees; (b) supplies and equipment; (c) subsistence allowance.

Second. On-the-job training.

Third. Unemployment allowances.

The joint resolution provides an appropriation of $595,890,000 for readjustment benefits for veterans to be paid by the Veterans' Administration. The benefits consist of tuition fees and supplies and equipment for institutional trainees, payments for on-the-job training, and unemployment allowances. The major portion of the added requirements for the current year is attributable to the enactment of Public Laws 411 and 512, Eightieth Congress, since the consideration of the regular fiscal year 1949 appropriations. The total amount available for this purpose for the fiscal year 1949 was $2,629,977,894. Through the month of February total obligations were $2,062,425,606. Actual expenditures in the month of February were $273,599,720, and total expenditures in the month of March approximate $344,000,000. The balance available in the fund as of April 1 was $219,250,000, and the best estimate available is that an average of $271,000,000 per month will be required to the end of the fiscal year.

In connection with the budget for 1950, the amount recommended to be appropriated for readjustment benefits included an amount of $323,193,891 estimated to be utilized in fiscal year 1949. The changed situation with regard to the education and training program now appears to require that the full amount included in the budget be available for use in fiscal year 1950.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Does not the gentleman feel that the increased enrollment is due somewhat to unemployment conditions?

Mr. KERR. I think that is certainly correct. The increased enrollment is due very much, if not largely, to the unemployment conditions in the country.

The estimate was submitted by the budget to the Congress on April 11, and the committee was informed in hearings on April 12 that present funds will be exhausted within 10 days. The committee has had an opportunity to make only the most cursory review of the matter but is

convinced that at least the amount proposed will be required. The amount of the appropriation is no control over expenditures inasmuch as expenditures are entirely dependent upon the number of applicants for training and for other benefits to which veterans are entitled under the law.

Therefore, the committee recommends the enactment of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon about 12:30 we were summoned to a meeting of the Deficiency Committee for 1:30. The day before an estimate had come up here from the Bureau of the Budget for $595,000,000 to pay for readjustment allowances for veterans. The Veterans' Administration, according to our hearings, had submitted this matter to the Bureau of the Budget with its estimate on the 9th of March, indicating a very decided deficiency. Yet, the budget message did not arrive here until day before yesterday afternoon. It, and the hearings, indicated that at least this amount would be necessary to meet the obligations of the Veterans' Administration to the 30th of June. Perhaps it will take more.

I presume that if the recess were scheduled for 2 weeks ahead of next Thursday instead of next Thursday, the budget message would not have arrived until 2 days before the recess. The reason for this resolution is that there are more veterans taking on-the-job training, and the allowances for that and for institutional training, such as colleges, has increased very markedly during the year. Unemployment allowances have increased very markedly. The number for unemployment allowances in October was 240,000; in March it was 670,000 indicating almost 3 times as many on the 52–20 allowance. We hope that the estimated drop off in April, May, and June will take place. That is all set forth in the hearings.

Frankly, in view of the fact that Congress has passed the law authorizing and directing the Veterans' Administration to make these payments, there is nothing we can do except pass this resolution. I regret that it comes up and has to come up, but there is no such thing in my book as failing to meet a definite obligation the Congress has created. We must pass the resolution right away so that the Veterans' Administration will be able to send out the checks which have been promised.

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

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Am I correct in the assumption that the budget submitted by the President for the fiscal year 1950 contained an amount to take care of a possible deficit in this item available for expenditure in 1949?

Mr. TABER. That is true. It contained an item amounting to $323,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. In other words, the President's 1950 budget anticipated the possible deficiency in this item in the 1949 budget of $323,000,000?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, as the result of this request for $595,000,000, we find that the amount for expenditure in 1949 will be increased over the President's budget estimate by the difference between $323,000,000 and $595,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. $272,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. So that $272,000,000 is in effect an unbudgeted item and represents an amount beyond any budget estimate that has been submitted by the President?

Mr. TABER. It represents an item of $272,000,000 above his January submission. There was a budget estimate submitted on Monday afternoon for the $595,000,000. It does represent an increase above the January submission by that amount.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am very much interested, because it was thought last year when those bills passed the Congress that the educational and on-the-job training work would taper off, that it was more or less the end of the program. I think it shows there is a great deal of unemployment, and that is one reason for the increase.

Mr. TABER. That probably is the reason for the increase.

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

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

Mr. SADLAK. My question is directed to the unemployment benefits, or the 52–20 club. Is it a fact that the same office in the State administers the 52–20 payments as is in charge of making payments for unemployment benefits?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. SADLAK. Therefore, where you have unemployment, the work load automatically is increased on the personnel of these offices by the daily increase in unemployment of veterans?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, we pass today a notable milestone in the history of congressional appropriations. We have now reported to the House all the annual supply bills for the support of the executive and judicial branches of the Government, and by tonight or tomorrow night we will have established the unprecedented record of sending to the Senate all the annual appropriation bills before mid-April. It is a record without precedent since the constitutional amendment abolishing the short session.

Furthermore, these bills have been so exhaustively studied and so thoroughly processed that they have been presented to the House by the practically unanimous vote of the membership of the subcommittees on both sides of the aisle and have reached the floor in such carefully considered form that none of them have been materially modified. And they have been accepted by the House practically in the form in which reported by the committee.

The exceptional efficiency with which the appropriation bills have been handled this session has been made possible by a number of contributing factors.

Foremost, it may be said, was the inauguration of the practice of assigning members of the Committee on Appropriations to a single subcommittee, instead of to two or more subcommittees as in former sessions, making possible the concerted functioning of all subcommittees simultaneously.

Next, I should say, was the indefatigable industry and zeal of the chairmen and the members of the several subcommittees, on both sides of the aisle, in the handling of the hearings and investigations, and in their determination to meet the dates scheduled for the respective reports.

Third, particular credit must be given to the capable and efficient members of the committee staff, who have worked all day and far into the night through months of crowded hearings and rendered an outstanding service unexcelled in the annals of the committee.

And last, much of the credit is to be attributed to the splendid cooperation and support of the House leadership which has smoothed the way and kept open the avenues of prompt consideration when we brought our bills to the floor.

May I say, Mr. Chairman, we are not only sending the supply bills to the Senate in record-breaking time and form but we have been successful in making large reductions in the budget estimates and in holding planned outlays to what impressed us as the essentials. Every bill except one presented by the committee and passed by the House has been appreciably below the estimate of appropriations, including both the First and Second Deficiency Appropriation bills, which we have also passed and sent to the Senate before the Easter recess.

The budget estimates applying to all the regular annual bills referred to aggregate $29,357,897,996. The bills as they have passed the House and the one expected to pass the House this afternoon or tomorrow, carry a grand total of $28,269,635,101. The difference in favor of the taxpayer is $1,088,262,895. I am appending a table giving the components of these amounts by bills.

From this table it will be noted that while the bills reported by the committee are more than a billion dollars below the budget estimates, they are $2,538,183,220 in excess of comparable appropriations for the fiscal year 1949. However, the budget estimates for 1950 include $2,260,540,958 directly attributable to legislation enacted by the Eightieth Congress. Increased veterans' benefits account for almost $1,000,000,000 of this amount, and pay increases to Government employees account for $550,000,000. When these mandatory items are taken into account and provision is made for increases in work loads and volume of business, the bills as passed for 1950 are not materially in excess of comparable amounts for 1949. The total of appropriations recommended by the committee is $1,088,262,895 below the estimates recommended in the budget. Every bill

reported has been substantially below the budget except the bill providing funds for the Military Establishment.

The budget, as submitted, did not include estimates for universal military training, but the President informed the Congress that it was his purpose to propose legislation authorizing universal military training and that it would require appropriations of $800,000,000 the first year. While this amount was not actually submitted as a budget estimate, it was referred to by the President in the budget and was taken into account by the Budget Bureau in computing probable expenditures for national defense in the ensuing fiscal year. It now becomes evident that no appropriation for this purpose will be required, so it is fair to say that the appropriation for the Military Establishment, as recommneded by the committee, though apparently in excess of budget estimates, is in reality substantially below the total appropriations contemplated by the Budget Bureau and the President at the time the budget was prepared.

All circumstances considered, the House may well view the work of the subcommittees in the processing of these bills as a commendable accomplishment and a tribute to the application and the judgment of the membership of the subcommittees, irrespective of political consideration.

Their problems were in no sense easy. It requires no effort and little thought to make arbitrary slashes, letting the consequences be such as they may. That is not intelligent economy. The Appropriations Committee is confronted with demands in consequence of law and in response to situations which it is powerless to alter or ignore. Its task is to determine the least amount of money required to meet the situation in the most efficient and economical way. Our reports to the House follow out that conception of the committee's responsibility.

The place to avoid additional spending and to keep budgets in line with foreseeable revenue is right here in the Congress in the consideration of legislative measures that embody additional Treasury demands. For example, at the last session of Congress additional compensation was authorized for Federal personnel. That meant an added expense for the fiscal year beginning next July 1 of approximately millions of dollars, and swelled the total of every bill the committee has reported. It is doubtful whether when these authorizations are before the House, due consideration was given to the expansion they involve in the ultimate aggregate of the budget, and to the added demands they mean upon revenue. When we later meet with these increases in the supply bills, we become very much disturbed. But it is a bit late by that time.

Let me also remind you that 76 percent of the expenditures contemplated by the 1950 budget are earmarked for national defense, international affairs, and finance, veterans, and interest on the public debt; 76 percent just for those four categories. The remaining 24 percent or $10,000,000,000, applies to all of the other multitudinous activities of the Federal Government. For the present, therefore, we are more or less restricted in our economy efforts to the $10,000,000,000 latitude. That is not an unconscionable amount for so wide a spread. Of course, it is well above the prewar level for comparable objects, but that is due to newly authorized undertakings and to a very large extent to the pay-roll expansion in consequence of liberalization of the Classification Act and successive pay increases.

This general summary should convey some idea of the difficulty confronting the members of the Appropriations Committee in subtracting, upon justifiable grounds, substantial amounts from the regular annual appropriation bills.

The expeditious and effective management of the appropriation bills this session, and the reduction of the budget estimates, as transmitted to the Senate constitute a noble accomplishment.

But even at that, there is reason to believe that the committee and the Congress could have been even a little more economical. Certainly there is need for the most rigid economy. The resources of the country are not unlimited. There is a bottom not only to the revenues available but to the natural resources of the country, as well.

There is need for retrenchment of expenditure, not only for the sake of the national economy but as a part of national defense. The General of the Army appearing before one of the subcommittees emphasized the fact that we could imperil national defense by the expenditure of excessive funds for the armed services in time of peace. And it cannot be too strongly emphasized that we cannot continue to vote for increased appropriations unless we expect in the near future to vote for additional taxes.

Mr. Chairman, there follows a recapitulation of the regular annual appropriation bills as reported to the House with a comparison of amounts carried for the current fiscal year and the amounts recommended by the Budget:

Bill	Appropriations, 1949	Budget estimates, 1950	Committee bill, 1950	Committee bill for 1950 compared with—	
				Appropriations, 1949	Budget estimates, 1950
District of Columbia	$99, 879, 483	$103, 321, 427	$98, 923, 621	−$955, 862	−$4, 397, 806
Treasury-Post Office	2, 545, 392, 680	3, 172, 666, 750	3, 072, 817, 903	+527, 425, 223	−99, 848, 847
Labor-Federal Security	1, 857, 955, 310	2, 235, 065, 685	2, 211, 794, 085	+353, 838, 775	−23, 271, 600
Civil Functions	648, 575, 666	767, 733, 220	586, 762, 000	−61, 813, 666	−180, 971, 220
Interior	409, 389, 974	616, 805, 020	536, 211, 908	+126, 821, 934	−89, 593, 112
Agriculture	573, 888, 953	726, 879, 908	701, 122, 079	+127, 233, 126	−25, 757, 829
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary	599, 704, 390	740, 023, 456	684, 616, 102	+84, 911, 712	−55, 407, 354
Military Establishment	10, 454, 477, 413	13, 219, 835, 700	13, 272, 815, 800	+2, 818, 338, 387	+52, 980, 100
Independent Offices	6, 808, 368, 663	7, 775, 566, 830	7, 104, 571, 603	+296, 202, 940	−670, 995, 227
Total	23, 997, 632, 532	29, 357, 897, 996	28, 269, 635, 101	+4, 272, 002, 569	−1, 088, 262, 895
First deficiency, 1949	466, 882, 177				
Second deficiency, 1949	671, 047, 172				
Veterans benefits, estimate	595, 890, 000				
Grand total	25, 731, 451, 881			+2, 538, 183, 220	

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

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER].

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Chairman, the remarks just made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Appropriations Committee, were to me both interesting and amusing especially when he rejoiced over the fact that his committee has established an all-time record for appropriations during this session of Congress.

I desire to call to the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that such a record could have been established by the Eightieth Congress if his many motions to increase appropriations during that Congress had prevailed.

Just to keep the record straight, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri, who now asserts such a burning zeal for economy, during the Eightieth Congress offered 10 amendments relating to just one department which, if they had been accepted, would have increased appropriations for that one department by $306,077,666. I think I am correct in saying that on every appropriation bill passed by the Eightieth Congress the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] offered motions to recommit to be reported back forthwith to include increased appropriations. Members of his own committee have told me that the increased appropriations proposed by Chairman CANNON, both during debate on various supply bills and in his motions to recommit, would have amounted to $289,385,710. In other words, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], had had his way, the Eightieth Congress would not have been as successful in saving the taxpayers' money and to have balanced the budget for the first time since 1932.

So that one can make a fair comparison between the performance and the pleas for economy by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I recall to Members of the House his strenuous opposition to efforts by the Republican minority to eliminate the TVA steam plant from a recent appropriation bill. The cost of this project and those which necessarily follow it will ultimately cost $150,000,000.

The gentleman from Missouri also speaks in glowing terms of the excellent job that has been done by the Appropriations Committee staff and the careful consideration that has been given the supply bills so far during the present session of Congress. The staff referred to, of course, can only mean clerks and employees of the committee. No doubt

these employees are competent and have done a good job. However, in his statement he fails to tell the Congress that he discharged the investigating staff that was set up during the Eightieth Congress under the Reorganization Act, and that no investigating staff has replaced those who were fired. Without such a staff how can anyone believe that requests for appropriations by various departments can be properly studied and judged.

Only last week the gentleman from Missouri placed a number of letters in the Appendix of the RECORD. These letters were from businessmen throughout the country complimenting him on statements demanding economy. Most of the businessmen who wrote these letters sent copies to their Members of Congress. I rarely reply to letters which are merely a copy of a letter to someone else that is sent to me. I did, however, reply to these letters with the following:

DEAR MR. BLANK: Thank you for sending me a copy of your letter to Congressman CLARENCE CANNON.

I think it is a fine thing for you and others to write Mr. CANNON such letters. You may be able to persuade him to act and vote as he talks.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely,

PAUL SHAFER.

It is quite apparent that these letters written to the gentleman from Missouri have not had much effect because the record shows that the supply bills that have been considered by Congress during the present session have been increased a total of almost $2,000,000,000 over similar bills passed last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sum:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

For an additional amount for "Readjustment benefits," 1949, $595,890,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I welcome to the ranks of those who seek economy in expenditures of the Federal Government the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. It is simply amazing to me to see how he has been converted to the necessity of retrenchment in the expenditure of public funds. I compliment him upon the remarks which he made this morning, and similar speeches which he has made from time to time to the Committee on Appropriations, but let me warn you and warn the country that while we may take just pride in the speed with which we have passed these monumental appropriation bills, we are not through. Nothing has been said about the demands that will be made upon the Treasury when the whole program, to which I understand the gentleman subscribes, is passed and brought before the House. This program is involved in deficiency appropriations that will come before the Congress prior to its adjournment. If the program as announced is legislated into law, and must be implemented by appropriations, it will make these estimates look puny and small. So I want to warn the country and the Congress right now, in view of what the gentleman has said, that we expect in the future to examine these estimates of deficiencies that come before the Congress to take care of, for instance, the Atlantic Pact, China, Greek-Turkish aid, aid to dependent and neglected children in foreign countries, social-security-tax legislation, housing, and everything else, none of which have been submitted to this Congress up to the present time. God alone knows what the cost will be if that program is carried out and must be implemented by appropriations.

It is a little too early to pat ourselves on the back and let the country know that we have done such a magnificent job when on the major parts of your program legislative authorizations have not yet been made and when and if they are made, oh, what a different story will be before the public at that time.

It is a grand thing to talk about reducing appropriations, Mr. Chairman, and about a record for reducing appropriations; it is another thing to vote when the time comes to vote to actually carry out that purpose by casting a vote that you preach.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BRYSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. J. Res. 222) making an additional appropriation for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SADOWSKI asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in three instances and include excerpts.

Mr. PRICE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include excerpts from an editorial appearing in the Chicago Tribune.

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

Mr. KEOGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an address.

Mr. ADDONIZIO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD in two instances and include resolutions.

Mr. BROOKS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include certain articles and excerpts.

ADMISSION INTO UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIEN FIANCÉS

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. J. Res. 160) to authorize completion of the processing of the visa cases, and admission into the United States, of certain alien fiancés, and fiancées of members, or of former members, of the armed forces of the United States, as was provided in the so-called GI Fiancés Act, as amended, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments as follows:

Page 2, line 12, strike out "January" and insert "April."

Page 2, lines 12 and 13, strike out "and were unable to come to the United States for reasons beyond their control."

Page 2, lines 14 and 15, strike out "before July 1, 1949" and insert "within five months after the effective date of this act."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain these amendments?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the amendments the Senate placed in the bill passed by the House have in anywise changed the bill, because the relief provided therein relates only to those cases of GI fiancés that were being processed at the time the act expired. The Senate changed the date from January 1 to April 1, 1949. However, that does not affect the objective of the act.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It gives them three more months to process them.

Mr. WALTER. It gives five more months to complete the processing that was going on at the time the act expired and does not make eligible any more GI fiancés.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, suppose that in 3 months' time they are not able to process them; they were in the hopper at the time, but there was some technical delay. Do I understand that is as of April 30, this year?

Mr. WALTER. January 1, 1949.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Suppose they have not started to work on the processing.

Mr. WALTER. If no application was made to the consul prior to midnight December 31, 1948, no case could now be considered. I understand most of the

eligible cases have been completed. There are some remaining, and the State Department has informed the Committee on the Judiciary that the 5 months provided for in the bill is the time that would be required.

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

There is no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VAN ZANDT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject American Taxpayers Have Sent $92,169,000,000 to Foreign Countries.

Mr. WELCH of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the San Francisco Call-Bulletin.

Mr. DONDERO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SCUDDER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Humboldt Times, Eureka, Calif.

NATIONAL MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1950

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 4146, with Mr. KEOGH in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. On yesterday, by unanimous consent, further general debate on the bill was limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, at the outset of my remarks I want to pay high compliment to this distinguished Committee on Appropriations that has brought in probably the largest bill that will be before this House during this session, in dollars and cents. This committee is composed of some of the most distinguished and best posted men in the Congress. It is headed by one of the Congress' most learned and gifted young statesmen, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]. He has done a magnificent job. It is a hard job. I have read the hearings, and the questions he asked indicate considerable knowledge of this complicated problem of our national defense and the money necessary for its support. Assisting him was the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], who, for a great many years and during the war, was chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations.

Also on the majority side is the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who for a great many years was a member of the Committee on Military Affairs and in recent years was a member of the Committee on Armed Services. On the minority side are two distinguished Members, both chairmen in the Eightieth Congress, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY], who headed the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], who headed the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department. This is a great committee, composed of outstanding, able men.

I have read a third of the hearings. I read the hearings in relation to the Air Force and the Navy. The only fault I find with the handiwork of this subcommittee is that they have followed, as far as the Navy and naval aviation is concerned, the conclusions and recommendations of the budget. They have given to the Committee on Appropriations and to this committee the figures the budget has recommended.

I say the facts justify a departure from the conclusions of the budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff in making their recommendation are entirely at variance with the recommendations of the budget. But this distinguished committee has adopted the budget figures, so this bill now becomes the committee's bill even though it writes in exactly what the budget has proposed for the Navy.

I call your attention to how this affects one branch of the service, naval aviation. Listen to this, and every line I am going to utter is taken from the hearings on this bill.

This bill cuts 2,930 planes from the number of operating naval aircraft that were planned for June 30, 1949.

It cuts the Navy attack carriers by 3, from 11 to 8. These ships, the airplane carriers, are the backbone of the modern Navy. There was a day and time when the battleship was the backbone. That day is past. Today the backbone of the modern Navy is the airplane carrier.

The budget recommended to take out of commission three of these carriers, and this distinguished Committee on Appropriations goes along with and approves the recommendation of the budget.

What else does this bill do? It deactivates nine naval air stations. Every one of them, except two, is outside the continental United States. It cuts out one attack-carrier group—a major unit of the Navy striking force.

It cuts out four Navy patrol-plane squadrons, these being antisubmarine planes for the defense of waters immediately adjacent to the United States.

It permits the Navy to procure almost 500 fewer planes in 1950 than were authorized in 1949. It permits the Navy to procure one-half the number of planes needed even to maintain the reduced strength of the Navy's air arm. It cuts the strength of the Navy's operating Air Force from 10,713 to 7,783.

Then the committee turned around and said, "The Navy can have only 843 planes built a year." If you can build only 843 planes a year, it means that you cannot maintain 7,783 operating and modern planes because the life of a plane is only 6 years. Therefore, they are stagnating the Navy air arm and they are letting the naval operating air force die on the vine.

In addition, this bill cuts the naval air personnel 550 officers and 12,000 enlisted men below the budget of last year.

Now, listen to this. It forces the discontinuance of training of Naval Reserve air groups on fleet carriers.

It reduces the number of aircraft overhauls by 16 percent from the authorized 1949 level. To sum up—it cuts the Navy's operating aircraft; it cuts its attack carriers; it cuts its naval personnel; it reduces to an astonishing extent its procurement authority; it forces the deactivation of nine air stations; it prevents the production of new-type aircraft. By the reduction of $30,000,000 in research, you cannot get any new types of Navy aircraft engines or aircraft in 1950 under the bill before the Committee today.

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

Mr. VINSON. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. Does it not also prevent any experimental work from being done so that naval aviation would be obliged to use whatever the Army has developed, even though it might not be adequate for the tasks of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON. It has the effect of forcing the Navy to continue to use and to maintain obsolescent airplanes in the future. That is the effect of this reduction of this $30,000,000.

I say this bill should be amended. I would like to see it amended to carry out at least what was done for the Navy and what was done for our defense establishment in 1949. Listen to this. In 1949 the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] brought in a bill which was rounded out in all respects and which gave the country adequate protection in peacetime. This bill provides $573,000,000 less for the Navy than was appropriated under the act of 1949.

The other day you heard the distinguished Britisher, Mr. Churchill, say that nothing has contributed more to keeping peace in the world than the atomic bomb. That is absolutely true. The atomic bomb, and with America keeping a worth-while national-defense establishment, has enabled us to maintain peace.

What is before us today? On the one hand, we are assuming greater responsibilities than ever before under the Atlantic Pact, and on the other hand by this bill which we now have before us, we are not only reducing by $573,000,000 the appropriation for the Navy, but we are also reducing the Army some 34,000 men in its personnel. I say to you, if you want to keep peace in Europe—if you want to keep peace in the world, then let the world know we are going to be prepared. We have just signed, as I said,

the Atlantic Pact, and the very next day, after assuming that additional responsibility, this Committee on Appropriations, following the conclusions of the budget, cut the very vitals out of naval aviation. I say there is nothing more important than aviation. The distinguished gentleman from Texas yesterday pointed that out. I agree with him. But he does not take his own medicine. He points out how valuable and effective aviation is; yet on the other hand, he comes here and reduces by some 3,000 planes the operating force which Congress appropriated in 1949. When he does that, he then says, "The Navy can only buy 843 planes in 1950," and you cannot maintain 7,783 planes by a yearly production of only 843 planes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. VINSON. With pleasure.

Mr. MAHON. Would not the gentleman also point out that the Navy has 12,000 planes; that the appropriation in this bill for the entire Navy is greater this year than it was last year; and that the appropriation for naval aviation is greater than it was last year; and that this is the greatest so-called peacetime military budget in the history of this Nation?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, yes; it may be the greatest that has ever been written, but your money is not being properly allocated. In regard to your first question, I pointed out in the debate of yesterday, and I challenge the gentleman to dispute the correctness of these figures, and I measure my words when I say this, that by this bill the total strength of operating aircraft is less by some 4,000 planes than was provided for in the bill for 1949.

Now, here are the figures. I knew this question was coming up. Air Force planes for 1949, 15,886; for the Navy, 14,500. That is a total of 30,386.

In this bill the Air Force gets 15,100, and the Navy, 10,500; a total of 25,600. Subtract the 25,600 from 30,386 and it is 4,786 less in the 1950 budget than was provided for in the 1949 budget.

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

Mr. VINSON. Just a minute. And that is what we did in 1949, the Eightieth Congress, which was heralded over the country by the President as a no-good Congress.

Now, what more does this bill do to the air power of the Navy? It knocks out an approved program by which two Essex-type carriers were to be modernized yearly so that modern naval aircraft can operate therefrom. Within 2 years most of the Navy attack carrier aircraft will not be able to operate from the decks of the unmodernized carriers. This bill ignores that fact completely.

The procurement rate under this bill is so low that the Navy will be down to 4,000 aircraft 5 or 6 years from now, barely one-third of its present aircraft strength. And the yearly input of 843 aircraft authorized in this budget has this effect.

It means a monthly average delivery rate of 70 airplanes. It would take 12 months to get that up to 200 per month, 24 months to get to 700 per month, and almost 3 years to reach the minimum rate to wage all-out war.

And all of these reductions, these failures to plan for the future, ignore completely the fact that more than 80 percent of the Navy's aircraft today were delivered during or before 1945—4 years ago. Their expected life is only 6 years. But this bill proposes just to let the naval air arm wither on the vine.

It was only last spring, Mr. Chairman, that this Congress and the President signed an appropriation act which provided for an end strength of 10,713 operating aircraft in the Navy.

Now we are to cut that back to 7,783—a reduction of 2,930 aircraft in active operation in the Navy. As I said before—and I find this most difficult to understand—this bill does not even provide enough naval aircraft procurement to maintain that lowered figure, which is 27.5 percent lower than the level proposed for this fiscal year.

This is a cut of $343,000,000 from the lowest budget proposed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff for naval air power of $1,030,000,000. To maintain the strength proposed in this budget, the Navy needs 1,700 new aircraft in fiscal year 1950. The bill proposes only 843, thereby forcing the Navy to make up the difference with obsolescent aircraft that will be comparatively worthless 2 years from now.

There is no doubt about it, Mr. Chairman.

This budget is the beginning point in the effort to destroy naval air strength.

It inserts a knife into the very vitals of naval power. It puts out the eyes of the fleet, sharply reduces its striking power, reduces its protection against submarine attack, and jeopardizes the ability of the American Navy to control the high seas.

What is the meaning of this? Who prompts this, and why? It defies logic.

Surely, Mr. Chairman, it is not the meaning of the Berlin airlift, with its risk of daily military incident with the Russians, that this is the time to reduce American air power by this slash in the Navy Air Force.

Certainly it is not even reasonable common sense to reduce American air power at the same time we assume the vastly increased responsibilities of the United States throughout the world under the new Atlantic Pact.

And obviously it cannot sensibly follow from our recently deteriorated position in the Far East, that this is the proper time to start to destroy the air power of our Navy.

Mr. Chairman, the lesson of the terrible destructions wrought at Pearl Harbor by carrier-based aircraft should make it perfectly obvious that we must maintain our own Naval Air Force striking strength up to date.

The destruction of the non-carrier-escorted British battleships *Repulse* and *Prince of Wales* in the South Pacific early in the war by Japanese aircraft means that we must, of course, provide adequately for the aerial protection of the American Fleet.

And need I remind you of the Doolittle raid on Japan—where land-based aircraft were compelled to use Navy aircraft carriers in order to get near enough to Japan to perform their hit-and-run bombing mission.

Let us not close our eyes to the fact that no aircraft carrier of any nation was sunk during World War II by shore-based aircraft. Let us not be blind to the fact that not one of our standard attack carriers of the *Essex* class was sunk by any form of attack in the last war.

Let us not fool ourselves! Maybe we can fool someone else, but let us not go so far as to fool ourselves at the same time.

No, Mr. Chairman, this budget for naval air power should and must be increased.

To do otherwise means that we are plucking the heart from the American Navy. To do otherwise is, in my opinion, inexcusably dangerous to the national security of the American people.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee is doing such a splendid job that I am going to yield him my 10 minutes.

Mr. VINSON. No; do not do it; I could not take it.

Mr. SHORT. I shall be glad to.

Mr. VINSON. I appreciate the gentleman's desire very much, but I wish the gentleman to use his own time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, those of you who were fortunate enough to hear the distinguished gentlemen from Texas yesterday [Mr. MAHON], and then the very able Member from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] this morning realize, I am sure, that there is little that I or anyone else could contribute to this debate. Yesterday this House voted $5,580,000,000 in extension of European aid under the Marshall plan. That was a half billion dollars more than we voted a year ago. You have been told what marvelous recovery has taken place during the past year in Europe—and Europe has largely recovered; I visited it two or three times last year. It seems to me that instead of increasing appropriations for aid under the Marshall plan we should increase appropriations for certain other phases of our defense. As Europe rises we go down; we siphon off the wealth of this country; we deplete out natural resources; we transfuse the blood of America to countries in Europe that are rendering us weak at home. It is high time, I believe, that we need to take stock and inventory of our national situation.

I voted against that $5,580,000,000 yesterday because I believe that $5,000,000,000 in atom bombs and in B-36's will do more to stop communism than anything else this Nation could do. I am constrained to agree with my chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], that we should increase the appropriation for naval aviation.

I deeply appreciate the subcommittee that brought out this bill, because you

were kind and you were even generous; you gave us $2,818,000,000 more than was assigned by the Bureau of the Budget. $13,272,000,000. And in addition to that almost $3,000,000,000 increase you gave us for the three different branches of the service. There is over $2,000,000,000 additional in contract authorizations. In other words, there is in this bill, including contract authorizations, a total of $15,905,000,000. Mr. Chairman, that is nearly $16,000,000,000 for national defense alone. That is twice as much as it cost to run this Government before this last global conflict. When you consider the five and one-half billions we are paying in interest on the $252,000,000,000 national debt, plus the almost $7,000,000,000 that is being spent by the Veterans' Administration in addition to the $5,500,000,000 that was voted yesterday for European aid, you can see the staggering cost to the American taxpayer merely for national defense, interest on the debt, and European recovery. These astronomical sums will destroy us.

I, myself, feel as does the gentleman from Texas, this is a most painful pill to take. I do not love castor oil but sometimes must take it. This budget is shocking; it is staggering; but it is necessary. What else can we do? It is my fond hope and fervent prayer that if we can get over the next 2 or 3 years, if the United Nations will be able to walk, and perhaps run a little, with an international police force to carry out its decisions, then we can reduce armaments all over the world and we can cut the tremendous cost that weighs so heavily upon the taxpayers in every nation. But we have not reached that Utopian ideal up to the present time. We must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air. The only language that some people understand is force.

The recent war taught us one lesson, the value of an integrated, coordinated, synchronized striking force in all three branches. The Army, Navy, and Air Force are essential in modern warfare. We could not win without all three. While we are living in an air and atomic age, with the air arm supreme, and while the Navy and the Army must take, perhaps, a subordinate place, they must not be overlooked or neglected.

Gen. Omar Nelson Bradley from my State, perhaps the greatest general of this last global conflict, a master strategist, has told our committee and has stated in public, that it is supreme folly to think that one branch of our Armed Services could win a modern war. The Air Force could not bomb without the Navy supplying the weapons overseas, a most important logistic prbolem, and after the cities are bombed, we need a land force to march in and take over.

Let us stop this silly bickering among the different branches of our services because all three are very essential and most necessary in order to win any war.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing sacrosanct about the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget. I am not criticizing the present Director of the Budget. I heard Frank Pace last week down in our National Rivers and Harbors Congress and he impresses me as being a very fine, able young man. But who is any Director of the Budget, regardless of whom he might be, to determine what is necessary for the adequate protection and defense of this Nation? I would rather risk the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Gen. Omar N. Bradley, Admiral Louis E. Denfeld, and Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg.

It is the Congress of the United States, and particularly the two Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House that are to determine what is necessary for our national defense. The subcommittee, composed of these fine, able men, in spite of the splendid job they have done in bringing out this bill, in my opinion, made a mistake by following the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget so far as naval aviation is concerned. Unless we adopt the amendment that will be offered by the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], I fear that we will not have much of a Navy by 1952. We all know that these planes rapidly become obsolete; we know that we must keep a private industry going. You cannot manufacture a plane overnight. I repeat what I said to this body a short time ago, that not one plane we had on the drawing board before Pearl Harbor was ever used in this last global conflict. We do not want to adopt the Maginot Line philosophy if there should be another world war, which will be as different from the last one as the last one was from the First World War. The reason France fell so quickly was because her leaders were thinking in terms of the war of 1914–18.

We must carry on our scientific research and technological development, and I congratulate the committee for appropriating more than $500,000,000 for this very worth-while purpose. Nothing could be more important.

May I express again to you five gentlemen on this subcommittee my personal appreciation for your kindness, your courtesy, in hearing us before you brought this bill out. I am afraid that if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] had not gathered a few of his little chickens around him to go in to see you, we would not have as good a bill as we have today. We appreciate what you have given us, but we do not want merely the crumbs. We are not like Lazarus. We want a strong air army and the grandest and best Navy in all the world, stronger than all others combined. We now have it. Let us not lose it. As long as we keep that way, with the possession of the atomic bomb, we are safe.

Mr. Chairman, there are three things that have kept Russia from taking all of Europe in the past year or two. The first is our possession of the atomic bomb. Secondly, is the recent demonstration of our might in air power in the form of the air lift from Frankfurt into the Tempelhof Airport in Berlin. Some of us took a look at that last November—every four minutes these four-motor planes landing with their cargos. They carry coal, potatoes, canned goods and everything necessary for their needs. That has taught Russia a lesson, and the world knows it well. The third thing in addition to this mighty demonstration of our power through the air lift and through possession of the atomic bomb is Russia's knowledge of our industrial might and productive capacity, because, after all, it was American aid that saved the day at Stalingrad, that saved Britain, that saved the United States, and I hope will help save the world.

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

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the establishment of every great military power in the history of the world has been founded upon the development of a new weapon.

Alexander supplied the Macedonian phalanx with a new lance, a spear 18 feet long, and with that equipment an infinitesimal Greek Army decimated a Persian Army of a million soldiers armed with every antiquated weapon Xerxes could supply.

Caesar armed his centurions with a new weapon, the short sword. And his legions behind interlocking shields, closing in at close quarters where the long blades of the enemy could not be swung, lunged up beneath the guard of their opponents with the deadly short sword before they were aware of their danger. With that weapon Rome conquered the known world.

At the Battle of Hastings, the Saxons with their heavy maces and two-handed swords outslugged and outslashed the Normans, but the Conqueror's archers, armed with the long bow, filled the air with flights of arrows which fell slanting into the faces of the Saxons; annihilated Saxon power and laid the foundations of modern England.

Napoleon perfected a new gun, and personally supervised and inspected the output of his foundries. And from the day when, as a young lieutenant, he swept the streets of Paris with canister, until his supreme victory at Austerlitz, where he depressed his guns to crush the ice beneath the charging squadrons of allied cavalry, he won a continental empire with artillery.

Again, in the last World War, allied success was based largely on the aerial bomb. We could not have reduced Berlin and crushed German power without the aerial bomb.

Success in the next war—if there should ever be another war—likewise rests upon the utilization of a new weapon, the atomic bomb. Churchill—who according to his own appraisal "has not always been wrong"—says that but for the atomic bomb we would now be at war. And all military authorities agree that this new and terrible weapon can be decisive if there should be another world conflict.

But in order to be effective the atomic bomb, powerful and deadly as it is, is useless unless delivered to its target. If there should be another war, which God forbid, the outcome could be decisively determined by atomic warfare in 3 weeks or less. But such a war could not be won by keeping atomic bombs in storage here in the United States. It could not be won by starting transportation of the atomic

bomb in army supply trains. It could not be won by shipping atomic bombs in naval vessels. The Army cannot reach Moscow. Both Napoleon and Hitler tried that and failed. No battleship or submarine can reach Moscow.

All military experts agree that Russia would occupy the entire European continent within 90 days after the opening of hostilities. And neither the Army nor the Navy could reach Moscow with the first atomic bomb in 3 weeks—or 3 years.

Naval aircraft cannot deliver the bomb. Naval airplanes are limited to a range of approximately 500 miles—700 miles at most. Navy flat tops in the Mediterranean or the Baltic Sea or the North Atlantic could not possibly survive. It is generally conceded that Russia has a minimum of 15,000 effective planes of modern design.

As a matter of fact Russia preceded us in the development of jet propelled planes. She had jet planes in the air while we were still experimenting and when we could get them up in the air but could not get them down. She would welcome one of our carriers in European waters and one of our expensive flat tops would be little more than a sitting duck under such a barrage.

Only land based bombers could reach Moscow with a lethel charge. With the signing of the North Atlantic Pact we would have ample land bases and within a week we could blast every nerve center, every center of communication and production, every military concentration, and every naval submarine and air base. Why should we waste vast sums of money on naval planes tied down to a radius of five or seven hundred miles, to be launched from floating docks which cannot even approach the shores of continental Europe—when a smaller amount of money can supply land-based planes about the effectiveness of which there can be no possible question?

We have the greatest navy in the world. And we will keep it the greatest navy in the world. But the function of the Navy in modern warfare is the maintenance of lines of communication and transportation. Let it exercise those functions. The launching of atomic bombs at strategic targets is the function of another branch of the service, and let that branch of the service perform the duties for which it is adapted.

There was a day when wars were won by control of the sea. And England gave the world a hundred years of peace through mastery of the seas. But today wars are decided by control of the air. And we must meet changed conditions or perish.

Of course a war could not be won by air power alone. There must be troops for occupation and navy ships for transportation. But under the Marshall plan and North Atlantic Pact we will have allies with troops and ships who should also be given an opportunity to discharge their obligations as contracting powers. Why not let them contribute some of the boys needed to occupy enemy territory after we have demoralized and annihilated enemy territory from the air? We followed that plan in the last war and American boys are living today whose bones would be mouldering in alien soil had we insisted on rushing them in when our allies had an obligation to participate and were willing to send in their boys as a fair share of their contribution to the war and to the defense of their people and their civilization.

The safety of our Nation and the maintenance of peace are not so much dependent on the amount of money we spend for armament as it is dependent on the kind of armament we buy. We can spend a hundred billion dollars on the wrong kind of weapons and lose a war. Or we can spend ten billion dollars on modern weapons and preserve the safety of the Nation and avoid a war.

How can we forget the fatal decision of the French Chamber of Deputies on precisely the same question which is facing us here today? They were urged to build airplanes. But they declined on the ground that the airplane was useful only for reconnaissance, and their matchless army protected by the impregnable Maginot Line was invincible. As a result, the number of army planes manufactured in France declined every month for the entire year preceding the attack upon Poland, and when French battalions gallantly holding their own against the German advance were decimated from the air and telegraphed frantically back to Paris for planes—there were no planes to send them. Let us not make the same mistake. If we must spend money for armament, let us invest it in modern weapons to meet the changing conditions of the times. Let us spend it for long-range land-based bombers which will do more than anything else to preserve the peace of the world. Churchill says only the atomic bomb is preserving peace. Let us insure peace by providing along with the atomic bomb the means of making the bomb effective.

The only way to avoid a war is to have available at any instant the means of striking swiftly and surely and effectively at any distance. And the atomic bomb serviced by land-based bombers is the only weapon which can insure that protection. As long as we have both we can and will maintain the peace of the world.

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

Mr. CANNON. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I agree wholeheartedly with the emphasis and the supreme importance that the gentleman from Missouri is placing on long-range land-based bombers. But those land-based bombers and the atomic bomb alone will never win any war. Our fellow Missourian, Omar Bradley, I think, perhaps knows a little more about military strategy than the gentleman and myself combined.

Mr. CANNON. I am in complete accord with the gentleman. And this bill takes care of precisely that situation. We are appropriating in this bill the greatest amount of money ever appropriated for naval aviation, and the full budget estimate for practically every peacetime need of both the Army and the Navy. With the Army and the Navy and the air power provided by this bill, we will be invincible and peace is assured.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I am personally reluctant to enter this debate. I would not have spoken had not members of the present Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with the Armed Services asked me to do so. It was my privilege to serve on the subcommittee for the War Department for a number of years, and I heard the testimony for a number of years and all during the war on the development of the Army and Air Force. And during the 2 years prior to this, in the Deficiency Committee, I also heard a great deal about the Navy as well as the Army and the Air Force.

During the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress it was also my privilege to be a member of the Congressional Joint Policy Committee on Aviation, which had representatives from the Army, Navy, and Air Force as advisory members to give us the benefit of their knowledge and to make known the wishes of those services.

During the past few years it has been my privilege to work in support of greater appropriations for the Air Force.

I recall very well the battle for the 70-group air force last year and the important part played by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. I was then a member of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and had a part in working out the language to increase funds for aircraft procurement and to insure that we should get the maximum of modern types and gadgets consistent with the security outlook at any given time. It was a pair of committee amendments to a deficiency bill which started the 70-group air force in the Eightieth Congress.

And those of you who were Members of the Eightieth Congress will remember that in the deficiency bill which was handled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], we provided some $800,000,000 above the budget and the administration program for the procurement of airplanes. That initiated the 70-group air force. So I feel that I can honestly say I am somewhat air-minded, and I do not want the Navy to be overlooked in whatever development of air power it is proper for the Navy to have.

At the same time, in looking at the over-all picture it must be recognized by everybody that when you appropriate fifteen and sixteen billions, a third or more of the national budget, for the armed services, that we must spend our money where we can get the most for it.

When the Joint Policy Committee asked the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force for their estimates of what they would need for a period of years, their figures were printed in a document known as Report No. 949 of the Senate on National Aviation Policy; it was the report of the National Aviation Policy Board to the Congress of the United States.

By reference to the figures which appear on page 9 of that report, you will find that under plan B the appropriations carried in the present bill give the Navy approximately 80 percent of what the Navy itself said it wanted for 1950 under plan B, while even with the increase proposed by the Committee for the Air Force, the Air Force will not get quite 80 percent of its plan.

In other words, under the bill as now presented to the committee, the Navy will have 80 percent of what it said it would need under plan B, but the Air Force is not even brought up to that 80-percent point.

Something has been said about research. I understand that the present bill carries $530,000,000 for research, of which $203,000,000 is to the Navy; $215,000,000 to the Air Force; and $112,000,000 to the Army. So there is a fairly large provision for research for each of the services. Now as to increasing funds for Naval Air. A fundamental problem is involved. I confess very readily if anyone wants to ask me: "Do you know as much about it as these admirals? Do you know as much about it as General Vandenberg or General Bradley?" I will say, "Of course I do not." I will say, however, that no Member of Congress can escape his portion of responsibility for making decisions of national policy when it comes to the defense of the country. The Constitution did reserve to the Congress and particularly to the House control over the purse and the sword; and you cannot as an individual Member of the Congress escape your share of the responsibility. Members who are assigned to the Committee on Appropriations cannot escape the responsibility for making decisions objectively by hearing what one service says, what another service says, and then trying to give the best balanced judgment he can.

A fundamental decision of this Congress is in the process of making, whether we recognize it or not: Whether or not we are going to develop two air forces. I can recall when the Air Corps was a very small part of the Army; but, in response to the development of aircraft research and new weapons the Air Corps grew until finally in the so-called Unification Act we set up the old Air Corps as a separate department of the Air Force.

If we now build up the Bureau of Aeronautics or its successor in the Navy until we have something comparable to what the Air Corps used to be in the Army, we are going to find ourselves with two air forces, the independent air force which grew off from the Army and the new Air Force of the Navy.

In my own thinking on this matter I have never been able to get away from a very potent illustration that was given one day by General Curtis LeMay. Curtis LeMay was the man who was in charge of the B-29's when the B-29's carried the war to Japan, and is now in charge of strategic air planning. I recall the time when he said somewhat pointedly, and perhaps more than pointedly, that the Air Corps could not understand during the war why it was called upon to use B-29's to provide an umbrella for the Navy in an attack upon a certain objective in Japan when the B-29's had to drop 2,000 tons of bombs to protect a carrier so that smaller Navy bombers could deposit 600 tons on the primary target. He pointed out it would have been much easier and would not have risked the big carrier to let the B-29's put those 2,000 tons of bombs on the primary target rather than spending them to shield a carrier so that its lighter bombers could take 600 tons of bombs to the primary target.

I think there is a proper place for air attached to the Army in connection with certain tactical operations and there is a proper place for air attached to the Navy in connection with its normal operations; but if we are going to get the most for our money, our principal money for air ought to go to the Air Force. Bear in mind here that even with the increase provided by the committee bill you have not got them quite up to 80 percent of plan (B) whereas the Navy is up to a little better than 80 percent of plan (B) with the bill as here presented.

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

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON. The distinguished gentleman from South Dakota has served with great credit to the country for years on the Appropriations Committee. Here is what disturbs a great many of us. The bill says we can have only 7,783 operating aircraft for the Navy. All right. I am finding no fault with cutting down from 10,000 to 7,000, but, on the other hand, it says you can only have annually 843 planes. The life of a plane is approximately 6 years. It is purely a question of mathematics. Just multiply 843 by 6 and that will show you what the strength will be.

How can you maintain 7,783 operating aircraft if you only build 843 a year? All we are asking is that you try to bring it up to what the committee says. The committee says we shall have 7,783, but they only permit us to buy 843 a year; therefore you cannot get 7,783 out of purchasing only 843 a year.

What I think we ought to do, and I would like the judgment of the gentleman, is this: The Joint Chiefs of Staff say we ought to have 1,300. The distinguished gentleman from California is going to offer an amendment which would provide 1,200 a year instead of 840.

That is really the only difference. We all agree on the importance of aviation. The committee has said you must keep 7,000 in active operation, but it does not give us enough money to keep but 5,000 going.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, may I say that there would be enough money in this bill for the Navy to get those planes if it were properly allocated. The suggestion I would make is that the Navy recanvas its application of funds to antiquated, obsolete types of vessels and use that for aircraft. That is suggestion No. 1.

Mr. VINSON. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly. I think by a reallocation and putting out of commission various ships we could concentrate on Navy aviation and might accomplish it in the same way. But the bill is not written that way. The only way we can deal with it is as the bill is written right now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is one suggestion, and I am glad the gentleman agrees with me that is the logical approach to it.

Second, if we are going to escape this continual rivalry between the services, I hope the distinguished gentleman's committee will bring out a bill and give this Congress an opportunity to provide for interchangeability of ratings and commissions between the various services, so that a man in the Navy may transfer to the Air Force and vice versa, or a man who grows up in the Army may transfer to the Navy and vice versa without losing his rank. When that happens we will get rid of these rivalries and jealousies that bid for these various appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, there are two ways in which this great Nation of ours can be defeated. One of them is by economic bankruptcy and the other is by military might.

We in this Congress today are on the horns of a fearsome dilemma. We must provide the Nation with defense forces adequate to meet every possible contingency and the need is perhaps greater than at any time in history. Yet to do this in the fullest sense and to keep on doing it for a number of years would bankrupt this Nation.

We must compromise. We cannot have all of everything that we might conceivably be able to use. The money we can spend must be spent on weapons that will serve our vital, immediate needs if war would come.

We have heard a great deal of talk today on who would win the next war. I think there is something else we must consider and that is how to prevent that next war. The next war will not be prevented because this country has aircraft carriers but it will be prevented because we have weapons today that will reach to the heart of the enemy country, striking at its capital and at its productive centers, including bombers like the B-36's that will reach into any aggressor nation. I have heard the B-36 condemned; I have heard it criticized; I have heard men tell me that we have no long-range fighter planes to escort these bombers on their long missions, and that therefore the losses would be prohibitive.

During the last war I flew B-24's on targets like Ploesti, Vienna, and Munich, and we had no long-range escorts when we started those missions. Our losses were heavy, but they were not

prohibitive. We think we did a job, and I think those Members on the Committee on Foreign Affairs who have gone to those places have seen the rubble that was left and have seen the enemy countries' productive sources destroyed. They saw that we did a job, the airpower in the next war will do that job, and that will be the greatest deterrent against any aggressor nation in launching an attack against these United States. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I urge that the Congress do everything possible through legislation and appropriation to strengthen our long-range strategic bombing force. That is our primary weapon. It is the only weapon that will strike anywhere effectively and on short notice. We have been told that the airgroup carriers could go into the Mediterranean and the Baltic. If you remember those losses that we had when we were trying to supply Malta and in trying to get through to Murmansk, you will realize, I think, that it would be most impracticable. That they would be sitting ducks. An aggressor nation usually has the largest force and usually strikes first. They aim to strike and effect their conquest and consolidate their position before effective opposition can be assembled.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] said, the initial phase of the next war must be won in the first two or three weeks. We must have sufficient air power to maintain air supremacy, and we must have that long-range bombing force to go to the vitals of the enemy country. This would give us time to consolidate our positions and prepare for the long drawn out conflict ahead.

It is strategic bombardment that the totalitarian leaders fear. This is what Mr. Churchill meant when he spoke of air supremacy, and that is what we mean when we say American air power is peace power.

I am not attempting to say, Mr. Chairman, that air power can win a war all by itself. I understand the need for balanced forces. But I do contend that balanced forces should mean the proportion of each that our situation and means dictate. I contend that it cannot sensibly mean the same amount of each—or sea, air, and ground forces of equal cost. At any time, for the most suitable Army, Navy and Air Force of any nation to require equal amounts of money would be an astounding coincidence. To eat a balanced diet is not to spend the same amount on meat, vegetables, and potatoes.

I am convinced that our situation requires, more than anything else, a long-range strategic bombing force. A force large enough and properly trained to deliver an overwhelming atomic attack at any time it should become necessary. We should have the most powerful Army and Navy that we can afford, but we must maintain this bombing arm at maximum efficiency at all times.

It has been argued, however, that our long-range bombers could not accomplish their mission. The B-36, in particular, has been frequently disparaged. It has been called slow, too large, uneconomical, and a "sitting duck" for fighters. These charges I have heard before. They were leveled at the B-17. Yet the B-17 carried the war to Germany with deadly effectiveness. It made a contribution to the defeat of that country that no statistician could compute. These charges were leveled at the B-29. The B-29 smashed Japan.

Now the B-36 receives the same criticism. I don't want to repeat figures you have all heard, but certainly the B-36 has shown on many occasions this past year that the charges of inadequate speed, range, and load-carrying capacity are dubious at best. The statement that it is uneconomical I cannot comprehend. In terms of destructive power, what weapon can compare in economy with a heavy bomber carrying an atomic bomb?

We were attentive, before the last war, to the criticisms of the B-17. We paid a terrible price in blood and treasure for our error. Let us not repeat so costly a mistake and give ground to some of the Maginot line type of thinking we had before the last war. Let us not have any more repetitions of the condemnation of Billy Mitchell. We have heard the argument advanced for this super aircraft carrier that is going to cost $189,000,000. It will cost over a quarter of a billion dollars once it is filled with its complement of planes; a carrier that will take us some time to build; a carrier that I believe will not be able to go through the Panama Canal.

I have heard the effectiveness of strategic bombing itself minimized. No person could examine the terrible destruction in Germany without realizing what that destruction meant in terms of war potentiality that was never brought to bear against us. But most of that destruction was actually accomplished during 1944 and early 1945. Our attack, and that of the RAF, could have hit full stride in 1943. But here and in Britain the opponents of air power were strong. In consequence, the attack was pitifully slow in reaching full strength. For that a price was paid in blood. In future war the price of folly will be ruin.

It is fashionable today even to minimize the atomic bomb. I can well understand the fears that prompt such whistling in the dark. I wish it were just another bomb. But I know it is not, and we all know that it is not.

Mr. Chairman, the resources and needs of this country, our strategic position, and above all the realities of modern warfare all dictate that our primary need is for unquestioned supremacy in long-range bombardment.

We should create this force, and we should support any project that will contribute to its effectiveness. War, aircraft, and weapons are changing constantly. Our forces must be kept abreast of these developments. Research and development facilities and projects should receive all possible support. Warfare today is technical and demanding. Highly trained, capable men of the best character are vitally needed in all our services. Means must be found to attract these men into their country's service.

If we do these things, Mr. Chairman, we will have the power most suited to deter aggression. We will be able to afford it. If war does come, we will be in a position to begin the immediate and systematic reduction of the enemy. We learned the hard way once. It should never happen again.

Let us today back our able committee's report and maintain an adequate defense force, whose decision has been pointed toward the type of fighting we can expect in the next war, not the last. A committee who has kept in mind the economic drain of a defense program on the taxpayers and attempted to lighten the load as much as is feasible with a cold war on, a cold war that can quickly become a holocaust. Let us back the able committee which has given serious consideration to the appropriation today and have a balanced budget. We have not cut the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget for the Navy aircraft by 1 cent. I think that the committee has done an admirable job, and we should back it up to the fullest extent.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that we should cease operations on this supercarrier the Navy wants to start. I do feel we should have a clear and a better picture of just what the situation is with reference to what will be available to the Navy in the line of airplanes before we vote to increase the number of those planes.

Last year we authorized the Navy to contract for $588,000,000 worth of planes. Those planes were expected to be 1,537 in number, but the Navy can buy only 1,223 because the costs are higher. These 1,223 planes that they expect to buy are very much larger and more expensive planes than the ones they have already bought.

Let us see what that picture is. They estimate that on June 30 they will have in storage 3,479 planes, of which 2,400 they say are obsolete. That "obsolete" does not mean not useful or operable, it simply means they are out of date. They claim they will draw out of storage 785, leaving 2,385 in storage at the end of the fiscal year 1950, of which 1,600 will be obsolete. They claim, and the table on page 618 of the hearings shows it, that they will have 1,075 new planes, and the 785 added from storage makes a total of 1,860 new planes.

Their present operating schedule, as appears on pages 594 and 595 of the hearings, is 15 large groups and 4 small groups. Next year they intend to juggle those figures around so that there will be 14 large groups and 8 small groups. This does not mean a reduction in the number of planes in operation.

On top of that, what we have needed the most was trained pilots, and this bill provides for an increase in the number of trained pilots from about 750 to 1,500 in the year. That is the most important thing they need to do.

Let us take stock of this whole airplane picture. We are equipped with the B-36's and the B-29's in sufficient number so that we are probably able to protect ourselves in pretty good shape, but we have to be careful as we approach any

critical situation that we throw into storage enough of the critical materials, the materials that are necessary to make the jet engines, and the materials that are necessary to make airplanes, that is, the bauxite that goes into the aluminum. We need to stock-pile those things and be ready so that when we approach trouble, when we think we are going to have trouble, we will be in position to go ahead and make modern and up-to-date planes in sufficient quantity to do us some good.

We should go ahead now and use up those planes which are becoming obsolete and keep ourselves in such a position that we will be able to step in when the time comes and when it is necessary to get the very best planes and the best engines that are available. It seems to me, that according to their own statements by the Secretary of the Navy and the Chief of Naval Operations, that they have 11 large carriers in operation this year and are only cut down to 8. The smaller carriers, which are of the most use in hunting for the Snorkel submarine, have been increased from 10 to 11 as to the number in operation. Further, as I understand it, the Marine Corps is operating 3 of these smaller carriers. I do not think this leaves the Bureau of Aeronautics in a hole. They really have more money available for obligation, with $643,000,000 to build planes and to let contracts with, than they had before. There was an appropriation of $588,000,000 which was intended for the 1949 budget, but we made it immediately available by the 18th of May, when that bill was passed, so that really we are giving them more money, and although they cannot buy as many planes as they would like, because of the larger-sized planes that they want, we still are giving them more money. It seems to me that that factor ought to be taken into consideration by the House and that we should not increase this bill as it comes from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to defer any discussion on any proposed amendments to the bill until such amendments are offered under the 5-minute rule. I want to go back to the over-all picture and the bill itself.

This is my thirteenth annual military appropriation bill. I have been on the Military Functions Subcommittee since January 3, 1937. I have never known a harder working group of men than the men on that committee. When I came on this committee, Lucius Clay was a captain in the outside office of the Chief of Engineers. I have been privileged to serve in a most interesting period of American history in a most interesting capacity, for which I am truly grateful. As the years go by, and as I continue to serve on this committee, I become more and more convinced, Mr. Chairman, that a sound, strong economy, with a strong stable government is the first prerequisite of our national defense. You cannot have a strong national defense built upon a weak economy. I sometimes wonder, Mr. Chairman, whether we unknowingly, through our own selfish desires, are destroying from within the very thing that we are trying to defend ourselves against from without—and that is our own free Government.

The first question that our President should have and undoubtedly has in mind with regard to the national defense program is: How far can we go in our spending program, of which this $16,000,000,000 national defense bill is a part, without jeopardizing our economic position in the world? How much can we spend, Mr. Chairman, for all Government purposes that go to make up our tremendous national budget? How much can we spend, yes, on airships and on ships that sail the seas before our Ship of State strikes and perhaps founders on the rocks of economic disaster?

Our national defense, Mr. Chairman, is as strong and as weak as the economic structure of our Nation is strong or weak, for that structure supports national defense. I shall return to this in a moment.

This 1950 budget contains $15,900,000,000 for national defense, including contract authorizations. Of this amount $13,219,000,000-plus is cash. Let us compare that with the 1949 appropriations. The bill for 1949 as it passed the House during my chairmanship of the Military Functions Subcommittee contained $10,454,000,000. This 1950 bill contains in cash alone $2,818,338,000 more than the 1949 bill contained. There is a reason for some of these increases. For instance, we have been living, as it were, on what might be called fat. The Navy inventory during that period has dropped from $14,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000. A great many surplus items that we had at the end of the war are exhausted, and we must replace them. Then, too, we have a larger Army, Navy, and Air Force. Last year, Mr. Chairman, this House by an overwhelming vote increased the Air Force far above the budget figures. That action of the House was a mandate to me which I felt compelled to obey. But to return now to the Military Functions Subcommittee items, let us see how much we reduced these bills that made up this budget in the past 2 years; I am referring to 1948 and 1949 during which time I was privileged to act as chairman of the subcommittee. The 1948 military functions bill passed in 1947 included the Army and Air Force only. The bill as it passed the House was $475,809,000 below the 1947 appropriation, a reduction of almost half a billion dollars over 1947. The 1949 bill was reduced $647,900,000 below the 1948 appropriation. While we were not able to sustain all of those cuts in the conference with the other body we did sustain approximately a billion dollars for the 2 years. When the 1948 bill went through the House we had cut more than 74,000 civilian employees off the Army and Air Force budget, and when it came out of conference we were still 58,000 civilian employees below the budget. In the 1949 bill we cut 80,000 more employees off the budget; or, in the 2 years, 138,000 employees were taken off the pay rolls by this committee by my subcommittee under my chairmanship. I was very proud of that committee.

The Navy subcommittee did a splendid job during the same 2 years. It was a grand and wonderful subcommittee. The 1948 Navy bill was $377,500,000 below the 1947 appropriation as it went through; and the 1949 Navy bill was $241,000,000 below the 1948 appropriation. I mention this, Mr. Chairman, to demonstrate that the Military Functions Subcommittee and Navy Subcommittee which handled the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy bills for 2 years and prior to this year did an outstanding job. We have some of the same men on this subcommittee handling the bill this year. We had put the National Defense Establishment into the financial frying pan and fried out much of the surplus fat. It is perfectly obvious that there is not going to be as much fat to fry out the third year as there was the first and second years when we started the job.

There never has been a time during the 13 years I have been on this subcommittee when there was any politics in the subcommittee. Time and time again we divided, yes; we disagreed, but never along political lines. The same was true in this committee. Mr. Chairman, the encouraging thing about this bill to me is that when we bring the bill in here we are divided in our ideas as to what should be done with certain phases of it upon nonpolitical lines. A Democrat gets up on this side of the aisle supported by a Republican on the other side of the aisle, and a Republican gets up on the other side and is supported by a Democrat on the right-hand side of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak for a moment about the so-called functional budget. Two years ago I had Secretary Symington, General Spaatz, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, Lieutenant General Eaker, and General Rawlings, the budget officer, over to the office of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, where we discussed there at my request a functional budget. If you and I were in business and we had five branches, we would want to know what it cost to operate each branch, what the sales in these individual branches were, and the profits, if any. That is the kind of an accounting system we would insist upon having. We could then say to the branch manager of branch 5: "You did not do a good job. We are going to fire you." And say to the manager of branch No. 1: "You did a splendid job. We are going to raise your pay and that of your assistants; we are going to move your assistant over as manager of branch 5."

For instance, I want to know just what it cost to operate Bolling Field, or any other installation, and I do not want to go to 17 or 18 agencies to get that information. We discussed this fully at that meeting more than 2 years ago. We have this year a functional budget in the Air Corps giving that kind of information. It is not complete, it is not all I want, but it is a good start.

Two years ago the Navy budget was drawn along the same lines and this Navy budget in the present bill, Mr. Chairman, was rewritten in part along functional lines in our subcommittee. If I am wrong, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] can correct me. He has an outstanding knowledge of the Navy. We placed it upon a functional basis. Is that right?

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is right.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. We are now working on the Army functional budget along the same lines. These things take time. I am glad to have the support of the Hoover Commission. That Commission is doing an outstanding job, but in justice to these subcommittees I also must say that we have been 2 years ahead of the Hoover Commission on this budgeting problem. Of course there is still waste and a great deal of it. I wish I could talk to you about that today, but time will not permit. We are reducing waste in the armed services.

The first thing we should do before making up a national defense budget is to determine just what nation is most likely to attack us and what nation is strong enough to attack us. Once that is determined, the next question is, what are the missions of the three services going to be in carrying out an offensive and defensive war against that particular attacking nation, whatever nation it may be.

The next step will be to determine the manpower, equipment, matériel, and other costs to carry out each mission by the service to whom that mission has been assigned. The first mission will be that of destruction of enemy plants, productive capacity, and transportation facilities behind the lines through strategic bombing. That mission has been assigned to the Department of the Air Force. The Joint Chiefs of Staff should and undoubtedly have determined just how large an air force, number of groups, the type of equipment, and so forth, will be required to carry out that mission. The first offensive against us by the enemy will be that of trying to destroy our commerce and lines of communication, depriving us of strategic materials required for our defense. To the Navy will be assigned the task and mission of protecting our commerce and preventing the enemy from destroying that commerce. This will require ships, carrier planes, submarines, and so forth. Immediately upon the opening of hostilities the mission of the Army will be, among other things, the protection of our overseas bases by regimental combat teams and other troops, to take possession of bases with paratroopers, to defend our installations overseas and at home wherever they may be and repair and stand ready to take possession of any territory that may have been evacuated by the enemy either forcibly or otherwise. These are just a few of the missions of the three services. Once these missions have been determined, together with the length of time it will take to carry them out as nearly as possible, then it becomes a matter of men, equipment, matériel, and supplies necessary to carry out such missions. The Joint Chiefs of Staff send the amount required for these purposes to the President, the budget figures are then revised and reduced, such revision and reduction being dependent upon, first, our ability to carry on a peacetime national budget without endangering or wrecking our financial and economic structure, and, second, the length of time we have to build up our force in the light of the facts and circumstances as they exist at the time. That is in effect the way this budget should be and undoubtedly was made up. The $30,000,000,000 requested originally by the services was by no means a scientific budget. On the contrary, each service was guessing what the other service would ask for and determined that they were going to ask for more than the other two services. Like a poker player they knew what they had in their own hand but had to guess what the other fellow had in his. The budget that actually came down to us was a budget which met all the requirements of our immediate needs in view of all the conditions as they existed at the time.

Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee has an outstanding chairman in GEORGE MAHON. He made a splendid presentation yesterday. None better was ever made on the floor of the House in support of a bill. He did an outstanding job. It was a pleasure to work with him.

I have worked with HARRY SHEPPARD and CHARLIE PLUMLEY for the past 2 years. It was mainly through their efforts that the cuts were made in the Navy appropriations in the 1948 and 1949 bills. Whatever was done to this Navy bill here so far as savings were concerned was primarily due to their efforts.

BOB SIKES comes to our sub-committee as a new member, but with a world of experience with a legislative committee, experience that is sorely needed in our committee, experience which gave us the view of a legislative committee on many of these issues.

I do not want to fail to say a word about two men who worked with us on this bill. One is Bob Lambert, the executive secretary of the committee for many years. He was my executive secretary when I was chairman of the committee. He did an outstanding job on a most difficult bill. I want to commend Bob Lee, who is a minority employee of Mr. TABER on the Committee on Appropriations. He was loaned to me by Mr. TABER, and he did a splendid job for me. I do not know what I would have done without him and the work he did.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to my colleague, the vice-chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, you have heard an extensive discussion pertaining to the financial composition of the bill which is presently under consideration by the membership. Our committee spent a long time in research into necessities for the finances requested by the respective departments, which appeared before us. I pay my compliments to the gentleman from Texas, GEORGE MAHON, for the manner in which he functioned in his official capacity as chairman of the committee, handling a very troublesome bill. I also want to pay tribute to every member of the subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for the fine cooperative spirit which they showed in trying to attain an end and accomplish a purpose necessary to do the job and yet give to the taxpayers of this Nation proper protection, which factor is always a pertinent part of the committee's consideration when a bill of this character is before them.

I also want to pay my respects and my compliments to a gentleman who has been acting as our statistician, Mr. Robert Lambert, who has been with us for a long time. While I have but recently come to the committee, you older members on the military aspects of the work in its prior operations, have enjoyed his cooperation. I also want to pay my compliments for the fine contribution of Frank Saunders, the younger member of the clerical staff. He came to our committee and did a very splendid job and contributed his part to the over-all picture with which we had to deal.

Another group of gentlemen that I feel it is incumbent upon me to refer to, is the budget officers of the respective branches of the military—Admiral Hopwood, budget officer for the Navy; Major General Arnold, for the Army; Lieutenant General Rollins for the Air Corps. These men, in my opinion, have been called upon in the prior accumulation of material within the departments for which they function to exercise great care and caution and in working with the committee their cooperation was unquestionable at all times.

Furthermore, I would like to say to this assembled membership that I have never had occasion to question the integrity, mathematically or morally, of those gentlemen or any of the other witnesses who appeared before our committee.

There has been, of course, difference of opinion in the final analysis because that is what makes this body what it is. Each Member has an individual right in this House to form his opinions and cast his votes as his conscience and inner promptings guide him.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise very briefly to commend the gentleman and the other members of the subcommittee and especially the chairman, on the work of the committee, on doing a very difficult job. And particularly to point out that I think this year for the first time, in what has been a long-standing controversy, the chairman and the gentleman from California and others have brought out as effective a solution as has ever been brought out.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his courteous comments.

In what I am going to say to the assembled membership of the House this afternoon I wish it distinctly understood that while in one instance I differ with

my chairman and some other members of my subcommittee, it is not a difference in which personalities are at all involved; it is a difference of analyzing a problem and reaching a conclusion. Consequently, insofar as the membership of the committee is concerned I may say to you, frankly, that our working arrangements have been most happy, and I sincerely trust that I may live a long time and have an opportunity to continue functioning with these splendid gentlemen from both sides of the aisle, although I do reserve to myself the right to exercise the prerogative of doing my own thinking.

I want you to bear in mind during the consideration of this bill that very competent people have explained the financial aspect of the bill pretty literally in detail. Much more will be brought out later, of course, when the bill is considered under the 5-minute rule. I wish to approach this issue from a different slant, with your permission; let us approach it from the aspect of policy on a national basis and not upon one of defense of the military against some other branch of the service. My reason for approaching it with that philosophy is predicated upon the fact that all the witnesses who appeared before us in the top echelon who make our military policy, every one of them without reservation has definitely stated, voluntarily and also in response to interrogation, that there was a place for all three services and that he or they felt that particular service division of operation was now clarified so that the Air Force knew its responsibilities, the Army knew its responsibilities, and the Navy knew its responsibilities.

I will admit that heretofore we have had considerable newspaper publicity emanating in my opinion from a lot of swivel chair generals not in unform who invariably get their money by writing headlines but who are not always too well posted on what is necessary in military procedure. We all realize, however, that if they were not given the opportunity to write their headlines and make their comments that possibly their salaries would evaporate or lessen and they might have to step down to a lower level of income. I am in no manner interested or particularly concerned with headline writers, irrespective of what branch they represent, or with radio commentators; I would far rather sit down and listen to the men who through their actual military experience and the services they have rendered to our Nation—in the past tense—really know what the job is all about. When I say that, my mind goes back to Admirals Ernest King, Bill Halsey, Chet Nimitz, and all the rest of the splendid men who made up our wonderful defense establishment, from Eisenhower and Arnold down, wonderful men for whom I have the greatest respect and whose opinions I value most highly. In fact, we spent money to send these gentlemen through an academic processing in the military concept in order that they might have the ability to analyze our military problems and then advise us on the strategy necessary to apply the military functions should that become essential.

Listening to some of the discussions that have taken place here—and I am just reminiscing; there is no continuity to what I am saying; I realize that, but it all adds up to a whole—one of the gentlemen in his analysis stated that the Navy was limited to its flight aspect to 500 miles. I may say to the gentleman that he has just transposed some of his mathematics, because the actuality is that Navy heavy bombers have a range of 5,000 miles. So, those are just little things, and sometimes in the contribution to the general whole too much significance must not be attributed to such unwittingly erroneous statements.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I have been reading the report of the committee on this bill under the item of Air Force. I am wondering if during the hearings any reference was made to the establishment of an Air Force Academy for the training of future officers? The gentleman being from California and I personally having introduced a bill to establish one in the State of California, I should be interested in hearing what comments he has to make concerning it.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; there was considerable discussion in the committee relative to that particular proposition.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. PLUMLEY. To reply further to the inquiry of the gentleman from California [Mr. McDONOUGH], it may interest him to know that the particular matter not only was discussed in the hearings but there is a legislative bill before the Congress pertaining to the subject matter.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman referred to the range of the heavy bombers in flight and said it was 5,000 miles.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That had specific reference to the Navy's heavy bombers.

Mr. HORAN. That is carrier-based bombers?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Carrier-based heavy bombers designed for attack bombing.

Mr. HORAN. Is that a detail that has come about during the past year, since we considered this bill a year ago?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would say definitely yes; in other words, this particular type of plane was in or past the blueprint stage as of a year ago. However, it is already in operation and has proven extremely successful from flight deck into the air and return.

Mr. HORAN. The gentleman realizes, of course, that is our whole concept appropriationwise in the treatment of the services, does he not?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am going to offer an amendment, I may say to the gentleman, that will clarify his question and I think answer it rather definitely.

Mr. HORAN. I was informed of a rumor that a jet-propelled heavy bomber took off from a carrier on the east coast, flew to the west coast, up and down the west coast, then flew back to the carrier in the East; is that true?

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that is not a rumor; it is a fact.

Mr. RIVERS. That is a fact; yes.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. The gentleman from California as always is making a very fine statement. I wonder if he would object if I pointed out, in addition to the things that have been brought out, the fact that Jimmy Doolittle's bombers took off from a carrier to make the first strike on Japan in World War II and even though his bombers did not come back to those carriers, the Navy now has bigger, heavier planes that are daily taking off and landing on carriers.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution because it is predicated upon fact and something that I suggest the House take into consideration at a later time.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I ask the gentleman to yield and request an answer to my question previously asked. The gentleman from Washington asked the gentleman a question before I think he had sufficient time to answer the question as to his attitude toward an Air Force Academy in California and the necessity for an Air Force Academy?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In other words, what the gentleman wants me to do is commit myself to the establishment of an academy there. My answer is yes, because it is necessary.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PRICE. Before they get the air academy out there, they are going to have a mighty stiff fight from Illinois.

Mr. SHORT. And do not forget Missouri.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to be courteous and gracious, but may I say if you are going to have any private fights, take them out in the alley.

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

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

Mr. VINSON. As the question was raised by a gentleman on my right in reference to bombers flying off of airplane carriers, may I ask, is it not a fact that the modernization program of the carrier type *Essex* is going forward now to such an extent that large bombers of at least 100,000 pounds can fly on and fly off?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman is correct, and there is one thing I would like to call attention to. While we are in the status of remodifying the *Essex* type and we can deck those planes, you must not overlook the fact when you are going into that type of heavy plane that you have got to have something downstairs to take care of them. It is a question of whether modification will fulfill the completed mission as compared with a bigger carrier.

Mr. VINSON. In the curtailment of appropriations in this bill, it denies any further modernization of any more than those two already being modernized now?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to answer that question directly. I am inclined at the moment to say yes, as I recall it. Let me say this: I am sure the older Members of the House will concede the fact that I have never had any desire not to answer any question that I could answer. However, may I say that when you are handling an appropriation of the size of the armed forces budget that this committee has had to deal with, you have to be very careful in answering your mathematical questions that you do not confuse one aspect of a paragraph versus that of another aspect.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of the time on this side.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am a little worried over some of the remarks of our colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], and I am sorry he is not here at the present time. I wanted him to yield at the time, which he did briefly. I think we all agree on the supreme importance of long-range land-based bombers, but, certainly, in emphasizing their priority we should not underestimate the need for both the Army and Navy, and should always remember what Omar Bradley recently said in a speech in Boston, and he has told us repeatedly in our committee the same thing. General Bradley was perhaps the greatest strategist of the last war. In my humble opinion, he was the greatest general of World War II. I think General Eisenhower would agree to that. General Bradley said that it is utter folly to think that we can ever win a modern war with only one branch of the armed services.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that is a statement of fact, as is known by any one who is familiar with military concepts.

Mr. SHORT. Perhaps the thing that contributed most to the winning of the war in the Pacific was really our aircraft carriers. They won the Battle of Midway. The airplanes took off and they came back. Every service man in this House who served in the last war knows the importance of the air carrier.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. They are movable bases.

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

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

Mr. COLE of New York. There is a phase of the Air Force procurement which is somewhat disturbing to me from the reports and rumors I hear, and that is whether the Air Force in this concentration of the purchase of long-range bombers to the extent of cutting back its fighter-plane program is going to jeopardize a well-rounded Air Force defensive outlook.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no question about that.

Mr. COLE of New York. My question is whether the committee reporting this bill is concerned in that respect, or whether the funds approved for the Air Force are sufficient to give them this three to five hundred million dollars for long-range bombers and fighter planes also.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would rather put it this way, Mr. Chairman. I am concerned about it, and fully intend to offer an amendment which will express my sentiments, because in your production requirements—and I am sure the gentleman recognizes this and knows it even better than I—the time involved in the production of planes of that character runs from 15 to 24 months, and those are the things that are so important to a balanced, rounded-out picture that must be anticipated in any appropriation bill.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON. I would like to ask the gentleman about a matter that I cannot find in the bill. I think it is important, and I think it is in the gentleman's own district. Is there anything in here about acquiring the extra land required for the Muroc Lake Experimental Station?

Mr. SHEPPARD. No; not that I recall. That is under the status of investigation, engineeringly speaking, at this time, and I presume it will be recommended for consideration at a later date. At least, that is my information at the moment.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I see there is an amount of $75,000 for field officers' quarters in Alaska. I was wondering if the Army was planning to bring that cost down. That is an awful lot of money.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentleman that the committee membership was just as concerned with that as is the gentleman. I spent considerable time in Alaska in my early stage of life, and I want to say this, that there is an extremely high cost of construction in Alaska. I even went so far, knowing that country as I do, or as I did, as to suggest that it might be feasible for them to construct their own sawmill in order to avoid that terrific transportation charge that pertains between the States and Alaska. I will say this for the armed forces, they are working now on an experiment with a type of Quonset hut that I think perhaps may be the ultimate solution. I do not know that it may be, but they are trying it out in countries of that general weather character, and I hope it will have something to do with that. But under the present circumstances, we are just stymied with the problem.

In closing, I would like to draw a rather homely parallel if I may be permitted. We are all sincerely and honestly concerned with the economy of our country and its welfare. But, you know, as this picture occurs to me, I go back in my mind to 1945 when my committee was privileged to go over to Europe. They went through the Pacific and covered practically every military installation throughout Europe. At that time we came back and made a report to the White House and then to the Congress, and, as the chairman of Naval Appropriations, you may recall that I exceeded the budget for the purpose of inaugurating a naval reserve program. I received a lot of liberal criticism; in other words, in many instances I was spanked rather thoroughly, and only recently those who did the most vituperous spanking said that they considered the naval program today and its category was outstanding, comparatively speaking. So I am going to again, when this bill comes under the 5-minute rule, offer an amendment, because I think it is essential to the welfare of the Nation if we can take for granted what those in the Executive staff and who write the formula of strategic procedure have told us is the function that the Navy must perform. I say that, of course, with respect to everybody, and everybody in this House has a right to his own opinion. But, I firmly believe that if we are going to protect the continuity of our form of government and our way of life, that the best way to do it is to be able to protect ourselves against any eventuality and not hypothetically.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. HORAN. I think the gentleman is to be commended for his work in perpetuating and protecting the Naval Reserves. In my State of Washington during the last summer the Naval Reserves were the only ones that were effective and happy. The Army and Air Force Reserves were in bad shape.

I commend the gentleman on his foresight, and also commend the subcommittee on having taken care of that very important element, the Reserve force, in the bill before us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Speaking of the Navy, is it not true that England found, to her bitter sorrow, that cutting up the Navy, dividing it too much, as it were, caused a great deal of hardship and a great deal of loss of life, and now England's navy and England's naval air force are back where they were before?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think undoubtedly the gentlewoman is correct in her position there. History will record the mistake that was made in that particular respect.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am wondering whether the cut in naval aviation is not the beginning of a program to dry up naval aviation and eventually remove the Navy from the seas.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The gentleman's observation is one that might be worthy of consideration, but I leave that to his own judgment, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 1, strike out lines 3 and 4, and on page 2 strike out lines 1 to 4, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof: "That there is hereby appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated $13,215,618,000, for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment, and for other purposes, in not to exceed the following respective amounts, namely."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to approach this bill as an expert or an amateur on military science. I am speaking merely as a humble citizen interested in the welfare of his country and who happens at the moment to be sitting in the Hall of this House.

The economic life of the United States is at stake. Its security is at stake. The decisions this Congress makes before it comes to an end may determine the future course of the history of our own great and beloved country.

The President of the United States together with the Chiefs of Staff and the military experts of all the arms and the civilan heads of the various departments through long, dreary months struggled to bring out an armed forces budget. They brought out that budget. The total amount of that budget was $15,300,000,000, nearly $3,000,000,000 in excess of the sums appropriated in the current fiscal year.

At the same time the President of the United States recommended an enormous sum for foreign aid. We passed that bill yesterday.

Those needs are the reverse sides of the same coin, the coin of national security.

In view of the background out of which the Presidential estimates arose, estimates that took into full consideration from the high level of the Presidency and all the top officers, military and civilian, all the elements in the problem, economic, international, and military, in view of the work they have done and the conclusions they have reached, I think it would be wholly irresponsible for this House, with what little additional evidence is before it, to fly in the face of those recommendations, to repudiate the President's recommendations and those of the armed services, and follow this committee, in effect its subcommittee, in increasing the Presidential estimates by $631,000,000. After all, every one of those dollars, while perhaps meaningless to us, when lost in this enormous figure on a piece of paper, means a living, buying dollar in the hands of the hard-working American who earned it and from whom we take it. This amendment, if adopted, will limit the over-all total of appropriated cash to the figure in the Presidential budget and knock out some $54,000,000 that the committee has added to it. The other big items of increase over the Presidential requests are in contract authorizations. They will come later in the bill. I shall deal with them appropriately when the time comes.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. The gentleman voted yesterday for $5,500,000,000 for European aid, did he not?

Mr. COUDERT. That is exactly why I want to have the opportunity this time to vote for exactly the recommended figure. I voted for the Presidential figure yesterday. I think the House should vote for the Presidential figure today. I do not want to throw completely out of balance the national security picture or the cold-war picture.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes, reserving the last 4 minutes to the committee.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I think there may be one other Member who would like to be heard for 5 minutes on the amendment. I wonder if the gentleman would make it 15 minutes. May I say that this is a pretty important amendment, and I think the people of the United States should have the opportunity, at least, to have this question presented.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, and that the committee may have the last 4 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS].

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Chairman, the first impression might be that there is an inconsistency if we vote one day for a high appropriation and on another day vote for an addition to an appropriation bill, and then vote on the same day, or in the same series of bills, for a limitation upon an appropriation bill. I think there is no inconsistency whatever. I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is very much in order, and will bring to the Congress and to the people of the United States what should be the most important issue today before the Congress and the people. The United States is just a multiple of the families of the United States. Few families can say "We have an emergency in this family, and we will spend all the money that we want to spend." The average family has to say, "We have an emergency in this family. We will spend money to meet that emergency from the family budget. We will be forced to reduce expenditures on some less essential item."

We have reached the point in the United States where, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] pointed out, some 37 percent of the income is going for taxes. That has long been recognized as being beyond the danger point. Therefore, we in the Congress should recognize what should be called a matter of relative urgency, and we should spend the money of the taxpayers of the United States for those things which are most necessary in any fiscal year. I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] raises a good issue when he says that in this bill we should stay within the limit established by the President of the United States and should keep our expenditures, as necessary as they may be, within those limits. While I might even vote for an amendment to increase the bill in some particular item, which I think is more necessary than some other, I would still vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT], which says that we should spend only within the limit proposed by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with the passage of the bills that have presently been reported by the Committee on Appropriations, the funds available to the executive department for expenditure in the next fiscal year will be over $4,000,000,000 above the amount available for expenditure this year. This amendment seeks to decrease the total carried in this bill by $53,484,000, as I remember the figure. That is not a very substantial amount as compared with the $13,215,000,000, the total. But, nevertheless, it would reestablish a principle which has only been violated once this year, and that was in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, where we went above the budget by $216,000,000. It would reestablish the principle that the Congress keeps within the budget estimates that are submitted to us by the President. I, therefore, hope that this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will be adopted. It is perfectly clear that we owe a responsibility to the people of the United States to keep from spending more money than should be spent. I ask that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHESNEY] is recognized.

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I wish to say that I am not opposed to any strong national-defense program. However, today we are debating an appropriation bill for the armed forces almost as large as we would appropriate if this country were actually at war.

I was not a Member of the Eightieth Congress, but I followed the course of the unification bill very closely. At that time I was hopeful that the great duplication of material, personnel, and effort would be reduced to a minimum. When the bill was passed, I felt that at last the armed forces were on the right path toward a sound national-defense program.

The example of unification of our armed forces was ably illustrated in many of the invasions of the South Pacific when all the components of the armed forces worked in close harmony toward attaining their objective. This was the first display of cooperation among the forces and I know that if this type of teamwork was not carried out, many of the battles would have ended in defeat.

I am a firm believer in the unification of our armed forces. During my 5 years in the armed services as an enlisted man and an officer, the majority of which time was devoted to the training of personnel and to carrying out the administrative functions of the Army Air Forces, I had the opportunity to witness waste of material, waste of personnel, duplication of functions, and general poor administration in the armed forces. I fully realize that in wartime there are millions of men from every walk of life banded together in the service of their country and leeway must be given to waste. However, I always felt that the uniting of logistics in the armed service could be easily coordinated without too much effort if the leaders would step down and break their iron-bound customs and traditions. I am not a person to completely disregard custom and tradition; however, during my service in World War II I observed many types of inefficiency. As an example, in cases where the Army Air Force and the Navy Air Force each had its own supply depots and landing fields in the same city, due to the individualistic attitude of each force, Army planes were not permitted to land on Navy air fields and Navy planes were not permitted to land on Army air fields. Further, the distribution of equipment from Navy supply depots to Army Air Force personnel was prohibited. This same situation existed in the attempt of Navy personnel to procure supplies from Army Air Force depots.

This very example of duplication and waste was typical throughout World War II until, in certain quarters, the components began to act in close cooperation. When the unification bill was passed in the Eightieth Congress, I felt that we had taken a very progressive step in establishing greater cooperation among the armed forces.

I make these statements because I feel that the billions of dollars which have been spent in the past could have been saved by efficient methods and good common business sense.

Today we are debating a bill for the appropriation of more billions of dollars—an amount so great that it makes the average taxpayer shudder when he visualizes the additional taxes he must pay to meet this obligation.

I personally believe that if the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are better informed as to the operation and maintenance of the armed forces than I am, would cease thinking of padding many of their operations, they could give more serious consideration to implementing and furthering our civilian reserve program, which, I feel, has been handled in a very haphazard manner. It is certainly bad planning when full consideration is not given to the maintenance of the high efficiency and skills of our former enlisted and officer personnel. Many of the former service personnel who have seriously considered staying in the Reserve are now dropping out at a very rapid rate, and this is due to the lackadaisical attitude of the armed forces toward Reserve programs. There should be no doubt in anyone's mind that if there is another war a great majority of the military personnel will be comprised not only of men from civilian life, but also the thousands of men who were trained during the last war. The latter should be given the opportunity to maintain their skills at a level of maximum efficiency in order to be ready in case of an emergency. I intend to vote for this bill, but I certainly feel that the armed forces should start thinking of real economy and should work toward that end. They should start eliminating duplication and nonessential activities. Furthermore, I believe that the armed forces can save money by minimizing travel of personnel throughout the world by efficient methods of allocation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized to close the debate.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I hope the Members will look at the first paragraph of the bill and see what the gentleman's amendment undertakes to do. Here we have a bill of 91 pages which we had planned to read this afternoon, study carefully, listen to debate, listen to amendments, and after we had heard all the facts and the evidence, like a jury in a case, we would say that under the circumstances we thought our decision should be to appropriate a certain amount of money for the National Military Establishment. But the gentleman from New York, [Mr. COUDERT] wishes us to say before we read the bill, before we hear the evidence, before we hear the debate, wishes us to say in advance of that what we should do. I shall not be a party to an amendment which would deny to Members on both sides of the aisle the decision, as we approach the various items, of saying just how much Congress should appropriate. I therefore urge the Committee to vote down this suggested amendment.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Why should Members of Congress blindly follow the recommendations of either the President or the Director of the Budget? Certainly the Director of the Budget is not an authority on military affairs.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Yet the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT] is going to vote what the President says we need for European aid; he is going to vote what the President says we need for national defense, and the members of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services, the Members of Congress, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, are to be ignored completely.

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

Mr. MAHON. I cannot yield for the moment.

I repeat, in my opinion it is up to us to state in such detail as we wish, what we should appropriate for the various branches of the military service; it is not up to the Budget or to anyone else; it is our responsibility, and we cannot dodge it by casting a lump sum into the hands of the President and saying, "You can spend it. We absolve ourselves of all responsibility, we wash our hands of the matter."

I am not unsympathetic toward the desire to accomplish economy, and if there is some place in the bill where the gentleman wishes to offer an amendment making cuts whereby he can save $53,000,000, I hope he will do so.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COUDERT. In answer to the statement made by the gentleman from Missouri, does the gentleman really believe that the five members of the subcommittee who acted on this bill in a brief period are better informed than the President and the Secretary of Defense in determining what should be the over-all figure for national defense?

Mr. MAHON. I say that Congress should not abdicate its functions. I say that after eleven weeks of hearings and hundreds of hours of study the members of the Committee are vastly better informed about some provisions of this bill than some of the people in the executive branch. Congress must not abdicate; we must stand firm in our constitutional function to legislate.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. What would happen should the gentleman's amendment be adopted and then the total of the items individually as we go through the bill exceed in the aggregate the sum stated in the first paragraph?

Mr. MAHON. The question is a good one. I presume we should have to ask consent to undo the action previously taken. This is another reason why the amendment of the gentleman from New York should not be agreed to. Yet, I commend the gentleman from New York for the objective which he is seeking to achieve. He is an able member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman let me answer the inquiry of the gentleman from New York?

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

Mr. COUDERT. There is ample precedent for this procedure. It was started back in 1924 and it has been done a number of times since, the last time

being in the Coast Guard bill of last year. There is an over-all limitation on the total of the individual items that may be in excess when added up.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COUDERT) there were—ayes 21, noes 87.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, the Government has lost one of its most faithful and efficient employees. Mr. Joseph Gartland, Director of the Budget and Administrative Planning, in the United States Post Office Department, died on Monday and was buried today.

Mr. Gartland had served the Department in many capacities over a period of 50 years. He was appointed on May 11, 1898, as a clerk in the Wellsboro, Pa., post office.

As inspector in charge of the Army Mail Service, American Expeditionary Forces, he served in Britain, Germany, France, and Luxemburg, during World War I. Following the war he was appointed Assistant Director of the Postal Savings System.

In 1924, he was detailed as Chief Inspector of the Interior Department. Commenting on the efficient manner in which he served in this position, the Secretary of the Interior, Hubert Work, informed the Postmaster General that his services in this Department cannot be too highly commended. Largely through his efforts, the work of our bureaus has been coordinated as never before, with direct financial savings to the Government beyond computation.

Mr. Gartland was elevated to the position of Assistant Chief Post Office Inspector in 1933, and served in that position until October 1, 1942, when he was appointed Director of the Budget and Administrative Planning, the position from which he retired in March of this year.

During his half century in the postal service, Mr. Gartland served as Assistant Superintendent of Post Office Service, secretary of the United States Censorship Policy Board, traveling representative of the First Assistant Postmaster General, and chairman of the United States Budget Officers Conference. He was Chairman of the Operations Board of the Post Office Department from 1942 to 1946, and conducted the first schools of instruction for post-office inspectors in 1930.

Mr. Gartland was connected with the United States Post Office Department nearly one-third of its 159 years of existence. He served under 15 of the 53 Postmasters General, and during the span of his service, revenues grew from $89,000,000 to over $1,411,000,000 annually.

This faithful public servant frequently appeared as a representative of the Post Office Department before congressional committees in recent years, and he is well known to many members of the House. As a member of the Treasury-Post Office Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, it was my privilege to know him intimately. His gentle spirit and gracious manner endeared him to all who knew him. His patriotic devotion to duty characterized his long life of public service. Our Government can ill afford to lose men of his caliber.

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

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

Mr. CANFIELD. I shall always remember Mr. Gartland's appearances before our subcommittee. He was character-plus and his testimony was always to the point. He liked to remember that he was not only a public servant but also a taxpayer of the United States.

Mr. GARY. I thank the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. REES. Mr. Chairman, I am saddened by the news of the death of one of the outstanding career employees in the postal service. Joe Gartland, former director of budget and administrative planning of the Post Office Department, passed away yesterday, less than a month after he retired from the postal service to which he had given more than a half-century of service.

As former chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the last Congress, I had come to know and admire Joe Gartland and, like other Members of Congress and his colleagues, I cherished his friendship and relied upon his excellent advice with respect to postal matters.

The postal service, and indeed the country, has lost one of its truly fine public servants. I join with my colleagues here in the House in expressing my sympathy and condolences to his widow, and two children.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD immediately following the debate on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Coudert amendment. On yesterday I offered an amendment to the European recovery legislation which would reduce the amount only $380,000,000. You know what happened to that amendment. It was decisively defeated. Now I understand this committee will offer an amount substantially above that recommended by the President in his budget. Mr. Chairman, I call your attention to the statement by the President in refutation of the statements made by the committee members. He said, and I quote:

> I have had the benefit of the considered advice of civilian and military leaders best qualified to evaluate the international, strategic, and economic aspects of our national defense requirements. I believe that these recommendations reflect a proper relationship between our security requirements and our economic and financial resources, and envision an Army, Navy, and Air Force in a condition of relative readiness, all functioning as an integrated team.

So it is apparent that the President did consult with civilian and military leaders whom he thought were best qualified to evaluate our national defense requirements in view of the world situation of today. I am thoroughly convinced that the bill before us (H. R. 4146), is sufficient without increasing the amounts as is now proposed. I take this position, Mr. Chairman, not in opposition to the policy underlying this bill, as I am for an adequate national defense, and I have spent years of my life as a member of the American Legion advocating a full security program for this great Nation. I believe, however, that at this time when there are such terrific demands for money from the Treasury, and in view of the further fact that we are entering a period of recession with the possibility of a reduced national income, we should begin to pare all appropriation bills. That is my position and I stand on that ground on this bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to say in view of the importance and the nature of the bill that I shall find it necessary to object to any further extraneous debates. I am sure the Members will understand the situation.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think if the debate that we have had proves anything, it proves the necessity for more unification. I think there is still overlapping and duplication and waste in the armed forces. I think that a great deal of money could be saved by more efficient handling of the affairs of all three branches of the service.

I applaud the Secretary of National Defense in proceeding with the unfication plan. I think if we are going to have a bang-up job of defense, he has to proceed and he has to cut out this jealousy and bickering and rivalry between the services. He has a huge problem there and we have a big problem in this Congress, too, to help in this respect and to back up the Secretary of Defense in his efforts to apply unification as recommended by the Hoover Commission report in respect to the elimination of waste in the armed forces. There is, no doubt, some waste in the armed forces, and as long as there is a dollar wasted in the armed forces, we ought to cooperate in eliminating that waste.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am for aviation; I am for more aviation. I think aviation is so vital to the defense of this country that you can hardly appreciate its urgent importance. I think it is fair, however, to comment on this. I am not critical of the committee. I think the committee has done a good job. I think they are sincere and honest and hardworking, patriotic gentlemen, who are doing the best they can for the defense of this country. I want to call the attention of

the House to the fact that we have not completed the development of the Air Force. It has been only a few weeks ago we passed a bill setting up a 70-group air force, and every expert on air security has told us that we need a 70-group air force. As I say, I am not critical of the committee since the committee did provide $800,000,000 in this bill additional for the Air Force. But, that does not give us the ultimate of what our experts say we need in the way of air power. It gives us only 58 groups whereas now we have 55 air groups; only three additional air groups. I think that in the long range program we cannot overlook this fact: that we must continue to fight for the further development of the Air Force, if we are going to properly protect this country. In our struggle to get additional appropriations for this or that branch of the service, I feel that we cannot overlook the vital branch of air service, the Air Force. I do not want the Congress to overlook the further development of the long-range program of a 70-group air force.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 2 words.

Mr. Chairman, the debate so far reflects here on the floor of the House a conflict which has existed for some time and exists now between the two arms of the air, Naval Air and the Air Force. It is reflected here at this time because the battle for appropriations still exists.

I have had the honor of being chairman of the combat aviation subcommittee of the Congressional Aviation Policy Board in the Eightieth Congress and have been through this fight, a fight waged on both sides for a long time. I should like to point out to the Members of the House that this is the season of the year for the Air Force and the Navy, yes, and other agencies of Government, to do their propagandizing of the Congress of the United States. Not very long ago we had a very splendid air show based over here at Andrews Field by the Air Force, in which they displayed the splendid might of the Air Force. That no sooner had cooled off than the Members of this Congress began to get invitations to go down to Norfolk and go out on a naval aircraft carrier. Of course, that is a little easier way to propagandize, because, after all, they keep you aboard overnight and feed you and that is just lovely. Everybody who goes aboard can learn all about the value of naval aviation. It is a great thing.

This appropriation bill brought out by this committee provides for about 80 percent of what the Air Force asks for in cash and contract authorizations and provides about 80 percent of what the Naval Air Force asks for in the way of cash and contract authorizations for the procurement of aircraft. There is very little difference in the treatment of the two, but if either side has got the worst of it, it is the Air Force, which has a little less than 80 percent of what it needs to build to its authorized strength of 70 groups.

I am a little bit surprised that my friend from Georgia does not stand up here and advocate the necessary increase of the Air Force budget to build a full 70-group-air-force program instead of stopping at the 58-group force.

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

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

Mr. VINSON. Let me say to the gentleman from California at the outset that my recommendations are not based on any conflict or rivalry between Naval Air and the Air Force. Nothing I have said would indicate that. I am merely pointing out the appropriation required to provide sufficient planes to support the number of first-line Navy planes the Appropriations Committee has approved. As to the 70-group air force, the committee generously gave about what was given last year, $851,000,000. So, now, there will be a postponement of only 2 years in building up to the 70-group air force. This is the second year on the 70-group-air-force program, and we have 3 more years to go and $800,000,000. By 1954 we will have a fully balanced 70-group air force.

Mr. HINSHAW. If the gentleman will permit me, I have the table before me showing the figures submitted by both the Air Force and the Navy to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board just about a year ago, a year ago the 1st of March. In that request the Navy asked for cash appropriations of $670,000,000 and contract authority of $770,000,000 for the fiscal year 1950. The Air Force asked for $1,700,000,000 in cash and $2,600,000,000 in contract authority.

Under the bill we are now considering the Navy has received approximately 80 percent of what it asks for, namely, $523,000,000 in cash and $576,000,000 in contract authorizations, whereas the Air Force is receiving somewhat less than 80 percent. It gets $1,100,000,000 instead of $1,700,000,000 in cash, and it gets $1,992,000,000 instead of $2,600,000,000 in contract authority.

If what you want to do is build both of these arms to merely the level of what we called plan B in the Congressional Aviation Policy Board report, then both arms must be built up to something like the figures shown in this report, and not merely one arm. I suggest the committee has treated both sides equally. If 80 percent of requirements is the figure we are to support, then let us support the figure the committee has brought here. It is fair and equitable to both arms of the service, both Naval Air and Air Force. I submit that for your consideration without any propaganda, trying to be as conscientious and even-minded as I can on this subject, as I love them both.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Council, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates not in excess of $50 per diem for individuals; printing and binding; payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with work related to the activity of the Council; $200,000.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON: On page 2, line 11, strike out "$50" and insert "$35."

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because the National Security Act of 1947 provides that $35 is the maximum per diem to be paid to people brought in temporarily for the advisory committees. I recognize that the National Security Act did not say what should be the rate of pay for advisory personnel employed by the National Security Act, but in view of the fact that a bill is now pending in the other body and a bill is now pending in the Committee on Armed Services dealing with amendments to the National Security Act, I hope that this per diem payment can be kept as it now is until these bills have been considered. Of course, there is not much involved in this, but it is a matter of principle. The Appropriations Committee has a perfect right to fix this as a limitation in this bill. You are clearly within your rights. But, in my opinion, other sections in the bill dealing with this same point are subject to point of order. It says in the National Security Act that the maximum pay shall be $35 per day. Just give us a little chance to work on this and we will probably agree with you on $50, but we may try to keep it at $35. That is the whole purpose of my amendment. Let us keep all of these per diem payments uniform.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Of course, this is a $16,000,000,000 bill and here we are talking about $35 a day for experts and technicians who work for the National Security Council. The committee is trying in every possible way to reduce civilian personnel. That is our object. We are told that it is necessary to occasionally bring in experts for a few days—just a few days. The Council brings in people like the president of General Motors, and the head of General Electric, the very top men of the Nation. Of course, their time in many instances, I would say, might be worth $1,000 a day or more.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the gentleman's position, I am perfectly willing to withdraw my amendment. Of course, the committee has the right.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not insist upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the National Security Resources Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of $50 per diem; expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the National Security Resources Board; printing and binding; travel expenses; the services of domestic and foreign organizations by contract without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes,

as amended; purchase (not to exceed two for replacement only) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); a health service program as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 150); and not to exceed $5,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Chairman for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $3,500,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 303 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, approved July 26, 1947), members of advisory committees and part-time advisory personnel may be appointed by the Chairman of the Board at rates for individuals not exceeding $50 per diem.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the proviso on page 3 is legislation on an appropriation bill, because the National Security Act in section 303 states that it shall be $35 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to be heard, except to say that I do feel this should be clarified by legislation. I have no argument to present as to whether or not it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For expenses necessary for the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the War Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Joint Staff, the Munitions Board, and the Research and Development Board, including personal services in the District of Columbia; purchase (not to exceed four) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; not to exceed $20,000 for payment of claims pursuant to section 403 of the Federal Tort Claims Act (28 U. S. C. 2672); and not to exceed $50,000 for emergency and extraordinary expenses, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of Defense for such purposes as he deems proper, and his determination thereon shall be final and conclusive; $9,000,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 303 (a) of the National Security Act of 1947 (Public Law 253, approved July 26, 1947), members of advisory committees and part-time advisory personnel may be appointed by the Secretary of Defense at rates for individuals not exceeding $50 per diem.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the proviso on page 4 is legislation on an appropriation bill, because the act fixes it at $35 a day.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order is conceded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Retired pay, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force: For pay, as authorized by law and not otherwise provided for, of military personnel on the retired lists of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force, $180,000,000, to be allocated to such agency or agencies of the National Military Establishment as the Secretary of Defense determines will assure the most economical administration of the funds herein provided.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that portion of the section on retired pay after the figure $180,000,000 is legislation on an appropriation bill. Mr. Chairman, the National Security Act of 1947 specifically defines the authority of the Secretary of National Defense. It enumerates in section 202 the authority, and nowhere gives the Secretary of National Defense any administrative responsibilities or administrative authority. What this does is to take the retired pay of the four services from where it is today being administered in their own offices and puts them in the Office of the Secretary of National Defense. The Secretary of National Defense is so circumscribed by his duties that he does not have any administrative function.

The reason I make this point of order is because this whole subject matter is being considered in the Senate today, and is before the House Committee on the Armed Services. We are going into this question as to the broadening of the authority of the Secretary of National Defense. I believe, therefore, that it should not be prejudged in an appropriation bill or that the Committee on Appropriations should legislate until there has been a thorough hearing on the question.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. MAHON. The committee had in mind that we had passed a unification bill and undertook to save funds by throwing together in the office of the Secretary of Defense all retired pay for the Army, Navy, and Air Force. By reason of the consolidation we estimated that $10,000,000 could be saved, and we made that reduction in the bill. We conferred with the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force with regard to the matter. It was in accordance with their suggestion and we had their complete cooperation. In view of the fact, however, that there may be some question about the technical legal aspects, I do not press the point.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I have no objection, probably to its being administered in the Secretary's office after the powers that he is asking for are considered by the legislative committee. The Senate committee is having a hearing on it today and we are going to have a hearing on it to see whether or not we will confer administrative authority on the Secretary of National Defense.

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

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. I think a point that should be kept in mind by the committee is that we are trying to save $10,000,000 this year which we cannot save if the point of order is insisted upon.

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman is clearly in error; I am not dealing with the $180,000,000, but merely the administration of the $180,000,000. This proposal comes after the $180,000,000. The law does not give the Secretary of National Defense the power to administer anything. His duties are spelled out, and that is not one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule. The gentleman from Georgia makes a point of order against the language on page 4 in line 22, after the figure "$180,000,000" on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair is of opinion that if the Secretary of Defense has the authority to do what the bill seeks to permit him to do the language is merely redundant; but if the Secretary of Defense does not have the authority, this language is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For travel allowances and travel in kind, as authorized by law, for persons traveling in connection with the military activities of the Department of the Army, including mileage, transportation, reimbursement of actual expenses, or per diem allowances, to officers, contract surgeons, and others whose rank, pay and allowances are assimilated to officers; transportation of troops; transportation, or reimbursement therefor, of cadets, enlisted men, recruits, recruiting parties, applicants for enlistment between places of acceptance for enlistment and recruiting stations, rejected applicants for enlistment, general prisoners, cadets and accepted cadets from their homes to the Military Academy, discharged cadets, civilian employees, civilian witnesses before courts martial, and dependents of civilian and military personnel; travel pay to discharged military personnel; transportation of discharged or paroled prisoners and persons discharged from Saint Elizabeths Hospital after transfer thereto from the military service; transportation of persons discharged other than honorably; monetary allowances for liquid coffee for troops traveling when supplied with cooked or travel rations; commutation of quarters and rations to enlisted men traveling on detached duty when it is impracticable to carry rations, and to applicants for enlistment and general prisoners traveling under orders; per diem allowances or actual cost of subsistence while in a travel status, to civilian employees and civilian witnesses before courts martial; for rental of camp sites and the local procurement of communication service, fuel, light, water service, and other necessary supplies and services incident to individual or troop movements, including transportation of organizational equipment and impedimenta; and for transportation of authorized baggage of military and civilian personnel, including packing and unpacking; $77,000,000: *Provided*, That other appropriations for the Department of the Army shall be charged with such amounts as may be required for travel in connection with development, procurement, production, maintenance, or construction activities; and, with such exception, no other Army appropriation in this act shall be available for any expense for or incident to travel of personnel of the Regular Army or civilian employees under the Department of the Army, except the appropriation "Contingencies of the Army" and the appropriations for Engineer Service, Army, the Army National Guard, the Organized Reserves, the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, and except as may be provided for in the appropriations "Special Field Exercises," and "Inter-American Relations, Department of the Army;"

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take this time which might have been better used in general debate, but there are just one or two thoughts that I feel obliged to express. I do not want anything I may say to be considered as in the least a reflection on the Committee on Appropriations, for I think the gentleman from

Texas yesterday when he opened the debate on this bill approached this giant problem in a very humble and a very fair way; he admitted that this was a task which was almost impossible for the Appropriations Committee to perform. He admitted that if we were going to face peace during the ensuing year that this appropriation was too high, but that if we were facing war it was obviously too low. So the Appropriations Committee itself is necessarily wrestling with a number of imponderables here which it is very difficult for the House to resolve. Of course, as far as I am concerned, there is nothing in the world I can do except to follow the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee and vote for this bill. I cannot take a chance otherwise, but I think it ought to be called to the attention of the Committee of the Whole that there probably is an enormous amount of waste in this bill which the Appropriations Committee cannot very well under present circumstances do too much about.

In this morning's New York Times, and I take it that the quotations were reasonably accurate, it was reported that a task force of our Commission to Reorganize the Executive Departments said that if the armed forces would reform its accounting practices alone, just the accounting practices, we might be able to save $1,500,000,000 a year. The same article indicated that in the original approach to the Appropriations Committee for funds the armed forces asked for funds to build family houses in Alaska at a cost of $58,500 per dwelling unit, a fantastic and entirely unjustified figure. That same report stated that the armed forces requested funds to modernize more tanks than the armed forces actually possessed. The same report indicated that the armed forces had requested an appropriation of funds which would have been sufficient to purchase 880,000 tropical uniforms, more, of course, than we can foresee a possible need for, at a cost of $129 per uniform.

May I say that as far as I can see there is nothing much that the Committee on Appropriations can do about these extravagant estimates, these grossly negligent figures; there is nothing we Members of the House who do not have expert or detailed knowledge of the situation can presently do about it, but I would like to make this one suggestion for our future consideration, and that is that we probably would not waste money in appropriating two, three, or four times as much money for the use of the Committee on Appropriations as it now has. If we gave that committee the extra money for larger expert staffs, so that it can go into detail on every one of these money requests, we would, in my opinion, save in the long run hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars in considering appropriation bills of this character.

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

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

Mr. COUDERT. The gentleman has asked what we could do other than to follow blindly the recommendations made in this bill.

Mr. HAND. Except to give the Appropriations Committee more money so that it can do a more detailed job.

Mr. COUDERT. Is there not another alternative? Is there any reason why the gentleman and the Members of the House should not follow the recommendations of the President and the National Defense Establishment in the matter of this budget?

Mr. HAND. The gentlemen and I are for the same objectives but I do not want blindly to follow the President, either.

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

Mr. HAND. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. In connection with the report to which the gentleman has called attention, it is also a fact that the report indicates a request for $39,000,000 in this bill for the purchase of 6,955 howitzers and the report states that the actual cost is only $9,000,000. The gentleman has brought out many things that should be called to the attention of the Committee and upon which we should have some explanation.

Mr. HAND. I may say to the gentleman that I was immensely disturbed when I read that report.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Regarding the Alaska housing situation, last year the committee sent investigators to Alaska. The fact of the matter is that those houses at Fairbanks cost $74,000 apiece. The $59,000 was for company, civilian, and noncommissioned officers quarters at Fairbanks and at Anchorage. The committee went up there and went into that matter.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, the committee went into the matter of Alaska housing very carefully. I had the Chief Engineer of the United States Army in my office last year. He promised to discontinue cost-plus contracts. I said, "When you build a house, the first material you have to have is concrete. Concrete is made out of water, gravel, sand, and cement. You have the water, gravel, and sand. Where do you buy your cement? What does it cost you a ton at the source of supply and on building site in Alaska?" Who got the difference? I took every item like that and I put those items in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We sent an investigator up in there. They changed the chief engineers and now we are going to build the $74,000 houses under competitive bidding for $34,000. So we are doing something about it. That investigatory staff was very effective.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that members of the subcommittee have given consideration to these matters which have been raised and have undertaken to make every provision possible under the circumstances and under the law with regard to accounting and with regard to the cost of houses and with regard to many of these other important matters which very appropriately have been discussed before the committee here today?

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Last year we sent investigators to check into the Quartermaster Corps. Seventy percent of the Army procurement is quartermaster, and 35 percent is clothing and food and subsistence. I have a 100-page report on those two items. We submitted that report to the Quartermaster General, and he answered it paragraph by paragraph. That report was condensed and put in the record, and you will find it in the hearings on this bill.

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

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HAND. The gentleman, I am sure, understands that I know, as all of the Members of the House know, that the Committee on Appropriations devote themselves unceasingly and unselfishly to their task. I am only suggesting that in the future you should have more with which to work.

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. There is no question about that. I was just pointing out some of the things that are being done.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for the transportation of Army supplies, equipment, funds of the Army, including packing, crating, and unpacking; maintenance and operation of transportation facilities and installations, including the purchase, construction, alteration, operation, lease, repair, development, and maintenance of and research in transportation equipment, including boats, vessels, and railroad equipment; personal services in the District of Columbia; procurement of supplies and equipment; printing and binding; communication service; maps, wharfage, tolls, ferriage, drayage, and cartage; conducting instruction in Army transportation activities; $340,000,000: *Provided*, That during the current fiscal year the cost of transportation from point of origin to the first point of storage or consumption of supplies, equipment, and material in connection with the manufacturing and purchasing activities of the Quartermaster Corps may be charged to the appropriations from which such supplies, equipment, and material are procured: *Provided further*, That vessels under the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission, the Department of the Army, or the Department of the Navy, may be transferred or otherwise made available without reimbursement to any of such agencies upon the request of the head of one agency and the approval of the agency having jurisdiction of the vessels concerned.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BONNER. I make the point of order that the proviso on page 18, lines 16 through 22, is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman from Texas is not able to say whether or not the point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the language to which the

point of order is addressed is legislation on an appropriation bill, and sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For expenses necessary for equipping, maintaining, operating, and training the Army National Guard, including expenses of camps, airfields, storage facilities and alterations and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than 10 years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities, the purchase (not to exceed 100) and hire of passenger motor vehicles for official use only, and the modification, repair, maintenance and operation of airplanes; transportation of things; personal services at the seat of government or elsewhere (including services of personnel of the Army National Guard employed as civilians, without regard to their military rank) necessary for the care, maintenance, modification and repair of materials and equipment, for Federal property and custodial accounting work, and for administrative and such other duties as may be required; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Army National Guard who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty and other expenses connected therewith as authorized by the act of June 15, 1936 (10 U. S. C. 455 a–d); pay at a rate not less than $2,400 per annum and travel of property and disbursing officers for the United States; travel expenses (other than mileage), at the same rates as authorized by law for Army National Guard personnel on active Federal duty, of Army National Guard division and regimental commanders while inspecting units in compliance with National Guard regulations when specifically authorized by the Chief, National Guard Bureau; attendance of Army National Guard personel at military service schools and expenses of enlisted men of the Regular Army on duty with the Army National Guard, including allowances for quarters and subsistence; drill pay of the Army National Guard; travel of personnel of the Regular Army detailed to or on duty with the Army National Guard, including mileage, transportation of dependents, and transportation, packing, crating and unpacking of household goods and effects; procurement and issue to the Army National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia of military equipment and supplies, as provided by law, including motor-propelled vehicles and airplanes, and repair and modification of such equipment and supplies; $216,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army is hereby authorized to issue to the Army National Guard without charge against this appropriation except for actual expenses incident to such issue, supplies and equipment from surplus or excess supplies or equipment purchased for the Army: *Provided further*, That the number of caretakers authorized to be employed for any one unit or pool under the provisions of section 90 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended, may be such as is deemed necessary by the Secretary of the Army: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the settlement of claims (not exceeding $500 in any one case) for damages to or loss of private property incident to the operation of camps of instruction, either during the stay of Army National Guard units in such camps or while en route thereto or therefrom.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I do this for the purpose of asking the distinguished gentleman from Texas with reference to the armory program which is dealt with in this bill in connection with the National Guard and the other civilian components.

This is the situation, Mr. Chairman. There is pending now before the Committee on Armed Services, and a hearing has been had on it, a bill seeking to bring about the complete unification and the joint use of the armories throughout the country. For a long time the Navy has been building armories, and the National Guard has been building armories. What we are trying to do now is to have armories suitable for all branches of the service.

It may so happen that in one town you might have to have more than one armory, but there cannot be any justification for the Navy having an armory, the National Guard having an armory, the Army Reserve having an armory, and the Marine Corps Reserve having an armory.

We have had a hearing, which has been completed, on this matter. The distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] conducted the hearing. The only reason why the bill is not reported out is that we are trying to check up to find out how many armories each one of these organizations has so that we can work out a program for their joint use.

This bill makes money available for temporary construction for the various civilian components. I think this temporary construction should be abandoned until we can work out a complete unification. This is where we can get some bona fide unification. This is where we can build in one community armory facilities sufficient to serve all the branches of the service. It is absurd for the National Guard to have an armory to use on Monday nights and the Marine Corps Reserve to have an armory that they will use on Tuesday nights. What we are trying to do is have an armory that all of them can use jointly. This temporary construction that is allowed in these various sections means a promulgation of the present policy, which we hope to abolish just as soon as the Committee on Armed Services can get the necessary information.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DURHAM] to enlighten the Committee on this because I know all members of the Committee wants to do the same thing.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to know from the chairman of the committee just what this language means on pages 31 and 32, starting with line 23:

Alterations and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than 10 years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities.

Does that mean the Army will be in a position to build armories throughout the country?

Mr. MAHON. The committee had before it representatives of the National Guard. There is no money in the bill for the National Guard armories. We also had before us representatives of the Organized Reserves. They have worked out a program which will give them some temporary relief. As you know, it is most important in a democracy such as ours that our Reserve program function well. So they have presented to us a program under which it is permissible under the existing law to expend $10,000,000 in making temporary provisions for armories for the Organized Reserves. It may, of course, extend over the years to the Organized Reserves, in order that they may get going with their program. When you come along with a permanent unified program in this or in succeeding Congresses that demand can be more fully met.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what we are trying to do. We have spent weeks on this matter of the reserve forces facilities trying to decide on needed facilities for them to use in the States and in the communities. The only report that has been made available to the committee so far is a complete report by the National Guard which I have in my hand. What we are trying to work out, as the chairman has said, is a plan to unify the forces. We find in a city they may have an armory used by the Navy with fine electronic equipment and radar in it, and the National Guard armory over here trying to carry out their function where the men have to drive 100 miles in order to do the same thing. So the committee asked them to come up here with a bona fide plan to put those services together so that there can be a joint use of these facilities. At the present time there is $800,000,000 worth of equipment in the National Guard armories throughout the United States. There are 1,900 National Guard armories, and the report shows that there are only 82 being used jointly. That simply does not mean very good business. I hope that there will be nothing in this bill to jeopardize this program, because in my opinion this will be the greatest asset to the national defense picture of anything that we can develop.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, the committee is completely in accord with what he is seeking to achieve in the way of a joint-armory program for all of the Reserve components. The committee however, takes the position that the situation of the Organized Reserves of the country has now reached a point that if we do not do something, to boost their morale and give them a place to train and help their program along, that this Organized Reserves program may be killed. This provides $10,000,000 which can be used for temporary armories for the Organized Reserves. They are the Quonset-type of armories, which have been used so effectively by the Navy in many places. While they are called temporary, they will last for years. I feel we must bear in mind the fact that the gentleman has

not yet completed action on his bill. The Senate has not acted on his bill. If it should be approved by both bodies, and I hope it will, it must then go to the Committee on Appropriations and then we would have to wait for a year or 2 years before any of these armories are going to be completed.

Mr. DURHAM. I might say to the distinguished gentleman, who served on the Committee on Armed Services, that it is not my bill. I think the gentleman himself introduced a bill which is before the committee at the present time. The whole object, as I said a few moments ago, is to try to bring about this joint use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, what I am afraid of getting into is this temporary construction program. That is what worries me, because I feel, unless we can get State cooperation and Army and Navy cooperation, together with the National Guard, which you know is a difficult problem to work out, we will not be able to get the best results. But we have achieved closer cooperation in the hearings on this and we have gotten closer together on this than we ever have in the history of any legislation that I have seen handled in the Committee on Armed Services. What I want to be assured of is that this program will not in any way give them a wedge to drive in down there. At the present time the Army and Navy Munitions Board has appointed a committee in every State in the Union. And every State in the Union has reported on the National Guard. If we can have time before the end of this session of Congress—we can work this thing out and it is a must program. But if we get this thing jumbled up here as it has been for many years, I know what will happen. I am afraid of what will happen, because it has been happening. I certainly hope, and I want to be assured by this committee that we are not going to jeopardize this program that we are trying to work out.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. What the gentleman and the gentleman's committee is trying to do is to bring about complete unification of the armories.

Mr. DURHAM. That is right.

Mr. VINSON. Under the language of this bill it means that you are going to have a 10-year period building separate units for each one of the organizations.

Mr. DURHAM. And you can give the Secretary of National Defense all the authority that you can confer on him here in the Congress and he can never do this job unless we do it by legislation.

Mr. VINSON. If you want bona fide unification, this is the way to get it.

Mr. DURHAM. That is exactly what we have been trying to do.

Mr. MAHON. That is why the committee has insisted, if I may say so, with the gentleman's permission, that these armories be fully utilized and that these different components work together. We anticipate real cooperation and we are just trying to help the cause along. We are very much interested in the National Guard and the Organized Reserves. I know of the keen interest of the gentleman from North Carolina in the program.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. We have worked out certain amendments dealing with this thing, and I do hope the Committee will accept them because the objective is the same; we want to have one armory system and not five or six different armory systems.

Mr. MAHON. That is exactly the attitude of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true your subcommittee understands the problem of the Reserves in general and not just Officers' Reserve Corps?

Mr. DURHAM. The gentleman is exactly correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. And we are working with the target in view of providing a permanent armory system at the earliest possible date.

Mr. DURHAM. It is to be a permanent unified armory program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It will not only improve the service but will also save a lot of money by combining their use.

Mr. DURHAM. It is a complete program.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I do not believe the committee should have serious objection.

Mr. DURHAM. It will carry out a training program which has been advocated for many years if properly conducted.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. It will also give an opportunity to the armed services to evaluate all the armories for unified purposes. We have in mind, of course, the fact that Naval Reserve armories will not lend themselves to practical use by National Guard officers.

Mr. DURHAM. That is true, and they are planning where to place the armories. One armory, for instance, might cost $200,000 and another $50,000.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. They could be utilized and coordinated.

Mr. DURHAM. The definite plans are before the committee at the present time, for the type of armories, and everything is before the committee.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. Also our committee is working out this program of defense.

Mr. DURHAM. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. It is a logical program that considers the problems of the different Reserve components of the Guard, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Reserves.

Mr. DURHAM. Three years ago at the end of the war the gentleman and myself, as you recall, visited the Bureau of the Budget, and asked them to O. K. this. At the present time they have O. K.'d a 10-year building program of $500,000,000.

Mr. RIVERS. While the bill carries $10,000,000, I should like to see this program proceeded with with the utmost dispatch.

Mr. DURHAM. If we can authorize this and take a part of it each year, it will prove to be a successful program.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. For the information of the House I might say that the chairman had designated a special subcommittee to handle this whole Reserve question.

Mr. VINSON. That is right.

Mr. SHORT. And we expect to begin hearings immediately after the Easter recess.

Mr. VINSON. A subcommittee has been appointed to deal with this matter, and I have designated the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] to be chairman of it. I trust the gentleman from North Carolina will call to the chairman's attention the amendments that we want to put in, because we have the same purpose; we want to bring about unification and not merely talk about unification.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that here is a very definite place in legislative processes that shows lack of coordination between a very important legislative committee the Armed Services Committee, and a very important subcommittee of the Committee of Appropriations which has done such fine work. In other words, here is the hard-working Appropriations Committee coming in and asking for $10,000,000 which manifestly should not be voted for, if you are going to have earliest possible effective unification in connection with an important segment of the armed forces.

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

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to my distinguished colleague from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to say to the Members and to my colleague that our committee has been thoroughly conversant with the program that the gentleman has indicated here. May I say this to you, however, that there has been no absolute program for the Organized Reserves thus far of the Air Force and the Army that has been worth a shotgun and will not be until we have a well-considered program.

Mr. RIVERS. We are working on that.

Mr. DOYLE. We are not going to tolerate losing the Reserve components. We believe in them and will strengthen them.

Let me remind you that we must act intelligently in this matter and that

there is no reason for haste. You might spend $10,000,000 in 10 months, which would otherwise be saved. This bill provides that nothing shall be spent on property unless it is leased for at least 10 years. That is not a temporary program. It is clearly a program which can become one of several times 10 years. We are looking to a permanent program of sound, sensible unification of and joint use of armories, and I suggest to the Members, even of the Committee on Appropriations, that here is a chance to save $10,000,000 and compel unification. We should make it compulsory. There is no need of duplication of millions of dollars of taxpayers' dollars. They must be efficiently expended and public property used fully.

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

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri, who is always so courteous to me.

Mr. SHORT. I think the statement made by the gentleman from California is absolutely correct; we have shamefully treated the Reserves of all departments, particularly of the Army and of the Air. The Navy is much better, but they have been given, I think, $75,000,000. Congress voted monye to the Air Force for the Reserves; they have not spent any of that money or done anything about it, and it is most regrettable that we are losing many of our very best men, men of war experience. That is the reason the chairman has set up this special subcommittee of which I shall be chairman, and we are going to begin hearings immediately after the Easter recess and put the heat on the boys over in the Pentagon.

Mr. DOYLE. I am a member of that important subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services of which the distinguished gentleman speaks and I may say one of the bills before us is a bill offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], of the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana, who renders such invaluable service on the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. BROOKS. May I say that some of us have been watching the Reserve program for many years and we have endeavored to get a place in which to house these Reserves. Until we have a building we are not going to have much of a Reserve program. In my opinion, we ought to have unification. That is what the Armed Services Committee is going to come forward with. Until we have a Reserve program that is properly integrated between the services, we do not have the answer.

Mr. DOYLE. I thank the gentleman. The justification of the collection of taxes for the purpose of building armories for the National Guard or Reserve components is need for these buildings, and publicly owned armories must be used to the maximum, consistent of proper use and needs of the community. Communities do not need armories which are closed to use by all Reserve components in the communities excepting only one such unit. These buildings can only justify themselves by the use which they have need of, by Reserves who have need of such use. The declared policy of this Congress must be consistently for economical use of all publicly paid for buildings and this includes armories. The leaders and members of these Reserve components should get their feet together under the table and coordinate their joint use of armories. In war they fight together and in peace they should pull together in use of buildings provided for them by the taxpayers. At the local level wherever these armories are now located or new ones are constructed, the declared policy carried out must be that there shall be a maximum use to the end that the National Guard and all Reserve components shall be allowed to use these armories jointly and fully and cooperatively. There are 6 days and nights, excluding the Sabbath, in each week when these armories should be used if there are National Guard or other Reserve components who want to use them. I repeat that real need and much use—not limited use—are the justifications of tax collections to build and maintain these armories.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I find myself somewhat confused because of the apparent interjection and the taking over of command of this bill by the legislative committee on the armed services and taking it away from the Appropriations Committee. There has been a tremendous amount of talk here about amendments which are not presently pending before the committee. I have tried to see if I cannot get heads or tails out of exactly what is being proposed and what the amendments are that are being suggested by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and the members of his committee.

I want to tell you of a situation in my own city. If you are seeking to cure that sort of situation, and if there is anything in this bill that will try to do it, or if you have any legislation that will do it, I hope you will bring it before the Congress.

In my city the Navy built a Naval Reserve armory on land given to it by the city in one of the most beautiful locations in the entire city. I am told that the expense of building this Naval Reserve armory with all of its equipment will exceed $1,000,000. I know that the Naval Reserve components were recruited to full strength because the Navy gave to those reserve components of the Navy every single thing they asked for in the way of equipment, in the way of uniforms and everything else.

Located in the same city is the National Guard armory owned by the State, a very antiquated, inefficient and obsolete building. The National Guard tried to recruit men following the war, with the result that they found great difficulty because they were not furnished equipment to make it attractive to the recruits to go into the army. When they came out on Armistice Day the Naval Reserve recruited to its full strength turned out on parade. A group of patriotic young men just out of the war, wearing their own Eisenhower coats and whatever equipment they could find around, were marching in there representing the Army and right down on the corner at the same time was an army store selling the very equipment to the public that the National Guard boys were clamoring for. All right.

I protested most vigorously to Mr. Forrestal over that situation and it was not 10 days before supplies began to flow into this National Guard unit. As a result it is now a splendid National Guard unit and these people are working. But we have the National Guard armory with all of its expense and its equipment, we have the naval armory with all of its expense and all of its equipment, then on top of that we have the Reserves of the Army. The Army Reserve Corps leased from the city another building at a tremendous monthly rental to house the Army Reserves.

Thus, we have three buildings; one, the Navy and the Naval Reserves; one, the National Guard; and, another one, the Army Reserves, all occupying separate structures and all costing us a tremendous sum of money.

I have tried to call that to the attention of the Secretary of Defense and said, "My God, if that is what unification means, it is the most ridiculous thing that I have heard of in all my life." Why have we not had brains applied to this so that, in my community as well as in any number of others I could cite, where the same condition prevails, we could have one splendid, fine building that would house all of these activities and save the overhead that is incident to the operation, and provide the facilities that we ought to provide in these towns where they expect to build and maintain national defense activities of this Nation?

The question I ask is this: I have heard a lot about the $10,000,000 cut; I do not know what it means. There is an over-all appropriation estimate here on page 33 of $216,000,000. Other Members of the House are confused because of the mix-up of time between the committee headed by my friend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the Committee on Appropriations, to know exactly what we are talking about.

Will the gentleman explain to me and tell me whether or not his committee proposes to bring legislation to this House that will not permit a disgraceful situation to continue as the one which I have pointed out?

Mr. VINSON. Take the illustration that the gentleman has just used of the three different arms. This bill will permit temporary repairs to be carried on on those three different set-ups. We now propose to consolidate them and have one to meet all three services. That is what we are trying to do.

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

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be given five additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman this: In my city, like in many other cities where they have spent, as I say, in building and equipping a naval armory, over $1,000,000 for a magnificent structure, if they could integrate the facilities of the Army Reserves and the National Guard and the Naval Reserves into that structure, is it the gentleman's proposal that that be done?

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly what the bill calls for, to utilize one establishment, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. KEEFE. Who is going to determine whether it is possible to do it in this set-up?

Mr. VINSON. We are going to write into the bill that the Secretary of National Defense shall have complete control and must have the authority to allocate it for joint use of all the services. This provision in the bill continues to carry on exactly what the gentleman is talking about, because it permits temporary repairs. Now I say that we should not engage in temporary repair; that we should get away from any repairs at all, and to tell these different component parts of the armed services to try to get together and use one and the same armory instead of each one building separate armories.

Mr. KEEFE. Let me ask the gentleman a question. He has answered that part of it. Am I correct in the assumption that in the language appearing under the head of "Army National Guard," beginning on page 31, what you are seeking to do is to eliminate the language in that part of the bill which would permit the expenditure of money for the building on leased land, under leases for 10 years, or the repairs and equipment of perhaps obsolete existing structures, and to take the money out of the bill that is allocable for that purpose and withhold it until your authorization bill comes before the Congress; is that correct?

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

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SIKES. May I say to my friend that the $10,000,000 which has been referred to is carried under "Organized Reserves Appropriation" on the bottom of page 35 in an item of $115,000,000. And, if I may take just a few seconds longer, may I say that this committee is thoroughly in accord with the idea that we should have a joint-armory program at the earliest possible moment, but until the committee of the gentleman from Georgia brings in such a bill and until the other body has approved such a bill and until the Committee on Appropriations has had an opportunity to supply funds for such a program, we must either provide temporary facilities in those areas when there are no facilities or run the risk of seriously damaging the program.

Mr. KEEFE. That is the next question I was going to ask, and that is this: If you do not appropriate these funds to provide at least temporary facilities for the organized Reserves and the National Guard, then you are going to destroy those Reserves in my community and every other community throughout this country; is that not true?

Mr. SIKES. That is correct.

Mr. KEEFE. We cannot afford to wait on the suspicion that perhaps this committee will bring in such a bill, and we cannot afford to wait until we know that both the House and the Senate will accept such a proposal. With that understanding of the situation, so far as I am concerned, I intend to support the action of the Committee on Appropriations, and it would seem to me to be entirely unwise to throw aside the work that the subcommittee has put upon this proposition with the mere hope and expectation that at some undetermined time in the future there may be legislation offered from the committee headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] to deal with this problem, with no assurance that it will be passed in the present session of Congress. I do not want to see either the Organized Reserves or the present National Guard set-up, housed as inadequately as it may be, destroyed until the over-all program is written into law that will provide for adequate integration of these services.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORGANIZED RESERVES

For pay and allowances, not otherwise provided for, of members of the Organized Reserve Corps on duty in accordance with law; mileage, actual and necessary expenses, or per diem in lieu thereof, at rates authorized by law, and transportation of temporary change of station baggage incurred by officers and enlisted men of the Regular Army and Organized Reserve Corps personnel traveling on duty in connection with the Organized Reserve Corps and for travel of dependents, and transportation of other effects as authorized by law of such personnel ordered to make a permanent change of station for duty in connection with the Organized Reserve Corps; personal services; pay, transportation, subsistence, clothing, and medical and hospital treatment of enlisted members of the Organized Reserve Corps; conducting correspondence or extension courses for instruction of members of the Organized Reserve Corps, including necessary supplies, procurement of maps and textbooks; transportation and traveling expenses of employees; purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms; establishment, maintenance, and operation of Organized Reserve Corps headquarters, installations, aviation facilities and camps for training of the Organized Reserve Corps; alterations and additions to present structures; transportation and erection of temporary structures; construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges and facilities, including acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein and temporary use thereof; arms, equipment, supplies, and matériel (not otherwise provided for) required to arm and equip Organized Reserve Corps organizations; purchase (not to exceed 200) and hire of passenger motor vehicles and hire and purchase of aircraft; miscellaneous expenses incident to the administration of the Organized Reserve Corps; expenses incident to the use, including upkeep costs, of supplies, equipment, and matériel furnished from stocks under the control of the Department of the Army; medical and hospital treatment of members of the Organized Reserve Corps who suffer injury or contract disease in line of duty, as provided by the act of June 15, 1936 (10 U. S. C. 455 a-d), and such other purposes in connection therewith as are authorized by the said act, including pay and allowances, subsistence, transportation, and burial expenses; in all, $115,000,000.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On pages 31 and 32, starting with line 23 on page 31, strike out the following: "and alterations and additions to present structures, transportation and erection of temporary structures, either on Government-owned or State-owned land, or on land made available by lease or loan from any political subdivision of a State or any individual, corporation, or organization for a period of not less than 10 years, construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that we have already passed this portion of the bill and the amendment is not in order.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, it was my understanding that the Clerk had read only down to line 7 on page 34.

The CHAIRMAN. That paragraph has been read. The Clerk has now read down to line 25 on page 35.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 31 for the purpose of offering an amendment.

Mr. MAHON. and Mr. SHEPPARD objected.

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURHAM: On page 35, lines 2 to 10, strike out the following: "establishment, maintenance, and operation of Organized Reserve Corps headquarters, installations, aviation facilities and camps for training of the Organized Reserve Corps; alterations and additions to present structures; transportation and erection of temporary structures; construction and maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges and facilities, including acquisition of land, rights pertaining thereto, leasehold and other interests therein and temporary use thereof" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "maintenance and operation of Organized Reserve Corps headquarters, installations, aviation facilities and camps for training of the Organized Reserve Corps; maintenance of buildings, structures, rifle ranges, and facilities."

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has already been fully discussed here, and the effect it will have. If you take part of this program, which can be done under the appropriation bill, and get it all jumbled up, we will finally wind up with no reserve program.

One who has studied this reserve program over the past few years knows we have made great progress. The gentleman from Florida, who today is serving on the Committee on Appropriations, was one of the members who started out to study this reserve program right after the war. We did an excellent job of trying to put them together. I would certainly hate to see a program start out here at the present time. Why in the world the War Department should ask for such a program, after they have already at the suggestion of the Chief of Staff appointed a committee, the Munitions Board, to make a complete and very

expensive survey at the expense of the War Department, I cannot understand. There is $216,000,000 in this bill for construction that can be used. I know how they are going to use it. It is not just the $10,000,000, it is $216,000,000 that can be shifted around. Is that true or is it not true?

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is in error. Ten million dollars is in the bill for armories for the organized reserves and for the others who can use them.

Mr. DURHAM. The total amount is $216,000,000 that can be used for training facilities?

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, that is on page 33, and your amendment does not apply to page 33 at all.

Mr. DURHAM. I understand that very well. In fact, this amendment affects part of the Reserve officers' training program. You have three types of Reserve programs here. You have the Air Corps training Reserve program, Reserve program and National Guard.

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

Mr. DURHAM. I yield.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will just read the provision, he will find that the $216,000,000 is for all activities of the National Guard, for the drill training, for uniforms and summer training, and so on.

Mr. DURHAM. This is for the whole program and not just for the building facilities?

Mr. MAHON. That is right.

Mr. DURHAM. In that case, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

For the procurement, maintenance, and issue, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army to institutions at which one or more units of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps are maintained, of such public animals, means of transportation, supplies, tentage, equipment, and uniforms as he may deem necessary, including cleaning and laundering of uniforms and clothing at camps; and to forage, at the expense of the United States, public animals so issued, and to pay commutation in lieu of uniforms at a rate to be fixed annually by the Secretary of the Army; transporting said animals and other authorized supplies and equipment from place of issue to the several institutions and training camps and return of same to place of issue when necessary; purchase of training manuals, including Government publications and blank forms; for the establishment and maintenance of camps for the further practical instruction of the members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, and for transporting members of such corps to and from such camps or other places designated by the Secretary of the Army, and to subsist them while traveling to and from such camps and while remaining therein so far as appropriations will permit, or, in lieu of transporting them to and from such camps and subsisting them while en route, to pay them travel allowance at the rate of 5 cents per mile for the distance by the shortest usually traveled route from the places from which they are authorized to proceed to the camp and for the return travel thereto, and to pay the return travel pay in advance of the actual performance of the travel, or to pay commutation in lieu of subsistence at camps at rates fixed by the Secretary of the Army; expenses incident to the use, including upkeep costs, of supplies, equipment, and matériel furnished in accordance with law from stocks under the control of the Department of the Army; pay for students attending advanced camps at the rate authorized by law; payment of commutation of subsistence to members of the senior division of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, at a rate not exceeding the cost of the garrison ration prescribed for the Army, as authorized in the act approved June 3, 1916, as amended by the act approved June 4, 1920 (10 U. S. C. 387); medical and hospital treatment of members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps, who suffer personal injury or contract disease in line of duty, and for other expenses in connection therewith, including pay and allowances, subsistence, transportation, and burial expenses, as authorized by the act of June 15, 1936 (10 U. S. C. 455a–d); mileage, traveling expenses, or transportation, for transportation of dependents (including dependents of retired officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the first three grades, and enlisted men of the first three grades of the Regular Army Reserve, ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom), and for packing, crating and unpacking, and transportation of baggage (including baggage of retired officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the first three grades, and enlisted men of the first three grades of the Regular Army Reserve ordered to active duty and upon relief therefrom) for officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men traveling on duty pertaining to or on detail to or relief from duty with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; purchase (not to exceed 30) and hire of passenger motor vehicles; procurement and issue as provided in section 55c of the act approved June 4, 1920 (10 U. S. C. 1180), and in section 1225, Revised Statutes, as amended, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, to schools and colleges, other than those provided for in section 40 of the act above referred to, of such arms, tentage, and equipment, and of ammunition, targets, and target materials, including the transporting of the same, and the overhauling and repair of articles issued as the Secretary of the Army shall deem necessary for proper military training in said schools and colleges; $25,000,000: *Provided*, That uniforms and other equipment or material issued to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps in accordance with law shall be furnished from surplus or excess stocks of the Department of the Army without payment from this appropriation, except for actual expense incurred in the manufacture or issue: *Provided further*, That in no case shall the amount paid from this appropriation for uniforms, equipment, or material furnished to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps from stocks under the control of the Department of the Army be in excess of the price current at the time the issue is made: *Provided further*, That hereafter no appropriation shall be used for the organization or maintenance of a greater number of mounted units in the Reserve Officers' Training Corps than were in existence on January 1, 1928: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated elsewhere in this act, except for printing and binding and pay and allowance of officers and enlisted men, shall be used for expenses in connection with the Reserve Officers' Training Corps.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I thought it would be advisable to take the floor at this time to clear up any misunderstandings as a result of some of the statements which were made on the floor of the House relative to the cost of the building of these reserve armories. I can well understand the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in respect to watching the expenditures in the military organizations. I think he is to be highly complimented for so doing. What he said this afternoon, however, interested me tremendously because he knows that during the past 2 years I happened to be chairman of the subcommittee dealing with building facilities for the Army and Navy, and watched very closely the construction program of the Naval Reserve armories throughout the country.

I appreciate to the fullest degree the underlying purpose behind the program. But I was quite familiar with the cost of these armories; and when the statement was made here this afternoon that in the home city of the gentleman from Wisconsin they constructed a Naval Reserve armory which cost over a million dollars, it interested me tremendously because I knew that the Navy Department, through the Bureau of Yards and Docks, had established a standard type of armory known as the Quonset-hut type, with the proper head house to carry on the administrative work. Now, I know that none of those armories cost over $300,000. I knew it only because I had inquired many, many times over a period of time when the so-called Naval Reserve armories were under construction in the various parts of the country. I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin, himself, elicited a great deal of interest in what the Navy was attempting to do by developing the so-called Naval Reserve program in his home district. He spoke to me about it on a number of occasions. Now, I just want to give the facts that I received from the Bureau of Yards and Docks in order that we might be able to clarify this situation. We all know that in our districts we hear many things being said which are not altogether true or may be partially true, and some of them not a bit true. But in the home town of the gentleman from Wisconsin—Oshkosh—the Navy Department entered into a contract with the so-called Ben B. Ganther Co., located at 78 State Street, Oshkosh, for the construction of a Naval Reserve armory of the Quonset-hut type at a cost of $245,745. The total amount of money available for the project, which included the fitting out and tooling and the equipment of many different kinds, was only $273,718. That included everything. I thought that information would be available for the gentleman so that he might be able to give us, perhaps, the source of his information as to who gave him the million-dollar figure.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. To begin with, the figure that the gentleman has quoted was the correct contract price without any extras that were added which did not include the cost of the Quonsets themselves and the expense of hauling them there to the site. That is number one,

and it was a very substantial amount. Secondly, the expense that you have listed of two-hundred-odd-thousand dollars that went in there for equipment, I was advised by the people and the admiral who came there to dedicate it when I was there, and by the commanding officer himself, that the electronic equipment and all of the machine tools and everything else that was in there would cost over $700,000.

The gentleman asked the source of my information; I got it from the people on the ground, the very best people whom I could approach who seemed to know something about it. The information shows that the total cost of this outfit without any expense for the land, which was given by the city, would run in excess of a million dollars. I do not care what the Bureau of Yards and Docks says.

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

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. I think we all appreciate the interest of the gentleman from Wisconsin, but the facts are that the total cost of the construction job was $245,745; and that is all that the contractor got for the construction of the building and the grading of the grounds.

When we speak about equipment, whether it be electronic equipment or any other kind, we know that all that material is surplus material; we know that the Quonset huts were surplus material; we know that the material and the equipment would deteriorate wherever it may be if we do not make some use of it. Because of its availability it can be incorporated in the over-all naval reserve program and we have brought it together in buildings that were constructed for those purposes. I think the Navy has done a magnificent job in that respect, and for that purpose alone I came here to the floor this afternoon to defend what they have done on an economical basis as well as from the standpoint of the security of this country.

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss to know what difference it makes whether the Naval Reserve armory built in some city of Wisconsin a few years ago cost either the sum of approximately one-half million dollars or a sum in excess of a million dollars. This argument is beside the point in face of our knowledge as to the manner in which the armed forces have splashed funds around, with no remote idea of ever attempting to save one penny for the taxpayers. We all know that our armed forces would fortify the moon if they could get to it and Congress would allow them to do so.

Now, we talk about duplicating armory facilities in various localities of this country—the Naval Reserve groups, the National Guard, and any one of the other Reserve components of our armed forces having duplicating armory facilities that are only used by either of the components 4 or 5 days a month. Of course, unification would make available the same facilities for the various components at a tremendous saving to this Government.

Please do not believe that I am merely a disgruntled enlisted man of the last World War just because I served as an enlisted man, when I say that systematic duplication in all the armed forces is costing us more than double the amount necessary for the defense of this country. There is less democracy in our armed forces than in any other department of our Government, and I venture to say there is less democracy in our armed forces than in the armed forces of our enemies. Why the necessity of duplicating facilities for officers and enlisted men is a question that no man in this House can answer. The officer and enlisted man have separate eating quarters, separate drinking fountains, separate latrines, separate barracks, and separate everything else as though the officers and the enlisted men constituted separate armies. Perhaps the officers might become contaminated if they ate with the enlisted men, and the same might be true with reference to the drinking fountains even though the water spouts straight up out of the fountain, and to use the same latrine might cause the enlisted man not to have the proper respect for the superior rank. Why they should not eat together or at least in the same building is another unanswered question.

These duplicated facilities in every branch of the armed forces cost this Government millions of dollars each year, and this Congress hesitates to advise the big brass to cut out the Boy Scout tactics. Rather than attempt to save money the high-ranking brass of our armed forces had rather knock off little regulations as to where you should park your car and which direction the vehicle should face, and whether the enlisted man can do this, that, or the other. Elimination of these pinhead ideas would afford enough money in this appropriation bill to buy all the airplanes that the Air Force and Navy are now crying for. For some reason the membership of the Congress does not care to talk about the totalitarian tactics existing in our armed forces, which are costing us so much money.

Gentlemen, imagine the cost of separate eating quarters, sleeping quarters, latrines, drinking facilities, recreational halls, and so forth, housed in separate buildings for but the simple purpose of separating officers and enlisted men that can produce no ultimate results other than uncalled for hatred—with the majority of the armed force officers not believing in the simplicity of this archaic system. Then, too, imagine the number of bombers that could be built with the savings of unification.

This Congress does not lack for brains, because there are plenty of smart men here, but it could certainly stand individual courage.

The Clerk read as follows:

Promotion of rifle practice: For construction, equipment and maintenance of rifle ranges, the instruction of citizens in marksmanship; and promotion of practice in the use of rifled arms, for arms, ammunition, targets, and other accessories for target practice, for issue and sale in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and approved by the Secretary of the Army; clerical services, including not exceeding $91,427 in the District of Columbia; procurement of materials, supplies, trophies, prizes, badges, services, and such other items as are authorized in section 113, act of June 3, 1916, and under this head in War Department Appropriation Act of June 7, 1924; conduct of the national matches, including incidental travel of rifle teams and of individuals and of Marine Corps and other detachments required in the operation of the matches and including incidental travel of rifle teams and individuals attending regional, national, and international competitions, and for the purchase of medals and badges for use in National Rifle Association competitions, including those fired as a part of the national matches; mileage at 8 cents per mile for members of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice when authorized by the Secretary of the Army, any provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding; and maintenance of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, including not to exceed $10,500 for incidental expenses in addition to the amount authorized by act of May 28, 1928; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Army; $272,500: *Provided*, That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard and Organized Reserves, who, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, volunteer to participate without pay as competitors or range officers in the national matches to be held during the current fiscal year, may attend such matches without pay, notwithstanding any provision of law to the contrary, but shall be entitled to travel and subsistence allowances at the same rates as are provided for civilians who attend and participate in said matches, but this proviso shall not operate to prohibit the pay of such competitors or range officers, provided funds for such payment are available from this appropriation, nor shall any provision in this act operate to deprive a Reserve officer ordered to active duty incident to the national matches of pay for the full period of such active duty, provided funds for such payment are available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard and Organized Reserves may be ordered to duty, with their consent, for the care, maintenance, and operation of the ranges used in the conduct of the national matches, and such officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men while so engaged shall be entitled to the same pay, subsistence, and transportation as officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of corresponding grades of the Regular Army are entitled by law, which expense shall be provided by the appropriation "Promotion of rifle practice"; and after being duly mustered may be paid for the period from the date of leaving home rendezvous to date of return thereto as determined in advance, both dates inclusive.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: Page 41, line 15, strike out the sum "$272,500" and insert "522,500."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment concerns the National Rifle Board. I feel that the majority of the membership here today have in their communities what is commonly known as the National Rifle Association which is an offspring of the National Rifle Board.

The National Rifle Board was created back in 1903 for the purpose of promoting and aiding our national defense.

In 1916 the National Defense Act when adopted instructed the Secretary of War to encourage rifle practice among our able-bodied citizens, and the program was to be carried on through the National Rifle Board.

The National Rifle Board is composed of 21 members appointed by the Secretary of War from among the Army, Navy, Air Forces, Marine Corps, and the Reserve components of our national defense.

The program for 1950 as set up by the Secretary of National Defense called for the expenditure of a little better than a million dollars. It provided for a program under the jurisdiction or supervision of the National Rifle Board to be carried on among the schools and colleges, senior and junior rifle clubs, and also the promotion of national and international rifle matches.

The cost of maintaining the National Rifle Board is more than taken care of by the tax that our Federal Government receives from the sale of ammunition. It approximates about $12,000,000 annually. Then, also, the Board disposes of obsolete or surplus rifles and the Federal Government receives approximately a million-dollar income annually from the sale of them.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I am delighted the gentleman has offered this amendment. I shall support it and I hope it will carry in the Committee.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I thank the gentleman. The $250,000 we ask for is the minimum the National Rifle Board must have to conduct its program for the fiscal year 1950. In 1937 they were given $645,000; in 1938, $645,000; and again in 1941, $732,000. With the advent of World War II the program was discontinued. Now the National Rifle Board desires to reinstate this program so that encouragement can be given to developing marksmanship and the use of rifles among the younger men and women of the country.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Has the National Rifle Board been continued since its first inception?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct, since 1904.

Mr. DONDERO. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I would like to pay the gentleman this compliment and let the House know that in view of the presentation which he made in respect to the necessity for these funds, I am very sure this committee raised the present budget $112,000.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The Bureau of the Budget requested $160,000 and the committee was kind enough to increase it to $272,500, but we are asking for another $250,000 so that the program can produce real results.

The Department of National Defense actually requested $1,075,000 for the National Rifle Board program for the fiscal year 1950. Then the Bureau of the Budget, speaking for the President, reduced this amount to $160,000, a paltry sum, in view of the needs of this program.

The committee was kind enough to increase the Budget Bureau's figure of $160,000 to $272,500.

If my amendment is adopted the amount of $272,500 will be increased by $250,000 or a total of $522,500.

This program is a part of our national defense effort and I trust that the members of the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that the budget estimate for 1950 called for $160,000 for this program. The committee recommended $272,500, which is an increase of $112,500.

The committee recommended this increase so that that part of the program which deals with rifle practice in schools, the providing of ammunition for rifle practice in secondary schools, can be carried on and so that an additional five civilian employees by the National Rifle Board can be obtained in order to aid in the distribution of the obsolete arms and equipment which the gentleman has discussed. It was the understanding of the subcommittee that this was all the money that is presently needed, unless we are to again inaugurate the Camp Perry type of national rifle ranges. There was some question in the minds of the subcommittee members whether we are ready to go into that type of program; or whether a regional type of match could not more economically be undertaken to take the place of the national matches. The committee is very much in sympathy with this valuable and important work. It definitely wants the work carried on. But the committee does feel from the evidence submitted that the money it has appropriated is adequate for the coming year.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that we are providing hundreds of millions of dollars for ammunition and all sorts of training in our armed forces, and that we are confronted with the possibility of a new tax bill, and that we do not want to provide additional money for those shooting matches and have tax dollars shot away, when they can be used for better purposes?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I would like to point out that the executive vice president of the National Rifle Association of America in writing insists the money provided by the committee is not adequate to carry out the program for fiscal 1950.

Mr. SIKES. I realize that the gentleman may have such a letter, submitted in good faith, but may I point out that the subcommittee heard testimony from many people, and that it was the considered judgment of the subcommittee after hearing all of the testimony that these essential functions, the distribution of the obsolete arms and equipment and the carrying on of rifle practice in the schools, could be continued with the money carried in this bill. In later appropriations we probably shall want to provide for the rifle matches in addition.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. Will the gentleman advise the committee how much of the $112,500 added by the committee is to go to the schools and colleges in terms of the rifle groups?

Mr. SIKES. One hundred thousand dollars. The other $12,500 is to provide for five additional employees to aid in the distribution of obsolete arms and equipment, on which the Government realizes a substantial return.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VINSON. I desire to ascertain from the Chair if it would be in order to dispense with the further reading of the bill and have it open for amendment, if someone from the committe made that request?

The CHAIRMAN. In the opinion of the Chair, the pending amendment should be disposed of first.

Mr. VINSON. Would it be proper to make such a request after the amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would entertain such a request at that time.

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman and ladies and gentlemen of the House, this is the first time as a freshman Congressman that I rise to join in debate of any kind. Yesterday we adopted a bill for the European recovery program calling for the expenditure of over $5,000,000,000. During the debate I seriously considered voting for the reduction of some amount of money. But, as I sat here and listened to the different distinguished Members of this House debate the question, I resolved in my own mind that if I voted for the amount of money that was asked for in the bill I was voting for the best interests of this great country of ours. So, I voted in the affirmative. Today we are being asked to vote for over $15,000,000,000 for the armed forces of the United States. And, what for? Because we are in a program of preparedness. I say that we are not only preparing ourselves, but we are faced with the threat of a war. Why do we not tell the American public, the American people of this great country, that we are preparing for war and that the clouds of war are now threatening us? That is why we are being called

upon to vote for these great amounts of money.

I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We are asked to spend billions of dollars and then we quibble about a mere $250,000 that will prepare our civilians in this preparedness program. That is the reason I stand here today supporting the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania in his amendment for a mere $250,000 so that the civilian program can be carried out and so that the civilians of this great country can be prepared. I sincerely hope that the members of this Committe will support this amendment because I feel that we are being faced with another threat of war, and if we are being faced with another threat of war, let us be prepared right down the line. Let us tell the American people we are threatened by another war. The Atlantic Pact is only a choosing of sides by the nations who are friendly to the United States, and those nations friendly to Russia are choosing their side today. So I plead with you that you support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment do now close.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VAN ZANDT and Mr. TAURIELLO) there were—ayes 43, noes 90.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remaining portion of the bill be considered as read, that points of order be waived, and that the bill be open to amendment at any point.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we should do that. I must ask that the bill be read.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk read as follows:

For new construction and procurement of aircraft and equipment, spare parts and accessories therefor, including expansion of public plants or private plants (not to exceed $500,000), and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants, and for the employment of personnel in the Bureau of Aeronautics necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, to remain available until expended, $523,070,000, of which $418,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $576,546,000.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order with respect to the last three lines of that paragraph—lines 8, 9, and 10, on page 65, as legislation on an appropriation bill. If the total amount specified in the bill is not increased, I shall not insist upon the point of order. If it is increased by amendment, I shall be compelled to insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order should be disposed of before any amendment is considered.

Mr. COUDERT. In that event, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that language.

Mr. Chairman, may I state a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, is it the final decision of the Chairman that I may not reserve the point of order until the amendment is disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that it has not been the practice to reserve points of order and then consider amendments. The Chair will entertain the gentleman's point of order if the gentleman presses it.

Mr. COUDERT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I feel constrained to insist upon the point of order. The reason of course is that the amendment will increase the amount specified in the Presidential budget, the committee not having increased this item. I am sorry I have to insist upon it. My purpose really was to reserve the point of order so that I might make it if the amendment should carry to increase the amount.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from New York indicate to the Chair whether his point of order is addressed only to the language appearing on page 65, lines 8 to 10, after the word "purposes" on line 8, and not including the amount?

Mr. COUDERT. It is directed to the language authorizing contracts by the Navy—the contract authorization provision. I believe that is legislation and not properly in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has made that point clear to the Chair.

Mr. COUDERT. Then, Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands, however, that the amount of the appropriation in line 10 on page 65 is not included in the gentleman's point of order.

Mr. COUDERT. Yes, it is; Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is it or is it not?

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I am making the point of order against the contract authorization. I do not want to insist upon it if the amount is not increased.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that part of the gentleman's statement.

Mr. COUDERT. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I must insist upon the point of order to the entire paragraph, including the amount. In other words, Mr. Chairman, my point of order is to the following language: "and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $576,546,000."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, of course there is authorization by law for the procurement and contracts of procurement of munitions, armaments and airplanes. It seems to me that there is ample justification for the provision contained in this bill. I insist, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is not well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from New York makes the point of order to the language appearing on page 65, line 8, after the word "purposes" down to and including the figure on line 10 on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. The Chair is of the opinion that if in existing law the Secretary of the Navy were authorized to enter into such contracts, this language in the bill would not be necessary; if the Secretary of the Navy is without that power, this language is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: On page 65, line 5, strike out "$523,770,000" and insert "$1,399,616,000."

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment for the purpose of bringing to your attention a very pertinent factor in our national defense program.

The Navy part of the appropriation bill now being considered by this Congress is woefully inadequate in one of its most important features. I refer to the funds for procurement of new aircraft.

At no time since the end of the war have we appropriated for sufficient new aircraft to support our current operating levels. We have been lulled into a false sense of security by maintaining our forces mainly with surplus aircraft left over from the war. Let me impress upon you, gentlemen, that more than 80 percent of the present aircraft of the Navy were procured during or prior to 1945 and are fast approaching the point at which they will no longer be of any military usefulness.

The current appropriation bill for the Navy carries but $687,000,000 with which the Navy can buy only 843 new aircraft. This is about half the aircraft needed to equip our peacetime organization to a reasonable degree of readiness. Deficiencies can be made up in quantity, but not in quality, and then only for the coming year, by using World War II models. It is 2 years from now and later that become most critical since funds appropriated now will provide the aircraft that will be in the fleet 2 years hence.

Deficiencies in numbers of aircraft to be procured are glaringly evident in the fields of those for antisubmarine warfare

and carrier task forces conducting offensive operations in the most forward combat areas. There is an urgent need to correct this situation and the bill now before us must be the start.

The Navy has an urgent requirement, beyond those planes provided for in the bill now before us, to procure 230 additional aircraft of the attack fighter-bomber type and 25 additional aircraft of the patrol 2- and 4-engine type in order to partially improve a most difficult anti-submarine situation. Also, equally urgent is the necessity to procure 152 additional jet fighters in order to permit the carrier-task forces to vigorously and immediately carry an air war to an enemy. Such an early offensive is essential if we are to be strong enough to prevent such catastrophies as the Philippine campaign in 1941 and the seizure of Norway in 1940 by the Germans. Strong carrier-task forces could have prevented both of these fiascos and could have turned utter rout into victory and measurably shortened the global struggle. We now possess the necessary carriers for this assignment in a war of the future, but unless we provide the necessary aircraft, it will be impossible for them to do the job.

The Navy must have a minimum of $300,000,000 additional contract authority now for the procurement of new aircraft. Without this additional authority, we must accept the fact that one of the most important parts of the national air potential, will begin a steady and inescapable decline. No additional cash is required in this bill for this purpose.

What will this $300,000,000 do? It will permit procurement of 1,265 new aircraft instead of 843, an increase of 50 percent. This increase also provides for the armament necessary for the additional planes authorized. All of this increase will be in combat models except for 10 jet trainers. It is important to note that of the 1,265 aircraft that can be purchased, 1,205 will be combat models, fighters, attack, and patrol types. The remaining 60 will be: 5 of the transport type, especially important in view of the Navy participation in Operation Vittles; 20 jet trainers; and 35 helicopters for rescue, observation, and utility services.

As I have indicated before and I want you to note, the planes we provide for in this bill will be the aircraft which will be in the fleet 2 years from now. The United States is fortunate in its unique possession of the aircraft carrier as a weapon of modern warfare. It is only logical that we should exploit to the utmost the great advantage of this potent weapon, combining its effectiveness with the strength of our Air Force in full recognition that the two are mutually complementary.

Mr. Chairman, I can see no reason at this time why the amendment should not be favorably considered by Members of the House.

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

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

Mr. COLE of New York. I want to assure the gentleman his amendment has my wholehearted support, but I should like to ask him the effect of his amendment. Is not the effect of the amendment to restore to the appropriation available to the Navy Department for the procurement of aircraft approximately the amount which the Joint Chiefs of Staff requested and the amount which the Budget Bureau reduced?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The answer to the gentleman is "Yes."

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHESNEY. In what way does this program apply in reference to the unification program which the Eightieth Congress passed last year?

Mr. SHEPPARD. In my opinion, the Eightieth Congress in passing the legislation it did set forth a given air policy. In other words, in the wisdom of the Congress it thought that it was authorizing a military procedure that was essential in the coming conflict if such were possible or if such happened. However, in the legislative attitude as expressed by the Congress, I do not recall any specific portion of the language of the bill that said the so-called coordinated program should be exclusive of one particular type of operation. It is a unified situation.

Mr. CHESNEY. Is it not true that in the last war the Army air force accomplished the same job that the Navy is attempting to do now?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It did not and it never has and anybody who knows the story realizes that is the fact.

Mr. CHESNEY. Did not the Army air force patrol the Caribbean in connection with submarine warfare?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I grant the gentleman that, but it was the Navy who took MacArthur back home.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It may be well to enlighten the membership of the committee as to just what it would mean to replace our present conventional type of aircraft with jets as far as carrier operations are concerned.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It is the difference between the ability to do a job expeditiously and proper under modern scientific conditions with which we will have to contend, or remain an obsolete characteristic. In other words, let us protect the boys who have to fly over the water as well as the boys who fly over land.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It may be well also to explain the advantages of the helicopter from the rescue or life-saving standpoint.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Perhaps I could refer to that with some degree of experience because I was the only Member of Congress who went up in the helicopter when they brought it to Washington a few years ago. I know its adaptability to rescue work. Our Forestry Department is using this type of aircraft for fire patrol. We have also used it up in Alaska for various purposes and when we had the deep snow in the West last winter it was used to drop feed and to take care of the families out there in other ways. It has accomplished a great deal scientifically speaking.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that seven-tenths of the surface of the earth is water? Today the Navy has control of that water, and it can go everywhere in the world unhampered. But this is an air age, and it is just so important for the Navy to have control of the air over the sea as it is to have air control over any other part of the surface of the earth. It is the greatest protection to our freedom that we have. Do not weaken but strengthen our naval aviation. Then this country can maintain our true way of life.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I say to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the Navy is charged with the direct responsibility of keeping the sea lanes open in order that our commerce may continue to flow and be kept operative, and if we are going to charge them with that responsibility, it is no more than fair and just that we should give them that protection.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Will the gentleman state whether or not this amount which has now been advanced by the Joint Chiefs of Staff is not the rock-bottom minimum considered by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and is a cut-down from the original amount that they considered?

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no question in the world about that. In other words, let us get this record straight. Once the Presidential budget is established, then it becomes imperative upon the part of those who have to deal with that budget to fit themselves within the budget and not ask for any more.

Mr. HÉBERT. They are estopped by the Bureau of the Budget from advancing the cost further.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Absolutely so.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANNON as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SHEPPARD: Page 65, line 5, strike out "$523,070,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$1,099,616,000."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to restore to the bill the amount eliminated by the point of order. It reinstates the amount stricken out by the point of order.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment and the substitute close at 5 o'clock, with the last 15 minutes to be reserved for the members of the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California. It seems to me we must maintain a balanced program, and when I favor that point of view I am for a truly balanced program for all elements of air power.

Air power as we know it has two component parts in our Military Establishment. We have the Air Force, which has done in the past and, I am sure, will continue in the future to do an outstanding job. However, we must remember the Navy air arm has a different function than that performed by the Air Force.

It so happens that I had some experience during the last war on active duty with the third and fifth fleets in the Pacific. I can assure each and every one of you in this body that most of the job that was done by the Navy Air Corps then, and I think in the future, cannot be done by the Air Force. The Air Force with its land-based planes can and will perform important functions, but the ship-based planes must be available for the special jobs they will be called upon to perform.

I was interested in the statement made earlier in the afternoon by my colleague from South Dakota in which he quoted General LeMay as saying that the B-29 gave protection to our Pacific carrier task groups. With all due deference to the statement made by General LeMay, I cannot under any circumstances see how a group of B-29's could protect a task group of carriers or any group of Navy ships. It is just not practicable. The only way you can protect carriers is by fighter escort and torpedo bombers, the F-6's and the TBM's, or other comparable planes. For B-29's to protect carriers is absolutely absurd.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is possible the B-29 could have been given a target to keep enemy planes grounded while the operation from the carrier was being conducted.

Mr. FORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely correct. They may have had a mission to cover the airfields and keep the planes from taking off, but for B-29's to stay at 30,000 feet and in that way give protection to a group of carriers is, I repeat, absolutely absurd.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I did not intend to say that it was a practical thing. I was only pointing out that it was a rather impractical thing to tie up some B-29's to drop 2,000 tons of bombs on a secondary target so that our Navy planes could drop 600 on a primary target. It would have been much more practical, it seems to me, to let the B-29's go on to the primary target.

Mr. FORD. I agree with that statement.

In the operation of carriers off the coast of Japan, off the coast of the Philippines, and off the coast of Okinawa our bombing planes got ample protection from the carrier fighter planes. Carrier bombing planes got very little protection from the Air Force escorting planes while operating in the Pacific.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. It was impossible for the Air Force to afford coverage either at Okinawa or at Leyte. The Navy had to furnish their own coverage, the gentleman knows that.

Mr. FORD. I certainly do.

Mr. RIVERS. It was not possible for the Air Force to do that.

Mr. FORD. The Air Force did not have the bases or the planes and the Air Force in the future in such operations would be similarly handicapped.

Mr. RIVERS. There was no way for them to do it.

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

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I should like to endorse the statement the gentleman has just made, for I, too, had the privilege of serving in the Naval Air Corps; and I might observe that the Navy air arm did 75 percent of the work in the Pacific.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, may I make this plain at the beginning. The amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] restores the $576,000,000 that was stricken out by the point of order made by the gentleman from New York and adds thereto $300,000,000 to keep the Navy in the air business and not abolish naval aviation. The sum and substance of this amendment is to retain to the Navy the naval aviation.

We have signed the Atlantic Pact. If we do not give the Navy $300,000,000 for naval aviation and research, we will have signed the death warrant of naval aviation, make no mistake about that.

I think there is enough glory in the United States and in the world for all of our services to get along in absolute harmony. There is plenty of glory for the Air Force, for the Army, and for the Navy in their primary and allocated missions. I was terribly disturbed a little while ago when the chairman of this great Committee on Appropriations made some statements on the floor which I trust and fervently pray he will correct, because they are without foundation in fact. He made the statement, and I hope he will correct it, that the Navy did not have planes which could fly over 500 miles. I tell you—and I know whereof I speak—that we have planes that can fly 2,500 miles and return; and we have planes that can do even better than that.

In addition I state as a fact that they can carry atomic bombs. I state as another fact that they can return to carriers. To get up on the floor and make a statement of that kind is doing a disservice to the great record of the Navy and belying the things that the Navy can do, things that no other branch of the service dare attempt to do. Say, for instance, that we did not have carrier-based planes. What I am about to say is in all deference to the Air Force. I want you to remember that the Navy and the Air Force are getting along all right. We are going to give $800,000,000 to the Air Force because they are entitled to it, but it does not follow that the Navy is not entitled to their glory, which they have earned. Say, for instance, that we do not have carriers to patrol the coast of Europe when that war with Russia comes—which I hope is long delayed. Our carrier-based planes will keep the forces of the enemy strewn all over Europe, because they will not know where the carrier-based planes are going to strike. But land-based planes will be attacked, because they will know where they are coming from. The chairman of the committee said another thing. He said that we have to win the war in 3 weeks. If we do not win the war in 3 weeks, take it from me that there will be no bases in continental Europe, because the Russian Army can kick any army off of continental Europe in 6 weeks. I know. London and Great Britain will be a shambles. If you do not have carried-based planes, you will not carry on, and your Navy will have been wiped out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, it is really a pity that we hear on the floor of the House today talk apparently from those who are experts in the field of aviation—both Army and Naval Air. But I want to speak a word for that branch of the service, namely, Naval Air only because for a period of 10 years I served on the Committee on Naval Affairs up to the time of the consolidation of the Military Affairs Committee with the Committee on Naval Affairs 2 years ago. Down through the period of years we followed with a great deal of interest the magnificent job, not only that the Navy as a whole has done, but the naval air arm in those most dangerous days in the Pacific area when they had so little and so few things to fight with; in those days when they were using torpedo boats as destroyers. They were making the best of the situation that they were dealing with. Only a brief word can be said about this amendment to put it clearly before the Members of the House, and that is whether or not we want to maintain the efficiency of the authorized strength of the air arm of the Navy or whether, because we refuse by the adoption of this amendment offered by the gentleman from California, to provide enough planes to maintain the naval air arm on an efficient basis. If this amendment is defeated, I say to you men and women, Members of the House, that in relatively few years, because of the lack of replacements in the Navy program, the efficiency of the naval air arm will be cut just in half. That is the thought we want to keep in mind as we vote today on this amendment, which I am wholeheartedly in favor of. We must also keep in mind that 80 percent of the planes the Navy now has were purchased in 1945 or in the years before. It is important, it seems to me, in this unsettled world we are now living in, that we maintain the efficiency of the armed

forces in a balanced status. This amendment was recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Many other things have been cut out by the Bureau of the Budget down through the years, but in this case I am referring to the needs of the air arm for the Navy and trust the amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I just stated to my very dear friend, the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services that we have the best illustration of the integration of the armed services when the chairman of that committee moved his forces in here on the floor this afternoon to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

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

Mr. KEEFE. I cannot yield.

Mr. Chairman, I find I am somewhat confused, as are some of the other Members of Congress, in knowing just what is the right thing to do. There is not a man or woman in this House who does not want to do the thing to provide for the security of the Nation and to give the funds that are necessary to implement it. The Appropriations Subcommittee lists some very distinguished men among its membership. They have heard this testimony over a period of weeks and they have given careful thought to the problems involved. If the amendment of the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], be adopted, if you grant the entire budget estimate for this item, you will still fall far short of what was requested. We are told that the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended $343,000,000 more than the Bureau of the Budget has recommended. The fact of the matter is, as I read the hearings, that the Joint Chiefs of Staff came up with a program which asked for $30,000,000,000 to put this country on a war footing right now. That was then scaled down to $23,000,000,000; and after meeting, after meeting, after meeting, they finally scaled their requests down and came to agreement under the President's prodding and pressure, and the over-all ceiling established at the amounts that are submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. If you give this $343,000,000 you are not coming anywhere near the amount of money that the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended to the Bureau of the Budget.

Whom are we going to believe in this matter; that is the thing that bothers me. Pick up the hearings and look at the first page. There is the testimony of Secretary Sullivan. He represents the Navy; he is supposed to speak for the Navy, and this is what he says:

> Though the total proposed appropriations for the Navy are $600,000,000 less than the naval appropriations for the current fiscal year, the Navy accepts and completely supports President Truman's budget.

I understand thoroughly that he is an appointee of the President, he is the Cabinet officer; and I understand that he is not permitted to come out and support anything other than the Bureau of the Budget estimate. As a member of the Committee on Appropriations I thoroughly understand that, but if the situation were in reality $343,000,000 as the absolute minimum, why are you asking for $300,000,000? Why not $343,000,000? Why have you again scaled it down by $43,000,000? I think you ought to support the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations that has given this thing very great study.

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

The gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] is recognized.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, as I tried to explain a few moments ago, the appropriations for cash and contract authorizations for the procurement of aircraft for both the Air Force and the Navy have been reduced approximately to 80 percent of what these services originally thought was necessary to build themselves to the proper strength necessary, not to win a war, but to prevent the losing of a war at the very outset of hostilities. I have no disagreement with the desire of the gentleman from Georgia, and the gentleman from California, my beloved colleagues, to put the Navy on a par with what it ought to be in accordance with plan B that was submitted to the Congressional Aviation Policy Board; but at the same time I think that if they take that position they must logically also take the position of increasing the Air Force appropriations for the procurement of aircraft by the 20 percent which they have been cut; otherwise, their position is not logical.

I should like also to call to the attention of my colleagues one very important fact: As we know from reading the press, General Eisenhower is down in Key West right now, delegated to go there by the Secretary of Defense to attempt to obtain some kind of agreement between the Joint Chiefs of Staff as to exactly what will be the roles and missions of the various components of the armed forces. We called attention to that conflict among the Joint Chiefs last year in the Eightieth Congress in the Congressional Aviation Policy Board's report. Full agreement has not yet been accomplished. As matters stand today, evidently they have been given a specific sum from the Bureau of the Budget which said: "Whack it up, boys; divide it three ways, and each one of you do what you think you can with it." The Committee on Appropriations has done differently; they have attempted to obtain full justification for these programs and to bring here a bill which is fair to all concerned; and I think it does a better job of defending the United States from the appropriation standpoint than has been done by the Bureau of the Budget. I compliment the committee for the bill they have brought in. At the same time I call the attention of my friend from Georgia to the fact that if he is going to be consistent he must also support a further increase in the budget for the Air Force, because he himself says that, under the present bill, to arrive at the 70-group air force will take 2 years longer under the appropriations included in the present budget than he and I both think should be the outside limit in time. I would like to ask the gentleman from Georgia if that is not true?

Mr. VINSON. As a matter of fact, with the $800,000,000 made available now, it will be 1954 before we will have a 70-air group.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is correct, and the target date which has been given to all of us for the setting up of our Air Force and our Naval Air arm, our entire Military Establishment, is 1952.

Mr. VINSON. That is correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. And not 1954.

Mr. VINSON. That is exactly right.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COFFEY].

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate that has been going on here for 2 days, mainly concerned with an increase in Air Force appropriations over those of the Navy and Army. I am in wholehearted agreement with the committee; therefore, I find that the reoccurrence of the Maginot Line type of thinking in this House is somewhat alarming.

Now, it is to be expected that the Navy and Army "brass" would feel that way. The Navy, in particular, having been the first line of defense for 150 years, refuses to admit that they no longer have the answer to the defense problem. The admirals are putting up a gallant fight; they spare no effort each week end. They sacrifice themselves and their crew members in order to take a luxury cruise on the *Franklin D. Roosevelt* to prove its value to the visiting Congressmen. They are die-hards, but they are surely dying, and they will possibly go down with the supercarrier.

Of course, there is a lot of basis to many of their arguments. The Navy having its own army—the Marine Corps—and its own air force does a very efficient job; however, by the same token, the Army would perhaps be better pleased and perhaps a little more efficient if they had their own air force and their own navy. I am sure that the Air Force would be positively delighted to have its own air-borne army, and the marines are peculiarly adapted to this role, and also its own navy. Everyone would be much happier, but, unfortunately, we just cannot afford it.

We will, very shortly, pass a record peacetime budget. This is necessary, but we cannot continue along this road much further. We have just about reached our saturation point.

The United States is the greatest stabilizing force in the world only as long as it remains economically healthy. We cannot, therefore, under present conditions, with our present commitments abroad spend more than sixteen billions on the national defense. This is insufficient to prepare for war. Indeed, yesterday, the gentleman from Texas stated it would require almost four times this amount to put us into readiness for war, and most all of the Members know the terrible cost of war, if it should come.

Therefore, I submit to you that we are approaching this matter from the wrong direction. Since we are unable to afford

war preparation, we must utilize this sum to the greatest possible advantage. Now, it is not our wish to prepare for war. It is our wish to prevent war. How can we do that? Their answer is simple. We are manifestly unable to match Russia on the ground, for every division we can arm in Europe, they can place in opposition one army. They are not afraid of our Navy. They have no Navy except for the Snorkel submarine. They do not require one. They are content to wait until our great fleets approach and then wipe them from the oceans by air power. There is only one way we can touch Russia and that is by air power. Therefore, if our wish is to prevent and not to fight war let us invest the major part of our limited funds in the only weapon for which Russia has fear.

I do not believe this is a new strategic concept. It is known that air power has been cried from the roof tops for years, but I do think the Members of this great body should accept the facts of life and face reality.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the Committee will defeat the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, let the Committee clearly understand the issue. Under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from California, it means that we would have 1,265 modern, up-to-date planes. Under the amendment proposed by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], it means that you will only have 843 planes. Now, that is the issue.

The committee said that the Navy should have 7,783 active planes in commission; but, on the other hand, it said the Navy can only build annually 843. You cannot have 7,783 active planes if you are only permitted to build or purchase annually 843 planes. So, to carry out the mandate of the committee to have 7,783 planes, it is necessary to increase the yearly contract authorization or the yearly purchases of new aircraft. So the gentleman from California is trying to be consistent, as are other members of the subcommittee when he says, "We accept the figure of 7,783." But, you must build more than 843. You must build at least 422 more, which would be 1,265. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] said that when the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended 1,361 planes it was based upon a budget of $23,000,000,000. He is absolutely in error. It was based upon a budget of $17,500,000,000, which the Secretary of National Defense sent to the Bureau of the Budget. The Joint Chiefs of Staff said that you must have 1,361 planes annually to maintain 7,783 planes. Now, that is the whole issue. You cannot figure is out any other way. Because a plane is only good for 6 years, the present total of 843 planes is wholly inadequate.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support this amendment because I think the obligations of this country have been spread so far that the best thing we can do is to protect our own interest. I think this is a very effective way to do it.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. Does the gentleman have reference to the Sheppard amendment?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman make that plain, again.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think you all understand my position on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, with this bill, and the one that has been reported and will come up tomorrow, the Congress will have increased the amount of funds available to departments between four and five billion dollars above what they had for the current fiscal year. On the 18th of May last the Congress passed a bill appropriating $588,000,000 for the construction of airplanes for the Navy. With that they were able to let contracts for 1,223. Now with $643,000,000 they are talking about only 843. It just does not make sense.

What the Navy needs is carriers of the smaller variety that are equipped with moderate-sized planes that can cruise around within a radius of 500 miles, or so, and look out for these Snorkel submarines. That is their job in the airplane field. With the money that is here provided they are set up to have 15 groups of planes of 100 each and 4 smaller ones this year. Next year they are expected to reduce from 15 to 14 the number of the large groups and to increase the number of the smaller groups from 4 to 8. They will have 1,071 coming in on the contracts that have already been let, and if they are given this money they will have that many the following year. There is no point in our going ahead beyond these figures. We will have provided what the Navy needs. The Navy already has over 10,000 planes; really, it has 14,000, and the Army probably 20,000, but the Navy has enough good planes so that it can continue to operate for quite some time. If we go ahead now and build a lot of new planes, they will be half obsolete, and instead of taking care of the situation and having the most modern planes if anything should happen, and when the planes that we have in storage are worn out, we will just not be as well off as we would be if we postponed some of this construction until a little later.

We have plenty now to take care of whatever situation might arise. We have planes in the Air Force, where they are building and developing the large planes. There is no sense in our going ahead and building more of the Navy planes at this time, these small planes that they need. We should try to conserve some of our money.

If we adopt the amendment that has been offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] it will add $300,000,000 to the appropriation, and instead of being $4,000,000,000 above last year it will be nearly $5,000,000,000. We ought not to get into that kind of a proposition. If we get into any more increases, we are going to be in a situation where we cannot avoid a tax bill. It seems to me that our people do not want to be voting here in this Congress for more appropriations and then get in the position where we vote against a tax bill. We are going to have to have a tax bill that will take 40 to 45 percent of the disposable income of the people if we go on with the spending programs that have been proposed. We must begin to think about that and conserve our energy and conserve our materials so that we will have something to fight with if we have trouble. It seems to me we should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and not go above the committee report.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE].

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is most unusual for me ever to take the floor in support of a proposal providing for the expenditure of larger amounts of money, and I would not do so at this time if it were not that I felt so sincerely that this amendment should be adopted that I cannot remain silent. As I see it, the committe action indicates a trend which, if carried out, in the near future will spell the end of Navy aviation. I doubt very seriously that any Member of this Congress would deliberately and consciously vote to dismantle and scrap our naval forces, but most certainly if we adopt a policy, even though for the moment it may be indicating a trend, which will deny to the Navy the use of the air in the performance of its naval mission, then we might just as well take from the seas every single combat vessel we own, because without the full and unrestricted use of the air by the Navy in the performance of its missions it might better never undertake the missions at all.

It is difficult for me to understand upon what basis of justification this committee can increase the amounts allocated to the Air Force by $800,000,000 beyond the amount the budget allowed the Air Force for the procurement of aviation and yet, at the same time, say to the Navy that they should have no increase.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while he and I have listened here this afternoon to budget, budget, budget, that particular part of the budget was never considered downtown. It came in up here.

Mr. COLE of New York. It should be borne in mind that this committee has

recommended for procurement by the Air Force $800,000,000 worth of airplanes beyond what the budget recommended. It is my own personal notion that while the committee did quite right in reducing the $800,000,000 which had been set up for universal military training and setting it up for procurement of aircraft, the $800,000,000 should have been distributed in some appropriate fashion between the Air Force and naval aviation, so that both services could take advantage of that amount of money in procurement of aircraft.

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

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. I am happy that the gentleman from New York, one of the ablest and hardest working members of our Committee on Armed Services, has issued this solemn warning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania served with great distinction both in World War I and in World War II. He served in the Navy in the last conflict, in the Pacific. Is it not a fact that not one single aircraft carrier of any country in World War II was sunk by land-based planes?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. SHORT. Is it not also a fact that no carrier of the Essex type was sunk by any form of attack?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. SHORT. Yet some people think that naval aviation is outmoded. It contributed more to our victory in the Pacific than any other one thing.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Without it we probably would have lost the war in the Pacific.

Mr. SHORT. I hope the gentlemen have not forgotten the Battle of Midway.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call to the attention of the Committee that the majority of the members of the House Committee on Armed Services are supporting the Sheppard amendment. Let me remind you the Committee on Armed Services is composed of men who have served on the old Committee on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs of the House for many years. In addition there are several freshmen, like myself, who have had military service, who serve on the committee. Over a period of years the committee has been constantly briefed on world conditions. We have been told by spokesmen for our military services what we need to give to the American people the security to which they are entitled. With this knowledge the majority of the members of the Committee on Armed Services today support the Sheppard amendment.

We all know that each branch of our Armed Services has been given a mission. We know that the Chief of Staff of each branch of our Armed Services is charged with the responsibility of keeping his force in a state of readiness to carry out that mission. Therefore the Navy is simply asking the Congress of the United States for planes—replacements is what it amounts to—so that the Navy, including its naval air arm will be in a state of readiness to fulfill its assigned mission.

A moment ago I mentioned replacements. I would like to address myself at this time to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], and ask him this question: Is it not true that the planes to be provided by the additional $300,000,000, which your amendment provides for, will simply provide modern planes to replace those that will become obsolete in a matter of several years?

Mr. SHEPPARD. It will provide modern combat types of planes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I qualify my answer by saying, of course, with the exception of helicopters. My answer to the gentleman's question is that my amendment will provide planes to replace all combat type planes with the exception of helicopters.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the Navy carrier groups are being modernized and that the conventional type of airplane is being laid aside, and the jet type is taking its place.

Mr. SHEPPARD. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Unless we have a flow of modern aircraft into the Navy, we will not be able to keep the naval air groups modernized.

Mr. SHEPPARD. There is no question about it. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In regard to the helicopter, is it not a necessary part of carrier operations, and used effectively for lifesaving purposes?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The testimony was to the effect that it is absolutely necessary for lifesaving purposes, not only in carrier work, but in other ramifications of the same type of work.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I do hope that the committee will accept the Sheppard amendment so that our armed forces will be kept at the degree of readiness necessary to carry out the mission assigned them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I am not disposed to delay the committee longer, but I do want it understood that so far as I am concerned, this is not a question of measuring dollars with one breach of our military service as against another branch. I have no such intention. I do not want anyone to misconstrue my approach to the problem in such a fashion. I say to you that the Navy's air arm is rapidly becoming obsolescent. If you charge them with the duties of protecting our operations on the high seas, then you should obviously give them air protection upon the same basis as you would any other branch of our military service. I can see no other approach to this problem except on that basis. I am sure of that, because I have made it my business on many vacations, instead of going home, to visit the military installations throughout the United States and elsewhere. I think I am reasonably conversant with what is going on, so far as obsolescence in the naval air branch is concerned. I say to you that if we are going to respond to our obligation, if we charge the Navy with keeping the sea lanes open, and if we charge the Navy with fighting the pigboats and the submarines, which have already reached a greater degree of numbers than in this country, then in the name of decency let us give the air protection to which the Navy is entitled.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. Is it not true that the aircraft carrier, as far as the Navy task forces have been concerned in the last war, and in the present disposition, is the center of the task force? It is the heart, and unless you have it adequately protected you will have the same thing we had in the last war when carriers without adequate radar and zonar went out but never returned; instances when men went out in planes and never returned, but had they had adequate equipment we would have had a much better striking force; but they did a lot with what they had.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think the gentleman's experience merits careful attention; he speaks with far greater experience than I, for he was in combat and I was not.

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

Mr. SHEPPARD. I yield.

Mr. CHESNEY. Does the gentleman believe that the carrier will win the next war in time of battle?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Certainly I do not; I would be stupid if I believed that, just as anybody else would be stupid to believe that air alone could win the next war; it takes a combination of the three services to make a success.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I voted for the 500 airplanes before the Second World War; I have never regretted it. I have been very much shocked and rather terrified at the effort that it seems to me is being made to scrap and weaken naval air. I certainly will vote for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I merely wish to make the observation as one who participated in the island-hopping operations in the Pacific in common with a great many other Members of the House that we could not possibly have done the job, we could not have obtained the bases that were so vital to us if we had not had the close air support that was given at that time by tactical aircraft from the aircraft carriers.

I gather that this amendment does not deal with strategic air, but that it deals with the air power which is actually necessary in close support of combat

troops going ashore. I feel very deeply about the matter from personal experience. It was not because the Army did not want to support us, it was only because they did not have the available bases from which to launch the close-up support needed by the ground troops.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Seven-tenths of the surface of the earth is covered by the sea. At the present time our Navy has control of these vast ocean areas. Since this is the age of air power, our Navy must possess completely adequate air equipment to insure the continuance of its controls over these sea areas of the world. Naval air power is every bit as important as land air power. Remember this: Throughout history, both ancient and modern, that nation which controlled the sea was the leading nation in the world, and no nation who has failed to control the sea ever became great.

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. LATHAM. I hope that this amendment is adopted. I think it is tremendously important to the security of this country that it be adopted. I would remind you that in one specific island campaign, just one, 7,000 Japanese planes were shot down, and of those 7,000 planes, 4,155 were shot down by the naval air arm. I believe that were we to permit either the decline or the demise of the naval air arm, we would be removing and destroying the single most important force that we have in this country today for the protection of your family and mine, and of your country and mine.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Is it not a fact that unless we approve this amendment that the air strength of the United States Navy in relatively few years will be cut in half?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That would seem to be in the cards.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. That is why the Joint Chiefs of Staff recommended the additional appropriation.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is so.

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

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COLE of New York. As a matter of fact, naval aviation will not be cut in half; it will be cut one-third of what the Congress a year ago directed and authorized; naval aviation will be cut one-third instead of one-half.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Yes; and with this momentous bill before us it is incredible that that be done.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. FULTON. May I comment that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LATHAM] and the gentleman from California [Mr. JACKSON] are certainly in position to know that naval air strength is vitally needed, from their combat experience in the past war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has expired.

The gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] is recognized.

Mr. SIKES. The Committee has been told repeatedly, and I say it again, today we seek only to keep from crippling naval aviation in the coming years; we are not asking for more personnel; we are not asking for more ships; we are asking only for the planes that we know are going to be needed. We are asking for 1,265 additional planes, almost altogether of combat type, the newest improved combat planes, instead of the 843 which are now provided under the bill.

Why do we need more planes? Because aircraft burn out fast. Let us take a look at the figures of planes on hand. The current inventory is 14,000 naval planes, currently operating 7,765, but in 1955, if we do not vote for the Sheppard amendment, there will be in the Navy inventory only 4,121 planes and operating only 2,984 planes. Whereas if you vote for the Sheppard amendment, there will be in 1955, 5,660 planes in the inventory and 4,141 planes operating.

There are 22 groups of naval air in addition to trainers and other type planes. The Navy's part of the defense requires more planes in the coming years than will be available under the bill. In other words, the Navy cannot properly carry on its part of the job if it is not allowed to build up its incoming stock of new planes faster than the current bill will permit. Why? Because of the fact that planes do burn out fast. Obsolescence is a very important factor. Attrition constantly eats away planes. There is only an average life of 6 years for a plane from the time it is made until it is outdated or worn out or wrecked. Even planes in mothballs will not last indefinitely.

We have talked here about the functions of the Navy. Let me reiterate very briefly some of the things that naval air is called on to do in its job of helping to defend the peace and to protect this Nation against emergencies.

We pointed out what naval air can do. A carrier-based plane has recently flown from one coast to the other coast and all the way back to the carrier from whence it started. We pointed out that carrier-based Navy planes today carry the heaviest bomb load of any fighter planes in the world. We pointed out that Jimmy Doolittle struck the first blow on the Japanese homeland when he took off from carriers with bombers and though he did not go back to those carriers the Navy now has heavier planes, larger planes, which every day take off from carriers and return to those carriers.

Yes, the Navy is doing a job. It has a historic function to perform in carrying on antisubmarine and mine warfare. We have not touched very much today on this. Yet may I remind you that in the beginning of World War II Hitler had only about 50 submarines. He implemented that number very rapidly, but at the beginning he only had about 50 submarines and with them he very nearly drove shipping from the seas. Naval air has an equally important part in mine warfare and countermine measures. Each of these functions appears slated to occupy a much more important place in our own defense in future warfare than heretofore.

The Navy will need all the planes which the Sheppard amendment would permit. This is a proposal of much importance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am rather surprised to hear so many friends of the Navy accuse our subcommittee of scuttling and sinking the Navy. If the Navy is being scuttled and sunk with its air force, it will take down to Davy Jones' locker $5,018,873,600 of appropriations provided for in this bill. If the Navy is not getting an adequate number of planes with that money, it is because they are spending the money for super carriers and other weapons than airplanes. When they presented their estimates these planes did not become important, but the super carriers were. It is only when they saw a chance of getting $300,000,000 more that these planes became so important.

Let us see what the story is here. We started out with a $30,000,000,000 request from the various bureaus and divisions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The amount of $23,000,000,000 was submitted to the Chiefs of Staff. The Chiefs of Staff sent to the President $16,900,000,000, and finally, when it got down to the budget, they asked for $14,400,000,000.

The President sent this budget back to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for further reduction. He sent it back because it still was too high "in view of the military needs and the economic aspects of our national defense and our economic and financial resources."

Then they came back up with another budget for $14,497,000,000. That was sent back down again by the President with a ceiling which was apportioned by the Army, the Navy and the Air Corps. The Navy share in cash and contract authorizations was $5,000,000,000 and the Navy determined how much of that $5,000,000,000 was to go to air, how much for ships and how this sum was to be spent. If they are short of airplanes in this bill it is because they themselves, Mr. Chairman, did not put them in.

In the budget of $14,997,000,000 the Army finally received $4,434,000,000. They were cut $476,000,000. Nobody talks about raising that. Then the Navy was given $4,624,000,000 cash plus contract authorizations, and they were reduced to $4,347,000,000 cash, plus the contract authorization, a reduction of $271,000,000. That is the budget Secretary Sullivan said he supported. The Air Force was reduced accordingly. The reason this committee put in that $800,000,000 for the Air Force was because the House itself had taken it out of the committee's hands last year and increased the

Air Force. That was a mandate of this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Navy will have 1,071 planes delivered in 1951 out of the 1948 appropriation. They will have an additional 993 more which will be delivered in 1951 and 1952 out of 1949 and 1950 funds. That is over 2,000 planes for the 2-year period.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we ought to stand by the amount fixed by the President as allocated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that the substitute motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] was offered by the gentleman at my request in order that I might, under the parliamentary procedure, have the privilege of closing the debate on the question before the House. I had prepared the motion and would have offered it myself except for that situation.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the shortness of the time which I have I should like not to yield for any questions, and in view of that fact I shall be very careful to quote the record straight.

This committee has worked hard on this bill, about 7 hours per day for 11 weeks, and I want you to know I appreciate the fine support which you have given us in declining even to accept one amendment. But this is the major contest of the day, and it is tremendously important.

I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been a little bit disappointed that some people have been looking backward to the bases in the Pacific. Does anybody in the House think we are about to give up those bases where American boys fought, bled, and died? No. We have funds in the bill to make our continued possession of those bases a reality, and I want the American people to know that their sons will not have to die again for the conquest of Guam and Saipan and those other bases that Members have made reference to. We already have those bases, and we do not propose to give them up.

Now, as to the bases in the Atlantic, we have two B-29 groups stationed in England that roam the skies in that part of the world, and the evidence is pretty good that the British do not intend to give up those bases in time of emergency or war. They are a tenacious people. Let us look forward in our consideration.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made that we are running counter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has been made so often that I am afraid some of you will take it seriously. We are not running counter to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In the Cannon amendment we are doing exactly what the Joint Chiefs of Staff say. In other words, the President said, "Gentlemen of the Military Establishment, you can have about $15,000,000,000; that is all we can spend, because there is about $8,000,000,000 more that we are going to spend on national defense in other undertakings, such as atomic energy, and so forth."

So, the Joint Chiefs of Staff sat down and they agreed on the budget, and this budget is the budget of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under the ceiling established by the President, so please do not be misled by suggestions to the contrary.

Moreover, one of my distinguished friends said, "It looks as if we are going to dismantle and scrap the Navy." If the Navy is so poorly operated that it cannot on $5,000,000,000 run a pretty decent establishment, there is something radically wrong with the Navy. Five billion dollars is more than we gave the Navy last year, with more for aviation than we provided last year, and people shout, "They are going to scrap the Navy." Oh, but they say, "Yes, but you are going to scrap the air force of the Navy." The Navy was told by the President and by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Mr. Navy, you have about $5,000,000,000. Now, you spend it as you think you would like to spend it, Mr. Navy." And Mr. Navy said, "I am going to spend it this way." So it was the Navy that decided on the 800 planes to add to the 14,000 planes they already have. Scrap the Navy? What strange words, in view of the cold facts in this situation.

If the Navy had wanted to say as to this supercarrier, which was never actually approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and is going to cost about $200,000,000, "We will not lay the keel next week on that, we want to buy some more planes with that money," they could have done it.

I do not know of a Navy man in or out of Washington who will say that in the event of another war the battleship will be used to fire a single shot—a single shot—yet the Navy is spending huge sums to operate the battleship *Missouri*. Who made that decision? The Navy. Yet the battleship serves as a training ship and is of service in this respect. If the Navy desired to utilize the $5,000,000,000 in a different type program it could have planned to do so. Everybody agrees that $5,000,000,000 is enough for the Navy. Why did not the Navy change its plans and present a program that is adequate and that we can support? I say, for my money, $5,000,000,000 is enough for the Navy, as $6,000,000,000 is for the Air Force and $4,400,000,000 for the Army, under all the circumstances. Frankly, I think the Navy has a fairly good program. Under the plans the Navy will remain strong in the air and otherwise.

Let me get this point over to you. This amendment is for the buying of planes. Here I have a statement from the Navy as to what will be needed to put into operation this amendment. It shows that additional military and civilian personnel will be required. It seems to me the present 360,000 civilian employees which the Navy has is adequate.

I do not see why we should fail to remember that this is the biggest peacetime military bill in history, $2,000,000,000 above what it was last year. Have we not gone far enough? The taxpayers who are going to have to pay additional taxes if the sums in this bill are increased above the committee recommendations will be disposed to agree that $5,000,000,000 is enough for the Navy. If that means scrapping the Navy, heaven help the Navy.

The Navy has an important part to play. It is to command the seas, the surface of the seas and beneath the surface of the seas. The Navy has the problem of ships. The Air Force has the primary problem of the air, according to the decision of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at Key West. Wherever possible the Air Force will help the Navy on the water and the Navy will help the Air Force in the air, but primarily the air is for the United States Air Force.

Let us not look back. If war breaks out tomorrow, we have a pretty good guess with whom it will be. We know that the reason it has not already broken out is perhaps the fact that we have the atomic bomb and we have the planes to carry the bomb to the interior of those faraway places, to the population and industrial centers of the potential enemy. The greatest deterrent to a potential enemy today is the United States Air Force.

Our Navy is incomparable. We are not threatened as far as the Navy is concerned. What navy can meet us on the seas? None whatever. That is not where our weakness lies. The possibility of weakness is in the air. That is where the threat of 15,000 planes belonging to the possible potential enemy might give us trouble. Let us fight for those things that help us where we most need help. If war comes the decisive operations will be in the air.

That is the reason why we kicked the budget overboard and used our own judgment in providing additional funds for the United States Air Force. But please let us not try to divide the defense dollar into three equal parts. You should have seen General Eisenhower smile when he made reference to the strange coincidence of each service requesting approximately the same number of dollars. You know it is not right. We cannot be all things to all people. We have to do our duty and stand forthright. We are not the servants of the Army and Navy and the Air Force. We are the servants of the American people. Likewise, the services, too, are the servants of the American people. I plead with you to defeat the amendment and stand fast for the bill as written.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendments read again for the information of the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] and the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] will be read.

There was no objection.

The amendments were again read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHEPPARD) there were—ayes 125, noes 63.

So the substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, would a unanimous consent request be in order at this time to restore the language stricken out on the point of order at page 65?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the pending amendment should be disposed of first.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, as amended by the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For personal services at the seat of Government for the Marine Corps, $3,505,000.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the subcommittee, permit a question?

Mr. MAHON. Yes; I shall be glad to.

Mr. FLOOD. Can the chairman assure us that there is nothing in the appropriation bill with reference to the Marine Corps that will in any way endanger the existence of the Corps in its traditional entity in the armed forces?

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing whatever in the bill which would in any way endanger the Marine Corps; the Marine Corps has received the kindest treatment of all of the armed services by the committee.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I was sure that the members of this distinguished committee, from their long experience and knowledge of the armed forces would be the first to rally to the defense of the greatest combat unit in any nation in the world, the United States Marine Corps.

Paraphrasing a few words of the great historian, Macaulay, and adding a couple of lines of the great hymn of the Marine Corps, let me say that when the Washington Monument shall have sunk into the Potomac, when the dome of this great Capitol shall have fallen into dust, the Marine Corps will be on duty and true to its motto "Semper Fidelis." Mr. Chairman, if the Army and the Navy and the Air Force "ever look at heaven's scenes, they will find the streets are guarded by United States Marines."

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction, procurement, and contract modification of aircraft and equipment, armor and armament, spare parts and accessories therefor; electronic and communication equipment, detection and warning systems, and specialized equipment; expansion of public plants, and Government-owned equipment and installation thereof in public or private plants for the foregoing purposes; industrial mobilization, including maintenance of reserve plants and equipment and procurement planning; transportation of things and personal services in the field; to remain available until expended, $1,100,000,000, of which $875,000,000 is for payment of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes including not to exceed $75,000,000 for payment, during the current fiscal year, of obligations incurred prior to June 30, 1946, against the appropriation "Air Corps, Army," 1942–46; and, in addition, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes in an amount not to exceed $1,992,755,000: *Provided*, That the unexpended balance of the appropriation "Air Corps, Army," 1947, shall remain available until June 30, 1950, for the payment of obligations incurred thereunder prior to July 1, 1947.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COUDERT: On page 67, line 14, strike out "$1,992,755,000" and insert "$1,415,000,000."

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, when this committee started reading this bill I offered an amendment and stated that I meant to give the committee an opportunity to restore the total authorizations and appropriations for the armed services to the figure proposed by the President. The amendment offered at the outset of the bill would have restored $54,000,000 of the increase made by this committee. The amendment I am offering will restore $577,000,000 more. The two added together reach the total of $631,000,000, which is the amount by which the President's budget estimates for the armed forces were increased by the action of the Committee on Appropriations in this bill.

The Presidential recommendations are for the large sum of $1,415,000,000 for Air Force procurement. I propose to restore that figure in this bill; that is what the amendment is. I believe it should be voted and I hope it will be.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. The effect of the gentleman's amendment is to cut the Air Force to a 48-group force instead of the 58-group force recommended by the committee.

Mr. COUDERT. My intention, I may say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, is to rely upon the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the President and his advisers as to the total amount that should be appropriated for such purpose, and that amount is $1,415,000,000, which is the amount in my amendment. I believe the amendment should be adopted; and, frankly, I think nothing else is justified.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. Should the committee adopt the gentleman's amendment, the effect is to maintain only a 48-group air force; in other words, we strike down the five-hundred-and-some-odd millions that the committee put in to provide for the maintenance of the 58-group air force.

Mr. COUDERT. That may well be the effect of it.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I wish to call the attention of the Committee to the hearings. The proposal has been made to increase the amount of the appropriation for the Air Force and naval air. The new Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, stated on page 245 of the supplemental hearings:

The President's program is the one I expect to support.

Further than that, on page 18 of the original hearings, Air Force Secretary Symington said:

The Air Force is supporting the 48-group program.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the Members of the House that if they want to completely repudiate the President, the Secretary of National Defense, the entire national-defense establishments, and the chiefs of staff, then vote down my amendment. If they want to support those individuals above mentioned, vote for it.

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

Mr. COUDERT. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Some things have been said here today which I might have resented had I been in a state of mind to resent them.

Mr. COUDERT. I am sure the gentleman is never in such a state of mind.

Mr. PLUMLEY. I have served upon the Committee on Military Affairs for some years with other gentlemen of that committee. When they say I do not know anything about what is going on in this country or abroad or anywhere else, having served on the Committee on Appropriations having to do with the Navy, and having been chairman of it, and when they try to tell me that some new man as budget officer knows more about the Navy and more about the necessities of the Navy and more about what the War Department should have than I do, I must take issue with them.

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Chairman, I hope my amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in six minutes.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, I do this more or less to express my own views in general over what has occurred today. It is extremely refreshing and most interesting to see so many gentlemen on the other side of the aisle presently supporting the Presidential budget. May I say it is one of the most gratifying things I have witnessed in a long, long time.

Mr. COUDERT. Does the gentleman object to support of the President when he is right on those rare occasions?

Mr. SHEPPARD. I reserve the right to take my own attitude on that. I also refuse to adopt the general policy that the gentleman is momentarily laying down, politically speaking, because I think that is what my people elected me to do.

I do think it is a mighty splendid thing and I sincerely trust you gentlemen will concur in the future program of the President as you have in this one.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York would undo the work of the committee, a work which is undoubtedly concurred in almost unanimously by all Members of the House. We are taking a step toward the so-called 70-group program. Our present bill provides for about 58 groups, and insofar as I know, there is no serious objection in the House.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further remarks to make except that I hope the committee will vote today as it has on previous occasions on this important issue.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is it not a fact that the adoption of this amendment would undo some of the work we started out to do last year when we provided funds for a 70 air group?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is absolutely correct. We do not want to blow hot today and cold tomorrow. We do not want a start-today-and-stop-tomorrow-program. We want to follow through with a consistent program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill be considered as read and open to amendment.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of the bill? If not, the Chair will consider the offering of amendments.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer to page 65 of the bill where a point or order was raised by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COUDERT]. I ask unanimous consent that the language stricken out on a point of order be restored in order that there will be a contract authorization rather than cash. I understand that is the suggestion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COUDERT. That was my suggestion and I am delighted to acquiesce in it.

Mr. MAHON. And we thereby reduce the cash sums as they were agreed to in the amendment and substitute the printed text of the original bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman should specify the exact portion of the bill, including page and line, in order that there will be no question as to what is stricken out or is not stricken out.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's point is well taken. I refer to line 5, page 65, reinsert this language:

until expended, $523,070,000, of which $418,000,000 is for liquidation of obligations incurred under authority heretofore granted to enter into contracts for the foregoing purposes; and in addition, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts for the purposes of this appropriation in an amount not to exceed $576,546,000.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the Chairman of the subcommittee explain this point? I think there is some confusion on it. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] offered an amendment which I think picked up the $576,546,000 which appears on page 65, line 10 of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Because of the fact that the language referred to by the gentleman from Texas had been stricken out.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, if the language is put back into the bill, what effect does that have upon the Cannon amendment?

Mr. MAHON. That language will be as read, and on line 5, the sum which in the amendment was $1,099,616,000 will be stricken out and we will have the substitution for the other sum as printed in the bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, we revert to the original language in the bill?

Mr. MAHON. Precisely.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the Scrivner amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRIVNER: Page 70, line 13, after the words "as authorized by law", insert a comma and the following: "*Provided, however,* That no part of these funds shall be spent for blue uniforms or parts thereof."

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this amendment cannot possibly generate as much controversy or heat as the two previous amendments have. However, this amendment is important in two ways; important in principle and important in economy. The Air Force intended about a year ago to put its airmen, not soldiers, in blue uniforms. The House a year ago, when the amendment was up in the deficiency bill, voted that down and said they should wear the o.d. as soldiers in the Army. Now the proposal is up again. It is now proposed that the o.d. uniforms that the Army has, when the pipe line for blue uniforms is filled, shall be transferred from the Air Force and put into the supply stocks of the Army, and that the Air Force will be furnished blue uniforms, blue caps, black shoes, and caps with blue visors.

The Quartermaster General is the officer who must procure and distribute all of these items. You can see in time of emergency that this program, if adopted, will duplicate and double the work that the quartermaster has to do. He must procure blue uniforms, blue shirts, black shoes in all of the sizes—100 sizes of shoes—at the same time he is procuring o.d. uniforms and o.d. shirts and tan shoes for the Army. I feel that inasmuch as the House expressed its views last year, that as a matter of principle it should express its views this year. Personally I would like to go further in the other direction as suggested by the chairman of the subcommittee yesterday that all of the members of all the armed services, when they are on shore duty, should be wearing the same uniform, and then you would be getting some place toward unification rather than quadruplification as you are now in these varied uniforms.

It has been said, and in the hearings it was partially shown, that after the pipe line and everything was filled with blue uniforms, that the cost of the blue uniforms would be substantially the same as the o.d. Nobody could tell how much extra handling, extra stenciling, extra ordering, extra invoicing, and extra warehousing and all of that would add to the cost of the quartermaster in the distribution of two types of uniforms. Now, if emergency comes, you will have the quartermaster faced with the matter of sending to some point, whether it is Alaska or some island, two different types of uniforms to serve men on the airfields and military men that are serving in the Ground Forces on the islands. I wore the o.d. uniform for some time, and I was very proud of it. It has an honorable history. I saw a sample uniform as a young noncom walked down the corridor of the Capitol, and not a single eye turned toward him, male or female, so it does not have the glamor it was supposed to have. As far as morale is concerned, that argument is gone. Every branch of the service has more recruits than it needs. I would like to wait and see what the new Secretary of Defense has to say about this particular type of uniform and the triplification of the services. I have written him a letter asking him about this and other things, to which no reply has been had.

I hope the House feels as it did a year ago and that the amendment will be carried, so that there will be one uniform for the Army and the Air Force.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does not the gentleman feel that where large bodies of troops from both the Air Force and the Army are together in a group, it would be far better to have distinctive uniforms so their officers could tell them apart?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If their officers cannot tell them apart without distinctive uniforms something is wrong.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Suppose they were in a group of two or three thousand, mixed up.

Mr. SCRIVNER. So what? I have been in the service, and I expect the gentleman has, too. I have seen groups of as high as three or four thousand men, and from different units, and I could identify those under my command. I do not know why an Air Force officer could not recognize his own men.

Mr. O'TOOLE. They might not be in military formation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 8 minutes, the last minute to be reserved to the committee.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE].

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas. I would not do so if I thought there would be any additional cost involved in the adoption of the blue uniform by the Air Force. In fact, I believe, after investigating, that the Air Force in going to blue would possibly save money for the taxpayers.

I do not see anything unnatural about the Air Force desire for a distinctive uniform. Certainly there is no sinister motive in their request.

Anticipating the opposition to the blue uniform for the Air Force, I made some investigations into this matter. After carefully weighing and evaluating all the factors, I find that the Secretaries of Defense, of the Army, of the Navy, and of the Air Force recommended to the President that distinctive uniforms for the respective services should continue to be authorized in the interest of morale and esprit de corps. This recommendation was approved by the President, who authorized the Secretary of the Air Force to prescribe in his name the uniform of the United States Air Force.

Acting under the authority conferred by the President, the Air Force has prescribed a uniform which shall be a distinctive shade of blue. Prior to taking this action, exhaustive studies were made by the Air Staff in cooperation with the Army Staff, particularly personnel of the office of the Quartermaster General, who have been continuously engaged in the ramified problems incident to clothing and equipment of military personnel.

As a result of a careful analysis of the entire problem, including the function of determining the specifications, requirements, budget estimates, purchase, inspection, transportation, storage, packing, distribution, and stock control, it was found that the distinctive blue uniform could be adopted by the Air Force without any change in budget requirements and without any additional cost accruing to the National Military Establishment.

There will be a gradual change to the new uniform. Stocks of the old uniform now on hand will be used. There will be no waste, because the olive-drab uniform will continue to be authorized for wear by Air Force personnel until present Air Force stocks are exhausted. New issues, however, will be in the blue.

Due to a difference in items issued, the new uniform will be slightly less expensive than the comparable Army uniform. I shall cover the cost later.

What I want to make clear to my friends in the House is that absolutely the only thing involved here is whether the Air Force, like the Army and the Navy, is entitled to a distinctive uniform. I feel that it is. And I hope the majority of the House will agree with me this afternoon.

There are many very good reasons, firmly rooted in solid realities, why the Air Force needs this uniform.

To look at the thing one way—why should they not want to wear blue? Most men do. I am sure that most civilian suits sold are some shade or other of blue. Most uniforms in the world are of blue. And that is for the exceedingly simple reason that more men look well in blue than in any other color. In fact, our own Army wore blue for many years. They were forced to change to olive drab solely by tactical necessity—and then retained blue for dress occasions. The Air Force is not faced with the tactical necessity of camouflage. Why on earth, then should they not be permitted to return to the color—a color long traditional in the United States service—which the Army preferred before practical combat necessity forced a change?

The point I make is this: adopt blue for the Air Force uniform and you increase the odds of the average airman looking his best in uniform. It is that simple. Equally obvious is the resultant gain in personal pride and self-respect.

Pride and self-respect are intangibles, but they are potent. So are morale and esprit de corps. Morale and esprit de corps are things of the emotions. Perhaps man should be less emotional. Maybe a creature of cold intellect alone would be more reasonable and efficient. But men are not creatures of intellect alone. There are social and psychological forces that have to be considered when you are dealing with people. You have got to consider these factors even when you deplore them. For my part, however, I see nothing to deplore in a man's desire to be able to take pride in being a part of a military organization devoted to the service of his country. This desire represents the ultimate expression of a deeply felt need that is part of every socially conscious human being. A uniform is a symbol. As a symbol, it plays a vital part, along with the customs and traditions of a service, in developing the spirit so vital to a fighting man. It is incalculable how large a role the distinctive marine uniform has played in creating the pride, esprit, and fighting spirit for which that valiant corps is world-famous.

It has been argued that the glamor of flying gives the Air Force more esprit de corps than it needs anyway. That seems silly to me. I can easily imagine a man who disliked the service but stayed in because he did like to fly. I do not suggest that the Air Force has any problem in that respect, but I do say that enthusiasm for airplanes is not necessarily the same thing as esprit de corps.

We could deny that anything that will enhance the morale, discipline, and appeal of our Air Force should be done, and done quickly? In these times it would seem beyond question.

With those who argue that the uniform change would retard unification and promote friction between the services, I cannot agree. Is there friction between fire and police departments stemming from their different uniforms? Unity and friction both stem from other factors besides clothing. Any tendency to dissension today is caused primarily by the changing and uncertain factors in warfare itself. Besides, the Congress in 1947 endorsed the essential principle of this thing when it determined that total merger with one uniform was undesirable. The logic and importance of the Army and Navy having their own distinctive uniform were recognized at that time. Why should this not apply to the Air Force? Expediency alone kept the Air Force in Army uniform at that time. There were enough problems to be solved.

Things are vastly different today. The Air Force has a uniform designed and ready to be put into use. They also have a simple, workable plan for changing into it at no added expense to the Government.

Again I want to make it clear that if this thing involved any great diversion of efforts or funds from the vital tasks of the Air Force I would oppose it in practice even while approving in principle. But it involves neither of these.

I want to stress the matter of cost, because I have heard it asked, "Isn't this a bad time to be appropriating a lot of money to buy the Air Force fancy new uniforms?" Well, why a lot of money? One color dye is no more costly than another. As a matter of fact, I have learned that the new uniform will actually cost $3.86 less than the old one. Moreover, the change itself can be effected without extra cost. The Air Force buys uniforms all along. As planned, they will just switch from old to new, buying at the same rate. By using the blue first just for off-duty wear, and then for parades and ceremonies, they can continue wearing their olive drab until it is worn out. What is not used will be returned to the Army.

I might say in passing, in connection with the remark I just quoted, that neither is the new uniform fancy. I find it, if anything, to show more restraint, especially in the case of officers, than the old one. It seems to me to combine the dignity and attractiveness to a degree that is bound to reflect credit on both the Air Force and the Nation.

That is all I have to say about that matter, Mr. Chairman. It seems beyond dispute to me. It is simple and inexpensive to do. It is logical and based on sound principles of human nature. It is in accord with traditional practice among major nations the world over. It will enhance the morale and efficiency of a vital arm of our fighting forces.

I respectfully urge that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COFFEY].

Mr. COFFEY. Mr. Chairman, the study of military history is highly fascinating. It is also valuable—especially

for men in public life in these difficult times. It is impossible to study the subject without being forcibly impressed by the vital role that tradition has always played in the lives of military men.

That is not surprising. Tradition is important to all men. It is especially so to those who devote themselves to the public welfare—or to any cause outside their own private interests. Here in this House we have many cherished traditions which serve as both guidance and inspiration. There are many school teachers and other public servants, underpaid and overworked, who I am sure are held to their vital tasks by tradition alone. I mention this to show that tradition is a positive force. It is also indispensable.

In the military life this is doubly true. Military men live under conditions that are not always personally desirable. They must frequently live in distant, unpleasant, places. They accept a discipline that would be unnecessary and galling in the normal pursuits of life. In time of war they endure great hardships and extreme danger. Yet they must have high morale; ready and cheerful acceptance of discipline, hardship and danger; and genuine enthusiasm for their way of life. That, I submit, is a difficult requirement. Yet we take for granted that this requirement will be met. For the most part, it always has been, and tradition more than anything else is responsible.

Now uniforms and tradition are inseparable. Every famous fighting unit in history has had its distinctive uniform that symbolized that unit's history and tradition, what it had done and what it stood for. Our own Marine Corps is an excellent example of what I am talking about. Someone proposed not long ago that the distinctive uniform of the Marines be abolished. There was a public outcry all over the land. People knew instinctively what that would mean. Abolish the uniform and you abolish the Marine Corps. That uniform represents what the Marines stand for all over the world. As soon as a raw recruit puts it on, he feels new pride and new responsibility.

Now I know of no unit in the world that has greater cause for pride, or bears greater responsibility than our Air Force. They too are known the world over for their deeds. But they often are not recognized even at home by their uniform. They alone are in this predicament. Naval aviators wear a distinctive uniform. Marines have their uniform. Within our own Army there are what amounts to a number of distinctive uniforms. That is interesting. Types of footwear, various devices, different colored scarves and helmet liners—these things sprang up as new modes of fighting created new attitudes, prides, and traditions. It is a natural process. It fills a real need.

Do these loyalities, prides, and traditions, centering around units and arms, hinder over-all unity? Do they obscure loyalty to the armed forces as such, and to the Nation? They do not. They play rather the role of family ties in a community. Moreover, they arise inevitably out of the ways men live and fight.

Uniforms symbolize, not create, pride and tradition. These cannot be abolished, nor could they be dispensed with.

Our Air Force should be able to derive the maximum benefit from these vital constructive forces. Many men have entered the Air Force since the war. Consider what the morale and discipline of these new men, as well as the morale state of the Air Force itself, will mean to us in any future conflict. When I think of these things, I realize how important a thing a suitable, distinctive, Air Force uniform really is. It should be adopted with no more delay than is absolutely unavoidable.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman believe that all Congressmen should wear blue suits?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, in the name of common sense and fairness, why should not the men in each branch of the services be allowed to wear a uniform of their own choice? Believe it or not, men take a fierce pride in their uniforms. It is a very personal thing. Since the Secretary of Defense this year directed that the Secretaries of the different branches of the armed services should decide the uniform that each branch should wear, the Secretary of the Air Force, after conferring with both officers and enlisted men, decided on a uniform which would distinguish them just as soldiers are distinguished by khaki, and the Navy and Marine Corps distinguished by their respective uniforms. It will not cost any more money to purchase blue uniforms. Aviators fly the blue skies. Why should they not wear blue uniforms? Khaki is fitting for the ground forces—not for airmen. The Quartermaster General and the Secretary of the Air Force have agreed not to purchase these blue uniforms until the khaki or other uniforms now on hand are used. These uniforms of course will not go into use until the first day of September 1950, and as a matter of building morale and creating a fine esprit de corps among the Air Force, I hope the amendment is voted down.

Early this year the Air Force requested from higher authority a policy on uniforms, whether or not there would be one uniform for the entire National Military Establishment or whether each service would prescribe its own uniform. The latter was approved and the Secretary of Defense authorized the Secretary of the Air Force to prescribe the uniform for that service. Let there be no doubt, gentlemen, that unless proper authority had approved the blue uniform for the Air Force it would not have been prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force. The President has delegated to the Secretary of each Department the authority to prescribe the uniforms for his respective service. Why then are we trying to duplicate authority? Why do you then not attempt to prescribe the identical uniform for the Navy and the Marines? Uniforms have long been the semblance of a unit; without a uniform where is the pride of the soldier, sailor, or a marine? There is no basis in fact for the thought that because the Army has a few extra odd-sized o.d. overcoats in stock and the Air Force has a new uniform that the Army will have to wear these overcoats until all stocks are exhausted. The Air Force has under previous agreements agreed to take proportionate shares of stocks when these are split. Since it has been argued and proven beyond a reasonable doubt that the new blue uniform can be furnished at approximately the same cost as the o.d. uniforms without any additional cost to the taxpayer, why then is there opposition? It is true that the Air Force can carry out its mission in dungarees or any other type garment, but since they are a department and quite possibly the dominant one of the period it is our duty as representatives of the people to adequately provide that which is essential to the morale and general welfare of the air personnel.

Since under Public Law 158 it is the responsibility of the USAF to provide service for itself, and, further, since the stocks of common items will be divided, it costs no more to account and handle blue uniforms than o.d. clothing. The 12 items of clothing are a minor effort on the part of the supply system of the USAF. When you consider that within this system the USAF handles thousands of items per year the effect and impact of 12 items is practically nil.

The Air Force and the Quartermaster General have worked diligently in the preparation of a plan whereby o.d. uniforms will be used by the Air Force until worn out through fair wear and tear in the service. Here is every evidence that there is no nullification of the express purpose of the Air Force to assist the Quartermaster General with his o.d. clothing program. For the fiscal year 1950, utilization of funds for purchase of blue rather than o.d. cloth is a logical situation. As it is not planned to issue the blue uniform before September 1, 1950, stocks of blue uniforms will begin to fill the pipe line as the last stocks of o.d. uniforms come from the pipe line to Air Force personnel.

This House has recognized the dynamic character of our Air Force when by overwhelming vote a 70-group air force was authorized, but if we are to prevail in the proposition, it takes more than airplanes and air bases to make the Air Force the dynamic instrument that Congress wants. We must think of the men of the Air Force about which all else revolves. These men have a fierce pride in their organization which is distinguished from the other military services but for the uniform of its personnel.

As the uniform is a most personal item, the fortitude of the Air Force personnel is a major issue.

Since consideration of the blue uniform has circulated among Air Force personnel, a material improvement in esprit de corps has occurred.

The Congress wants, yes, demands, that the Air Force be progressive in all avenues of its endeavors. I believe the Congress is satisfied with the strides the Air Force has made in advancing aircraft and engine design and performance together with ground equipment utilization. Therefore, it behooves us to support this onward march and approve to the airmen the blue uniform to com-

plete the whole picture of advancement and acclaim the morale so prevalent in the Air Force today as a result of the fact that a blue uniform may be worn by all Air Force personnel.

In summing up the facts it is clear that we must now decide: To abide by the Commander in Chief who has approved this blue uniform for the USAF; provide for the service that is protecting your home and mine; stop bickering over minor policy matters that really are the responsibility of the National Military Establishment.

Let not your aging years deter your mind from the youthful pride in being given a new uniform, whether a new pair of coveralls or while in the service a new uniform.

I assure you it does make a difference in the manner in which a man will fight for his country as well as yours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN].

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. The argument has been advanced that for unification purposes they all should wear the same uniform. As a former member of the service, I believe that we have no trouble as far as cooperation is concerned between the enlisted men in the different branches of the services, or the officers of lower grade. All your conflict is in the higher brass. And that will not be obscured by the fact that all of the men wear the same uniform. The statement has been made that the blues would cost more money, but from the investigation I made I found that there will actually be a saving of money with the blue uniforms, after the supply lines are emptied on the khaki uniforms. You will save $3.86 on each uniform and over a period of 3 years, you will save $1,930,000 by putting the Air Force in blue uniforms. The reason for this saving is that the soldier has to have a heavy overcoat in which he can sleep in the rain and the cold. That is not true of the Air Force. They can wear lighter clothing. And as a result there is substantial saving to the Government, if you vote for the blue uniform and defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, Mr. SIKES, a member of the committee, will close in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the chips are down. If the services want a distinctive uniform, and that uniform is in keeping with the traditions and dignity of the service, there is no reason why they should not have it, if the cost is not prohibitive. Many of us have been concerned, of course, about that. After checking into that angle, we find that the new uniform is going to cost about $3 less than the old uniforms. Of course, if we put all the men in the Air Force in a new blue uniform at once, it would cost a great deal of extra money. That would involve a lot of waste. But we have it positively stated to us that this will be a gradual policy of integration. The new uniforms will be issued to the men as the old uniforms are worn out. Consequently the same personnel who are in charge of the stocks of uniforms will continue and the same warehouse staffs will be involved and there will be little, if any, additional cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 76, insert after line 12, the following new section:

"SEC. 601. The appropriations in this act shall not be available for the pay, allowances, or travel of any person inducted without his consent into the armed forces under the Selective Service Act of 1948, who is, on July 1, 1949, over 22 years of age. The appropriations in this act shall not be available, after September 24, 1949, for the pay, allowances, or travel of any other person inducted without his consent into the armed forces under the Selective Service Act of 1948. This section shall not apply with respect to any person who, after June 24, 1948, or after the date of enactment of this act, shall voluntarily have extended the term of his service."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, may I be recognized on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I maintain that the point of order is not well taken.

This amendment is strictly a limitation of the present appropriation under this act; it does not add any other money; it does not say that any action shall be taken by any administrative officer; it does not instruct the services to do anything; it simply puts a limit similar to that in title 6, section 603, on page 77, which reads:

During the current fiscal year provisions of law prohibiting payment of compensation to or employment of any person not a citizen of the United States shall not apply to personnel of the National Military Establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

An examination of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania indicates that it is in the nature of a limitation on the appropriation.

The point of order is overruled.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment which I have offered to release draftees in a reasonable time, brings up a real question. The Eightieth Congress passed the draft bill which looked necessary then, when it clearly is not now. The effect of the bill was to put young citizens in the armed services without their consent between the ages of 19 and 26, whether we like to face the fact or not. That was Public Law No. 759 of the Eightieth Congress.

These young men inducted under this act are still in the armed services without their consent. Many of us veterans of World War II who have been in the service by our own consent, like and admire the services. But I am not in favor of keeping young men in the services against their consent when there is no national emergency of a level to create a dire need, and the services are turning away volunteers who want to make it a career.

Public Law 759 states, in section 20:

The Secretary of the Army for the Army and Air Force, and the Secretary of the Navy for the Navy and the Marine Corps, are hereby directed and authorized to initiate and carry forward an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign in an effort to obtain the required personnel strength.

That is a specific direction under section 20 of the act to carry out an intensified voluntary enlistment campaign. And the voluntary enlistment program has had to be shut off, these programs are now so successful.

You heard the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] when he said without objection or contradiction from anyone on the floor of this House, either by any member of the Armed Services Committee or otherwise—and I believe the gentleman from Kansas is an experienced member of the Armed Services Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee.

Every branch of the service has more recruits than it can now take.

If this be the case, why not permit these fellows who are over 22 on July 1, 1949, and who need to go back to work and start on the interrupted career of their choice, to get out of the services by the first of the next fiscal year, July 1, 1949? And then for the young fellows who ought to be going back to school and who do not wish to remain in the services, let them out by September 24, 1949, and they can all go back to school next year.

You have men who are over 22 and up to 27 years of age in the armed services at this time who want to be getting back establishing their families, who should be getting back to their life work. This is not war service; this is involuntary peacetime military service.

Although there are too many people coming in under the recruiting programs now, why not have the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Air Force go ahead with a further intensified recruiting campaign and then give them the time under this amendment, almost 5 months—to replace these men? If you vote for this amendment you will permit orderly withdrawal from the armed services of these people in present involuntary peacetime servitude. That does not mean that the services would be releasing any one man on any certain date; it simply gives two terminal dates, by one of which, July 1, 1949, you will release the draftees over 22, and the date of September 24, 1949, by which terminal date it would be expected to release the ones between 19 and 22 years of age.

In addition to that, there is no more emergency in this country now than there will be 5 or 10 years from now, and we on the Armed Services and Foreign Affairs Committees know it. What you are doing is keeping these fellows in the service now who do not want to be there,

and neither the services nor the emergency require it.

A further provision in this amendment states that if the man voluntarily extends the term of his service after June 24, 1948, or after the passage of this bill, he can stay on in the service.

This amendment puts the burden on the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and Marine Corps to step up the enlistment program. It does something else. It makes these services sell the services to the men who are in them. The services can keep every man who is in there under the draft who does not have some urgent home reason to get out, if they do a selling job. If you want to be fair to these young draftees from 19 to 26 who are in there and who are forced in, vote for this amendment.

Everyone of us admits that no new draftees need be put into the service at this time. The Selective Service is not inducting registrants into the service any more. We are not drafting men, we are not taking any more on a voluntary basis than we have to, and are depriving many men of their chosen career in the armed services. Think of the veterans of the merchant marine who served with us under like combat conditions in the last war, now continued against their will in the armed services of this democracy in peacetime.

Let us open up the voluntary enlistments, let us increase the voluntary-enlistment program for the good of the services, and give these young fellows and their families a break.

I ask the Members to vote for this amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, the trouble with the amendment is it would allow these young men who have been drafted to stay in the armed services but would give them nothing to eat and no pay. It does not take them out. It just says that none of the money shall be spent for their pay or their food.

I do not believe we want to do that.

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

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

Mr. FULTON. Anyone who voluntarily wants to stay in the service can stay in by enlisting and anyone who does not want to stay in you can just bet if you do not have the money they will not be kept in.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER], would be the last man to have it said of him that he is on a subcommittee of which he is not a member.

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

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

Mr. SCRIVNER. I was for 2 years a member of the Subcommittee on the Army, Navy, and Air Force Appropriations, but with the change last November I am not at this time. But I would point out to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that one of the reasons why the enlistments are coming in is because of the very existence of the Selective Service Act.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been unalterably opposed to conscription, probably for the very simple reason that I was brought up in conscript countries. Although we have given this measure a different title in this country, we call it draft, it is by and large conscription.

It is also a fact, and I think it has been brought to the attention of this House repeatedly in recent weeks and months, that the voluntary enlistments have been so great that we keep putting off the drafting of these young men. In other words, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are getting all the volunteers and more than they can possibly take care of. That is a very good thing.

There is nothing finer in the world than a voluntary force. That has been proved in the past history of our country. Volunteers who voluntarily go to fight and to serve their country will do so with far more enthusiasm and far better than men who are dragged in.

Another thing about taking these young men in the age brackets of 19 to 22 is that it interferes very seriously with their education. That again is a thing that does not help us later on. It does not help our armed forces.

I believe that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is well worth the consideration of this House. I think that it will have the support of many of the women and also of the young men back home and I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the Committee will indulge me. I wavered whether I should take any time or not. However, I have come to the conclusion that the Armed Services Committee should be heard on this proposition. Of course, it is a matter that came from our committee. I think that those of you who were here at the time remember that I had the most distasteful task of handling this bill on the floor just before my primary campaign last summer. So, I can say to you that in many respects it was a most distasteful task.

But we have here an exact example of why you should not write legislation on the floor and why you should not attempt to repeal a law by resorting to an appropriation bill and attempting to twist the Holman rule into the repeal of an existing law. Fortunate for me, last summer when I was arguing for the passage of this bill I stated that if we had it we would not need it, and it has worked out exactly that way. The fact that we have it, we have reached the point that we have not had to induct anyone for a number of months now. But it is absolutely correct, as the gentleman from Kansas has said, that these enlistments are coming in because the law has been in existence. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is also correct, that it would have the effect of preventing the payment and the feeding and the clothing of the men now in the service and all those who might hereafter be taken in. I recall our battle last summer also. I appreciate the argument that they would not take them in if they could not pay them, but is that the way the great Congress of the United States is going to legislate?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The gentleman has mentioned the fact that they are not drafting any more, but my information is that there is at least one draft office in every one of the 3,500 counties in the United States; that there are presently being employed at full pay over 37,000 now under the draft order; that there are 3,500 offices in operation but they are not drafting anybody. Can the gentleman advise whether or not that is true?

Mr. KILDAY. I have the gentleman's point. Let me reply. I do not have the number nor how many they employ in the offices that are open. For the purpose of discussion I am willing to accept the gentleman's figures. However, that is not involved here; at least it is not involved in any matter pending before the Armed Services Committee, nor is it involved in any matter pending in this bill. Funds for Selective Service come in an entirely different bill, and the proper place, if the gentleman is vigilant, would be to strike out the money in that authorization.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Will not the gentleman agree that, inasmuch as it is agreed that we are not drafting any more people, we stop these 3,500 offices, and the expense of stenographers, and so forth?

Mr. KILDAY. I refuse to yield further, Mr. Chairman, because it has not been agreed that anyone is not going to be drafted, so that the premise does not permit of any discussion.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman tell the committee the effect of this amendment on Reserves?

Mr. KILDAY. Well, I do not know just where they would be. That is the trouble with writing legislation here on the floor. I do not know what the effect of it is going to be. This is an attempt to repeal existing law in an indirect manner. If it is to be repealed, let us bring in legislation and repeal it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 90, following line 21, insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 629. No part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for contracts with any person, firm, or corporation to make or cause to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any employee; no part of the appropriations made in this act shall be available for the salary or pay of any

officer, manager, superintendent, foreman, or other person or persons having charge of the work of any employee of the United States Government while making or causing to be made with a stop watch or other time-measuring device a time study of any job of any such employee between the starting and completion thereof, or of the movements of any such employee while engaged upon such work; nor shall any part of the appropriations made in this act be available to pay any premiums or bonus or cash reward to any employee in addition to his regular wages, except for suggestions resulting in improvements or economy in the operation of any Government plant; and no moneys herein appropriated for the Naval Establishment or made available therefor shall be used or expended under contracts hereafter made for the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, of any naval vessel, machinery, article, or articles that at the time of the proposed repair, purchase, or acquirement can be repaired, manufactured, or produced in each or any of the Government naval shipyards or arsenals of the United States, when time and facilities permit, and when, in the judgment of the Secretary, such repair, purchase, acquirement, or production would not involve an appreciable increase in cost to the Government, except when the repair, purchase, or acquirement, by or from any private contractor, would, in the opinion of the Secretary, be advantageous to the national defense."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the proposed amendment clearly imposes additional duties.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Rhode Island desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, in offering this amendment today I am not attempting to offer something that has not been in previous appropriation bills. The exact language of the amendment I am offering has appeared in appropriation bills for the military and the naval establishments for the past 25 or 30 years. Without any hearings on this particular section of the bill it was stricken out by the subcommittee handling the bill before us this afternoon. The House has acted upon this very same amendment in the past, and it was considered germane. In a conference between the House and the Senate a year ago this provision was agreed on. I think the amendment is in order at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. KEOGH). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Rhode Island offers an amendment against which a point of order is made on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. While it would seem to be a limitation of appropriation, the Chair calls the attention of the Committee to the fact that the amendment does confer discretionary authority upon the Secretary. It is the opinion of the Chair that to that extent the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have served on the Committee on Appropriations now going on the third year, and I have been one of those who have opposed writing legislation into an appropriation bill. However, I did not think this would be legislation on an appropriation bill, since this House has passed on this very same language for about 25 years.

Last year for the first time this language was stricken from the bill when the House had this matter before it for consideration. The Senate restored the entire language that I have attempted to have restored here today. In conference on the naval appropriation bill a year ago, for the fiscal year 1949, the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate agreed on the language that was called section 112 in this year's appropriation bill. The section 112 of last year was carried in this bill until the committee marked up the bill, and then it was stricken from the bill without any hearings at all as to whether or not this language should be contained in the bill.

This is one of the most obnoxious practices that can be introduced into any naval establishment or any private industry. I know that from talking to the employees of the naval establishments in my own State of Rhode Island, and they do not take their hat off to anybody or any private concern when it comes to efficiency and production in their assembly and repair shop. We have figures showing that they can repair airplanes and repair parts more cheaply than any private company in the country at the present time.

I offered this amendment in good faith today because it was included in various appropriation bills in the past. I am sorry to see that the committee has raised a point of order against it at this time.

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

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I wish to compliment the gentleman from Rhode Island on his diligence with respect to this matter. It is true that for 35 years similar provisions have been in appropriation bills. However, 2 years ago the provision was stricken from the military appropriation bill because it was considered to be no longer needed. A similar version was in the Navy bill last year.

When the pending bill was sent to us by the budget this provision was stricken out. The striking out was not the original action of the committee. I do know that since that action was taken the gentleman from Rhode Island has been most diligent in undertaking to present the matter to the committee. I commend him but, under the circumstances, I think no injury will be done. These studies will be made in such a way that no one can possibly complain at the action taken.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not like to disagree with the chairman of the subcommittee, but I have had dealings with commandants of naval stations during the past 9 years that I have been a Member of Congress. I have met some very fine, honest, and sincere men at the head of those establishments. I have also met some that I did not have much respect for, and whom many of the employees in those stations did not have much respect for. If this legislation is stricken from the bill at this time, and if the bill is allowed to stand as it is, we are going to run up against that same type of obnoxious practice which has existed in private employment. We are going to disrupt the efficient working of these naval establishments all over the country at the present time. At the same time we are going to give the green light to the naval and military establishments in Washington to not allow any of this assembly and repair work to be done in their own establishments. And in every State in the Union, where these military and naval establishments are located, we will find them being closed up. It has happened before, and it will happen again. When we start letting out private contracts to private concerns, the first thing the private concerns will do to get the contract from the Navy will be to underbid the price that the naval assembly and repair shop is doing that particular job for. Then, as soon as they have succeeded in closing up the establishment at Corpus Christi or the plant in Norfolk, Va., or some of the plants out on the west coast, they will raise the price 50 percent above what they got the first contract for. That is the way they do in order to get in. It is the same sort of thing we have had operating against the small-business establishments of this country. Big business will underbid small-business firms just to get the contract away from them. As soon as they drive the small-business firms out of this business, they come in on the gravy train, because they have no competition. Every naval establishment all over the country is in competition with every other naval establishment. There are no more efficient establishments in this country than those that we have working for our armed services. There are no more efficient plants than these arsenals and naval establishments.

I sincerely hope that the Senate will include this language in the bill when they have it under consideration and that the conferees on the part of the House will accept the language when they meet in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Chairman, it takes but little retrospection to warn the most reticent Members of this House that this bill is one on which there should be the maximum agreement. It is evident that we have honest divergencies of opinion on the choice of methods we wish to employ in our determination to preserve peace and check the spreading of communism in the yet remaining free countries of this world, whether they be Christian or non-Christian. However, there must be no divergency of opinion on the fact that our good intention to suppress communism and preserve world peace is pure illusionism unless the intention is backed with the physical might that is necessary to give it meaning.

Let us retrospect a little. Commencing on March 8, 1917, strikes, riots, mutiny, assassinations, revolution, and counterrevolutions brought on the complete collapse of the Russian Army in World War I. On November 6 and 7 at the head of a rabble Bolshevik army, Lenin, Trotsky, and Stalin seized the government and by a land decree ordered the immediate confiscation of the large estates and distribution to the peasants. On December 17, backed by an expanding Bolshevik army, all church property was confiscated and all religious instructions in schools was abolished. From January 1918 to 1922 with a merciless Bolshevik army executing the decrees, all land was nationalized and surplus food was confiscated; all banks were nationalized and private accounts confiscated; private trade was suppressed and all food and other commodities were confiscated and distributed under a Government rationing system; all industry was nationalized and free labor was abolished; and through terror, torture, and murder of millions of helpless men, women, and children, the communistic dictatorship was firmly established by this army.

Let us now turn to Italy. The end of World War I left this country with a vast national debt, a bankrupt and unstable economy, an impoverished and disunited people, a weak and confused Government that enjoyed no prestige and an Army that had neither will nor physical means to fight. Under these conditions, the Communist vermin under Socialist-front bored its cells into the vitals of the nation. On October 5–8, 1919, a Socialist Congress dominated by Communists, at Bologna, voted for adherence to the Third International. At the elections for Parliament on November 16 of that year the Communist-dominated Socialist Party secured 160 seats, and at the opening of Parliament refused to hail the King, and shouted, "Long live socialism," a striking demonstration of disloyalty. The Communist vermin bored rapidly, and before October 1922 it had demoralized the national economy by recurring strikes and complicated the political situation by its constant boring. The Government, with a spiritless and ill-equipped Army, was powerless to stop the spread of paralyzing Communist vermin. On October 31, 1922, Mussolini was summoned by the King to form a Cabinet. The ban on Fascists was lifted, and by force and violence the Communist vermin was extirpated.

Let us now turn to Germany. For several months before the end of World War I an expanded and war-strained German economy began to show signs of collapse. The long and sustained effort of the people in their support of the Imperial Army on all fronts began to show signs of abatement. In general, the entire German civilian population was in a state of complete exhaustion. Under these conditions, the Communist vermin began its boring through the labor masses of the nation. On November 8, 1917, the Communists, operating under a Socialist front and led by Kurt Eisner, succeeded in proclaiming a Republic in Bavaria. On November 9, the Socialist front proclaimed the National Republic and turned the Government over to the majority Socialists under Friedrich Ebert and Phillip Scheidemann.

This resulted in the complete collapse of the Imperial Army on all fronts. On January 5–15, 1919, the Spartacist revolutionists were joined by the Independent Socialists who by this time were the avowed Communists. Through February and March further Communist uprisings took place in Berlin, Munich, Hamburg, and other urban centers. On April 4 to May 1, a Soviet republic was proclaimed in Bavaria. Then followed Communist-inspired strikes, riots, and terror until the national economy was paralyzed. The government was helpless, and without a competent army to maintain its national economy and order. The Reichstag elections of September 14, 1930, resulted in the emergence of Hitler's National Socialists. This election ushered in a period of disorder and clashes with Communist bands. The army and civil authority were bored with Communist cells and ineffective to sustain law and order. On June 16, 1932, the government lifted its ban on Nazi storm troops. From this later date to January 30, 1933, these storm troops by force and violence completely annihilated the Communist vermin.

Mr. Chairman, we can see by this retrospection that the Communist vermin will fester and destroy the Nation when the Army lacks the physical means and will to give meaning to the national intention. The rise of both Mussolini and Hitler was predicated upon a benevolent concern for the public welfare in that their movements were aimed at the suppression of communism. The world, that by this time had fully appraised the Communist suppression of human freedom in Russia, hailed the Nazi and Fascist advent in Europe with mixed feelings of approval and disapproval. I was one who sympathized with any movement that aimed at the suppression of communism. However, my sympathy was not loyalty. When both nazism and fascism began to suppress human freedom, to toy with the right of men to worship God, to suppress the free thinking of men, and to suppress the political freedom of minority races and nations, their benevolent mission was ended and with it also ended my sympathy and that of all freedom-loving men.

Let us now come to the start of World War II. The economic world collapse of 1929 to 1936 left most of the free nations of Europe impoverished and without the financial means to support sufficient armies to insure their freedoms against the aggressive designs of either communism, nazism, or fascism. The Nazi leaders appear to have been aware that Communist miiltary power was the more formidable of any in either Europe or Asia. With this in mind, we can readily understand why the brutal Nazi leaders first loosed their armed legions eastward. The armies of France, England, the Low Countries, and those of the free governments of eastern Europe were like so many "sitting ducks." The Nazi showed no fear of the latter. They did fear the more formidable Communist Army. Thus, while communism and nazism were massing military power for a show-down as to which of the two should survive and impose its ideology upon the rest of the world, the United States contented itself with a land and naval force of less than 300,000 men. This gave no fear to the Nazi that a formidable American Army could reach Europe in time to give effective opposition. On the other hand, was not our fear of communism a fear shared in common with nazism and fascism? What the latter failed to foresee was that, comparing calculated risks, the United States would temporize with communism as a lesser threat to world peace than a Nazi army mightier than any that was ever assembled by the brains and effort of man. Our decision to temporize with communism was itself tempered with Communist Stalin's promise to recognize human and religious freedom for the people of Russia and the rest of the world. Stalin made the promise through fear of the mighty Nazi army. To what extent Communist Stalin has kept his promise is now a matter of history.

Mr. Chairman, I have retrospected on history to this extent in order to show that experience should teach us that the benevolent intentions or the sinister intention of a nation can only take shape if that intention is supported by physical means in the form of military might. If our benevolent intention is to insure the human freedom and peace of the world, it is our duty to provide the military power commensurate with that intention. It is my opinion that the bill now before us should be passed. If the appropriation made by the bill may be said to be great, it is better that our error be on the safe rather than the unsafe side.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, since the debate on the Interior appropriation bill last week, during which I revealed the tie-up between Guy "Flash" Myers, a Wall Street promoter, and the bureaucrats in the Bonneville area, I have received a flood of personal letters and telegrams from individual citizens from the States of Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and from most every section of our country.

All but one of these communications applauded my efforts to expose this thing. I have carefully analyzed these letters and telegrams. They came from farmers, small-business men, professional men, in fact from people in every walk of life who know their own best interests and the best interest of their country can best be served by protecting and preserving our free enterprise system.

I shall now read into the RECORD the full report of Robert E. Lee, chief of staff of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives of the Eightieth Congress, and who was originally appointed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the present chairman of the Appropriations Committee, during the Seventy-ninth Congress. Mr. Lee, as I have stated, made an investigation of the political and financial activities of the Bonneville Administration last fall. From this report

I quoted but one letter last week; the balance of the report follows herewith and speaks for itself:

RE OBSERVATIONS ON THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

Pursuant to instructions of the chairman a spot-check examination was conducted of the Bonneville Power Administration from July 15 to July 27, 1948, with particular reference to the problem as to whether or not the Administration was pursuing a reasonable course in behalf of the promotion of Federal power.

We find that aggressiveness on the part of that administration in behalf of Federal power is closer to a crusade than to an administration and leaves implications that all free enterprise advocates might well cogitate upon.

If the elimination of the so-called free enterprise in this field is not the policy of Congress a solution must necessarily be found in one of two alternatives:

1. Amendments to existing legislation both Federal and State, or,

2. A courageous clear-cut Federal power policy.

Obviously it is the choice of the people as to what their desires are in this regard, however, there is a clear-cut difference between public power referring to municipalities, REA, PUD, county control, etc., and Federal power which means the domination of this field from Washington, D. C.

Numerous studies have been made on the subject of where the Federal Government's interest should and does end and no attempt is made here to present any further study into the technicalities and philosophies involved on the part of the proponents of the various alternatives.

Certain fundamental questions, however, do arise which are recorded here merely to illustrate the complexity of the problem without any specific suggested course of action.

1. Is it proper for the Federal Government to socialize any industry?

2. Where should the responsibility of the Federal Government end with respect to flood control, navigation, irrigation, and power expansion?

EXISTING POLICIES

Under date of January 3, 1946, the Secretary of the Interior issued a memorandum on power policy to all staffs of the Department of the Interior, and, among other things, this document contained the following instructions. This policy is the interpretation of existing law and is the bible of Interior.

"Active assistance, from the very beginning of the planning and authorization of the project, shall be given to the organization of public agencies and cooperatives for the distribution of power in each project area. The statutory objectives are not attained by merely waiting for a preferred customer to come forward and offer to purchase the power."

Administrative Order No. 33, dated September 16, 1940, was issued by Paul J. Raver, Administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration, and, among other things, contained the following instructions:

"The Administration has a direct interest, in connection with its construction program, in proposals for system-wide acquisition of private-utility properties by public agencies which have applied or contracted for the purchase of power. The system acquisition staff will give reasonable technical assistance to public agencies which are attempting to acquire operating systems."

As a matter of interest concerning the attitude of the Interior Department, some quotations from the testimony of Secretary Krug at the time he was questioned concerning his confirmation before the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of the United States Senate are as follows:

"PRODUCTION AND DISTRIBUTION OF POWER

"Senator CORDON. Do you feel that as an administrative officer of the Government, it would be your duty to proselyte or evangelize in the local field to induce local people to go into the power business on the retail or distribution side?

"Mr. KRUG. No; I don't think it would be. When I said that I probably will from time to time talk of the TVA experience I meant it, but I don't think the Federal Government has any business in the local field in telling communities what they should be doing.

"The local communities are intelligent enough to find out for themselves what they should do, and I think the less we have of Federal agencies telling local communities what to do, the better off the country will be.

"Senator CORDON. Thank you. That is the answer I hoped for, and the answer I got."

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

The district power law was passed by the State of Washington in 1930, which permits the creation of so-called utility districts, based on a vote of the people. Subsequent to the affirmative vote of the people, three commissioners are elected, who may take over the property of private utilities either by negotiation or by condemnation, and may levy taxes to begin operations. They likewise may create a debt, which is generally done by the issuance of revenue bonds for the purpose of buying out the private utility. A careful reading of the act leaves no doubt but that it is specifically designed to eliminate private enterprise in this field, and, in the past decade, public utility districts have been voted in some 30 of the 39 counties in the State of Washington.

On April 27, 1948, the utility district commission adopted a resolution providing for the sale of $2,400,000 revenue bonds of Cowlitz County, Public Utility District No. 1, Washington, for purchase of properties in Cowlitz County from Puget Sound Power & Light Co. Bonds bought by Van Ingen and Nuveen jointly. No reoffering—bonds placed privately. Bond issue dated May 1, 1948, due $400,000 each year, 1969–74. Callable in 1950. First call at 103½—graduate reduction to par. Interest rate 3¼ percent.

The county treasurer reports (by telephone) that the credit on the books to the district from proceeds of sale is $2,283,900. This, if correct, would be sale at 95.1625.

Guy Myers was agent. His fee is 1 percent.

Chelan County, Wash., PUD No. 1

This district paid Puget $8,135,000 plus some sums to be later determined for certain properties in Chelan, Douglas, and Grant Counties. Van Ingen and Nuveen bought the bond issue of $9,035,000, at 95.

Nuveen reports bonds placed privately. The street generally questions private placement of the whole and expects to see an offering later. The bonds are divided in two serial issues, one at 3 percent callable 1952–67, and a second at 3¼ percent callable 1968–78 and a term issue of $3,220,000 at 3⅜ percent due 1983.

Guy Myers was agent at 1 percent. Payable one-tenth of 1 percent each year for 10 years. This to become an operating charge on district.

Attention is invited to the fact that the people of the district by discounting these bonds are being saddled from 5 to 7 percent of the issue before they even start. It is almost inconceivable that private interests would thus capitalize on a proposition that has been sold to the people as an economical device to insure cheap power.

ATTITUDE OF THE BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION CONCERNING FEDERAL POWER

It must be recognized that it is, of course, very difficult to determine what is located within a man's heart and the attitude of the administration of the Bonneville Power Administration must necessarily be determined from interviews with personnel and from examination of written records. During the course of the inquiry, Dr. Raver was absent on speaking engagements and it was possible only to visit with him very briefly. A series of questions were left with him for his written reply and pertinent ones are being included as a part of this report. Dr. Raver, when questioned about some of the material located in the files, indicated quite frankly that he was very much in favor of the Federal control of power in the Northwest and felt that it was inevitable that the private utility operators would necessarily have to liquidate their investment. He defended his activities on behalf of Federal power on the fact that the basic legislation justified such activity as he considered the Bonneville Project Act more social in nature than even the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

An exhaustive examination of clippings, news releases, speeches, and other records would justify the conclusion that Dr. Raver and his administration go beyond the scope of their duties in the administration of the act by conducting a crusade for Federal power which must necessarily lead to the further conclusion that private ownership has no place in this picture.

A quotation from a letter of February 16, 1943, from Paul J. Raver to the editor of the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman is set out hereinafter and its sincerity should be judged in light of the subsequent quotations from other correspondence located in the files of Bonneville Power Administration.

"Finally, I must deny categorically that I have a 'determination to destroy private ownership.' I believe thoroughly in the free-enterprise system."

The following quotation from the minutes of a meeting of June 29, 1948, of the Bonneville Power Administration executives is set out below. This meeting was called for a discussion of the pending negotiations for the acquisition of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co., by public utility districts.

"Dr. RAVER. My position is, this is a business approach to the thing. It has nothing to do with preference and priority clause of the Bonneville Act. As a business matter we feel we need some surplus to take care of the uncertainties but I would risk that if out of it we could get this whole Puget Sound Power & Light deal settled because I feel that it would be important enough to take that risk."

The following quotation is contained in a letter from Dr. Raver to Carlton Nau, of the American Public Power Association, of Washington, D. C., dated May 29, 1946:

"This will acknowledge your telegram requesting information regarding (name omitted). 'You request short factual statements of his activities and writings in opposition to public ownership.'

"(Name omitted) has not been one of the active outspoken opponents of public ownership in this region. There have been occasions when this company has been in the middle of a public ownership fight when he undoubtedly made statements and speeches in opposition to public ownership in defense of his own company and his own operating procedures. Certainly I do not place (name omitted) in the same category with some of the other private utility managers in this area who are continually misrepresenting the public-ownership problem and using underhanded tactics of one kind and another to defeat not only public ownership but to embarrass and retard the Bonneville Power Administration's program in this field."

On February 11, 1947, the American Public Power Association wrote to Dr. Raver asking his support for Lilienthal for Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. He was asked to "Do all in your power to assure confirmation." The letter bore the notation, "Noted, Dr. Raver."

Excerpts from a letter from Carl D. Thompson to Dr. Raver of the Public Ownership League of America dated June 24, 1948:

"Judging from all reports that I hear from different parts of the country, and a study of 10 or 15 measures that have been introduced in Congress aimed at crippling and, if possible, destroying our public power movement in the Northwest (and, for that matter, all over the country), I am very deeply concerned about what is happening and likely to happen during the next few years.

"Obviously, if present conditions and present control of Congress continues, our public power movement in the Northwest and throughout the country is doomed. This, I take it, is the precise purpose of those that are now in control. * * *

"You are reported to have said at one of the meetings recently held somewhere in the Northwest that you are urging all elements in that area to join forces in helping to protect the public power movement there. * * *

"Fortunately there are elements that are already committed to some degree of public ownership of basic utilities. And more particularly they are concerned especially with the protection of our public power movement. * * *

"What I would like to see is some kind of a federation of progressive forces that would work together in the defense of our advantages so far gained. * * *

"Don't you think it would be possible to bring together representatives of these different groups and ultimately to federate their forces so that we could be more effective in protecting and promoting our public power movement? * * *

"I feel very deeply that we simply must not lose our public power movement" (meaning Federal power and control).

This particular letter was discussed with Dr. Raver and it was pointed out to him that the letter bore a notation "Answered July 2, 1948, no file copy." Dr. Raver professed lack of knowledge as to precisely what he had stated in reply to this letter but he indicated he would undertake to locate a copy of his answer and transmit it to the staff. This was subsequently received and is quoted hereinafter.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION,
Portland, Oreg., July 6, 1948.

Dr. CARL D. THOMPSON,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR CARL: Thank you for your good letter of June 24.

I assume you have written in similar vein to Morton Tompkins and to your friends in the State of Washington.

It would be a fine thing if the federation of the sort you suggested could be developed; but as an observer, I doubt if it would be possible during the coming months. There are too many other issues occupying the public mind, such as the foreign situation. These will obscure the problem which concerns us. I believe the time will come when such a federation may be formed as a protective measure.

In the meantime, I should like personally to see a list of the organizations you mention if you can spare me one.

Sincerely,

PAUL J. RAVER,
Administrator.

Carl D. Thompson has for years been the guiding genius of the Public Ownership League of America. His public career has long been that of close association with the Socialist Party.

He was on the national committee of the Socialist Party in 1905 and his name was placed in nomination for president of the United States at the Socialist convention of 1908. From 1912 to 1916, he was director of information of the Socialist Party and in 1916 he managed the national Socialist campaign.

The file system of the Bonneville Power Administration provides for an abstracting device whereby incoming correspondence is abstracted on 3- by 5-inch cards. These cards were test-checked by the writer and in many cases the correspondence relating to the card was not readily available. However, the information on some of the abstract cards is reproduced as follows:

"American Public Power Association, Nau, Carlton L., general manager, 1129 Vermont Avenue, NW., Washington 25, D. C., 10-29-47. Regarding support for continuation of policy exempting federally financed projects from taxation."

"Aluminum Co. of America, Thayer, C. S., works manager, Vancouver, Wash., 3-23-48. Attaching identical copy of letter sent to Washington and Oregon Congressmen re need of the Northwest for power development."

"Grange News Berry, Ted F., editor, 3104 Western Avenue, Seattle 1, Wash., 5-27-48. Submitting comment re private utility party line emanating from Washington, D. C. and BPA statement on May 26 and quoted by the Associated Press."

The following letter is quoted in its entirety, presumably from Dr. Raver to Mr. C. G. Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, dated July 15, 1946. (This letter was not available to the writer at the time Dr. Raver was interviewed and consequently he was not asked concerning it.)

"I received your note while I was on my vacation and have turned it over to Bob Willard (former Acting General Counsel of the BPA, now with the Atomic Energy Commission) to formulate a reply for Cap, setting forth the minimum requirements for a private utility company contract.

"As to Loring (this may refer to Mr. Marlett, Assistant to Dr. Raver, whose middle name is Loring) and I am coming to Washington immediately, we realize the importance of having someone there during the formative period of your organization problem but it is simply out of the question for us to come down until we have formulated certain programs, which we have been working on strenuously the last few weeks.

"These three programs are as follows:

"1. Revitalizing the public power movement in the Northwest. Henry Alderman is heading this up and has the program pretty well outlined and we are working on it at the present time.

"2. Our long-range as well as 1948 construction program. On this I have insisted that our Engineering and System Planning organizations tie down a generator installation schedule with the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation for new dams on the Columbia and lay out our program for transmission line construction up to and including 1955 with plans for southern Idaho projected to 1965. Both of these forecasts of generator installations and transmission line construction, of course, are tied in with our load forecast for the region. I see no point in coming to Washington to talk about coordination until we are prepared to present a coordinated plan which can be used as a basis for such orders of the Secretary as he deems necessary to carry out the coordinated construction plan, assuming, of course that he agrees that our plan is feasible.

"3. With these two programs as a basis, we will also be in a position to present to the coordination committee and to the secretary, if it seems desirable, an organization plan to carry out the construction and operation program.

"All three of these programs are shaping up very rapidly and Loring expects to be in Washington on July 24. I will arrive there Sunday night, July 28.

"Loring, Henry Alderman, Frank Ward, and I have been working on the first step of our public-power program today in Seattle. This program involves pulling together all of the public-power forces of the region around an agreed program of public ownership and public acquisition of private utility company properties. As discussed with Cap, it involves fitting municipal ownership program with REA development in the rural areas into an existing public utility districts plan and enlisting the support of the public utility districts in carrying it out. In order to do this we are trying to work it out in harmony with plans of Carstensen and the Washington Grange so as not to upset their existing plans for private utility acquisition in the Puget and Washington Water Power Co. areas.

"We reviewed this program at some length with Tomkins (Mort, master of the Oregon State Grange) in Portland last Friday. He realizes the critical situation of the public-power program at the present time, particularly in the State of Oregon, and felt that our approach was sound but desired to check it with his executive committee before making any definite commitments. I told him I was planning to discuss the program with Carstensen (master of the Washington State Grange) in Seattle today and wanted to be sure that we had the full and wholehearted support of the Granges of both States on any program that we worked out. Tomkins called Carstensen after our meeting and reported to Hank that Carstensen was receptive to working out a cooperative program but was adamant in his opposition to mixing up a municipal ownership campaign with his plans for acquisition through public utility districts. He stated that Carstensen was not interested in a municipal-ownership campaign until after he knew the outcome of the election on Initiative 166 (this was a measure to provide for a vote of the public before revenue bonds were issued for the acquisition of private property. It was defeated.)

"We met with Carstensen at 10:30 this morning and I outlined the following situation to him: If the court case (now set for hearing on September 2 with a promise that the decision will be rendered within 10 days of the hearing) is favorable to the public utility districts, then the Puget deal must be made prior to December 5 if Initiative 166 carries.

"Carstensen stated that he was confident the court case would be favorable and that the deal would be made before the election on Initiative 166. He also stated that the Washington Water Power deal was already made and that the real purpose of the court case was to clear the way for making the Washington Water Power deal. They had expected to have the court case decided in May and the Washington Water Power deal out of the way before this time.

"I told him if this was the situation that he should use every effort to stop or at least delay the merger of Pacific Power & Light and Northwestern Electric until after the court decision, otherwise the Washington Water Power deal, which he claims is already made, would no longer be effective since Washington Water Power would be out from under Electric Bond & Share at the same time Pacific Power & Light and Northwestern Electric are merged. I am not sure that Washington Water Power will be divorced from the holding company at the same time Northwestern Electric and Pacific Power & Light are merged, but I do know that the plan is for Washington Water Power to acquire controlling interest in the common stock of the merged corporation.

"I pointed out to him that in my opinion the Northwestern Electric and Pacific Power & Light merger was being slipped through without the public realizing that it was only the first step in the further integration of operating companies in the area using Washington Water Power Co. as the original holding company and that subsequent steps might well include the Portland General Electric whose common stock, as a result of the reorganization of Pepco, was widely scattered in the hands of income bondholders and might well be acquired, as far as the controlling interest in concerned, by the new merged corporation or by the Washington Water Power Co. Furthermore, I pointed out to him that the company might be gambling that the court decision would be favorable to them and they could then step in, bail out Frank McLaughlin at $18 per share for the common stock of Puget and thus very quickly set up a major public utility company monopoly that would control the entire power development of the Northwest from here on out.

"This analysis was evidently new to Carstensen and he readily agreed to do anything we thought advisable to stop it. I suggested a number of hedges or efforts which various groups could make to stop or at least delay this merger until after the fall elections.

"1. Contact Governor Wallgren and ask him to telegraph the SEC to delay proceedings until such time as the State had had an opportunity to examine the implications of this merger. Henry readily agreed to this and suggested that the Governor might have his Advisory Commission study the matter. Henry felt that he could enlist the support of McLaughlin and Hemphill, who are members of this Commission, in formulating a protest because of the disadvantages to the development of the State and the development of its resources if the transmission and distribution of Government power came under the control of one large private utility monopoly. Carstensen agreed to take this up with the Governor tomorrow. It was also pointed out that the merger would probably have to come before the State Public Utility Commissioner for approval and the Governor would have an opportunity to discuss the matter with his own Public Utility Commissioner.

"2. I suggested to Carstensen that I explore the possibilities of developing municipal-ownership programs in the cities of Spokane, Yakima, and Walla Walla. He objected strenuously to starting anything in Spokane on the basis that the Spokane City Council has agreed to take no formal action on municipal ownership until the Washington Water Power deal is actually made and that the city council and the Grange leaders have agreed to let the people in Spokane decide for themselves whether they desire municipal ownership for a PUD after the deal has been made. Of course, he has stated unequivocally that this deal has been made with Aller and, therefore, he is quite anxious to stop this merger which presumably would take the properties out from under the control of Aller until after the court decision (which he expects to be favorable) at which time, according to Carstensen, the Washington Water Power deal will be made even before the Puget deal. Inasmuch as Carstensen maintained that if the city of Spokane voted for municipal ownership, the Washington Water Power deal would be killed, I agreed with him not to promote municipal ownership with the city council in my meeting with them next Tuesday morning. Consequently, I wish that you would have Cap check with Calder (chairman of the board of Electric Bond & Share Co.) and see if he can get the facts about Washington Water Power deal. It may be well that Carstensen has been misled by Meyers about the deal and if so, we should know about it and then be free to enlist his help or at least his consent in going ahead with the municipal-ownership program in Spokane.

"He also objected to our promoting municipal ownership in Yakima at this time but on a different basis. He stated that in his opinion two of the commissioners of the Yakima public utility district are strong for public ownership in Yakima County and that they have been misunderstood in their position because of a grange fight which arose out of the grange people trying to dictate to the newly elected commissioners what their position should be with respect to the sale of this property by Pacific Power & Light. Carstensen felt that it would be very bad at this time to support municipal ownership in Yakima as it would only tend to cause a wider rift between the commissioners and some of the grange officials and other public power supporters in Yakima. He stated that he was trying to pull all the public power forces together and he felt confident that all parties would be served best by having the public utility district take over instead of municipal ownership. He also stated that he was confident that a new public utility district commissioner would be elected this fall who is a strong supporter of acquisition.

"He also stated that the present public utility district commissioners had determined that if municipal ownership agitation started in Yakima they would institute condemnation proceedings against Pacific Power & Light in order to stop it. I made no definite comments about this except to state that we would not want to do anything to cause a break in our public power forces and wanted to pull them together. My own feeling is (although I did not express it to Carstensen) that some more individual work will have to be done on the situation with Carstensen and other public power leaders in the Yakima area before municipal ownership can be developed there with any possibility of success.

"In both the Spokane and Yakima situations, Carstensen agreed that if they were unsuccessful in fighting initiative 166 this fall (or in the case of Yakima, in electing a friendly public utility district commissioner this fall) that he would come all out for a strong municipal ownership campaign because, as he stated it, the public utility districts were on their last legs and they either had to win this fight or try some other alternative to accomplish the acquisition of the private companies in this State.

"We then discussed the Walla Walla situation and Carstensen agreed that municipal ownership in Walla Walla could go ahead without interfering in any way with their public utility district program. I requested that he support municipal ownership in Walla Walla if the city council decided to put it on the ballot this fall, but he gave no commitment as to his support.

"We also discussed with Carstensen certain other alternatives that need to be pushed now in order to strengthen the public power situation in the northwest and help defeat the merger. I pointed out that while the possibility of a competitive system in The Dalles and the existing competitive situation in the Hood River cooperative were Oregon developments, they had a bearing upon the situation in the State of Washington because they were in Pacific Power & Light territory and that, therefore, the grange should give its moral support and any other support that it could to these developments. Similarly, we pointed out that a public utility district election in Clatsop County (Astoria) was coming up on the fall ballot and that the leaders in the Oregon grange felt that if sufficient effort were placed on winning this election, they had a very good chance of winning it. I suggested to Carstensen that inasmuch as Nick Bez is a member of the governor's advisory commission and (according to Carstensen) is a strong supporter of the public utility districts that he might try to enlist the assistance of Bez in the problem of getting the issues properly before the people in Clatsop County.

"I mentioned also that Benton County had received an award of $1,250,000 and had been promised financing by Hassock. Carstensen's reaction to the Benton County award was that it was too high and that the PUD would find itself in the same embarrassing condition that Okanogan County finds itself in today as a result of paying too high a price for its properties. I did not mention to Carstensen the inconsistency of his position on the question of price.

"I told Carstensen that certain groups in Portland were interested in circulating a referendum petition when and if the city council acts favorably upon the Northwestern Electric and Pacific Power & Light application for city approval of their merger plans. Incidentally, Commissioner Lee made a statement in the Sunday morning paper to the effect that she had examined the proposed merger of the two companies and felt it should be approved by the city council because it would result in refinancing the company on a lower-interest rate. Our information is that a referendum requiring the city council's action to be submitted to the voters for approval can be secured by a petition containing 2,000 signatures in the city of Portland.

"When I told Carstensen about this possibility of delaying the merger proceedings, he inquired as the possibility of getting an initiative petition circulated and signed up in the city of Portland for muncipal ownership or for a PUD in time for the fall election. I indicated to him that I was not informed as to the number of signatures required but that I would look into this possibility purely as a delaying tactic and not with any feeling that such an election could be carried through to a successful conclusion.

"I neglected to mention in the proper place that Carstensen is having a meeting in Wenatchee on Monday, July 22, of all organizations interested in defeating Initiative 166. He expects to have the A. F. of L., the Public Power District Commissioners' Association, and the Grange as well as certain municipalities represented at this meeting. He proposed to have each of the organizations represented there send telegrams to the SEC protesting against the merger plans and asking for hearings on these plans in the Northwest. It is our feeling that if these hearings can be held in the Northwest, they can be used as a good public forum on the whole public power issue including the basic points in Initiative 166."

It is believed that a careful reading of this document illustrates rather forcefully that the zeal of the administration of the BPA goes beyond the mere function of Federal administration and becomes in the nature of a crusade for Federal power.

The following memorandum from Mr. O. G. Hittle to Paul J. Raver, dated May 2, 1947, is quoted in part:

"In discussing the desirability of the REA cooperatives in Oregon joining the Northwest Public Power Association with Guy I. Thomas, manager of West Oregon Electric Cooperative, I find that considerable educational work will be needed before the co-op people will accept the Northwest Public Power Association as their organization above the State REA Association. Guy stated that it was his present feeling that the cooperatives should first of all have their own organization and that in the case of a common struggle for public power they would then be in a position to join all other public power groups. He seems to be open-minded on the subject.

"I expect to attend the Board meeting of the West Oregon Electric Cooperative on May 13, 1947, at which time I will discuss this subject with the directors, hoping to get them to join the Northwest Public Power Association.

"The Tillamook PUD has at last received money from REA for the Trask River extension. We are doing everything in our power to expedite the delivery of power to the Trask River Lumber Mill."

The following memorandum from H. R. Richmond, Jr., district manager of the Bonneville Power Administration, to Paul J. Raver, is quoted;

"1. Attached is a copy of a letter sent by Mr. Aldrich of the Pendleton East Oregonian to the Secretary of War, with copies to the Chief of Staff of the Army and the President.

"2. As you may know, the city of Pendleton recently voted to change over to the city-manager form of government. The new city manager, Mr. Orin King, appears to be a very liberal, intelligent, and aggressive individual. I am going to suggest that he be invited to the next regional advisory council meeting, with the thought that he may eventually be invited to become a member."

EXTRACTS FROM A BONNEVILLE EMPLOYEE'S CONCEPTION OF HIS JOB

In September of 1946, the Bonneville Power Administration operated a booth at the Oregon State Fair, and one Mr. Olsen, a Bonneville employee, was in charge of the booth.

Notes left by Mr. Olsen indicated that he had tabulated the duties of a Bonneville Power employee in conformance with administrative order No. 33. The following quotations are believed to be of interest:

"I perform the following duties in accordance with provisions and limitations set up by administrative order No. 33.

"1. Explain why it is necessary for building of more dams.

"2. Explain the meaning of a balanced economy, show how low-cost Columbia River power will help bring a balanced economy.

"3. Prepare reports and explanations of growth and development of publicly owned distribution systems throughout the Nation, and especially in Columbia River drainage basin.

"4. Prepare and explain factual information on rates, savings, financial statements of publicly owned bodies now operating.

"5. Convincing people that public distribution of power is their inherent right.

"6. Preparing material to use in ads, pamphlets, and public-relations work.

"7. Speaking at meetings and fairs and answering questions about the public ownership of utilities. This involves much study and thought as to most effective method of presentation of the facts.

"8. Combatting private power company propaganda.

"9. Working with organizations—Grange, labor groups, farmers union, old-age pensions, POL, etc. (POL is assumed to be an abbreviation for Public Ownership League.)

"10. Selling idea of an economy of abundance.

"11. Selling public power.

"12. Selling idea that Columbia River power is nature's greatest gift to the people.

"13. Selling idea—it's theirs by prior right.

"14. Development operations requires study of public power throughout the entire Nation because NW public power development is a part of a Nation-wide program. Therefore, it is necessary for us to know about TVA, Boulder, Santee Cooper, Nebr., etc.—when one is attacked, all are attacked. Necessity for a unified national program."

EXTRACTS FROM NEWSPAPER CLIPPINGS, SPEECHES, ETC.

Dr. Raver had been quite pointed in a number of articles, speeches, etc., concerning the difficulty of operating BPA under Congressional restraints, and advocates the removal of such restraints. Probably the most typical document that would illustrate the views on this matter is an excerpt from an address by Paul J. Raver at Reed College in Portland, Ore., on April 17, 1948. This is set out as follows:

"An aggressive private utility in our position with a serious power shortage, would expand its facilities as rapidly as possible, particularly the addition of generators at Grand Coulee. With the large investment in the dam already made, the proportionately small investment in generators would be returned within a few years from energy sales. Obviously from a business standpoint this is a prudent investment. But our procedure to obtain an additional generator is slow and cumbersome. First of all, we must secure the concurrence of the Bureau of Reclamation as to the immediate need for the generator. The Bureau will then estimate costs, establish schedules, and present these to the Bureau of the Budget for approval, after agreement with the Secretary of the Interior. With Bureau of Budget approval the request is then laid before Congress for authorization. Authorization will not always carry with it the necessary appropriation, and if not the Bureau of Reclamation must then go back to Congress for funds. Similarly, BPA must present its request for funds for transmission lines to carry the power to market when the generator is installed. A private utility would act immediately, presenting the problem to their board of directors, and then proceed positively. The TVA must go to Congress for necessary authorization, but having control over its own revenues, it can then proceed. The Bonneville Administration has an equal responsibility to the needs of its market area, but lacking control over its revenue and source of power supply, cannot carry out its obligation with dispatch.

"Another contrast with private business, is the situation we face in the keeping of our accounts. The only required accounting for a private utility is the Federal Power Commission's uniform system of accounts. The Bonneville Administration is also required to utilize this system. On top of this, being a Federal agency, we are subject to all of the normal accounting requirements and procedures of the General Accounting Office. Furthermore, being responsible to the Department of Interior and subject to the budgetary control procedure of the Bureau of the Budget,, our accounting and fiscal controls must be established to meet their requirements. Another aspect of accounting control which is peculiar to our operation involves the Congressional limitation of funds to be expended on operation and maintenance. The uniform system of accounts establishes what charges shall go to operation and maintenance and to construction. This dual control contributes further to the inflexibility of our operations.

"Our day-by-day operations include all of the problems and responsibilities which are typical of a large private utility. In addition we have many which arise with a public agency. Maximum flexibility should be an objective of the management of a utility in preparing to meet these constant operating problems, many of which cannot be anticipated. To meet some of these problems, Congress has permitted modification in the original Bonneville Act. For example, we are now permitted to bargain collectively with hourly employees in several crafts, which provides us with a flexibility comparable to a private utility in dealing with this class of employees. The exception is that we have added controls and regulations placed upon us by the Civil Service Commission.

"In summing up these factors I have just cited, it might be stated that most of our trouble comes to a focus each year when we are subjected to what someone has termed the 'politics of the appropriations process.'

"Let me now give you some practical examples of how this political process affects us.

"1. Here is but one example of what occurs in our construction program. This happened last year.

"In the years prior to 1947, we had asked for and received authorization from the Congress which would permit us to order materials and start construction of a transmission line from the Dalles, Oreg., across the Columbia River to Goldendale, Wash.—a matter of 30 miles. This was to serve power to a fast-growing and power-short community which had a publicly owned utility distribution system.

"As I say, in the years prior to 1947, we had authority to order materials for this line and to start the construction upon receipt of the materials.

"For the fiscal year 1948 we needed money to complete setting the poles, stringing of the conductor, and installing the transformer facilities for delivery of power to the utility.

"Then the character of the Congress changed. The Eightieth Congress, which was to appropriate the funds to complete this job, decided as a matter of policy not to do so. There were new chairmen of the Appropriations Committee and of the subcommittee which refused our request. They had come into power on an announced over-all policy of national economy. They made broad cuts in all appropriations and, in the hurly-burly, the money for completion of this half-finished line was eliminated.

"When the House Appropriations Committee reported this cut, it was roughly 2 months before the end of the fiscal year and our crews had been working on the construction of the line.

"What was the Bonneville management to do? Were we to keep the crews plugging along in the hope the Senate committee would restore the amount and the restoration would survive conference, or should we fire the crews forthwith?

"Supposing we fired them and then got the money after all?

"Supposing we didn't get the money—what would we do about the stacks of insulators laid out along the line? There would not be even any money to pull them into storage.

"What about the holes that had been dug to set the poles in?

"While we debated this matter, a farmer threatened to sue us because one of his cows had fallen into one of these holes.

"But most important of all, what about the community that was depending upon delivery of power over that line? What about the commitments that the distributing utility had made to its customers based upon the assurance that power from Bonneville was on the way?

"There we were faced with the utility responsibility and with plenty of money in the bank from our revenues to do the job, but completely stymied.

"There was not one of us in the Bonneville Administration who believed there was anything arbitrary or wilful in this congressional action. We knew simply that the new membership of the committees had not yet had time to survey the problem for themselves. We had a new board of directors.

"Here is another example. The new Congress, with a good deal of reason on its side, was committed to the encouragement of private enterprise. As a means to this end, the Congress consciously put limitations on force account work by Federal bureaus and agencies. This was true in the case of the Bonneville Administration. Wording was written into our Appropriations Act which forbade us to do any of our own building. This had unforeseen consequences.

"All our construction work had to be contracted out. It was perhaps natural and inevitable for the bids of contractors to rise rapidly without the threat of competition by our own forces. It is impossible to document the increase in costs which this situation probably causes, but I am sure it must be large.

"Another difficulty that this abandonment of force account authority put us into was the increased complexity of our relationships with organized labor.

"Line construction is done by one group of unions. Operations of lines and substations is in the hands of another union.

"We had made special arrangements with the group of unions we do business with for the operation of a 'utility crew'. This was a group of workers who could do either construction work or operations work. It saved us an endless amount of time and money—which were important to meeting emergencies of various natures. But the change in the language of our appropriations act stopped all that. For a while it began to look as though we might have to contract out the operation of our lines—if we could find anybody who was willing to take that responsibility.

"Fortunately, before the appropriations procedure was finished we achieved some slight modification of the wording governing force account work.

"There is one other example of the practical difficulties Federal proprietorship gets into as a result of political pressures. It is one of the most anguishing experiences that can face a manager regardless of who owns his business.

"I refer to the arbitrary and often senseless ways in which reductions in force must be carried out.

"The brains and soul of any organization, whether it is government or privately owned, reside in the management and operations staffs. Bonneville is no different than any other enterprise in this respect.

"Beginning in 1938 when the Bonneville Administration had no business whatsoever, the Congress has allotted sums for operation, maintenance, and administration of the Bonneville system. The 1939 figure was, as I recall, $100,000. At that time we did not have a mile of transmission line, nor a kilowatt hour of power. As our business grew and as our operation and maintenance problem grew and our planning and sales problem grew, we asked the Congress each year for a little more money. Last year at this time we were spending operations, maintenance, and administration money at the rate of about $4,300,000 a year. This covered two general classes of items.

"1. The operation and maintenance of the physical plant—more than 3,000 miles of high-voltage transmission line; 59 substations. Operations of these facilities required crews of trained electrical operators and power dispatchers and switch tenders. Maintenance of these physical facilities required line patrols headquartered at strategic points throughout the Northwest region, repeated inspections for the purpose of preventing break-downs, availability of equipment for emergency work when break-downs did occur, and the operation and maintenance of an elaborate system of relay controls to minimize the danger of outages. About half our total expenditure of $4,300,000 was devoted to the maintenance of this physical system. During the war years we had been forced through lack of manpower and materials to neglect much maintenance that should have been attended to, and it was our hope last spring that we could obtain more money for this current year to catch up on this deferred maintenance.

"2. Less than half our operations and maintenance money was devoted to what might be called sales and administration. It was in this category that we made special effort to find highly creative people because it was in these administrative and sales departments that our planning and programming work had to be done. We were in a new business for the Government, the future was uncharted, bad guesses now would certainly wreck us in the future. Accordingly, over the 9-year period of my administration I made every effort to find people, not only with a good deal of technical training in the various branches of utility economics, but people with vision and understanding of the region which we serve.

"For example our sales staff was not composed of salesmen. It was headed, and still is headed, by a doctor of philosophy with vast training in utility economics, and utility rate making. It is his job to see that all the power is sold to the best possible advantage of the region and the Federal Treasury; that the rates at which this power is offered will pay out the Federal investment and at the same time be promotional enough to entice buyers and new types of consumption.

"Among his staff members is another highly trained economist and statistician whose sole job is to conduct a continuing study of trends in power consumption in various subareas of the Northwest region. Insofar as is economically possible, we must know where power is going to be needed in the Northwest 5 years from now because it takes 5 years to build a dam and about 3 years to build a transmission line; and if we are to plan these things adequately and without waste of money, we must know where they are going to be needed. This in turn requires some kind of a forecast. It takes an intimate knowledge of the highly complex techniques of power to make even an intelligent guess on these matters.

"In April the Appropriations Committee, newly staffed by Members of Congress who were unused to the study of the power business and who labored under the general impression that there was waste in all Government departments, trimmed our operations and maintenance budget from a current expenditure of $4,300,000 to $2,500,000. What this meant was that if the Senate did not give us more, we would have to cut back our operations by about 47 percent.

"The usual history of such things is that the House appropriates a minimum amount, the Senate increases it substantially and the difference is somhow split when the appropriation bill gets to conference.

"Obviously we did not want to wreck our organization any more than necessary. It was then apparent that we would have to trim the staff by July 1. We hoped we wouldn't have to trim it down to the House figure; but we could not be sure.

"So our personnel division and the controller's office worked out three alternatives: First, we guessed how much we might get if the Senate was generous and the House should soften up in conference. We thought we might get about $3,500,000. This would still be a substantial cut from the $4,300,000 we were then operating on, but we prepared a schedule for elimination of jobs and reduction of other items to fall within the $3,500,000.

"Then, on the chance that we were being optimistic with this $3,500,000 figure, we worked out a different schedule of economy for a $3,000,000 level.

"Finally, we took as a third possible alternative the worst that could happen—the amount allowed us by the House, $2,500,000.

"All this involved a terrific amount of work. The head of each division and office in the Administration had to figure out which jobs he would eliminate under each of the three possibilities. This was tough because there just didn't seem to be any way we could carry on any kind of a reasonable operation under the third alternative.

"The situation was further complicated by the various employee securities offered by the civil-service laws where length of service and veterans' preference quite often are the controlling factors in who is retained and who is fired. Quite often we found that if we eliminated the job, the person in it had prior rights to a job which was not eliminated. This situation resulted in a tremendous amount of displacement within the organization.

"To make a long story short, when the chips were down we found the worst had happened. We were forced to cut operations from $4,300,000 to $2,500,000.

"We abolished more than 650 jobs. The employees in many of these jobs displaced other employees by reason of their seniority rights. As a result of this perhaps a third of the remaining jobs in the organization had new occupants who were unfamiliar with the work.

"The wording of the appropriation law wiped out one entire division which we had been at particular pains to build over a period of 10 years. The wreckage to the staff was incalculable. Practically every one of our people got as good or better jobs elsewhere in the Government or in private enterprise.

"We reduced our line crews both in number and in size and the men who were displaced were snapped up immediately by the utility industry.

"We could trim our physical operations staff only so much—people had to be available to operate switch gear and dispatch power. So we took the biggest bite out of our planning staff—67 percent.

"Work which we had developed in the new fields of power use over a long period of time was abandoned. For example, we had been carrying on a correlation of studies in electric space heating. We had at one time a small staff—three men—working on this. We had established grants-in-aid with a couple of the Northwest colleges for research in this field. It is a subject about which far too little is known and in which there are many important problems to be solved. Electric space heat is inevitable in the Northwest. A considerable file had been built up and then we were forced to wipe the staff out. All of them got better jobs elsewhere. One man is working for the Navy; another man is working for one of the big electric supply companies; the third—an electrical engineer—decided there was nothing in Government employment and is now becoming extremely prosperous as a stock rancher. The great file of material which they had accumulated lies somewhere in the Bonneville archives. We constantly get requests for this information from utility systems and manufacturers, but there is no one to do more than acknowledge the letters.

"It is too soon to tell but things appear a good deal brighter this year. The Congressmen who were largely inexperienced in power and western development matters last year, have had a year to learn about it and to see the results of their clipping. They are intelligent, public-spirited men, and I am confident we will get a good deal more money this year than we got a year ago. But suppose we do get it? How am I going to staff up again on July 1? This year we had perhaps five survey crews laying out lines to be built with our badly cut funds. July 1 we may find ourselves with about $35,000,000 of construction money. To handle this we will have to have 18 crews. Are the survey men I fired last year going to come back to work for me now? I doubt it. How can I recruit survey men? I have only one recruitment officer in my decimated personnel office, and no money to hire any more.

"I can tell you now I am going to get it done some way, but I am afraid it will be more expensive than if we had been allowed to maintain a fairly stable level of employment during the past year. If I am to have these people available July 1, when we get our new money, I should start recruiting them now. But what can I tell them now? I can't make any really firm commitment of employment.

"There are numerous other examples of the special hazards which face Government-owned enterprises.

"I don't believe it is possible or proper to remove these hazards if removal means removal of control by the elected representatives of the people.

"I do believe, however, that a better balance can be struck between executive and legislative, State and Federal, forces on control of such operations.

"I believe that the Congress can guard its procedures against too free a reversal of policies via the appropriations route.

"In Bonneville's case, for example, I believe that Federal power sales policy could be better modified by amendment of the organic act with full debate thereon, rather than by language in the annual appropriation act.

"I believe further that agencies whose operations show a profit to the taxpayer and whose programs are self-liquidating could be trusted with more freedom in the use of revenues, subject, of course, to annual audit.

"Finally, I believe Federal budget making could be vastly improved by a segregation of self-liquidating public works from those which are not self-liquidating.

"All these beliefs of mine are based on the assumption that Federal proprietorship is with us to stay and will grow more extensive before it grows less so.

"I am not prepared to debate tonight whether this is good or bad.

"I can only recognize it as a condition."

Excerpts from newspaper articles which were reviewed by the writer for many years past are set out as follows which would indicate the fact that the administration of the Bonneville Power Administration is going beyond reasonable lengths in entering into political discussions and attempts to arouse the people for or against existing or proposed legislation.

The Oregon Journal of January 20, 1941—The Governor of Oregon apparently asked the opinion of Dr. Raver concerning the Oregon Public Utility District Act, the replies to which were published. Pertinent quotations from the newspaper article follow:

"Raver objects to the present law requiring two petitions to be filed in incorporation of a public utility district. * * * Raver wants the law amended so a public utility district may be incorporated within 30 days after filing the petition for incorporation. * * * Raver wants public utility districts to be given the right of immediate possession of property in condemnation proceedings. * * * Raver objects to the provision of existing law which subjects resolutions or ordinances of public utility district directors to referendum by district voters. * * * Raver would repeal the present law imposing direct and ad valorem taxes on district property. * * * Raver insists that provisions covering dissolution of a district are such that 'the need for drastic revision seems beyond dispute.'"

The Toledo (Oreg.) Leader of November 6, 1941:

"Mr. Fitts, representing Bonneville, was explaining advantages of the coast public utility district to local citizens along Main Street Tuesday."

The Condon (Oreg.) Globe-Times of November 7, 1941:

"A meeting was called by Morton Tompkins of the Bonneville Power Administration Friday evening in Arlington for the purpose of organizing a sponsoring committee as the preliminary step in forming a public utility district in those parts of Sherman, Gilliam, Morrow and Wheeler Counties now served by the Pacific Power & Light Co."

The Condon (Oreg.) Globe-Times of December 12, 1941:

"Morton Tompkins, State Grange officer and representative of the Bonneville Power Authority, who is interested in the people's utilities districts in Gilliam, Wheeler, Sherman, and Morrow Counties, was in Condon Saturday and picked the petitions from within this county which had been circulated and the registration attested by the county clerk."

Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of October 28, 1940:

"Appearing with Fred C. Shepard, urging peoples' utility district formation, Brazil stated that he represented Dr. Paul J. Raver, Bonneville Administrator, then urged that Bonneville power serve to bring new industry to central Oregon. He spoke of mineral resources which, he said, Bonneville power might serve to develop. Cheap transportation at tidewater is a factor in the aluminum operations on the Columbia which have contracted for power from Bonneville, he said.

"Shepard, who emphasized that his position does not put him under the provisions of the Hatch Act, read from a letter from Dr. Raver appearing recently in the editorial column of the bulletin as giving evidence that the possibility of power sales here as well as construction cost is a factor in determining feasibility of a Bonneville transmission line to central Oregon.

"'If you vote against the public-utility district, you are voting against Bonneville power; that's what you are telling the administrator,' he elucidated.

"Speaking directly on the coming election, he affirmed that the men running for office 'are not going to plunge the district into the power business, necessarily, but will get the full facts as to feasibility.'"

Baker (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald of February 1, 1941—the address of Morton Tompkins, field representative of the Bonneville Power Administration:

"Mr. Tompkins traced the history of power and contended that the question today is 'Who is going to control power?' He asked the audience not to consider Bonneville power alone, but power development in all of the Northwest. He spoke of bringing Bonneville and Grand Coulee power together and even discussed connections with systems still farther away. * * *

"'A great deal of the power reserved for public bodies has not been used. As a result the Bonneville Administration is dipping into the reserve for public bodies because of the call upon industry in the national emergency.'

"Later in his talk, Mr. Tompkins said, however, that 'Coming to Baker County is getting a long way from the source of supply. We can sell to private firms a lot closer to the dam, so at the present time the only power available for this area is that reserved for public bodies.'

"In discussing rates, Mr. Tompkins used charts to show a comparison of public-utilities district and private-utility rates. He said the present cost of 200 kilowatt hours per month in Baker County is $6.30, whereas it is estimated the cost under the public utility district would be $4.25. * * *

"The speaker said the district would pay for itself out of earnings, pay taxes and other expenses and give the people of Baker County earnings of $3,500,000 during a 30-year period."

Sherman County (Oreg.) Journal of April 11, 1941:

"Morton Tompkins, organizer of public-utility districts for the Bonneville Administration, was in town Thursday while on his way to Condon where a meeting was called for that night with the avowed purpose of petitioning for a district to be formed of the towns of Gilliam, Morrow, Sherman, and Wheeler Counties."

Baker, (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald of April 17, 1941:

"Assertion that savings of from 25 to 40 percent would be made in light and power rates in Baker County if the public-utility district gets into operation was made today by Morton Tompkins, representative of the Bonneville Administration who addressed the Lions Club at its weekly luncheon. * * *

"Mr. Tompkins presented five power bills which he said came from local concerns and pointed out savings which he claimed might be made."

Astoria (Oreg.) Astorian-Budget of April 25, 1941:

"THOMPSON, RAVER PROVIDE AMMUNITION AT PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT MEET

"Resilential power rates under a public-utility district would still be 10 to 20 percent lower, rural rates 19 to 41 percent lower and commercial rates in cities 26 to 33 percent lower than under the latest announced reductions of the Pacific Power & Light Co., Dr. Carl Thompson of the Bonneville Administration told a meeting in Seaside Thursday night.

"Dr. Thompson, who is secretary of the Public Ownership League of America and former national campaign manager for the Socialist Party, spoke under auspices of a seaside public-utility district sponsors' group.

"Dr. Raver declared that the power company has only a 1-year contract.

"'I can say definitely that I cannot guarantee under any circumstances to sell additional Columbia River power to the Pacific Power & Light Co.,' Dr. Raver wrote."

Baker (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald of May 24, 1941:

"With only a few days left before Baker County votes in the proposed people's utility-district ballot to accept or reject a public-utility district, D. L. Marlette, representing Dr. Paul Raver, Bonneville Dam Administrator, appeared in the high-school auditorium to add his weight to the sponsors of the district.

"Mr. Marlette said, 'I do not say there never will be any power, but presently there is none available. We are not sure at all of having any power for the Eastern Oregon Light & Power Co.

"'The only way for Baker to be sure of getting the power in any degree is to form a public-utility district.'"

A press release of August 21, 1941, by Dr. Raver concerning the signing of a preliminary agreement for the purchase of certain properties of the Mountain States Power Co. by a public-utility district contains the following quotation: "I believe this transfer which I am happy to have had a part in negotiating will facilitate the acquisition of private utility properties by other Oregon districts, nine of which have been organized for the purpose of marketing hydroelectric power on a nonprofit basis."

Grange News of January 17, 1948:

"Dr. Raver painted an optimistic picture for Bonneville and Coulee power, indicating his belief that the region was 'over the hump' of congressional opposition to public-power development in the region. He said the Federal Government had invested $360,000,000 and that sales of power to public agencies had reduced it already to $250,000,000. Bonneville's surplus as of last June, after all charges, amounted to over $22,000,000, Raver said. He urged a united front among all public-power agencies in appealing for future appropriations."

This specific quotation brings Bonneville very close to violating section 201 of title 18 which prohibits the use of Federal funds in attempting to influence legislation. Obviously Dr. Raver, who made the remarks in Seattle, was there on a Government expense account, and his salary was obviously running during the course of his remarks.

Walla Walla Union Bulletin of May 28, 1938, covered remarks of C. Girard Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to the following effect: "The Assistant Secretary's statement was in answer to a report issued Wednesday by the House Appropriations Committee. The report criticized sales of Bonneville power to public-utility districts and said that public utility-district actions in condemning properties of private power companies represented Soviet power policy.

" 'The whole report shows the attitude of the Republican Congress in opposition to public power. The committee cut $84,000,000 from the President's requests, including $5,000,000 for the Columbia Basin, after these requests had been trimmed to a minimum by the Budget Bureau.' "

The Wenatchee World of June 15, 1948, carried the following comments of Dr. Raver in a speech before the public-utility district commissioners of Washington:

"I only hope that out of such organizations as these will come a rebirth of leadership. * * *

"But are we producing as much aluminum now as during the war? No, as a matter of fact, we are only producing 1½ billion pounds, a billion less, and why, because we cannot get the power. Then along comes a reduction in Bonneville appropriations for transmission lines and substations and reductions in maintenance and construction programs. This does not add up * * *.

"Dr. Raver told the public-utility district group no private utilities would be given contracts for delivery of power for longer than a year. 'We just cannot do it because we are gambling as it is on an average water supply and scheduled installation of new generation equipment. We just hope we won't have a dry year in 1951 for if all goes well our forecasts of needs indicates we can make it by then * * *'.

"Foster Creek is a must. If we had secured the appropriations for this year we might not be starting 1953 as a critical year. Who knows but what the international situation may demand that power then? The same is true for McNary, cutting appropriations means delay and a gamble with national security and an extra burden on our dwindling oil supply. In event of war, oil-burning power plants would be cut off. Our basic thinking must be changed and soon if we expect to develop this great country and assure peace. We need a closer working relationship based on sound business principles."

Oregon Journal, Wednesday, July 21, 1948—Addressing the American Society of Civil Engineers, Dr. Raver stated, "If the Federal Government is to do the job in the Northwest, it must recognize that the power aspects of the development are basic to the economy of the region and indeed, to the Nation. This means that power development on the Columbia River system must be differentiated from public works in both the planning and budgeting of the Federal Government."

The Salem (Oreg.) Capitol Press of October 25, 1946, quoting Dr. Raver stated:

"We will take care of the public power agencies first, our aluminum plant customers second, and what's left will go to the private power companies * * *.

"Only after private steam plants are running to full capacity, and the total output is still insufficient will we consider taking power away from our aluminum customers for the benefit of people served by private utilities."

A letter of April 17, 1940, from Dr. Raver to former Representative Nan Wood Honeyman contained the following quotation:

' Uninformed individuals are also accepting as fact, statements that increased taxation inevitably would result under a public-utility district, presumably because the public-utility district would not be paying taxes. So far as Oregon is concerned, this is obviously private-utility propaganda which, in fact, cannot be substantiated. Under the laws of Oregon the public-utility district is required to pay property taxes for the support of State and local governments and school and other taxing districts on the same basis as private-utility companies. In other words, the public-utility district would carry its share of the tax burden. Of course, it is true that the public-utility district would not pay city franchise taxes or taxes to the Federal Government. Franchise taxes seldom produce substantial revenue. So far as Federal tax payments are concerned, these in no way would affect the revenues to the city, county, and State."

GUY C. "FLASH" MYERS

Captioned individual is a rather fabulous figure in the field of public power promotion and presents an enigma in that he is a Wall Street operator who seems to be working against the so-called capitalist system and has made literally millions of dollars in commissions on the sale of revenue bonds created by public-power districts. It is a rather strange spectacle to understand that the so-called selfish interest of free enterprise is here employed to promote the very thing that will ultimately destroy such enterprise. These large fees, of course, that this promoter has received become a part of the debt of the community which must be paid off by the ultimate consumer of the utility.

It appears that Mr. Myers first entered this field through an acquaintanceship with J. D. Ross, who was originally with the Securities and Exchange Commission and was subsequently appointed as the first administrator of the Bonneville Power Administration.

Guy C. Myers was born in Green Bay, Wis., and spent his early life in Wisconsin and New York. In 1907 he became employed by what is now known as the Illinois Power & Light Co. at Danville, Ill. In 1910 he became affiliated with the Eastern Montana Power Co., and in 1916 started in business for himself, buying and selling municipal bonds in Montana. In 1934 he moved to Seattle and is currently reported as residing in that city. He likewise maintains an office at 35 Wall Street, New York City.

He is reported in these early years to have organized the following: the Tri-State Rural Credit Association, the Farm Mortgage Corp., the Cane Irrigation District, the Red Lodge Canning Co., the Red Lodge-Rosebud Irrigation District, the Billings Canning Co., the Soule Apartments of Billings.

Some sources have indicated some of these early operations were highly speculative and failed to yield; however, no attempt has been made to check these early operations as the passage of time has dimmed their significance.

He apparently obtained the nickname "Flash" in Billings, Mont., and his phenomenal success seemed assured subsequent to his association with the late J. D. Ross, the great public-power pioneer.

For some years now Myers has been interested in promoting the sale of the Puget Sound Power & Light Co. facilities and came close to closing the deal at a figure of $135,000,000. Myers, however, is still attempting to dissolve remaining private enterprise in the area.

A review of correspondence in the files of the Bonneville Power Administration illustrates the close relationship of Mr. Myers to that Administration during the period of time when Mr. J. D. Ross was Administrator. It is emphasized here that there was no indication in the files that the present Administrator has any personal relationship whatsoever with Mr. Myers. However, his very attitude in administering his responsibility makes it possible for Myers' success. In conversations with Dr. Raver it would appear rather definite that Dr. Raver does not approve of the tactics used by Mr. Myers and has, in fact, indicated that he felt many of the estimates made in connection with the purchase of the private utilities were unreasonably high.

Letter from Guy C. Myers to Mr. Ross, dated April 1, 1938:

"I am informed from several sources in Oregon that the PUD election on April 8 for the seven power districts will be defeated. I hope this is wrong.

"I also had hoped that the election could have been held under a new law we are working up that would make it much easier for them to proceed if they did win the election.

"Everything else is moving along splendidly and I hope to see you soon. Best regards from us all."

A telegram to Mr. Ross, dated December 30, 1937, from Herman E. Lafkey read as follows:

"Failure of Myers to comply with written and oral agreement to personally finance utility district warrants issued for legal fees causing undue hardship on attorneys. Duties necessarily require time and expense with other sources of income practically cut off. Do you have any suggestions?"

The following telegram from Mr. Ross to Mr. Myers dated December 30, 1937 (Government rate) stated:

"Have received following telegram from Herman E. Lafkey, Southwest Washington Utility District Association (above telegram quoted). What do you want me to advise him?"

Telegram from Mr. Myers to Mr. Ross dated December 31, 1937:

"Warrants Lafkey holds do not comply with legal requirement from an investor's standpoint. My agreement calls for legally issued warrants. Chick can explain this to you. He holds similar types of warrants as Lafkey and no complaints from him. I received same wire from Lafkey and I am answering him air mail. Happy New Year."

The following series of telegrams, during the pertinent period when a good many of the public utility districts were promoted, are to J. D. Ross from Guy C. Myers:

NOVEMBER 22, 1938.

Some day when you have time will you give me a list of all the Commissioners' names that were elected in the last election, showing their district and address. I suppose you have these, or if not, you will be able to secure them. Bob says Grays Harbor district was sending letter on to me. I hope I get it before I leave for the west coast, so I can make some progress here.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

JUNE 25, 1948.

Washington promises us decision on Nebraska contract next Tuesday. Would leave immediately for Seattle. Could handle bonds for Cascade Locks if you think they are sound. Will need some figures on company. Have you got them or shall we get them here?

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK CITY.

DECEMBER 2, 1938.

Arrive Portland Stream Liner Tuesday morning. Traveling with attorney and banker. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

DECEMBER 29, 1938.

Answering your night letter, I will help in every way possible and have arranged to secure facts and figures on Pacific power and Northwest. This information being compiled now. I will be in Portland early part January to turn them over to you for your study. Congratulations re Neb. Due more to you than anyone. This is the biggest step forward in settling the power program that has been done so far. We all wish you a healthy and happy 1939. Regards.

GUY MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 8, 1939.

Please wire when do we receive Grays Harbor interstate confidential figures for our own use.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 17, 1939.

Please air mail copy power contract between Bonneville and any Washington power district. Regards.

GUY MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

FEBRUARY 23, 1937.

Dawson willing work with Schuler but cannot split his fees. Better suggest that bankers take care of Schuler. He will not have much work to do anyhow but can keep Dawson advised as to moves made by Myers. Is this O. K.? Received Grays Harbor figures. Please wire amount for working capital improvements and betterments. Have you seen Solomon? Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

MARCH 6, 1939.

Just learned Supreme Court kicked out Wahkiakum case. Advise me what this means. What is physical value Grays Harbor property? Duff confirms deal off on water properties. Please advise me result your talk with Griffin so I can have his attitude in checking with people here. This I will keep confidential. Air mailed today answer balance your wires. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 5, 1939.

Sent following wire Chuck today, "Am assured this morning bankers will conclude Pacific and Wahkiakum financing by May 1." Talked to Barnes today. He is preparing letter to me setting forth conditions under which he will negotiate for acquisition by districts of Puget Sound Power & Light Co. Be sure and have Lund give balance information to Laing at Chicago. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 11, 1939.

Just received wire from Chuck stating districts covering Puget meeting Seattle Sunday. Wired him arrive Tuesday asking if meeting could be postponed. Will have Barnes' letter tomorrow, could forward you to read before commissioners if meeting cannot be postponed. Can you do anything about postponing meeting? Please wire if contract between Bonneville West Coast Power has been signed. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 12, 1939.

Sending Barnes letter Seattle. Urging Nichols telephone stating you can give as much information as if here. Advising impossible say when you could arrive. Advised further delay his decision Grays Harbor would cause commissioners institue condemnation. Also under no conditions would you recommend higher than $2,842,000. Stress these points if he telephones so can settle matter this week. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

APRIL 14, 1939.

Air mailed you Portland yesterday copy Barnes letter. Original sent you Seattle both with covering letter. Leave New York 5 today. Wire me Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., Saturday until 6 p. m. in case you need additional ammunition. Have understanding with Nichols along lines you suggested. Do not tell commissioners anything unless they going Seattle meeting and then only you know I have made successful trade which will explain on arrival. Wired Judy asking commissioners pass resolution authorizing offer $300,000 water properties to forestall cities interfering district program. Wired Skamania pass resolution offer $40,000 Stevenson division. Arrive Tuesday streamliner. Regards.

GUY C. MYERS.

NEW YORK, N. Y.

MAY 9, 1939.

Hope you settle West Coast Transmission purchase quickly. Air mailed yesterday Boner Prescott Laing copy Grays Harbor purchase contract. Your Lunds going today. Also copy power contract Grays Harbor Wilapa. Snider says you have description real estate. If not wire. All exhibits your hands immediately general principle purchase contract agreed to by district. Contacting Duff Skamania. Anxiously awaiting Grays Harbor engineers report. Regards.

GUY MYERS.

NEW YORK CITY.

MISCELLANEOUS OBSERVATIONS

For the information of the committee, a list of speeches, as made by Bonneville employees, is set out hereinafter. It is noted that in the year ending June 1948, Dr. Raver made 23 formal speeches which is a little over approximately two a month.

SPEECHES GIVEN BY DR. PAUL J. RAVER, ADMINISTRATOR, BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION, JULY 1947–JULY 1948

July 3, 1947: The Dalles, Oreg., Kiwanis Club.

July 12, 1947: Seattle, Wash., Building Trades, Washington A. F. of L. (extemporaneous).

August 6, 1947: Coeur d'Alene, Idaho, Idaho State Federation of Labor (extemporaneous).

August 15, 1947: Longview, Wash., Northwest Public Power Association (extemporaneous).

September 1, 1947: Prosser, Wash., States Day celebration.

September 4, 1947: Springfield, Ill., Association of Illinois Electric Cooperatives.

September 17, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Labor Management Council (extemporaneous).

October 10, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Men's Club, White Temple Baptist Church (extemporaneous).

October 15, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Public Utilities Commissioners (extemporaneous).

November 25, 1947: Portland Oreg., Portland Council of Churches (extemporaneous).

December 12, 1947: Portland, Oreg., Board of Intergovernmental Relations (extemporaneous).

March 31, 1948: Portland, Oreg., Multnomah County Legion, Portland Post No. 1, Future of the Great Northwest.

April 5, 1948: Washington, D. C., review meeting with National Security Council.

April 13, 1948: Chicago, Ill., International Association of Operating Engineers (extemporaneous).

April 17, 1948: Portland, Oreg., Reed College, Northwest Political Science Association, Some Political Problems of Government Proprietorship.

April 22, 1948: Sacramento, Calif., Board of Intergovernmental Relations, Power Outlook for the Pacific Northwest.

May 6, 1948: Portland, Oreg., speech before supervisors of Bonneville Power Administration (extemporaneous).

May 11, 1948: Tacoma, Wash., Tacoma Kiwanis Club (extemporaneous).

May 28, 1948: Raymond, Wash., Pacific County Public Utility District, dedication of new building (extemporaneous).

June 12, 1948: Ephrata, Wash., Washington Public Utility Commissioners Association (semiannual convention) (extemporaneous).

July 10, 1948: Hungry Horse Dam, dedication Hungry Horse Dam (extemporaneous).

July 17, 1948: Quinault, Wash., Quinault Light Co. (extemporaneous).

July 21, 1948: Seattle, Wash., American Society of Civil Engineers, Production, Power, and the Pacific Northwest.

Exclusive of Dr. Raver the staff of Bonneville Power Administration made 59 public-speaking engagements, radio addresses, etc., during the fiscal year 1948. A review of material furnished indicates it is generally highly partial to Federal power and criticism of the Congress for failure to appropriate funds for expansion is found both directly and by implication. Copies of the material referred to is available in the staff files.

FORMER BONNEVILLE EMPLOYEES NOW EMPLOYED BY PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICTS

In response to a query as to the identity of employees of Bonneville Power Administration now employed by public-utility district, reply was received as follows:

George F. Ward, manager, Skamania County public-utility district, Stevenson, Wash.

Lacy M. Peoples, assistant superintendent of operations, Cowlitz County public-utility district, Longview, Wash.

Al Rotta, assistant chief engineer, Clark County public-utility district, Vancouver, Wash.

Jack M. Gillham, manager of the Tillamook public-utility district, Tillamook, Oreg.

Paul Hand, manager, Central Lincoln County public-utility district, Newport, Oreg.

Lawrence Bauer, district manager, Central Lincoln County public-utility district, Newport, Oreg.

Owen Hurd, manager, Benton, Wash., public-utility district, Prosser, Wash.

James Phillip, engineer, Franklin, Wash., public-utility district, Pasco, Wash.

J. L. Shreve, engineer, Chelan, Wash., public-utility district, Wenatchee, Wash.

A. C. Jacquot, manager, Okanogan, Wash., public-utility district, Okanogan, Wash.

Charles Luce, attorney, Benton, Wash., public-utility district, Walla Walla, Wash.

Ralph Barber, attorney, Klickitat, Wash., public-utility district, Goldenale, Wash.

Ivan Bloch, formerly chief of the Bonneville Industrial and Resources Development Division, is now in private practice as a consulting engineer. One of his clients is the Snohomish, Wash., public-utility district, Everett, Wash.

George Hamilton, formerly a Bonneville consultant, is also retained by the Snohomish public-utility district as a consulting engineer.

James Metcalf, formerly in charge of Bonneville power sales, is now employed by the Harza Engineering Co. in Chicago, and has recently represented this firm as consultant for one or two public-utility districts in the State of Washington.

Consultants on rolls who did work for Bonneville during the fiscal year 1948:

McKinley, Charles (terminated December 13, 1947), coordinating committee: Consultant for Bonneville Power Administration from January 1947 to December 1947. Professor of political science at Reed College. At Reed College from September 1926 to June 1935, from February 1937 to September 1940, and from September 1942 to present. Consultant for State Department, Division of Economic Studies, from October 1943 to June 1944. Consultant for National Resources Planning Board from November 1942 to June 1943, and June 1939 to September 1939. Business specialist for War Production Board from June 1942 to September 1942. All charges for Mr. McKinley have been borne by the Pacific Northwest Coordinating Committee, and his being on our rolls has been merely as a convenience to the committee and the Department.

Starr, Eugene C., system engineering: Consultant with Bonneville Power Administration since August 1944; senior electrical engineer (expert) from July 1939 to August

1944 (part-time). With Office of Scientific Research and Development, Washington, D. C., from 1942 to 1945 (part time). Professor of electrical engineering at Oregon State College, where he has taught since 1927. Recognized specialist on high-voltage electrical systems.

Stevens, Henry R., power resources: Consultant for Bonneville Power Administration since July 1947. With Bonneville Power Administration since July 1938. Chief of power resources section July 1944 to July 1947. Chief of power planning section from June 1942 to July 1944. Senior hydraulic engineer from April 1940 to June 1942. Engineer in charge of power planning and assistant to consulting engineer from November 1939 to April 1940. Senior hydraulic engineer for United States engineers at Seattle, Wash., from November 1928 to August 1931. Self-employed as consulting engineer from August 1931 to January 1934.

Thompson, Carl D., Administrator's office: consultant with Bonneville Power Administration from November 1938 to June 1942, July 1942 to January 1945, and April 1945 to the present. Executive Secretary of Public Ownership League of America from 1912 to 1914, and 1920 to the present. Member Department of the Interior Power Policy Committee in 1936.

Consultants on rolls who did not work for Bonneville during fiscal year 1948:

Bailey, Van Evera, $25 per diem: Power management.

Bellaschi, Peter L., $50 per diem: System engineering.

Beyer, Otto S., $50 per diem: Personnel.

Cosman, Cornelius M., $35 per diem: Power management.

Goff, John H., $35 per diem: Branch load estimating.

Schaber, Carl F., $50 per diem: Power management.

Sussman, Gilbert W., $35 per diem: Administrator's office.

Udy, Marvin J., $50 per diem: Power management.

Wilkins, Roy, $50 per diem: Division of Engineering.

Zinder, Hanina, $50 per diem: Rates and Statistics.

Olson, Herbert A., terminated January 31, 1948, $50 per diem: Personnel.

Tompkins, Morton, $20 per diem: Administrator's office.

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION ORGANIZATIONS

In response to a query as to the identity of organizations that the Bonneville Power Administration belongs to, the following was furnished:

1. Special Libraries Association, 31 East Tenth Street, New York City, N. Y. Annual cost $15.

Membership provides the following material and services: Periodical Special Libraries; discounts on books, bibliographies, free books, and pamphlets, free reference services. Except for the periodical, the remaining material is available only to members.

2. American Public Power Association, 726 Jackson Place NW., Washington, D. C. Annual cost $50.

Membership provides the following material and services, most of which can only be obtained through membership. Two copies of a monthly periodical; 12 copies of a biweekly news bulletin; reference service in the field of electric-utility industry; free copies of publications issued by other organizations; discounts on publications issued by other agencies.

During fiscal year 1948 the library obtained, without cost from this organization, about $25 worth of publications. Also during this period the library saved $80 in the purchase of four copies of a Distribution Engineering Manual which sold for $25 each but were available to association members at $5 each.

3. National Safety Council, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill. Annual cost: For fiscal 1949, the cost is $189.08. The annual cost fluctuates with the annual release of this organization's publication list.

Membership provides the following material and services: Periodicals, pamphlets, news letters and posters for distribution to employees; a special motor vehicle educational safety service for 60 truck drivers which includes a periodical and a periodical news letter, posters and awards; unlimited free consultation with the council's engineering and advisory staff; interlibrary loan facilities from its safety library; discounts on books, pamphlets and safety films.

4. Civil Service Assembly, 1313 East Sixtieth Street, Chicago 37, Ill. Annual cost $200.

Membership provides the following material and services: Copies of the quarterly periodical and the monthly news letter; test exchange service which provides for the loan of various occupational and other tests; use of the consultation service; receipt of a series of confidential personnel administration reports designed to help personnel officers; free interlibrary loan service.

5. Peninsula Light Co. at Gig Harbor, Wash. Initial membership fee purchased December of 1942 for $100. Annual costs subsequent thereto consist solely of the bills for metered-electric service. The administration had to join this cooperative in order to obtain local electric-power service for the operation of its Allyn substation. The Peninsula Light Co. is a small mutual organization which is the only source of this electric service in this area.

6. The Administration also has a number of library memberships with professional organizations, primarily for the purpose of obtaining their periodicals and proceedings. These associations include the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, American Society of Civil Engineers, American Society of Public Administration, and the American Institute of Accountants.

THE POLITICS OF THE APPROPRIATIVE PROCESS

As previously noted, Dr. Raver has apparently been quite outspoken in his criticism of the burdensome procedure of having to receive funds through congressional process. An editorial in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin of September 29, 1947, criticized Dr. Raver for this attempt to get from under the will of Congress.

He was asked to comment on his attitude in this regard and advised as follows:

"The editorial referred to is one which appeared in the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin on September 24, 1947.

"It refers to a phrase used by C. G. Davidson, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, in an informal talk before the Bonneville Regional Advisory Council's thirteenth session in Portland, Oreg.

"You will find the minutes of this session, including Mr. Davidson's remarks, in the file attached to the reply to your interrogatory concerning advisory boards.

"The substance of the Bend Bulletin editorial is largely an expression of opinion. The Bulletin, in paragraph 6 of its editorial, admits the present fiscal arrangements under which the Bonneville Power Administration operates are a handicap, but it expresses the opinion that the answer is for the Government to get out of the power business. In this it disagrees with the Congress which has approved statutes putting the Government into the power business.

"There is an implication in the Bulletin editorial that the Bonneville Administrator would like to see the Administration freed from control by the Congress. This is not true. An accurate statement of my position would be that I would like to see the Bonneville Administration empowered to use its own revenues in accordance with congressional policies for business-type Government operations. I have suggested on several occasions, both to Members of Congress and to others, that this might be done by (1) amendment to the Bonneville Act; or (2) covering the Administration under the provisions of the Corporation Control Act.

"I have already informally discussed these ideas with some Members of the Congress, and I shall be glad to discuss them further with members of the committee at their convenience.

"In referring to the Bonneville Advisory Board, the Bulletin states: 'Administrator Raver, however, has had little commerce with this Board but instead has set up his own so-called regional advisory board with a handpicked membership. The meetings of this group, held from time to time at different points in the region, provide Dr. Raver with a sounding board for the presentation of his power ideas.'

"As explained in the reply to your interrogatory relative to Advisory Boards, the Bonneville Administrator is in regular contact with the members of the Bonneville Advisory Board through the circumstance that the members of this Advisory Board are also the members of the Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee which meets monthly. At the time this committee was formed, it was agreed that matters previously taken up with the Bonneville Advisory Board would be taken up with the Inter-Agency Committee, and this has been done. In addition, I and members of my staff are in continual consultation with members of the Board in our day-to-day operations and business on policy and program matters.

"Information furnished you in reply to your interrogatory on advisory boards makes clear the character of the Bonneville Regional Advisory Council. A reading of the minutes furnished you shows that the Regional Advisory Council was not created as a substitute for the Advisory Board, and has operated in a different manner and for a different purpose.

"There is one other notable error of fact in the Bulletin editorial: 'Secretary Davidson makes no reference to the politics of the Bonneville administrative process that put such men as Morton Tompkins and Carl D. Thompson on its staff, that has denied publication of the project pay roll, that has tried pressuring private power operations into its control.'

"I have never refused requests for information relative to Bonneville personnel if such are at all reasonable and are within the limits of staff capacity to compile. I can find no record of a request for the project pay roll from the Bend Bulletin. I understand that the Bonneville employee lists have been published at regular intervals, along with the lists of all the Federal employees in Federal publications established for that purpose.

"I am at a loss as to what the Bulletin means when it refers to 'pressuring private power operations into its control.' It seems to me that this charge is inaccurate and requires a bill of particulars for a full understanding of it."

A great many other queries were left for reply by Dr. Raver and as of this writing have not yet been fully completed.

They appear to be rather voluminous and will not be included in this report. They will, however, be analyzed by the staff so that they might be more fully explored at the 1950 hearings.

Respectfully submitted.

ROBERT E. LEE,
Chief, Investigative Staff.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. KEOGH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4146) making appropriations for the National Security Council, the National Security Resources Board, and for military functions administered by the National Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DOLLIVER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back forthwith with amendments reducing each item 5 percent.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question, on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO), there were—ayes 271, noes 1.

So the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May anybody state that the gentleman from Iowa, who offered the motion to recommit, said he was opposed to the bill; and can it be indicated now that he did not vote?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman stated that he was opposed to the bill. The Chair cannot look into the operation of the gentleman's mind or into his actions, either.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 6, 1949, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2101. An act to abolish the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation of Washington, District of Columbia, and transfer its functions to the Secretary of Agriculture, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make disaster loans, and for other purposes.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McDaniel, its enrolling clerk announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 1741) entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a joint long-range proving ground for guided missiles, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. SALTONSTALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 184).

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, be, and he is hereby, elected chairman of the Standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Public Lands.

The resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—COLUMBIA VALLEY AUTHORITY (H. DOC. NO. 158)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend that legislation be enacted reorganizing certain Federal activities in the Columbia River Valley to the end that the Federal Government may play a more effective part in the development and conservation of the resources of the Pacific Northwest.

The resources activities of the Federal Government in this region are of great importance, not only because of the Government's responsibility with respect to the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, but also because of the extensive federally owned lands within the region.

Many Federal agencies have long participated in these activities to some degree, and the coordination of their separate activities presents a difficult organizational problem.

In general, two main objectives should guide the organization of the Government's resource activities. There should be unified treatment of the related resources within each natural area of the country—generally the watershed of a great river—and within the framework of sound Nation-wide policies. Furthermore, there should be the greatest possible decentralization of Federal powers, and the greatest possible local participation in their exercise, without lessening the necessary accountability of Federal officials to the President and to the Congress.

The traditional method of organizing the Government's resource activities, through departments and bureaus which carry on separate Nation-wide activities, does not itself provide for the unified consideration of each area's resources, which is so necessary, nor does it easily lend itself to decentralization. It has long been apparent that some organizational adjustments are necessary.

We have not found—nor do I expect that we shall find—a single organizational pattern that will fit perfectly the resource problems in the many diverse areas of the country.

The Tennessee Valley Authority, with headquarters in that valley, has been spectacularly successful in achieving many of the goals of a wise and balanced use of resources, through its own activities and through close cooperation with other Federal agencies and with State and local organizations. The integration of Federal activities, through the TVA, has contributed greatly to the growing prosperity of that region, and has met the acid test of satisfying the people who live there.

More recently, Federal interagency committees have been established in several of our western river basins, under the leadership of an interagency committee in Washington, D. C. These committees have proved useful in improving the coordination of Federal activities in those basins.

This committee system, however, has obvious limits, since none of the field representatives of the several departments and agencies concerned is responsible for an over-all view of all the resources of an area. Furthermore, the field committees have no power, other than the separate delegation of authority made to their members, and important problems must be referred through separate channels to headquarters in Washington, D. C., for decision there.

In improving the organization of Federal activities in the Pacific Northwest, we must recognize the unique features of that region. The Pacific Northwest—comprising principally Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and western Montana—is a relatively undeveloped area of our Nation, rich in resources and opportunities. The grand dimensions of the Columbia River give consistency to the problems, needs, and opportunities of the region.

The waters of the Columbia River system—among our rivers second only to the Mississippi in flow—are capable eventually of producing more than 30,000,000 kilowatts of electric power, of which only a little more than 3,000,000 kilowatts are now installed. There are possibilities or reclaiming many more acres of land by irrigation, as they may be needed, in addition to the 4,000,000 acres now irrigated. More than 40 percent of the Nation's saw timber and many important minerals, including 60 percent of our known phosphate reserves, are in the region. Properly developed and conserved, the resources of the Columbia Valley region can furnish enormous benefits to the people living there and to the Nation as a whole.

The Pacific Northwest has been developing very rapidly in recent years. The population has jumped 37 percent since 1940. The tonnage of agricultural production—not including livestock and livestock products—has risen about 25 percent in Washington, Oregon, and Idaho between 1940 and 1947. Total income payments have increased 200 percent since before the war in those three States, as compared to 150 percent for the country as a whole. The per capita income is among the highest in the Nation. These are signs of the progressive energy of the people of the region, and of the growth that can occur there.

However, this growth will not take place to the extent necessary to provide adequate employment for the growing population unless there is a steady program of investment in the development of basic resources in accordance with broadly conceived conservation and development plans.

The activities of the Federal Government have already been of great help. Bonneville and Grand Coulee Dams and the Bonneville power system, begun before the war, made possible the tremendous war and postwar expansion in population and in industry. Industrial development in aluminum, electrochemical and electrometallurgical industries, atomic energy, phosphates, and other lines is going forward rapidly. Each of these requires large amounts of low-cost power, in the production of which the Columbia River and its tributaries offer greater possibilities than any other river system in the country. Continued industrial progress depends upon turning these hydroelectric power potentialities into realities, since the present power supply is far short of the demand, and the region has no significant resources of coal or petroleum.

But far more than power is involved in the further development of the Columbia River for useful purposes. The disastrous flood of 1948 showed how much needs to be done, both in the river and on the land in the watershed, to reduce potential flood damage. The first irrigation water will soon be brought to the thirsty land in the Colorado Basin project below Grand Coulee Dam, and other irrigation projects are possible. The important lower Columbia fisheries program, to adjust the salmon-fishing industry to the dam-construction program, needs to be pushed forward. The use of the river for low-cost transportation of bulk goods can be greatly expanded.

Various Federal agencies are now at work on these phases of river development, and a considerable amount of competent planning has already been done. In particular, the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have jointly worked out the framework for a comprehensive program of dam-building. McNary and Hungry Horse Dams are now under construction, and others are about to be started to meet urgent needs.

So far as river development is concerned, the task ahead is twofold. Present plans and schedules should be incorporated in a more-inclusive, better-balanced river-development program. And a unified operating system must be established for the many facilities already built or to be constructed. These objectives require better organizational arrangements than we now have.

Furthermore, a great deal needs to be done to bring the land, forest, and mineral activities of the Federal Government into step with the water-development program. It is questionable economy to spend millions of dollars for dams as part of a flood-control scheme, unless at the same time we are doing all we can in the way of forest and soil conservation and rehabilitation, so that floods will be minimized rather than aggravated. Similarly, it is not sensible to spend millions of dollars to reclaim land, in order to create new farms, if at the same time we fail to take appropriate steps to save existing farm lands from being washed into the rivers.

It is obvious that Federal activities and expenditures concerning land resources need to be planned in relation to those concerning water resources. Here again better organizational arrangements are needed than we now have.

I do not wish to minimize the substantial progress that has been made under the programs as they have been conducted in the past. However, we have now reached a point where the growing scope and complexity of the Federal activities in the region require much greater integration and the full-time attention of top-level administrators if the tremendous potentialities of the region are to be wisely and rapidly developed.

I therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation to provide a means for welding together the many Federal activities concerned with the region's resources into a balanced, continuously developing program.

In so doing I recommend that certain Federal activities in the region be consolidated into a single agency, called the Columbia Valley Administration. To that agency should be transferred the Federal programs of constructing and operating physical facilities on the Columbia River and its tributaries for the multiple-purpose conservation and use of the water, including the generation and transmission of power. These programs are now carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration in the Department of the Interior, and by the Corps of Engineers in the Department of the Army. This consolidation will provide not only for a balanced program of constructing dams, irrigation works, power transmission lines, and other facilities, but also for a workable operating plan for using these facilities simultaneously for flood control, navigation, power generation and transmission, fish protection, and other purposes. It is plain common sense that the planning and operation of the system of river structures is a job for a single agency.

The Columbia Valley Administration would have the advantages of a sound foundation of basic planning already done, and a large construction program already under way. The bulk of its staff would be secured from existing agencies. It would follow the practice of existing agencies in carrying on its construction work by contract so far as practicable. Under these circumstances, the establishment of the Columbia Valley Administration would result in no hesitation or delay in the development program. Instead, the Administration would carry forward the work already started in a more effective manner.

I do not recommend the consolidation of any other Federal activities in the Columbia Valley Administration. I do recommend, however, that the Administration be given direct responsibility for preparing definite plans and programs for soil and forest conservation, mineral exploration and development, fish and wildlife conservation, and the other aspects of Federal resource activities in the region, and the means to see that those plans and programs move ahead in step. Such plans and programs would be worked out in cooperation with all interested groups—local, State, and Federal, private and public.

In this way the activities of the Columbia Valley Administration and other Federal agencies would be properly adjusted to each other and to the activities of State and local agencies, and the maximum degree of joint and cooperative action would result. In this way the activities of all agencies concerned with water, land, forest, mineral, and fish and wildlife resources can be brought into a consistent pattern of conservation and development.

The Columbia River rises in Canada, and part of its watershed is in that country. Under long-standing treaties, the Government of Canada and the United States consult with each other on any development projects which affect international waters, including the Columbia River. The Columbia Valley Administration can work out, in cooperation with appropriate Canadian agencies and in accordance with our treaty obligations, practical means of developing the resources of the Columbia River region, on both sides of the international boundary, on an integrated basis. It is my hope that we will be able in this respect to demonstrate to the world new ways of achieving mutual benefit through international programs of resource development.

A further vital element in developing a better organization of Federal resources activities in the Columbia Valley region is to bring about a larger degree of local participation. To this end I recommend that the Columbia Valley Administration be required to have its headquarters in the region, easily accessible to the people who live there. I recommend further that the Administration be required, with respect to all phases of its activities, to seek the advice, assistance, and participation of State and local governments, agriculture, labor, and business groups, educational institutions, and other representative groups concerned. This can best be done, as the Tennessee Valley Authority experience has shown, not through formalistic statutory machinery, but through the establishment by the Administration of a large number of advisory groups for its different activities and in different parts of the region, and through the use, wherever possible, of

established local agencies to carry out the development program.

In these various ways the Columbia Valley Administration, while retaining its basic accountability to the President and the Congress, will be far more responsive to the needs and interests and desires of the people of the region than the present subordinate field establishments of the Government can be.

The Columbia Valley Administration should, of course, administer its activities in accordance with Federal policies which apply to the whole country. In seeking decentralization of Federal authority and appropriate flexibility to meet the unique characteristics of the Pacific Northwest, we should not establish different national policies for that region than for the rest of the country.

For example, the Administration should be required, in accordance with long-established Federal policy, to respect existing water rights and the water rights laws of the several States. The Administration should be required to follow the reclamation laws in contracting for the disposition of land or water in reclamation projects. It should be required to give the customary preferences and priorities to public agencies and cooperatives in disposing of electric energy. It should be required to demonstrate the economic soundness of the various projects it undertakes, and to repay reimbursable costs, in accordance with national policies. In short, its activities should harmonize, and not conflict, with Federal policies concerning agriculture, commerce, labor, and the other broad areas of national interest.

Finally, the Columbia Valley Administration should be given, with respect to its revenue-producing activities, appropriate financial and operating flexibility under the business-type budgeting, accounting, and auditing methods established by the Government Corporation Control Act. Without detracting from the necessary control of the Administration by the President and the Congress, this will permit more businesslike procedures and more steady and economical scheduling of construction and operations than are now possible.

These recommendations I regard as the fundamental elements of a better organization of Federal resource activities in the Pacific Northwest. They involve no expansion of Federal powers, no encroachment on the rights of States, communities, or individuals. Instead they are designed to achieve a more sensible and unified organization of Federal activities, which will result in a more effective program for resource development and more effective participation by the people of the region in shaping that program.

The enactment of legislation embodying these recommendations will bring Government closer to the people—closer to the grass roots. This means Government action that will be more responsive to the needs of the people.

In recent years the people of our country have come to understand that the progressive growth of our economy and the maintenance of national security depend largely upon the wise use of our natural resources. We have reached overwhelming agreement that our natural resources must not be wastefully exploited, but instead must be developed and used for the benefit of all our people, and at the same time must be conserved so far as possible to preserve their usefulness permanently.

We have been making great strides toward accomplishing these objectives. Private citizens and groups, local and State government, and the Federal Government have all been doing more and more as we have found new technical methods and new ways of working together.

Much remains to be done. We will need sustained private and public effort over many years, based on a realization of the importance of long-range investment in developing and conserving natural resources. This is an effort in which each citizen should feel a direct responsibility—not only the private owner of resources, whose management of his property has an immediate bearing on the public good, but every other citizen as well, since the welfare of all depends upon the preservation and wise expansion of our resources.

I believe that the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration along the lines I have recommended will enable the Federal Government to carry out, far more vigorously and effectively than is now the case, its part in the tremendous long-range task of developing and conserving the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest for the increasing welfare of the people.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 13, 1949.*

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke today may have the privilege of revising and extending their remarks and that all Members of the House may have five legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

S. 1209

Mr. BATTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 1209 may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report for printing in the RECORD under the rule.

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

There was no objection.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 4029) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to procure for the Everglades National Park with available funds, including those made available by the State of Florida, the remaining lands and interest in lands within the boundary agreed upon between the State of Florida and the Secretary of the Interior, within and a part of that authorized by the act of May 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 816), and within which the State has already donated its lands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is a unanimous report from the Committee on Public Lands and, furthermore, that it means only the expenditure of State funds?

Mr. PETERSON. That is right.

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

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

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to consolidate the Federal ownership of lands within the boundary set forth in deed No. 19035 executed December 28, 1944, by the trustees of the internal improvement fund of the State of Florida, and accepted by the Secretary of the Interior on March 14, 1947, for Everglades National Park purposes, the said Secretary is hereby authorized, within the aforesaid boundary and with any funds made available for that purpose, to procure lands or interests therein by purchase or otherwise. Whenever practicable and not in conflict with the public interest, the said Secretary shall allow owners to retain reservations of mineral and oil rights for limited periods of time depending upon the location of their lands and taking into consideration the purpose for which the park has been established.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 5, after the period strike out the balance of the line and all of lines 6 to 10, inclusive, and insert the following:

"The Secretary, shall, upon the request of the landowners, permit such owners to retain reservations of oil, gas, and mineral rights, including the right to explore and develop such lands for oil, gas, and mineral purposes, until February 1, 1956, and the right of ingress and egress on such lands under rules and regulations of the Secretary. In the event that oil, gas, or minerals are discovered and produced in commercial quantities within such time for such purpose on such lands or unit of which it may be a part, reservations so made shall automatically extend for so long as oil, gas, or minerals are being produced from said lands in commercial quantities from said unit. Such reservations shall, however, be made by the owners subject to reasonable rules and regulations which the Secretary may prescribe for the protection of the park but which shall permit the reserve rights to be exercised so that the oil, gas, and minerals may be explored for, developed, extracted, and removed from the park area. Said operations shall be carried on under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe to reasonably protect the lands and areas for such park purposes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on Thomas Jefferson.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a short editorial.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD relative to an honor that has been bestowed upon the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

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

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I learned with deep interest and great pride that my one-time comrade and now congressional colleague, the Honorable PETER W. RODINO, JR., has been voted a life membership in the Private Joseph R. Rotunda, Jr., Post No. 848, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the city of Newark, N. J. In evidence of this beautiful tribute, Congressman RODINO was given a solid gold membership card, which was signed by John D. Vincenzo, the commander, and also by Angelo R. Chicone, Jr., the quartermaster.

I had the honor to serve in Italy with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and I know how deeply and sincerely this tribute of his comrades of the VFW reflects their high regard for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] not only for his loyal wartime service in Italy but for his splendid contributions to the welfare of his country through his service in the Congress of the United States.

We, who have had the pleasure of getting rather intimately acquainted with the gentleman from New Jersey, PETER RODINO, know of his sincerity of his determination to be well informed on all questions, and of his undying loyalty to all men and women who served in the armed forces of our country in any of our past wars.

I hope that I, as a comrade and as a colleague of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO], may convey my thanks and congratulations to the members of the Private Joseph R. Rotunda, Jr., Post for their thoughtfulness in giving this life membership. I am sure that this little gold card will always accompany the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] and be a reminder of your faith in him and of his devotion and obligation to you.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill general debate in the Committee of the Whole shall not exceed 2 hours, one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] and one-half of the time by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

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

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON ECA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the rule, if a conference report on the ECA bill is not filed by midnight tonight, unanimous consent having been granted by the House, it may be in order for the House to consider the conference report if and when received any time tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

VIRGIN ISLANDS CORPORATION

Mr. McSWEENEY, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 185, Rept. No. 439), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2989) to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Public Lands, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. CARNAHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the American Federal.

Mr. CLEMENTE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

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

There was no objection.

THE BRITISH FILM QUOTA DISCRIMINATES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I must beg the indulgence of the House for I intend to talk today in frank and strong language. I regret the necessity, but my subject will brook no milder treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I indict the present ministry of Great Britain on a charge of perfidy.

The victim of this perfidy today is one of our largest American industries. Its eventual victim may be the entire world-recovery program; its ultimate victims may be the people of Europe, the people of Britain, the people of the United States, and the peoples of the civilized world.

I intend to support my indictment, Mr. Speaker, with a recitation of the overt acts.

Members of this House are aware in a general way, I am sure, that ever since the war the British Government's policy toward the American motion-picture industry has been one of steady harassment. Its obvious purpose is to drive American motion pictures from the British market. It has thrown up one barrier after another to the entry of American films.

Britain has attempted to excuse these actions on the grounds of its need to conserve dollars. That is an excuse—an alibi—which will not hold water, as I intend to show.

Britain glosses over the clear fact that its actions violate its own pledges in international agreements to work for reduction of trade restrictions and to churn stagnated world trade and commerce into new activity of mutual benefit to all.

The British attitude is in astonishing contrast with the long-standing position of the American motion-picture industry toward the British film industry and toward all others everywhere.

The American motion-picture industry has never asked this Congress to legislate protection for it from foreign competition. It has never even suggested a trade barrier against imported films. It has always taken the position that the motion picture is a medium of expression, and like a book, a newspaper, a periodical, should be able to circulate freely. The American market is wide open to all producers of motion pictures. They need not run to our Government for permission to send us films. Their pictures are welcomed here by our own industry which believes very heartily in the excellent old American tradition that competition is good business.

Foreign films in the United States must pass one test alone: the test of merit. A good foreign film does handsomely at our boxoffices; a bad one does bad business, but they all have an equal chance with American productions in the American market.

The American industry has always enjoyed the major share of the British market, but it has won the market through merit. The British people have always wanted American pictures. They still want them.

Moreover, British theaters also want and need American films. British exhibitors must have our pictures to keep in operation. At no time have British producers been able to supply, and they cannot now supply, sufficient films to keep British theaters open.

In the period preceding and during World War II, the British Government adopted a policy of giving reasonable protection to the home industry through quota laws reserving playing time on British screens for British pictures. Until less than a year ago the quota was 20 percent. Even at this figure—less than half the quota now in force—there were many defaults by exhibitors unable to obtain an adequate supply of home-made product.

Since the advent of the present Government in Britain, the policy toward foreign films has swung to one of aggressive hostility and severity. To any objective observer, this policy, flying in the face of economic realities and subversive of Britain's international trade commitments, must be considered as being deliberately intended to squeeze out American films.

This new British policy became manifest in 1947 when the British Government suddenly cracked down with an import tax of 75 percent on the earnings of foreign-made pictures in Britain. Seventy-five percent, Mr. Speaker. The seriousness of such an astronomical levy is rivaled only by its patent absurdity.

The American motion-picture industry had no alternative but to stop shipping films to Britain.

We were all sympathetic to Britain's dollar problem—none more so than the American motion-picture industry itself, as the record clearly proves.

What was the practical effect of this blatantly discriminatory tax? It created a grand uproar in the British motion picture industry itself. British theaters would have been closing down on a wholesale basis if the tax had been long continued—with great resulting unemployment. British producers felt the blow as well. Confidence in the industry's stability ebbed. Every element in the industry suffered. But the obdurate stand of the British ministry persisted for months.

Finally, in March of 1948, the ministry agreed to abandonment of the tax. It accepted the voluntary offer of the American motion picture industry to take only $17,000,000 a year of its earnings out of Britain. This was a generous proposition, Mr. Speaker, an extremely generous one, for $17,000,000 represents just about a third of the current earnings of American films in Britain, and the agreement is to run until June of 1950.

All of us felt this marked the beginning of better relations between two nations which most certainly should stand together in these sullen, sultry times.

But those fine hopes went down the drain. The effective date of the agreement had scarcely been reached when the British Government, once again in the form of a sudden crack-down, jumped the first-feature quota to 45 percent—more than double the previous quota. And this time the British Government had no excuse of saving dollars. The agreement had taken care of that, and I repeat, Mr. Speaker, I think very substantially indeed.

Effective next October, the quota is reduced by 5 percent to 40 percent, but we can skip further reference to that. For all practical purposes, a 40 percent quota and a 45 percent quota are the same thing. A 5 percent cut does not even begin to remove the causes of chaos in the British industry nor is it less discriminatory.

Let us look at the practical effects of this high quota in Britain. Once again, the entire British film industry is in a grand uproar. The quality of British-made films is further on the skids, producers are having trouble getting financed, the box office is falling off, and there is mounting unemployment in the industry.

Think of it, Mr. Speaker, a 40 percent quota aimed directly at American-made films, when British producers could not make enough pictures to permit their own exhibitors to meet a quota only half as high!

Absurd? Ridiculous? Obviously. But there is no need to accept my view of it, or for that matter any views which may be entertained by the American motion picture industry.

The president of the Cinematograph Exhibitors Association is Sir Alexander King. I have not chosen to quote from Sir Alexander because we share the same name, but because I am happy to find his views on this distressing difficulty make such excellent sense. It is patently clear he knows his business.

On the occasion of his recent election to the presidency of the CEA, he called the 75 percent import tax a confiscation tax, and so it was.

He said the film agreement whereby American companies voluntarily limited their remittances to $17,000,000 a year from Britain "proves that our friends in the United States are still anxious to make a substantial contribution to Britain's economic difficulties." Then he turns to the imposition of the 45 percent quota:

> British producers rose magnificently to the occasion with promises. They promised to make 109 first features in 12 months—subsequently modified to 90. They promised British films would make more money than American films. This was to be a vintage year of British film production.
>
> They turned a muffled ear to the CEA when we said the quota was excessive, unreasonable, unnecessary, and inevitably hurtful to the welfare of the British film industry as a whole.
>
> They said the quota would make our industry flourish. Could one of them apply the word flourish to today's position?
>
> Our relations with America were never more strained. That state of affairs must not be allowed to continue. We must have closer cooperation between the British and American people. Any wedge between us today is dangerous to the cause of freedom and democracy.
>
> The time has come when bickering must stop and conflict cease on both sides of the Atlantic.
>
> I call for the rescinding of the 45 percent quota—

Said Sir Alexander King. Put in its place he urged—

> a figure that is workable. One year has proved that this high quota carried within itself the seeds of its own destruction.

Those are blunt words, Mr. Speaker, and admirably and tersely put. Now listen to another British authority.

The Honorable Tom O'Brien, a member of the House of Commons for West Nottingham, but in private life the general secretary of the largest British film trade-union—the National Association of Theatrical and Kine Employees—also has some trenchant observations to make. They are worth hearing. This is what he says:

> The remedies for the current misfortunes in film production are not to be sought in idle dreams or short cuts to salvation. The film industry has the largest number of regular weekly customers—33,000,000—yet it cannot finance its own product.
>
> It is no remedy to attempt to force cinema goers by statute or by regulations to see films they do not want to see, or to impose a quota that cannot be financed or fulfilled. That way lies discredit and disaster.
>
> It is no remedy to delude ourselves that permanent Government intervention can restore prosperity or produce miracles.

Out the mouths of Sir Alexander King, Mr. O'Brien, and other authoritative British spokesmen comes documentation for everything I have charged; that the 75-percent import tax was a confiscatory tax; that the 45-percent quota is discriminatory and that it cannot be fulfilled; and, finally, that any rift between Britain and America today is dangerous to the cause of democracy.

These same British spokesmen indicted their own film producers. Unsupported by their voices, I might have refrained from that myself, although there is no doubt that British producers must bear much of the blame for the insistent persecution of American films—and for their own misfortunes.

I will put my indictment of the British producers mildly. Shall we say that perhaps they misled the British Ministry into believing they could supply the British home market all by themselves? Let us say that they nudged the British Government into drastic acts against American interests with the understandable idea of garnering a greater return for themselves. But, as it turned out, they have simply outslickered themselves, and my primary indictment of the Ministry must stand.

The Ministry should have foreseen the result. It should have protected the broader interests of the entire industry—and for that matter, the interests of the entire British economy—and the interests of democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I am unable—literally unable—to find one vestige of economic rationality or justification in all this mess and muddle. I am unable to discover an iota of common sense in the British Government's flagrant violation of the spirit and intent of international agreements; I am unable even to imagine why Britain—a nation which so intensely depends upon foreign trade—should treat its solemn pledges to work for expanded trade and commerce as if they were so many scraps of paper.

Mr. Speaker, it is axiomatic that trade restrictions breed trade restrictions.

The British Ministry has chosen to bedevil one single American industry. Which is next?

The British Ministry gives beguiling lip service to the theory of reviving world trade but reneges on its word; we give our billions and keep our promises.

Not only in Britain, but almost everywhere around the world, the American motion picture must fight its way against a snarl of Government restrictions, trade barriers and special taxes.

Odd indeed, is it not, Mr. Speaker, that the gross offender in this unhappy situation should be Britain?

Bad as all these trade restrictions are from every economic point of view, they are even worse when viewed in the light of damming the free flow of ideas around the world—so necessary in this time of great challenge to all democracies.

The production headquarters of the American motion-picture industry, Mr. Speaker, are located in my State. It is one among the many prides of California, but in this case we gladly share our pride with all America. For there is no other industry more intimately intertwined with the daily lives of so many millions of our people.

I want this House to know, and I want the American people to know, Mr. Speaker, just what our American motion pictures are doing abroad today in our interests—and at great sacrifice to themselves.

In This Week magazine for April 3, Mr. Allen Chellas, an able writer, in no way connected with the motion-picture industry, tells the story of American motion pictures abroad today and tells it handsomely.

I want to quote a few pertinent paragraphs from his excellent article:

> American movies are conquering the minds of Germans and Japanese as effectively as our troops conquered Germany and Japan—

He writes.

> In Berlin, American movies are outdrawing Russian films, 6 to 1. Japanese movie attendance has doubled since 1945.
>
> These movies are helping our military win the battle of ideas by making new friends and influencing erstwhile enemies along the bumpy road to democracy.

Mr. Chellas quotes from Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, and Mr. Johnston had this to say:

> Wherever I traveled—France, England, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Germany—I realized that our movies are an immense mirror of life in America. In that mirror, millions—potentially pro or con America—see us, our habits, our ways of life. The motion picture with its intimacy, warmth and realism is the most potent medium to tell the American story abroad, particularly in Germany, where the struggle for possession of German minds is keenest and most critical.

I am well aware, Mr. Speaker, that I have said some harsh words about the British Ministry. But I held long counsel with myself before I chose them. I asked myself if it were best to hold my peace. I reminded myself that even a mildly provocative remark by any representative of this Government—high or low—directed at the government of a partner in the Atlantic Pact might seem at first flush to be imprudent.

But then I reminded myself that the "C" in ECA stands for "cooperation." I should like to see a vast deal more of it from the British Ministry. I think most of us in this Chamber would. I think most of the American people would.

Mr. Speaker, I am thoroughly committed to ECA; I entertain the warmest affection for the British people. I realize that there are sane and level heads in Britain who may eventually untangle this ugly knot—but let the present Ministry of Britain take heed:

American patience is not inexhaustible.

It is not too late for the British Government to regain the definite respect and standing it has lost in American eyes. Let it take a fresh look at itself and its unfair and capricious attitude. Let it reduce its monstrosity of a quota to a practical and reasonable figure—or, better still, eliminate it entirely. Let it do it voluntarily and without pressure. But let it by all means do it. I would strongly advise the British Government to do it and do it at once.

Mr. Speaker, because of the compelling importance of this matter, I shall ask the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member, to investigate this situation.

MAMIE L. HURLEY

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 594) for the relief of Mamie L. Hurley, with Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 2, line 12, after "act", insert ": *Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the nature of this bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. This is a claim bill. At the end of the bill the Senate has inserted *"Provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRY W. SHARPLEY

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 595) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon a certain claim of Harry W. Sharpley, his heirs, administrators, or assigns, against the United States, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 2, line 12, after "parties", insert ": *And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAURA SPINNICHIA

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 652) for the relief of Laura Spinnichia, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Page 1, line 11, strike out "McDonald" and insert "MacDonough."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL TORT CLAIMS ACT

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 779) to amend the Federal Tort Claims Act to increase the time within which claims under such act may be presented to Federal agencies or prosecuted in the United States district courts, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

> Amend the title so as to read: "An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide additional time for bringing suit against the United States in the case of certain tort claims, and for other purposes."

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL E. LAWSON

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1271) for the relief of Carl E. Lawson and Fireman's Fund Indemnity Co., with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate.

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

York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BYRNE of New York, LANE, and JENNINGS.

ROSE MARY AMMIRATO

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 1501) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rose Mary Ammirato, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. Private Law 447, Eightieth Congress, is hereby repealed."

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

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the situation with reference to this bill?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. A similar bill was passed by the Senate and signed by the President during the Eightieth Congress, but the phrase "any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated" was omitted, and the Treasury would not pay the claim. This bill was reintroduced, and the Senate has amended the bill to provide "Section 2. Private Law 447, Eightieth Congress, is hereby repealed."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is so as to avoid double payment?

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Exactly.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two short articles.

Mr. MACY (at the request of Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. HARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in two instances and include a statement.

Mr. McGREGOR asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Cleveland Plain Dealer.

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

Mr. CANFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Paterson (N. J.) Morning Call.

Mr. WEICHEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two news items.

Mr. McCULLOCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch.

Mr. CHUDOFF asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Daily News.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during the session of the House tomorrow during general debate.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. VURSELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, today I want to discuss proposed labor legislation which will soon come before this body. What we do with reference to this legislation will affect every citizen in the Nation. We want to be fair and just to all in writing this legislation. I think we should examine it under the following formula:

Will it encourage, protect, and be helpful to the laboring men, to agriculture, to business, and to all the people?

These three great segments—labor, business, and agriculture—all of which together make such a tremendous contribution to the Nation, must be encouraged equally with legislation that will move them all forward together in a harmonious and cooperative spirit which will not only render the greatest help to these three segments but will bring the greatest amount of domestic harmony and prosperity to the 140,000,000 people who make up this great America.

Two years ago the Congress made a 3-month comprehensive study in securing all possible facts upon which it wrote the Taft-Hartley law. In comparison, for political purposes and to keep campaign pledges, the party in power has reported out a bill after 2 weeks of hearings which recommends, in substance, the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and the institution in its stead of the old one-sided Wagner Act, enacted 14 years ago.

The committee adopted the unheard-of procedure of refusing to consider amendments to the administration bill offered by those in the committee who opposed it. Such high-handed, steam-roller tactics in the past have been unknown to this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, those who are supporting the administration bill, by their acts, take the position that regardless of the great expansion of business and labor organizations during the past 14 years, when the Nation has progressed in every other direction, that we shall not make any progress so far as labor and management relations are concerned. They would go back to the old Wagner Act and take us back to the jungle of tooth and claw, and to the chaotic conditions that often developed then between management and labor to the detriment of the entire Nation.

If I were not deeply interested in the welfare of the laboring men, of agriculture, business, and all of the people, and if I wanted to do a great disservice to labor and to all of the people, I would vote for the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law and for the substitution therefor of the vicious one-sided Wagner Act which has caused more strikes, more loss of time to labor, and more damage to the Nation than any piece of legislation passed during the past 14 years.

I think what we should do is to amend and correct any provisions in the present law that have proved under experience to be unjust to labor, and to take great pains in rewriting the act so that it will help the entire economy of the Nation. I believe the majority of the Republicans and Democrats in this House, regardless of the tremendous pressure put upon us, will have the courage to do what we think is best in legislation for labor, business, agriculture, and all of the people.

IS IT A SLAVE-LABOR LAW?

I should like to quote the following figures to show that the charges constantly made by some of the big labor leaders that the Taft-Hartley Act is a slave-labor law and would destroy the progress of unions is completely false. The big labor leaders who are good politicians and know the value of a slogan hurriedly got together after the law was enacted and coined the slogan branding it as a "Slave-labor law." Through their publications and over the radio they tried to pull down the iron curtain to prevent the laboring men from knowing the truth about this legislation.

To some extent they succeeded, but when the new law is written and the facts come out, as they are coming out now, I believe the laboring men will realize that they have been grossly deceived. Let me prove the falsity of these charges once and for all time by quoting figures from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

RAILROAD WORKERS

Let us see, for instance, how much it has enslaved the railway workers during the past 2 years of 1947-48.

Since this law became effective, railway workers have received wage increases totaling approximately $883,000,000, without the loss of 1 day's pay due to the stoppage of work.

During the past 2 weeks one contract has been negotiated between the railway unions and railway management increasing the pay of 100,000 railroad machinists and their helpers, along with many thousands of the 15 nonoperating railroad unions, by 26 percent, boosting their wages in this one settlement by about $650,000,000. In addition, they got a shorter hour workweek.

Certainly the threat of this act, even though the railway workers are exempted, has not enslaved them. Nevertheless, union railway officials continue to write us Congressmen urging that we repeal the Taft-Hartley law before it completely destroys labor. Such charges are an insult to the intelligence of the railway workers, and to the Members of the Congress.

BUILDING TRADES WORKERS

At the close of 1946, before the Taft-Hartley law became effective, the average pay of brick masons was about $2.06 an hour. Today the scale is $3 an hour, with $6 an hour in many instances if they work Saturdays.

Carpenters were receiving approximately $1.65 an hour in 1946. Today the scale is about $2 an hour.

Plumbers were receiving approximately $1.88 an hour in 1946. The pay scale today is around $2.50 to $3 an hour. I ask you, is there any slavery in these wages?

COAL MINERS

At the close of 1946 the average weekly pay of coal miners was $58.03 per week. The average weekly wage today is $72.70. In addition, coal miners who have worked 20 years and reached the age of 62 years are now receiving a pension of $100 a month. This happened during the past 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law, yet their leaders say it is a slave-labor law. How false.

INDUSTRIAL WORKERS

The millions of industrial workers in 1946 received an average wage of $43.74 per week. Their weekly wage today is $54.63. Do these wage increases enslave anyone?

During 1947-48 union membership in the United States has increased from 14,974,000 workers to 15,700,000, making a total gain in membership under the Taft-Hartley law of 726,000 new members.

These increases in wages, and the great increase in membership of unions proves completely false the charges the big labor leaders have made in their effort to deceive the rank and file of labor by calling this act a slave-labor law.

INJUNCTION PROVISION

I cannot conceive now that the heat of the campaign is over that the administration really wants the repeal of the provisions in the present law which provide for an 80-day period which gives the President and the governmental machinery set-up an opportunity through mediation and conciliation to prevent or settle a strike that would imperil the public health, safety, and the welfare of the entire Nation; particularly in view of the fact that in the past two years the President has found it necessary to use that power given him seven times in the successful settlements of such threatened strikes in the interest of all the people.

I think we must write the injunction provision into the new legislation if we cannot find some other approach that is just as good.

I understand an amendment will be offered in the Senate that the use of an injunction in a Nation-wide strike be done away with and that a mediation board be appointed to make a thorough investigation of a threatened strike and report its findings to the Congress immediately, if a settlement has not been reached.

Such an amendment might make the injunction process unnecessary, and serve the purpose. If both management and labor knew such a report would be referred to the Congress for action, such knowledge might encourage a settlement. I also feel that the Congress would immediately take proper action to enforce the findings of such a mediation board and prevent a strike that would do great damage to the public health, safety, and welfare of the Nation.

Some legislation must be worked out to protect all of the people and the economy of the Nation. The Attorney General has testified in substance before the Senate committee that the President has inherent injunctive power to delay such a strike, if it is necessary. Evidently, the administration for political reasons is trying to dodge the injunctive issue by name at least on the surface.

Those who want to meet this issue openly and fairly before labor and the people of the Nation contend that if the President has such power—which they doubt he has—it should be pointed out. If he does not have such power, it should be written into law to cope with Nation-wide disputes between labor and management to protect the people.

By claiming it is not necessary to write the injunctive power into the law, it appears that they may be trying to bypass the injunction, yet at the same time they infer that they have and will use such injunctive power if an emergency makes it necessary.

The miners' organization, the union officials of the steel organization, or the officials of the railway organizations—any of these three at their will can close down and wreck the economy of this Nation to the great detriment of all of the people. Some power must be provided where the President, or the Congress, can prevent such a condition from occurring in the interest of all the people of the Nation.

Under the Taft-Hartley law we took mediation and conciliation out of the Labor Department and made them independent agencies. They must remain independent from the Labor Department so that business management and labor, who are engaged in negotiation, conciliation, or mediation will know the Board with which they are dealing is fair and impartial.

In other words, everyone wants a fair trial before an impartial jury.

Mr. Speaker, the administration puts the Conciliation and Mediation Service back under the Secretary of Labor, who testified before the committee for the administration bill, and whose duty under the law setting up the Labor Department, is to promote the interest of the laboring people of America. In fact, the CIO and the American Federation of Labor are generally each given the appointment of one Assistant Secretary of Labor each to help run the Department.

You can see at a glance if this is done, business management can have no confidence in mediation and conciliation. It will again put the labor leaders largely in charge of administration and will destroy any chance of bringing about improved relations between labor and management. The Department of Labor will then act as judge, jury, and prosecutor in settling disputes. This must not be done in the interest of labor, business, and the Nation.

THE CLOSED SHOP

I am not certain that the closed shop, as written in the law, should be retained.

All building-trade laborers, I think, should be exempted from the closed shop. I firmly believe that other corrections should be made in the closed-shop provision. I believe that where the employers and the employees agree the closed shop is beneficial to both, that they should have the right to go back to the closed shop.

The printer's trade may be an example, in addition to the building trades.

There are other amendments that might be written into the act liberalizing the closed-shop provision, and other provisions, I think, will be. We want the legislation to be fair and just to all.

Of course, as in all legislation, some mistakes were made, and they must and will be corrected.

NON-COMMUNIST OATH

The administration bill leaves out that section of the Taft-Hartley law which requires union labor officials to sign an affidavit they are not Communists. It should be included in new legislation.

They object on the grounds that such a provision is an insult to the loyalty of union officials. If such a requirement is an insult to them, then every Member of the Congress, and every employee of the Federal Government, up to and including the Cabinet officers are subject to the same insult. All of us Members of Congress, Cabinet officials, and others are required to and do sign such affidavits before we can receive our pay.

I cannot believe union officials are entitled to greater courtesy than are the Members of the Congress, and the members of the President's Cabinet. I would amend the law and also require management as well to sign the affidavit.

The signing of this non-Communist oath, which has helped to drive Communists out of union leadership, has been of great value to labor and the Nation.

The united electrical workers, fur workers, and farm-equipment workers unions, and others of the CIO have been particularly affected and dominated by Communist union leadership.

Philip Murray, president of the CIO, working with Walter Reuther of the united auto workers, for the past 2 months has been putting on a drive to take over the farm-equipment workers union into the united automobile workers. Their publicly stated purpose is to change the control of this union, because it is Communist-dominated.

The failure of officers of the United Electrical Workers, many notoriously Communist, to file non-Communist affidavits was a primary ground on which the Atomic Energy Commission ordered the General Electric Co. to stop dealing with that union at two atomic-energy plants to protect our national security and the secrets of the atomic bombs. If this Communist section is not included in the new legislation the Atomic Energy Commission could not take such action to protect in the future atomic-energy secrets, because the law would then compel General Electric to recognize and deal with the Communist-affected United

Electrical Workers. I feel that the Congress should and will write this section, which has been left out of the administration bill, back into the new legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I think the following provisions left out of the administration bill, most of which were written into the Taft-Hartley law for the protection of the workers from coercion from both union officials and management, should be incorporated into the new law.

First. Contracts arrived at through negotiation between employers and employees should be enforceable by law as to both parties.

Second. The right to determine to strike, or not to strike in the present law by a secret-ballot vote of the members of the union should be retained.

Third. Jurisdictional strikes which do such great harm to both the members of the A. F. of L. and the CIO through constant work stoppages in a fight between these unions should continue to be outlawed.

Fourth. I think union officials should be compelled to continue to give union members and the Government at the end of each year an itemized account of all money received in dues, what it was spent for, and to whom it was paid.

This clause written into the Taft-Hartley law has saved millions of dollars to the union members in the big cities that in the past was wasted by the extravagance of some union officials, and, in many instances, through graft.

I cannot see why, if the big labor leaders want to be fair to the men from whom they collect the dues, they would so strenuously object to this provision. It is left out of the administration bill.

Fifth. I believe the provision in the present law which prevents union officials going to the employer and having a member of the union fired off of his job so long as he pays his dues should be retained. It is left out of the administration bill.

This is one of the most important provisions in the act to protect the union men from abuse by union officials. Under the Wagner Act, when all they had to do was to take a man's union card away from him and go to the employer and have him fired, that not only took away from him the right to earn a living for his family, but took his freedom away from him to express his views on the floor of the union.

Few men were willing to stand upon the floor of the union and object to the way the officers were conducting their union when they knew they could be fired off of their jobs by the union boss in 24 hours. That is why union officials in the big industrial cities and elsewhere can perpetuate themselves in offices, some of which waste and graft the funds of the union, call the men out on strike without their consent, and completely control the men and the union in the way they desire.

Mr. Speaker, may I close by stating that I realize many of the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law are not needed in many sections of the Nation outside of the big industrial centers and the big cities.

Many of the abuses which happen in the big industrial centers which the Taft-Hartley law sought to correct do not occur in many sections of the country outside of the big cities. Most union officials, particularly in the smaller towns and cities throughout the Nation, try to give the members good service and good leadership. Some in the larger cities do. However, to be constitutional, any law must apply to the entire Nation.

However, there have been such flagrant practices carried on by some labor leaders in the larger cities and industrial centers that it became necessary in the Eightieth Congress to try to develop legislation to curb these practices in the interest of labor, business, and the economy of the entire Nation.

Under the Taft-Hartley law some of the power vested in the big labor leaders under the Wagner Act was given back to the labor locals and to the rank and file of labor. It developed that some power had to be given to the Government to protect the national health and public safety of the Nation. The Taft-Hartley law sought to do this, and under this law during the past 2 years a better relationship has been brought about between management and labor which has kept production at a high level.

And during the past 2 years there has been less wages lost by labor through work stoppages. Labor has written the best contracts in its history, wages are the highest in its history, over 57,000,000 people are now employed and labor unions have had the phenomenal growth of an increase in membership of 740,000 new union members during the past 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law.

We who are interested in keeping labor steadily employed, we who are interested in the welfare of agriculture, business, and the whole Nation, are sincere in our belief that many of the provisions in the Taft-Hartley law beneficial to labor and to the economy of the Nation should be written into the new legislation that follows it.

It seems evident that the administration bill is a plain political approach to this most important problem of legislation. We do not believe that this labor legislation should be used as a political football for political advantage. It is too important to the rank and file of labor, to business, to agriculture, and to all the people of the Nation to deal with it on a political basis. The question of what is best for the entire Nation is the responsibility of us Members of Congress, and is the paramount question in our approach to this important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

WELFARE FUNDS

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, when the Education and Labor Committee held hearings on a bill to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act and substitute an amended Wagner Act, a witness appeared for one of the trade associations suggesting that the obligation to bargain collectively be so defined as not to include bargaining over welfare funds.

Welfare funds and benefits have been provided in union contracts as a result of collective bargaining for many years, some as far back as the 1920's. There are, in addition, many other welfare programs, originally established by far-sighted employers, which have since become the subjects of collective bargaining and have been modified in the process.

About 3,500,000 workers are now covered by welfare plans under collective bargaining. Some of the plans are very inclusive, while others cover only one or two hazards of workers, like old age, sickness or disability, or some parts of the expenditures incident to these hazards, like hospitalization or medical and surgical expenses. Under some of the plans the funds are provided by or through the employer, either as a general expense or as a royalty on production, while under other plans they are furnished jointly by the employer and the union.

The Taft-Hartley Act placed restrictions on the use and the administration of welfare funds and these restrictions are removed in H. R. 2032. The proposal of this witness was not to restore section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act. Instead, he proposed something much worse—nothing less than the removal of this most important subject from the obligation to bargain collectively, a matter which has so much to do with the compensation, the conditions of work and the welfare of wage earners.

In a number of cases the National Labor Relations Board, at the time it had the Taft-Hartley Act to administer, decided that the refusal to bargain over welfare funds was tantamount to a refusal to bargain in good faith—Inland Steel, W. W. Cross Co., and General Motors. The refusal to bargain over welfare funds was thus an unfair labor practice under both the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. The decision of the NLRB that welfare funds are within the area of collective bargaining was based on the sound premise that welfare funds are a form of compensation similar to wages and also that some of the programs, like health benefits and retirement, affect the conditions of employment.

Since 1935 the Congress and the American people have thought they were pursuing a policy of encouraging collective bargaining over the terms and conditions of employment. This interpretation of the refusal to bargain made by the NLRB has been sustained in two circuit courts of appeals and is now before the United States Supreme Court.

The logic is so clear that we must feel confident that the Supreme Court will support the court of appeals and the NLRB.

The opposition to collective bargaining over welfare funds comes from some disgruntled employers and others who have never liked collective bargaining anyway, and who therefore think that the next best thing to going back to dictatorship by the employer is to limit the scope or the subjects concerning which they must bargain. They want to be able to determine these vital matters unilaterally, to limit the receipt of the benefits to employees who stay with a particular com-

pany for 5, 10, or 20 years, and to influence the workers to think that there is no need to rely on their unions for these benefits.

In my district I have been able to see what a difference it makes to the workers and their families and to the communities to have a well-financed welfare program in operation—a program which would have been impossible to attain if it had not been for the strength and the bargaining power of the United Mine Workers. Without this program we would have several hundred thousand injured miners suffering from want and misery. We are thankful for this humanitarian program.

All over the country miners have been killed, disabled, or seriously injured and have had nothing but the inadequate workmen's compensation to fall back upon. The social-security program is of little use to these injured men because they are not old enough to qualify for old-age insurance benefits. The mine workers welfare fund took over to do a complete job of care and rehabilitation, giving many of these men the opportunity to earn their livelihood again in new trades or occupations. As the United Mine Workers Journal reported on March 15, 1949, the mine workers welfare fund, in addition to its direct benefits, has also spurred State agencies to do a more complete job of rehabilitation within the sphere of their authority.

The rehabilitation program of the welfare fund has not only focused attention on the deficiencies of State vocational rehabilitation agencies, due in the main to inadequate funds and widespread indifference to the plight of the disabled, but has spurred public officials into action, to set about the long overdue task of improving facilities and securing adequate funds to do the job they are supposed to do, which will of course benefit all citizens.

When a disabled miner, after the necessary medical treatment, is ready for vocational training, the welfare fund steers him to the proper authorities, who determine his aptitudes and interests and map out a program of study or training to fit him for a new means of livelihood. The welfare fund works in close cooperation with State rehabilitation services in finding suitable employment objectives and opportunities.

It is a pioneer undertaking, on a scale never before attempted for the disabled victims of industry, despite the fact that a Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program for handicapped civilians has supposedly been operating for nearly 30 years.

Shall we go back on this and other programs which have meant so much to the security and welfare of American labor? Shall we withhold the promise of greater security and welfare from the millions of American workers who have not yet been able to attain it because their unions have been weak or because they are only now beginning to take up these issues with their employers?

We are not a people who go back on progressive steps that have proved successful. If we understand the issues, we will want to move forward. The least we can do is to encourage employers and their workers to solve these problems in the American way, by collective bargaining which takes into account the special problems in different industries and the financial burden of obtaining greater economic security which different employers and groups of workers are willing and able to undertake. We should defeat this effort to narrow the area of collective bargaining and to block the progress made in recent years in advancing the program of taking care of the men injured or disabled in industry.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ERITREA AND SOMALIA

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the Eighty-first Congress, under this special order granted me by the Speaker, I am taking the opportunity to bring before you a most flagrant injustice which is about to be perpetrated upon a defenseless people with dire and tragic consequences to this Nation and to our world.

The remarks which I am about to make will be transmitted to the political section of the United Nations Organization for their consideration.

World War II began when the world sat idly by and allowed Italy to rape Ethiopia. World war III will begin if this action is again allowed by the United Nations Organization. This is not a threat but a statement of logic.

The political section of the United Nations Organization is now considering the return to Italy of her former colony, Somalia, and the giving to Italy of a former portion of Ethiopia—Eritrea. I charge that this is in direct contradiction to the treaty with Italy, to the stated purposes of the United Nations Organization, and to every part of our conscience and religious concepts. It makes a complete mockery of World War II, and it definitely starts the world on the road to world war III.

Why does Italy want Eritrea and Somalia? For one of two reasons—either to help out their bankrupt economy or to help Somalia and Eritrea. I charge that neither can be done. In the first place, Somalia and Eritrea are able only to take care of their own particular economic problems. There is no surplus which could go to Italy or any other nation except at the expense of the pain and suffering and virtual chattel slavery of the inhabitants of those countries. In the second place, I charge that Italy is not able to help either of these provinces, because Italy is upon the very border of complete break-down even with all of the help of the Marshall plan.

In the balance of my remarks I will point out that Eritrea is first a province of Ethiopia that was taken away from Ethiopia by force. Second, that the Eritreans, the vast majority, over 90 percent, want to be reunited with their mother country. Third, that the British definitely and specifically promised them—as will be shown in the immediately following paragraphs—that they would be allowed to return to Ethiopia. This was done during the war period. Fourth, that the people of Somalia, in their own plebiscite and as presented to the United Nations by their representatives on April 5, 1949, are overwhelmingly against the returning to any form of Italian administration.

I am deeply shocked by the actions of the Members of Italian ancestry of this House, except for one, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], in asking President Truman to see that these colonies are returned. Colonialism has never helped the working classes of any country, especially Italy, and colonialism is a concept which we Americans abhor and reject.

I, therefore, on behalf of the 15,000,000 Negro people of America and the tens of millions of right-thinking whites, through the Congress of the United States, petition the United Nations to hold a plebiscite in Eritrea and return it immediately to Ethiopia; to set up a United Nations trusteeship for Somalia for not more than 5 years, such trusteeship charged with the specific task of not only raising the standard of living of the people but educating them in the processes of self-government and, at the end of 5 years, holding democratic elections and turning the government over to the duly elected people. The balance of these remarks is replete with factual material which I have gathered concerning the war crimes of Italy in Ethiopia, British attitude toward Eritrea, and the petition of the people of Somalia for self-government.

PART I. ERITREA

Proclamation of Emperor Haile Selassie distributed by the British Government:

Eritrean people and people of the Benadir. You were separated from your mother, Ethiopia, and were put under the yoke of the enemy, and under the yoke of the enemy you still remain.

Our cruel enemies, the Italians, have taken your green and fertile land; they prevent you from plowing it and from grazing your cattle on it.

But now the day has come when you will be saved from all this ignominy and hardship.

I have come to restore the independence of my country, including Eritrea and the Benadir, whose people will henceforth dwell under the shade of the Ethiopian flag.

In this struggle we are neither alone nor without arms. We have the help of Great Britain, therefore I summon you to strive to deliver yourselves from the alien slavery. * * *

Eritrean soldiers in the ranks of Italy, do not fire a single shot against the British, who come to help us.

Proclamation of the British Government distributed by the RAF:

Eritrean soldiers, listen.

Desert from the Italians and join us.

Whenever we have sent you a message you have heard it and responded. We give you our thanks.

We know the reason you would not fight against us was that you did not wish to be ruled by the Italians; you will receive your full reward.

You people who wish to live under the flag of His Imperial Majesty, Haile Selassie I, and to have your own flag, we give you our word you shall be allowed to choose what government you desire.

It should be noted that the greater part of Eritrea belongs to the main mountain massif of Ethiopia, that it is

inhabited by people of similar race and culture, namely, a blend of Arabian and African stocks, speaking a language derived from the dead language Gueze, the Latin of Ethiopia, and the parent of many Ethiopian languages. Eritrea, like the rest of Ethiopia, is inhabited by Christians of the Alexandrine or Coptic Church and by Mohammedans. They share the dress and habits of the other peoples of Ethiopia, including those of Addis Ababa. Their notables are termed Dedjazmatch, Grazmatch, Fitaurari, Balambaras, and so forth, just as in Ethiopia, despite half a century of Italian rule.

This report on conditions and policy in Eritrea should be read in conjunction with the proclamation by Emperor Haile Selassie I, dated June 8, 1940, which was prepared in consultation with the British military authorities, who printed it, and had it distributed in Eritrea and Ethiopia by the Royal Air Force.

This proclamation is addressed particularly to the people and soldiers inhabiting the ex-Italian colony of Eritrea, to whom it appeals to join the Ethiopian and British forces in defeating the Italians. It promises reunion with Ethiopia to the people of Eritrea:

Ethiopian people, chiefs, and soldiers.

You have remained firm and fought against our enemy aggressor for the past 5 years without losing hope or breaking your ranks.

The free people of the world have been astonished by your courage and have expressed their sympathy for your struggle. Your valor and sacrifice have brought upon you pain and suffering, but your hope was not in vain.

Henceforth the British Government will bring their irresistible armies to aid us to regain our full independence.

Behold! I come to you.

We must give thanks to Almighty God that He turned to us His face of mercy. We must give thanks to the thousands of our brave Ethiopians who fell on the field of battle, and to those who were massacred by the cruelty of Fascist Italy.

Ethiopian people, chiefs, and soldiers.

The Italians are now fighting against the British Government. The reason is this: When Italy invaded our country the British Government prevented her army from getting food supplies because she opposed the League of Nations.

You know what you must now do. You who are with the enemy must all of you leave them immediately and join the Ethiopian forces in order to assist your country. Not one of you should collaborate with the enemy. Whenever you find the enemy you must attack him, crush him, and bar his way so that he may never return again.

Ethiopian heroes and warriors. I know all about your good work, and now I am anxious to witness your glorious deeds. Brave soldiers, priests, and elders, give good advice to the people. Farmers, traders, people of every calling, be strong in aiding your country. You will all receive the reward of your good deeds.

People of Hamasien, Akeleguzai, Seraie, Beni Amur, Habab, and Mensa, whether you are on this side of the frontier or over in Eritrea, you must all unite with your Ethiopian brothers; not one of you must be a collaborator with the Italians. You must not fight against your mother, Ethiopia, and your friend, the British Government. I know the desire of your hearts; it is my desire also, and the desire of all Ethiopians: Your place is with the other Ethiopian people.

Ethiopian peoples; you have to share together the pain of war, so, too, in peacetime you must share the fruit of civilization, by the aid of our allies, the League of Nations, and especially our ally the British Government. With their help we shall improve our government. The administration of the country will be developed on modern lines. Our relations with other peoples will enable us to keep in touch with them. We shall spread commerce, agriculture, and education. When Ethiopia regains her independence it is our wish that you will live together as one people. This opportunity for Ethiopia is in the hands of her brave sons. It is our duty, both old and young, to be united in order to drive our enemy from the country.

Ethiopian peoples.

We want you to know the kind help which has been given to us by the British Government. The British Government does not want anything from our country, it comes to destroy the Italian armies, which are the enemy of both Ethiopia and Great Britain, in order to help to regain the independence of Ethiopia. Whenever you find the English troops and officers you must receive them with pleasure, because they are bringing to us our independence. Do not forget they are our allies and guests.

May the Ethiopian Empire live forever.

May the British Government live forever.

JULY 8, 1940.

When the Italians were defeated the Eritrean people believed Eritrea would be at once united to Ethiopia. They also believed the Italians would be deprived of the land they had occupied in Eritrea according to promises made in certain leaflets dropped by the RAF.

The inhabitants of the village of Addi-Gadda, in Seraie Province, some 27 kilometers from Asmara, who had welcomed the British joyfully, in fact attempted to recover the land which had been seized by the Italian Count Marazzani some 30 years before. They requested the Italian farmer who occupied the land to vacate it, explaining what they believed to be the new position. On his refusal, they led their cattle to graze on the land. The farmer appealed to the British military authorities at Addi-Ugri, who, without investigation, accepted his version of the affair and sent armored cars and machine guns to attack the villagers, five of whom were killed and many wounded.

SINCE THE WAR

Soon after the British occupation of Eritrea the people of the capital, Asmara, began to demonstrate.

During the fight to defeat the Italians they had been promised liberation from Italian rule. Nevertheless, they found themselves still under the domination of Italians, who ill-treated and even killed them with impunity. It was only under the pressure of grievous wrongs that they approached the British military authorities to plead for redress.

There had existed under Italian rule the Carabinieri, an armed police force, and also the Policia Coloniale, the latter being a creation of Mussolini, and carefully selected in order that they might be 100 percent Fascist.

A number of Eritrean police were also embodied; these were termed Zapte. They occupied a completely subordinate position under the Italians.

These police were retained by the British military administration in their former rank and duties—the Italians still superior, the Eritreans subordinated to them.

Before the fall of Asmara the Italian administration had left the Zapte without pay for periods ranging from 1 to 3 months.

The fighting being at an end and the territory stabilized under a British administration, by whom all the police were now employed, the Zapte, at the beginning of May 1941, sent a deputation of some twenty of their number of the British military administration then called the Occupied Enemy Territory Administration—OETA—to ask for the arrears of pay which were due to them. They were received by an Italian captain of Carabinieri, who flew into a passion at their request, and demanded: "How dare you come here to ask for anything?" To the British officers he declared: "These people have come here simply to raise a riot." Then he ordered an Italian private of the Carabinieri to fire. The private obeyed the order, and one of the Zapte, Tesfa Selassie Hebt, fell dead just outside the OETA office. The rest of the Zapte deputation fled for their lives, chased by the Italian Carabinieri. One of the Zapte had run 2 kilometers when he was shot dead in front of the Eritrean Roman Catholic Church, which is named Kidane Mehret.

The murder outside this church went unpunished; the Italian Carabinieri who fired the shot which killed Tesfa Selassie Hebt outside the OETA office was sentenced to 9 months' imprisonment, but the Italians in command of the gaol released him, and he was seen soon afterward strolling about the town. The officer who ordered the policeman to fire was not even charged with any offense.

Before the two Eritrean policemen had been murdered the whole Eritrean population of Asmara had been suffering grave anxiety and distress. Many unpunished murders were taking place. Between the two squalid quarters of Asmara which the Italians had built for the Eritrean people was a broad main road, by which the Eritreans were permitted to pass, but on which they were not permitted to loiter. On this road, morning after morning, had been discovered the bodies of Eritreans who had been shot after dark. There had hitherto been no certain proof that the Italians were guilty of these crimes, but the murder of the two Zapte was a new circumstance supporting the conviction that they were responsible.

It was notorious that at Decamare, some 42 kilometers from Asmara in the direction of Ethiopia, Italians had lain hidden for many days under a bridge and, thus concealed, had shot dead many Eritrean dignitaries. Dedjazmatch Ghebrai Toklu—who had been appointed by the Italians and had been retained in his office by the British—had reported these murders to the British military authorities, who had arrested the Italians, but there had been no announcement that the Italians had been, or would be punished.

Under all these circumstances, the leaders of the Eritreans decided to call their people to demonstrate. The instructions of the leaders were to march

quietly to the OETA office, avoiding Italian premises and making no attack upon Italians. Between 3,000 and 4,000 Eritreans marched in procession to the OETA, carrying at their head the Ethiopian flag and the union jack.

The British officers at the OETA invited them to choose three spokesmen, who stated the case and urged that the Eritreans had loyally supported the British, and that it was unfair to let them down by leaving them to be maltreated by the Italians.

The British officers heard the spokesmen politely, then told them to go ahead with the demonstration, and appointed a British captain to head the procession and police to accompany it to keep order.

Cheered by this courteous reception, the Eritrean demonstrators marched to the Ethiopian Church of Saint Mariam, where they offered up prayers for the alleviation of their hard lot, and then at the Protestant Church, at the Moslem Mosque, at the Greek Church, and finally at the Roman Catholic Church reserved for Eritreans.

Having made their round of prayer, the people dispersed quietly, hoping their appeal would bring about a better understanding between themselves and the British, and result in the removal of the Italians from positions of authority.

On the contrary, the chief British administrator immediately issued a proclamation prohibiting the assembly of more than three persons, and forbidding the display of the Ethiopian flag or any badge concerned with Ethiopia.

The position of the Eritreans in relation to the Italians was not improved. It is true the British police were increased the Italian decreased, but the Italians were still in a position of superiority as compared with the Eritreans; they were still retained as judges in the courts and in charge of the city's water system and the hospitals, for which reason the Eritreans refused to enter the hospitals. Under these circumstances relations could not improve.

All this could not pass without some repercussions in Ethiopia, where many of the people murdered or otherwise victimized by the Italians had relatives, and where the Eritreans have always been recognized as brothers and fellow nationals. Some thousands of Eritreans escaped over the border into Ethiopia; a number of them made their way to Addis Ababa. The Emperor took all possible steps for appeasement. The Ethiopian Government provided land in Arussi Province for Eritrean refugees and set aside 25,000 Maria Teresa thalers—£2,500—to establish them. A Hamasien house was provided for the refugees who had reached Addis Ababa.

Later, quite independently of the Government, a society for the liberation of Hamasien was spontaneously formed by prominent public men in the capital, most of whom were born in Eritrea or have relatives there.

After some time the British administration in Eritrea instructed the Eritrean people to select 12 representatives from the various parts of the territory to form a native council. The duty of these representatives would be to bring before the British authorities any difficulties or grievances, which would be discussed with British representatives at meetings of the native council which the British authorities would summon.

The Eritrean representatives soon afterwards presented a written report to the British senior civil-affairs officer, Colonel White, protesting and advising against Italian control. They urged that Italians be removed from the management of the water system of the city, which opened to them the possibility of poisoning the supply. They pleaded that Italian judges were passing unjust sentences upon Fritreans, and that Italian prison officials treated them with unwarrantable cruelty. Colonel White expressed appreciation of these views, and promised to pass them to higher British authorities.

On a second visit the 12 councilors reported further mischief by the Italians and informed Colonel White that two Italians employed under the British as civil-affairs officers, Dr. Spicace at Adbi Ugri, and Dr. Ellero at Adbi Cahaie, were giving heavy punishment for trivial offenses, and were also working against the British authorities. Colonel White did not welcome this information, but later the British authorities themselves discovered that Dr. Spicace was hiding armed Italians in the area which he was administrating, and Dr. Ellero was doing the same thing. It was necessary to surround Adbi Ugri and Adbi Cahaie with British forces in order to arrest Dr. Spicace and Dr. Ellero and put them in a prisoner-of-war camp.

At that time a British major was living with Dr. Spicace. The major was not seen again by the Eritreans, who assumed that he had been removed.

At the outset of these events Colonel Platt was commanding officer in Eritrea, Brigadier Kennedy Cook was military administrator, and Colonel White was senior civil-affairs officer for Asmara only. Colonel White was replaced by Count de Sales, Brigadier Kennedy Cook was replaced as chief administrator by Brigadier Stephen Longgrigg, who was afterward replaced by Brigadier McCarthy.

The 12 Eritrean spokesmen continued reporting grave injustices. The senior civil-affairs officer replied that these matters would be discussed at the forthcoming meeting of the native council administration, but the meeting, which had been monthly, was made quarterly, and finally Brigadier Longgrigg suspended the meetings. Brigadier Longgrigg was at this time the chief British representative in Eritrea.

After the suspension of the meetings of the native council the Eritrean people had no recognized medium of contact with the British administration. The representatives they had chosen for the native council were not received.

The Italians still control the courts, and it is claimed they still impose heavy sentences for trifling offenses.

Italian Fascists, who held high office under Mussolini and were sent out by him to replace former Italian administrators, still hold the offices he gave them. Major Papa, for instance, who was sent from Rome as a trusted Fascist, is still major of police and virtually chief under the British. Other Italian officials still in office include: Commendatore Antonio Buongiorno, president of the court of Asmara; Commendatore Emanuele Montefusco, procurator del re, attorney general; Dr. Tucci, public prosecutor; Judge Davozza; Judge Dr. Luigi Guerra; Dr. Tonarelli, judge in the district court, Asmara; Dr. Lauro, district commissioner, Asmara; Dr. Rogani, assistant district commissioner, Asmara; Dr. Chiti, assistant district commissioner, Asmara; Dr. Italo Pizzi, chief tax collector; Commendatore Inserra, mayor of Asmara; Maresciallo Baldini, NCO, market police station officer, well known as one of the most cruel Fascists under the Italian regime.

Why are these Italian Fascists retained in office?

The War Office Report on British Military Administration in Eritrea states that by May 1942 Italian officials had been reduced from over 3,000 to 2,000, and Eritrean officials from 750 to 250. This is surprising.

Discrimination against the Eritrean population continues.

Over the front doors of cafes, cinemas, restaurants, hotels, and so forth, appear the words, "Vietato per Nativi," "Vietato per Indigeni," or in English, "Prohibited for Natives."

Italian taxi-drivers may not accept Eritrean customers. Italian drivers have been given the following circular:

> In base ad ordini ricevuto dall'autorita Brittanica e' fatto as'soluto divieto portare indigeni. Contravvenendo e questo ordine vi sara tolta la licenza—On the basis or orders received from the British authorities it is strictly forbidden to carry natives. Contravention of this order will entail withdrawal of the license.

Members of the Eritrean native council complained to me that while the British military administration grants import and export licenses to foreign residents of Eritrea to whom such licenses have been refused; the following names were mentioned: Adballs Gonafer, Kenyazmatch Ghebru Neggussi, Adbelkader Kebire, Said Haiti.

Members of the native council also complained that the British administration grants land to Italians, but refuses it to Eritreans. The grant to Italians in or near the following small towns was mentioned: Addi Woghera, district of Akelaguzai; Deghera Lebea, district of Akelaguazi; Ona Hayela, district of Seraie; Mai Gura, district of Akelaguzai; Merara, district of Hamasien.

This allegation in respect of land grants is confirmed by the following facts: The Ministry of Information pamphlet, "The First To Be Freed," states that the British administration had granted land to Italians and encouraged them to cultivate it, and has also given facilities to them to establish themselves in manufacturing enterprises.

Col. Stanley Parker, who was acting administrator when I arrived in Eritrea, stated to me that the Italians, in order to

make a lake, had evicted a number of Eritrean farmers from their land. These farmers appealed to the British administration to grant them other land, but had received the reply that, being only in provisional occupation of the territory, the British administration could not grant their request. This appears inconsistent with the fact that the British administration had granted land to Italians.

When at Addi Cahaie, I suggested to Major Lee, the British representative there, that it is unwise to increase the Italian hold on Eritrea by making grants of land to individual Italians, and by encouraging them to establish manufacturing and trading enterprises. Major Leigh replied that this had been done in order to reduce unemployment and save British revenue, and the Italians had been told that no guarantee could be given beyond the duration of the war.

Members of the native council further alleged that Eritreans may only cut dead wood even on their own land. If they are found to have cut wood which shows even a single green branch they are heavily fined.

Permits to cut green wood are given to the Italians. Such permits are refused to Eritreans. Among those whose applications for permits have been refused, the following were named: Ato (Mr.) Takle Tzelalu, Blatta Jacob Ogbagaber, Bashai Zeratzion Gilaghi.

On January 30, 1944, Ethiopian flags were displayed on many Eritrean homes. A daring demonstration was made by a group of Eritrean youth. They succeeded during the night in attaching 10 large flags in the Ethiopian colors, each 3 yards long, to electric-light standards in the main street, bearing the name of the former Italian Governor, Italo Balbo. They attached a similar flag to the principal mosque. On the flagstaffs of government house they flew two similar flags. At the police headquarters they covered the desk of the British colonel with an Ethiopian flag and put a portrait of the Emperor Haile Selassie on his chair.

They had had posters printed with a portrait of the Emperor, the Ethiopian colors, and a poem urging the British Government not to attempt to separate the people of Eritrea from their Emperor, for whom they were longing, and reminding the British that when they came to Eritrea in 1941 they pleaded with the Eritrean people to aid them, on the ground that they were bringing to the people their own Emperor and their own flag. The poem concluded with a warning that trouble would result if these promises were not fulfilled. Twenty of these posters were displayed in various parts of the town.

The British military authorities ordered the Eritrean police to tear down these manifestos, but they refused on the plea that they dare not thus incur popular resentment.

On Saturday, February 5, 1944, the Eritrean police made their own opinion felt. Two thousand eight hundred of them assembled at the police station in Corsa d' Italia and informed the officer in charge of the following decisions:

First. They refused to be judged any longer by Italian Fascist laws, which the British authorities had sanctioned.

Second. They protested against a recent order of withdrawal of their boots, and refused to go barefoot, or to wear the uniform the Italians had instituted for them, with the tarboosh, or fez.

Third. They refused to work under Italian police officers. They complained that when the British engaged them they had been assured they would work under British officers, but they were still under Italians.

Unless the above grievances were to be removed, they asked leave to resign.

Four thousand Eritrean police were involved; it would have been highly inconvenient to lose them all. To appease them, they were granted boots and British uniforms, but Italian superior officers, Italian judges, and Fascist laws were retained.

Steps were taken to prevent any further attempt by the police to display national aspiration or desire for a higher status. Some 200 constables were known to be able to read and write; they were therefore considered undesirable, and were accordingly dismissed. They were replaced by illiterate Takrurs from French Equatorial Africa, who had come to Eritrea to work as laborers, and by Arabs from the Yemen, who do not know either the local language, Tigrinya, or Amharic, the official language of Ethiopia.

Four Eritrean police officers, who were suspected because they held the more important positions in the force, were arrested: Inspector Assefau Agostino, Inspector Gabre Mariam, Inspector Gabre Jesus, Sergeant Takle Guiorguis Tamelso.

These officers were incarcerated without trial. They are still at the time of writing held untried in Fort Baldissera, so designated by the Italians after their general of that name, who replaced General Baratieri when the latter had been defeated by the Ethiopians at Adowa in 1896. The four police officers are prevented from communicating with either relatives or lawyers.

Agostino Zerit, father of Inspector Assefau Agostino, addressed a petition to the British administration, pleading for the release of his son. He received from Colonel Miller the following reply:

> With reference to your petition dated May 8, before Assefau Agostino, Inspector of Police, was interned I inquired into all the circumstances of the case.

After a long period in which Eritrean opinion appeared to be ignored by the British military administration, and no meeting of the native council has been officially summoned, Brigadier Longgrigg, the chief British administrator, initiated a curious sort of propaganda. He visited Addi Cahaie and there called together the representatives of the people, who are designated by the general term chief, and invited them to express their views on the future of Eritrea. He promised to forward their views to London. Having regard to the foregoing surprising events, the chiefs of Addi Cahaie were reluctant to express their true desire, which was for reunion to Ethiopia. They feared that by answering frankly they might incur the anger of the brigadier.

They therefore replied with caution, verbally, and afterwards in writing, that they represented but a small part of Eritrea, and could not therefore reply to so important a question without consulting other districts. They requested, however, to be informed in what way they should make their views known. Brigadier Longgrigg replied that they might do so through the columns of the Eritrean Weekly News, which is published in the local language, Tigrinya, by the British Ministry of Information in Asmara chiefs, eager, all of them, to formed the chiefs of Asmara of what Brigadier Longgrigg had said, and showed them their written reply to him. The Asmara Chiefs, eager, all of them, to rejoin Ethiopia—as are all the 12 members of the Eritrean native council appointed by the British—considered they must take action in reply to Brigadier Longgrigg's proposal. As public meetings were prohibited under the order that no more than three persons might assemble, they decided to meet in small groups in various houses to discuss the future and to take in this way a plebiscite. So far as it had gone, it was heavon the side of unity with Ethiopia. Meanwhile, the British authorities came to know of this move; on February 22, ily on the side of unity with Ethiopia. tables of Asmara, some of whom were members of the native council selected by the people and appointed by the British themselves. It should be noted that Grazmatch in Eritrea, as well as in Ethiopia, is a title signifying that the holder is occupying an administrative position, and that Blatta signifies both a man of learning and one who holds an administrative post.

Since the Italians occupied this part of the country the old importance of these titles and the positions their bearers formerly held has, of course, been reduced to a mere shadow: Grazmatch Zerre Bakit; Blatta Fasil Ogbazgi, brother of the present vice governor, or vice mayor, of Addis Ababa; Grazmatch Tesfa Michael Worke; Blatta Asfaha Abraha; Araya Sebhatu.

These arrests cast a curious light on Brigadier Longgrigg's professed desire to know the views of the Eritrean people on the future of their homeland and his promise to transmit their views to London. The Eritrean people were shocked by the arrest of the notables, and rallied courageously to their support. On February 23, 1944, a vast crowd of people assembled at the offices of the British military administration, where Col. Stanley Parker, at that time senior civil-affairs officer, received a deputation from them. Their spokesmen said, in part:

> Here we are gathered to say a few words to you. The people you British have arrested are good people; they are of good character and of good conduct; they do not steal or drink, kill or commit disorders. Therefore we know they can only have been arrested for political reasons. Please state why they have been arrested, and we will take the necessary measures. If it is for a political reason, we know that it is merely because they have expressed their desire

to join our own country, Ethiopia. They are patriots. We ask their release.

Colonel Parker replied that he personally regretted the arrests, in which he had had no part. He promised to bring the matter before his superiors.

We have seen that Brigadier Longgrigg, having invited Eritreans to express their opinion on the future of their homeland, the British military administration, under Brigadier Longgrigg, vigorously repressed the Eritrean attempt to manifest their desire for reunion with Ethiopia. An August 3, 1944, the Eritrean Weekly News, published in the local language, Tigrinya, by the British Ministry of Information in Asmara, under Major Mumford, opened the discussion Brigadier Longgrigg had suggested. The first article was anonymous, and there is little doubt it was composed in the editorial office. A translation of this article is attached. Its main points are:

First. Great Britain fought the Italians to give liberty to Ethiopia; therefore, Great Britain must be compensated.

Second. Ethiopia cannot manage Eritrea in a spiritual way, because she herself is twisted inside. Eritrea would be a ceaseless trouble to Ethiopia.

Third. The writer refers to a rebellion in the Ethiopian Province of Tigrai.

Fourth. The lowland part of Eritrea should be joined to the Sudan.

Fifth. The highland part or Ethiopia should be joined with Tigrai Province of Ethiopia, which should be annexed, with Axum, the Sacred City of Ethiopia, as its capital, and both placed under the protection of Britain for 25 years.

Sixth. After 25 years, more or less, the population will be invited to explain their ideas, and the protecting power can choose what proposal it likes. One bad thing about this article is that it assumes that what it advocates is going to happen, for it says:

> The Government which is going to be established with the kind of help of Great Britain.

Thereby it tends to create the impression that the matter is settled, and that in their own interests prudent people will accept the inevitable. It should be observed that the proposal to add the western lowlands of Eritrea to the Sudan, and to put the highland part of Eritrea under British rule, annexing also the Tigrai Province of Ethiopia, had already been given prominence in the Sudan Star.

It must be emphasized that the Eritrean Weekly is published by the British Ministry of Information. The anonymous article was sharply replied to by Alazar Tesfa-Micheal, who signed his article, which is also attached, because he said, "Truth cannot be hidden and love cannot be denied." He made these points:

First, whether from the highlands or the lowlands, from Eritrea or the Tigrai, Tigrinya-speaking Ethiopians are not going to deny their mother, Ethiopia, or separate themselves from their brothers who speak Amharic.

Second. Every nation on the face of the earth has its different dialects and religions, so with Ethiopia, but this does not prevent Ethiopians being our people.

Third. Ethiopia is well organized and can manage her own affairs and this includes her lost territory, Eritrea.

Fourth. The rebellion in the Tigrai was instigated by a small group which made the rebellion.

Fifth. When Italy invaded Ethiopia in 1935, thousands of Eritreans fought beside their Ethiopian brothers to resist the Italian invasion of Ethiopia, which they regarded as their own motherland.

Sixth. Thousands of Eritreans are leaving their beloved homes and parents in order to be included in Ethiopia.

Seventh. Eritreans share the same church festivals as Ethiopians and at these festivals, Ethiopian flags are shown and Ethiopian patriotic songs are sung.

Eighth. Ninety percent of Eritrean people are praying for reunion to Ethiopia.

The discussion was continued for some time. The Eritreans were unable to discover the identity of the writers who advocated British rule, though titles were ascribed to them, which if genuine, would have made identification easy, had their true names been disclosed. An article published in the Eritrean Weekly of November 2, is ascribed to Balaambaras Fesaha Kefle. Eritreans have not been able to identify the writer, who declares that in his time he has been prosperous, for he was a Bulockbask—an African corporal in the Italian Colonial Forces.

Such men were seldom able to read or write. This alleged corporal deplores the Italian defeat, and adds:

> Even if they do not return, may God protect our lords, the Italians, who gave us food, and drink, clothes and glory. We must not say anything against them. If we do we shall displease God.

This is strange propaganda for the British Ministry of Information to publish at the cost of British taxpayers. It is grievous that this hireling of the Italians—if in fact he exists—should have his article published at Britain's expense, whilst genuine representatives of the Eritrean people are coerced into silence.

The ex-Bulockbask is more ambitious in his claims for annexation of Ethiopian territory than the anonymous writer. He would have the enlarged Eritrea ruled by a descendant of the former emperor, Johannes. If that is not possible, he says, "the British Government will give us one of their best men." The same aim is uncovered—a new British colony.

There are a large number of Eritreans in Addis Ababa; a good number of them are chauffeurs and motor mechanics; they are exceedingly quick and intelligent and have a liking for machinery, and readily learn to handle motorcars.

Approximately 20 percent of the Ethiopian Government officials have been Eritreans ever since the Italian conquest of Eritrea which occurred between 1886 and 1890. The Ethiopian Government has always treated Eritreans as Ethiopian subjects. They could not pass into Ethiopia except by clandestine means. Many, however, did so in order to attend the Ethiopian Government schools. In Ethiopia there were, and are, prospects of material advancement and higher status for all of them. Recently, the Ethiopian Ministers in Moscow and Washington, Blatten Gheta Taezas and Blatta Ephraim Medhen, are Eritreans. Here is a list of some other Ethiopian officials who come from Eritrea:

MINISTRY OF JUSTICE

Ato Ambaye Wolde-Mariam (Vice Minister).

Ato Micael Tessema (Chief Inspector).

Ato Melesse Mikael (Chief of the Archives).

Ato Selemon Abraham (Chief Secretary to the Ministry).

Ato Mehane Gabre (Chief Treasurer).

Ato Kefle-Igzie Ihidego (High Court Judge).

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Ato Paolos Birhane (Chief Treasurer).

MINISTRY OF THE INTERIOR

Ato Gabre-Mascal Kefle-Igze (Secretary General).

MINISTRY OF THE PEN

Ato Tesfa-Mariam Guedela (Director of the Archives).

MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Ato Guebre-Micael Fessihaye (Chief Treasurer).

MINISTRY OF POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS

Ato Gabre-Mascal Hapte-Mariam (Director General).

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY

Ato Hagos Tewolde-Medhen (Chief Inspector and Director General).

MINISTRY OF WAR

Lt. Col. Iyassoa Mangasha (Inspector of the Control Department).

Capt. Abebe Teferi (Commander of Fifth Regiment).

Capt. Tewolde-Berhanit Egzi (Chief of Stores to the First Regiment).

Lt. Guebrai Gabre-Igze (Chief of Staff).

Lt. Abreha Tadeos (Staff).

THE EMPEROR'S PERSONAL STAFF

Ato Johannes Reda-Igzi (Chief of the Secretariat).

NATIONAL LIBRARY

Ato Sereke Berhane Gabre-Igziabiher (Director).

Actually the British Government in Eritrea is not doing as much for education as the Ethiopian Government, as the following facts indicate.

Under British administration there is only one trained teacher for Eritrean children, Capt. Kynaston Snell, an ex-LCC schoolmaster. Capt. Kynaston Snell has the assistance of Mr. Isaac Tewolde Medhen, an able Eritrean, brother of the Ethiopian Minister in Washington. For the rest, he has untrained Eritreans, mainly without any previous experience of teaching, who replied to his advertisement for young men who would like to teach, and have had only a brief elementary education.

The school course for Eritrean children covers 4 years, and is intended for pupils from 8 to 12 years of age, but may begin later.

The school budget is £7,000 per annum, and has to cover also the education of European children.

Outside the capital, where some warehouses were being converted into a girls' school, the British administration provides no new schools. The people are told that if they desire more schools they

must build them at their own expense; the administration can only provide a teacher.

No secondary or technical education is provided by the British administration for Eritrean children.

The only language taught in the Eritrean schools is Tigrinya, a local language, which opens to the pupils no literature or opportunities of international intercourse.

In Ethiopia the present achievement and future aims of the Ministry of Education are more ambitious; £95,674 was spent on education by the Ministry of Education in the year 1943–44, and £167,-245 is to be spent in 1944–45. There are a number of British, European, Indian, and Egyptian teachers. All schools teach Amharic and Gueze, the Latin of Ethiopia. English is introduced in the fourth class. Elementary schools go up to class three or four. Central schools have six classes. Secondary schools or secondary classes in central schools follow, and a number of pupils are sent abroad to complete their education at Cairo or Beirut. The Technical School, the School of Commerce, the Agricultural School, and the Haile Selassie I School of Arts and Sciences are all hopeful institutions necessary to a self-governing people.

The Eritrean people are strongly desirous of reunion with Ethiopia. They would not again accept Italian rule without active resistance.

It would be dishonorable for them to be given the territory. The Eritrean people would declare we had broken faith with them and make vigorous protest. The reputation of Britain and her influence in world affairs would be gravely damaged.

PART II. ITALY'S WAR CRIMES

From an appeal by Haile Selassie to the Christians of the world, July 31, 1937:

I charge the Italian Army with the following barbarities in addition to the great massacre:

The murder at various times and places of hundreds of men, women, and children by individual Italian soldiers who go entirely unpunished.

Reprisals upon various towns and villages in which many of the inhabitants have been shot on account of the presence or fear of armed bands of Ethiopians in the vicinity, the worst case having occurred at Lekempti, where 600 innocent inhabitants were shot.

The execution at different times of thousands of persons after summary trial by court martial for alleged offenses, such as possessing arms or inciting to disaffection.

The torture of prisoners and the burning alive in their huts of persons who defied the Italian authority.

The execution of Ras Desta and many other officers of my army taken prisoner on the field of battle.

The forcing of thousands of unmarried women and young widows in Addis Ababa and other towns into concentration camps and licensed brothels as prostitutes after medical examination, for which purpose Italian doctors may enter any house.

The killing of priests and Muslim sheiks when after the attempt on the life of General Graziani all Ethiopians present were surrounded and shot.

The denial of Christian burial to the victims of the executions and general massacre of February 19 to 21, their bodies being burned like rubbish in dumps with the aid of petrol, whilst their relatives were prohibited from removing them.

The destruction of the ancient church of the monastery of Debra Libanos and other churches by deliberately setting them on fire by way of reprisal.

The public execution of the Abuna (bishop) Petros at Addis Ababa in the month of July last year for refusing to sign an act of submission to the Italian authorities and refusing to pronounce the excommunication of Ethiopians who declined to make submission to the invader.

"Murder most foul as in the best it is,
But this most foul, strange and unnatural."
—Hamlet.

Provisional minimum estimate of the slaughter of Ethiopians compiled from the evidence thus far investigated—these figures are not final and there are in addition a large number of persons rendered permanent invalids:

Killed by poison gas	275,000
Patriots killed in battle during the 5 years of occupation	78,500
Children, women, old and infirm people killed by bombing during the occupation	17,800
Massacre of February 1937	30,000
Patriots condemned to death by court martial	24,000
Persons of both sexes who died in concentration camps from privation and maltreatment	35,000
Total	460,300

The unprovoked and unwarranted Italian invasion was effected by Italian and colonial troops in numbers far exceeding the forces for whom Ethiopia could provide even the most meager equipment, as well as by an immense superiority in arms of every description. This crime was above all rendered possible by the unrestricted employment of aircraft, the use of incendiary and high-explosive bombs, the indiscriminate machine gunning of the common people, the spraying of Ethiopian troop concentrations and vast areas of the country, towns, villages, farms, and lakes with poison gas.

The Italian warplanes did their murderous work unhindered, for Ethiopia possessed neither military airplanes nor antiaircraft guns. It was, however, the poison gas, sprayed as a deadly dew, destroying the eyes, burning through the clothing and the flesh to the very bones, which had the most devastating effect.

The hideous invasion was described by brave Dr. John Melly, who raised and led the British Ambulance Service in Ethiopia, in moving terms:

This isn't a war—it isn't even a slaughter—it's the torture of tens of thousands of defenseless men, women, and children, with bombs and poison gas. They're using gas incessantly; and we've treated hundreds of cases, including infants in arms. (From a letter of Dr. John Melly, December 4, 1936.)

The war thus ruthlessly prosecuted was the prelude to 5 years of equally atrocious and cruel usurpation, in which the robbery, rape, and murder of the conquered people by the Italian "master-race" was callously encouraged by the Fascist dictatorship in Rome.

Amid the record of sadist orgies, which disgraced Italian rule, certain monstrous policies can be discerned. There was an effort, which happily failed, to thrust a wedge between the Christian and Mohammedan peoples of Ethiopia and to stir up religious and racial enmity between them. Christians were singled out for special persecution and massacre in predominantly Mohammedan areas.

Dr. Martin, then Ethiopian Minister in London, received from a Mohammedan whom he had employed when governor of Chercher province, the following letter, written in Harar on September 7, 1936, and smuggled out of Ethiopia via Jibuti:

When I saw the wholesale massacre of Christian Ethiopians by Christian Italians, I stood and thanked God that he had not made me a Christian; yet I knew that the sin did not lie with Christ.

One Sunday I saw some Italian white soldiers enter an Ethiopian church and ring the bells. Sixteen old men thought it was time for prayer; before they could enter the church the Italians killed them. I heard the words of these poor old men: Egziabher Yasywo—May God open your eyes to the truth. I could not help crying, but the Italians were laughing; the dead bodies lay for 2 days on the steps of the church.

The first order given to the Italian armies was to kill everyone carrying the cross. I saw a man pick up a gold cross in the street, and whilst he had it in his hands an Italian soldier killed him, because he thought he was a Christian.

I saw an old man sitting in his house, his Bible in one hand and a white flag in the other. Italian soldiers entered the house and demanded the old man's money. He answered that he was poor, but offered them all he had, which amounted to but three thalers. They fired three bullets at him, and he crumpled up dead. Poor little Ethiopian children have been put to the sword or thrown into burning houses.

It must not be assumed, however, that Mohammedans were spared the iniquities of the occupation.

For instance, in May 1938 six Italian airplanes flew low over the town of Jimma, discharging their bombs on the Ethiopian houses, which were entirely burned to the ground; hundreds of innocent women and children chiefly Mohammedans, being burned to death in the inferno thus produced. This action was common.

In March 1938, the Italians took the eight leading men of a village near Gondar and carried them away by plane, ostensibly to visit the King of Italy in Rome. On the following day some young girls who had gone into the forest to collect firewood found, on the rocky banks of the Blue Nile the broken corpses of those poor men. This grim joke was played so often that "He went to Rome" became synonymous with, "He was murdered by the Italians."

A policy of extermination was carried out against all Ethiopians of superior education who had occupied administrative positions. In pursuance of this aim the Italians often invited chiefs and other notables to negotiate and then slaughtered them in cold blood. The Red Cross and the white flag of truce were violated by the Fascist barbarians with equal ruthlessness.

The terrible massacre in Addis Ababa and other towns of February 19, 20, and 21, was the apogee of Fascist barbarity; yet it must be emphasized that atrocities were constantly perpetrated throughout the entire 5 years of Italian usurpation.

It had long been customary for the Emperor of Ethiopia to make an annual

distribution of alms to the poor and infirm of the city on February 19. Marshal Graziani, holding the proud office of Italian Viceroy, decided to ape the Emperor at this ceremony, which was held in reverence by all Ethiopia. The archbishop and all the church and other dignitaries not in hiding or exile were ordered to attend. A Hungarian physician, Dr. Ladislas Sava, who remained in Ethiopia during the first years of the Italian occupation, has written the following poignant account of the tragedy which followed:

In the beginning the Ethiopian people behaved quietly, hiding their outraged feelings as best they could. Then suddenly bombs were thrown toward the table at which Graziani was sitting with his lieutenants. At the moment of the explosion he was hiding under the table, while the other Italian officers had flung themselves to the ground. The assailant was an Eritrean whom the Italians employed as interpreter.

A moment of silence followed, which lasted until the Italians realized that no more bombs were to be feared. Then the shooting was started by Cortese, who fired with his revolver into the group of Ethiopian dignitaries. The Italian Carabinieri followed this example. In a few moments there were more than 300 dead in the courtyard and around the palace alone.

Hardly a single Ethiopian escaped alive from the courtyard. The general massacre there was particularly senseless and revolting, for the people massed there were a crowd of aged invalids, blind, and crippled beggars and poor mothers of little children. The Blackshirts ran through the courtyard, seeking any Ethiopians still alive and shooting any still breathing.

The bomb had been thrown at 11 a. m. A few minutes later Blackshirts, Carabinieri and soldiers were running all over the town, ordering every shopkeeper to close his doors, and everyone else abroad to return home. In an hour there were no more people in the streets. Postal and telephonic communications were suspended. In the palace and the neighboring streets for within about 400 yards' radius the ground was covered with the dead.

Cortese convoked the Blackshirts to the seat of the Fascio, the chiefs to a consultation, the others to wait for orders. Soon they sped from the Fascio in every direction, fully armed. Everyone in the town was a prey to terrified anticipation, but what really happened was worse than any had feared. I am bound to say, for it is true, that blood was literally streaming down the streets. The corpses of men, women, and children, over which vultures hovered, were lying in all directions. Great flames from the burning houses illuminated the African night.

The organization of the massacre was systematic. The stopping of telegraphic and telephonic communication, in order to prevent people from giving any information to Europe, the closing of the shops and the evacuation of the streets were precautionary measures, carried out between 11 a. m. and 6 p. m. If the first shooting in the courtyard and around the palace occurred under the immediate fear and panic spread by the bomb thrown at Graziani, the massacre which started in the night was carefully prepared during 7 hours and cannot thus be excused.

During that awful night Ethiopians were thrust into lorries, heavily guarded by armed Blackshirts. Revolvers, truncheons, rifles, and daggers were used to murder unarmed black people, of both sexes and all ages. Every black person seen was arrested, bundled into a lorry and killed, either in the lorry or near the Emperor's palace, sometimes even at the moment when he met the Blackshirts. Ethiopian homes were searched and then burned with their inhabitants inside. To quicken the flames benzine and oil were used in great quantities. The shooting never ceased all night, but most of the murders were committed with daggers and truncheons. Whole streets were burned down, and if any of the occupants of the houses ran out from the flames they machine-gunned or stabbed with cries of "Duce! Duce!" From the lorries in which groups of prisoners were brought up to be murdered near the palace the blood flowed on to the streets, and again from the lorries we heard the cry, "Duce!"

I shall never forget that I saw that night Italian officers passing in their luxurious cars through the blood-drenched streets, stopping at some point whence they could have a better panorama of the murdering and the burning, accompanied by their wives, whom I am very reluctant to call women.

Graziana himself was taken to the Italian hospital. His wound did not prevent him from looking down from the window and like a second Nero delighting in the flames. He heard the cries "Duce! Duce!" and knew that each of these cries, each stab of a dagger or firing of a rifle meant another cruel murder.

It was a mass murder of men, women, and children, and also an immense slaughtering of animals. Ethiopian shepherds tried to herd some of the poor beasts into a corner, which appeared to them to offer some protection, but even the animals were not spared from rifles and machine guns.

The flames spread from the houses to some of the great trees which graced the streets; flaming, they collapsed with a tremendous noise.

In the morning the horror continued; homeless people wandered desperately through the streets, seeking their lost relatives. There were no cries, no loud weeping, no complaints which men could hear. Prayer is silent, the horror of the night left the people speechless.

There was blood in the stream, there were dead bodies under and over the Makonnen Bridge. I am not easily moved. A medical man, having dealt with the worst kinds of disease, having gone through the world war with front-line ambulances, should have good nerves; and I have good ones. Yet the things I saw were too much even for my medically trained and war-hardened nerves.

If anything can increase the horror of the bloody sight of thousands of dead, it is the feeling that we ourselves are safe, and that these people are not killed because they are enemies fighting with weapon against weapon, but defenseless civilians being murdered, and the knowledge, which I have in the present case, that while the lorries were still collecting the dead bodies from the streets, while the blood was still congealing on the ground, Blackshirts were already running to the Bank of Italy to change the thalers they had stolen in the night from Ethiopian homes, and the gold and silver ornaments from the necks of Ethiopian women whom they had killed.

No decent man could tell these things without reluctance, to reveal that they were done by white men like himself. But it is my duty to speak; it is my duty to tell that lorries were covered and dripping with blood, that Blackshirts put a stick from behind between the feet of running black men, in order to throw them to the ground, the more easily to murder them. It is my duty to say that I have seen men's heads split open by truncheons so that their brains gushed out; that murder was accompanied by robbery; that the massacre was so systematic that three places in the town were appointed for the collection of corpses.

Fascists in groups of four or five, heavily armed, again and again attacked a single unarmed Ethiopian. Machine guns were used even against women. No means of destroying human life was neglected on the night of the 19th of February, 1937.

A second night of massacre followed. I was again in my room. Since the beginning of the massacre I had kept my Ethiopian servant there with me, forbidding him even to show himself at the window, as any sight of him by an Italian might have meant his death. He had a little house beside mine, which was spared on the first night, but burned on the second. He sat during those terrible hours quite speechless, and with his head in his hands. I dared not ask him what he thought.

The killing was done in the night to prevent photographs being taken. If any white person ventured into the streets he was stopped at every corner and searched to see if he had a camera on him. The houses of white people were visited by Italian soldiers, who confiscated cameras.

There was military aviation in the town and these officers were dissatisfied that they had not been able to share the glory of the Blackshirt action on the 19th. So they were ordered to bomb the surroundings the next night, in order that they, too, should have their part in the massacre.

I have had many Italians in my surgery who told with great pride how many black people they had killed. One of them was very modest; he had killed only two. Others killed, or pretended to have killed, eighty or a hundred. I have heard them praising themselves for having stolen four or five hundred thalers in one night. Man-hunting was a much-appreciated sport.

The hours of daylight between the first and the second night of the massacre I shall never forget. We knew already before nightfall that the horror was not at an end; proclamations in Italian appeared in the streets, announcing that more blood would flow: "Graziana has hitherto shown his good heart to the Ethiopians; tonight he will show them his immense power."

The second night resembled the first in every way, except for some bombing around the town.

In the days which followed one could see black people meeting in the street, embracing each other and putting a hundred questions. It was a surprise to any Ethiopian in Addis Ababa to know that one or other of his relations or friends was not dead.

The massacre was closed by an incident which I relate, still trembling at the mere thought of it. A venerable Coptic priest had survived the war, the first terrible period of the occupation, and even the massacre of the 19th and 20th of February. He was still alive on the 21st, when the Italians finally stopped killing and robbing, though he was one of the men against whom the Fascist daggers were aimed. When the Italian authorities became aware that he was still alive, Cortese convoked the murderers to the seat of the Fascio. An order was given to Gallini, one of the most able dagger men, to stab the Coptic prelate. The priest was surprised in a house where some 20 to 25 Ethiopians, mostly women, were assembled to offer up a devoted prayer to the One who hears the cry of suffering humanity. While the prelate was kneeling in prayer, Gallini stabbed him with his dagger from behind, and retired with the satisfaction of one who had done his job.

It was also on the 19th and 20th of February that most of the black intelligentsia perished. Those cultured, educated, young Ethiopians, with whom our relations were so friendly before the invasion, had to perish for two reasons: First, because their learning and their position assured them a certain influence over their compatriots; secondly, because many of them possessed in their homes objects of value, especially from Europe, which the murderers distributed among themselves.

In a domiciliary search, ostensibly for British hand grenades, a group of Italians entered a human Ethiopian home near the Makonnen Bridge. Of course, they found no hand grenades, but there were thalers, kept for safety in a money box, and these were confiscated as a trophy of war, victory, and civilization. In the same room they found a picture of the Emperor Haile Selassie. For this symbol the whole family were condemned to death. In a few moments the house was in flames, and with it perished the members of the family locked inside. Their desperate cries were heard, but the Italians did not move from the place till they had ceased; they were anxious that none should escape the fire.

Gallows to which the bodies of patriots were always hanging were erected near the cathedral wall in Addis Ababa and throughout the peaceful countryside; Italian columns swept down on the villages, seized the mayor and the leading men and strung them up with neither trial nor inquiry. The massacre and destruction of entire villages was a common event.

The Ethiopian Church was the subject of bitter attack, because of the spiritual support it gave to the cause of national independence and resistance to the enemy; among many others which suffered, the historic Monastery of Debra Lebanos, along with the town, was wantonly burned to the ground and monks were murdered in their holy sanctuary.

In tendering this tragic collection of records I would urge you first to pause and consider what your feelings would have been if this wickedness had been perpetrated in our own land, and our dear ones had been its victims.

The evidence of these atrocities is voluminous. The criminals themselves have rendered it the more irrefutable by their own photographic testimony, of which I have many examples.

These brutalities have not been, and could not be, exceeded by the aggressors in any part of the world. Along with the whole invasion and occupation of Ethiopia, they are an integral part of the combined world aggression by Italy, Germany and Japan in World War II. The bombing of Ethiopian villages was a part of the same series of events as the destruction of Warsaw and Rotterdam, Lidice and Coventry, and the attack on Pearl Harbor. The heroic 5 years resistance of the Ethiopian patriots was part of the same global fight for liberty as the battle of Britain and the valiant defense of El Alamein, Bir Hakeim and Stalingrad.

I submit that the atrocities committed by the Italians in Ethiopia must be laid before the War Crimes Commission, upon which Ethiopian representatives should be invited to take their seat among those of the other injured peoples.

The Ethiopian people are entitled to compensation for the wrongs they have suffered, the greatest of which was the deliberate and systematic extermination of those of their nationals who possessed superior education and administrative or technical experience.

London Times, March 3, 1937:

There is reason to believe that the Italian reprisals in Addis Ababa after the attempt on Marshal Graziani, the Viceroy, were carried out with a savagery almost beyond description. For 3 days after the attempted assassination every able-bodied Italian in the place appears to have been encouraged to slaughter natives.

With rifles, pistols, bombs, knives, and clubs served out for the occasion, gangs of Blackshirts and workmen went through the native quarter killing every man, woman, and child they came across. Others, with flame throwers and tins of petrol fired the flimsy huts and houses and shot down those who tried to escape.

Immediately after the bomb was thrown at Marshal Graziani, Italian troops surrounded the area, and every Ethiopian within the circle was killed.

London News Chronicle, March 6, 1937:

The terrible account from an eyewitness which our Paris correspondent sends today of what happened in Addis Ababa confirms the rumors which have been in circulation of wholesale massacre and incendiarism.

The shooting of Ras Desta without even the pretense of a trial was an ominous indication of the brutal temper of the men now in power in Ethiopia.

Paris correspondent:

Funeral pyres are burning amid the blackened ruins of Addis Ababa, capital of conquered Ethiopia.

So many thousands of Ethiopian men, women and children were massacred that they cannot be buried, let alone counted.

The authorities are therefore piling the bodies into heaps, which are soused with petrol and set on fire.

In the first eyewitness account to reach official circles in Paris a Frenchman wrote:

The capital and its environs passed into a state of siege. Aeroplanes zoomed overhead, and tanks, and motorized machine guns patrolled all the roads shooting all whom they encountered.

From the legation we heard uninterrupted firing, punctuated from time to time with the sharp rat-a-tat of machine guns.

Bands of Blackshirts and Italian workers ran through the streets setting fire to the tukuls (native huts) with flame throwers.

Scores of inhabitants were unable to escape from their blazing huts and perished in the flames. The confusion was indescribable.

Eyewitness, Imperial Legation, April 7, 1937:

The gigantic birds of death soared in the sky from the aerodrome of Akaki, and with a frightful drone began to hurl bombs all over the city. From the fortified positions cannon and machine guns vomited a hail of shots without respite. In a few minutes the whole town was in conflagration. Smoke darkened the sky.

Terrified men, women, and children ran in all directions, only to be butchered by groups of 10, 20, 50, 100 Italian militiamen and Blackshirts.

Soon the streets were strewn with dead bodies.

One could see groups of Fascists chaining the poor men to lorries and amusing themselves by dragging them along from one part of the town to another until their bodies fell to pieces.

Others entertained themselves by scourging naked women to death under the eyes of their husbands or brothers, who were first rendered impotent.

Still others derived devilish pleasure out of crushing the little children made orphans a few minutes previously with their enormous heavy boots (godasses).

Blood flowed on all sides. Frightful screams of women and children mingled with the diabolical concert of modern arms.

During whole days this went on.

Official report, Imperial Ethiopian Government:

Many of the murdered were men of distinction. Many were forced to dig their graves, then, covered with bernouse capes, were mown down with machine guns. More than a hundred corpses have been recovered from one well alone. In some cases the victims were taken outside the town in trucks and ordered to dig a well. Whilst still in the well they were shot or blasted by hand grenades.

The Archbishop of Canterbury:

No one can think of those days and nights at Addis Ababa without a sense of horror.

The Archbishop of York:

It seems as though the springs of humanity are being dried up by continual pressure of horror upon horror, and we are in danger of becoming case-hardened.

It is amazing that this thing which took place in Addis Ababa has gone by without a howl from the whole of the civilized world. There has been some protest, and I am grateful for the words spoken lately in Parliament by the Archbishop of Canterbury, but protests on such matters should not come alone from the leaders of the churches.

The dean of Winchester:

Thousands of Ethiopians, who were engaged in peaceful pursuits, or even sleeping in their beds, were massacred like sheep, for no other offense than that of being Ethiopian. There is no Englishman, I think, who does not blush with shame when he reflects on the events of that year.

PART III. SOMALIA

MEMORANDUM TO THE UNITED NATIONS FROM THE SOMALI DELEGATION ON THE FUTURE OF EX-ITALIAN SOMALILAND

We, the lawful and duly authorized representatives of the Somali Youth League, representing the overwhelming majority of the Somalis, most respectfully submit this memorandum, supplementing previously submitted documents, to the General Assembly of the United Nations and its appropriate subdivisions, setting forth our position on the future of Somaliland, formerly held as an Italian colony.

2. Under the peace treaty, Italy has renounced all rights and titles to her former African colonies of which our country, Somalia, is one.

3. The Council of Foreign Ministers, failing to reach agreement in regard to the final disposal of these territories, submitted the matter to the General Assembly of the United Nations. Thus the Assembly is confronted with the responsibility of designating the administrative authority and setting up the trusteeship system for Somalia.

4. It is not our intention at this time to make concrete suggestions regarding the application of the trusteeship system to these territories, but we are vitally concerned with respect to the designation of the administering authority. We reserve for the future the right to present concrete suggestions for incorporation into any trusteeship plan for administering these territories.

5. It is generally understood that some of the great powers intend to support the unjust imperialist claims of the present Italian Government to readminister our country in spite of the report of the Four Power Commission of Investigation which unequivocally states that in Somalia, apart from "an insignificant number," none has asked for the restoration of the Italian administration. It is thus quite clear that the Somalis do not wish to live again under Italian rule. Therefore, we must state with emphasis that the restoration of Italian administration under any form or guise, even as a trustee under the supervision of the

United Nations, is totally unacceptable to our people.

6. We summarize briefly the main reasons for our opposition to the return of Italian rule:

A. The Somalis, under Italian rule, were deprived of education and enlightenment; they were not entitled to any form of education during her 50-year regime;

B. The Somalis were kept out of the economic field because Italian nationalists monopolized all commerce and industry, leaving our people to become peons, gatekeepers, orderlies, interpreters, cooks, coolies, porters, boys, waiters, etc.;

C. The Somalis were not allowed to form any association or political body. There was no freedom of speech and no freedom of action;

D. The Somalis were treated like chattels in the social sphere;

E. Italy is poor and she cannot finance her own country soundly much less our country of Somalia; and

F. The Somalis earnestly desire the unification of their country with the other Somali-inhabited territories, and by allowing Italy to return, they can never hope to achieve this greatest aim.

The points A, B, C, and D, above-mentioned, have, during the past 50 years of Italian rule, left their odious mark upon us so that it is impossible for Somalis to believe that they can ever be treated in a better manner by the Italians.

7. In addition to this, the administration has deprived the Somalis of fertile land in favor of Italian farmers and imposed forced labor, making the Somalis work for the Italians. This forced-labor problem, better known in Somalia as "colonia," is horrible and beyond description. To give you a rough idea of the barbarous and inhuman methods employed by the administration, we quote hereafter extracts from an official British publication of 1944:

"This labor shortage, which at one time threatened to stop production altogether, was caused by the wholesale refusal of the Somalis to continue to work for the Italians. This was hardly surprising. For when the circumstances under which labor had been recruited were investigated, a situation was disclosed even less tolerable than the state of Mogadishu jail. Under the colonial system men, women, and children had been taken by force from remote places and condemned to an indefinite period of servitude on Italian farms. To quote from an official report: 'Rations were grossly inadequate both in quality and quantity, and pay varied from 1 to 3 lire a day. Bachelors were forced to marry women who had been born and bred on the estate. Punishment, inflicted by the resident on the ex parte representations of the employer, was brutal and excessive. For a first offense of disobedience or indiscipline 50 lashes with a hippopotamus-hide whip was a common award, and for a second offense the victim was strung up for several hours on a gallows, with his toes just clear of the ground, suspended by chains attached to wooden billets under his armpits, and with his hands handcuffed behind his back. It is not unnatural that the native laboring population regarded our coming as a deliverance from their Italian oppressors and that they resolutely and determinedly refused to return to work for them, in spite of our efforts to persuade them to do so.' They had had enough of slavery." (The First To Be Freed, p. 60.)

8. The Somalis suffered enough of slavery, suppression and oppression under the Italian administration during and long before the Fascist regime. They will never forget the tyranny practiced by the administration. To Somalis, Italy is Italy, and Italians are Italians whether Demo-Christian, Fascist, Communist, Nazi, Socialist, Republican, Liberal. To them there is no difference whatsoever between Mussolini and Signor De Gasperi; between Count Ciano and Count Sforza; and between Signor Terruzzi and Signor Brusasca.

9. Italy lays claim to a share in the administration of her former colonies on the basis of the securing of an overseas outlet for her surplus population. As everyone knows Italian emigrants are now scattered all over the world. Millions are in the United States alone. Millions more are in Argentina, Brazil and other South American countries. Other millions reside in Great Britain, France and elsewhere in Europe. They are also in Africa, Asia and other parts of the world. These Italian emigrants live peacefully with the peoples of these countries and have their ordinary jobs as workers, traders, etc. None of them has ever dreamed of ruling or demanding the right to administer these countries to which they have migrated.

10. There is no reason why Italian residents in Somalia cannot remain and live peacefully with the inhabitants without again aspiring to rulership over the territory. This can be achieved if, and only if, they renounce their unjust imperialist claims and cease seeking to restore the Italian administration since the Somalis can never forget the records of the past Italian regime.

11. Besides the Italians, there are also other foreign elements in Somalia, the most important being Indians (Hindustani and Pakistani) and Arabs. The latter is the largest foreign community in Somalia as they actually number some 20,000. These immigrants have their ordinary jobs and none of them lays claim to sovereignty over the country.

12. Among the nations supporting the unjust imperialist claims of Italy some are rich, both in wealth and land. If they really wish—with good and sincere intention—to solve the problem of the Italian surplus population, they would do far better to let down the bars and permit a sufficient number of Italian immigrants into these prosperous lands rather than awarding to bankrupt Italy the infertile and desert lands of East Africa, where, because of former Italian oppression, emigrants from that land would not be welcome.

13. In addition to the problem of the Italian surplus, the new Government of Italy has repeatedly sought opportunity to send back to Africa some thousands of refugees from the former Italian colonies. Concluding its mission, the Four Power Commission of Investigation visited Italy and interviewed representatives of these refugees. These were avowed Fascists who had poured into Africa during and immediately after the Fascist conquest of Abyssinia. They are aptly and accurately described in the following excerpt from the First To Be Freed:

"In Somalia, too, the conditions found were similar in the main, though different in detail. True, Mogadishu had never suffered from the elephantiasis that had overtaken Asmara. True, the Italian population of the colony was only one-tenth of that of Eritrea; but they were more violently Fascist, incorrigibly corrupt, and cordially hated by the Somali, who is difficult to deal with even at his friendliest" (p. 12).

14. May we call your attention to the fact that the United Nations Declaration, which embodies the principles of the Atlantic Charter, upholds the right of self-determination. In Article 76 of the Charter, setting forth the objectives of the trusteeship system, such phrases as "freely expressed wishes of the people concerned," appear.

15. If against our wishes the First Committee and the General Assembly should decide to return Somalia to Italy, are we to assume that the Italian officials who are so bitterly hated by our people there are to be returned with the benediction of the United Nations? In such case, how can you expect us to trust and have faith in the United Nations?

16. In concluding our memorandum, we humbly and respectfully beg the Assembly to study carefully the contents of all that we have submitted and what we are going to submit.

17. Once again we stress that the Somalis do not desire and will not accept the restoration, in their country, of Italian administration under any form or guise even as a trustee under supervision of the United Nations.

18. May we draw the attention of the honorable members of the august Assembly to the fact that today they are the supreme judges of the fate of our country and its people. We wish to see these honorable members give more consideration and weight to the desires and welfare of the inhabitants. Furthermore, we trust that this august Assembly will not judge this issue on the basis of self-interest whether for political, religious or other reasons and will act as a neutral and impartial judge.

19. We faithfully hope that the august Assembly will carefully consider our just and legitimate demands expressed in this and other memoranda submitted.

We beg to remain, sirs,

Yours respectfully,

THE SOMALI REPRESENTATIVES,
ALI NOOR.
ABDULLAHI ISSA.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. THOMPSON and Mr. FUGATE (at the request of Mr. BLAND), from April 13 to 27, 1949, inclusive, on account of official business.

To Mr. DEANE, for Thursday, April 14, 1949, on account of official business.

To Mr. HOEVEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for 3 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. BARING, for April 12, 13, 14, and 15, on account of official business.

To Mr. WICKERSHAM (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for 2 days, on account of official business.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 851. An act to promote the settlement and development of the Territory of Alaska by facilitating the construction of necessary housing therein, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mrs. NORTON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 220. An act to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to revise the Alaska game law," approved July 1, 1943, as amended (57 Stat. 301);

H. R. 555. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California, Northern Division, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of all persons for reimbursement for damages and losses sustained as a result of a flood which occurred in December 1937 in levee district numbered 10, Yuba County, Calif.;

H. R. 572. An act for the relief of Sylvia M. Misetich;

H. R. 576. An act for the relief of Arthur G. Robinson;

H. R. 581. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of

Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim, or claims, of Hilda Links and E. J. Ohman, partners, and Fred L. Kroesing, all of Anchorage, Alaska;

H. R. 591. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lucille Davidson;

H. R. 592. An act for the relief of James W. Keith;

H. R. 618. An act for the relief of Eugene J. Bearman;

H. R. 659. An act for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth B. Murphy;

H. R. 729. An act for the relief of John J. O'Neil;

H. R. 739. An act for the relief of Mary Jane Harris;

H. R. 745. An act for the relief of B. John Hanson;

H. R. 1036. An act for the relief of R. C. Owen, R. C. Owen, Jr., and Roy Owen;

H. R. 1043. An act for the relief of Mrs. Wesley Berk (formerly Mrs. Ruth Cameron);

H. R. 1061. An act for the relief of Bernice Green;

H. R. 1066. An act for the relief of James Leon Keaton;

H. R. 1094. An act for the relief of Nellie M. Clark;

H. R. 1113. An act for the relief of James A. Stapleton, Ruth Burk, and Mildred Ovren, copartners doing business under the name and style of Stapleton Lumber & Piling Co.;

H. R. 1164. An act for the relief of the estate of H. M. McCorvey;

H. R. 1176. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Leroy Hann;

H. R. 1280. An act for the relief of Mrs. Judge E. Estes;

H. R. 1286. An act for the relief of Elizabeth Rowland;

H. R. 1755. An act to authorize a $100 per capita payment to members of the Red Lake Band of Chippewa Indians from the proceeds of the sale of timber and lumber on the Red Lake Reservation;

H. R. 1959. An act for the relief of the county of Allegheny, Pa.;

H. R. 1998. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the conveyance to Pinellas County, State of Florida, of certain public lands herein described," approved June 17, 1948 (Public Law 666, Eightieth Congress), for the purpose of correcting a land description therein;

H. R. 2708. For the relief of the legal guardian of Joseph DeSouza, Jr.;

H. R. 3856. An act to provide for a Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion;

H. J. Res. 186. Joint resolution to extend the time for use of construction reserve funds established under section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended; and

H. J. Res. 212. Joint resolution authorizing appropriations to the Federal Security Administrator in addition to those authorized under title V, part 2, of the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide for meeting emergency needs of crippled children during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 14, 1949, 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:

523. A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting separate reports on contracts and cooperative agreements entered into during fiscal year 1948 under the Research and Marketing Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

524. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize relief of authorized certifying officers of terminated war agencies in liquidation by the Treasury Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

525. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a proposed draft of legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 327 of the Communications Act of 1934 so as to permit, subject to certain conditions, the use of Army, Navy, Air Force, and Coast Guard communications facilities for the reception and transmission of commercial messages"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

526. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide cumulative sick and emergency leave with pay for teachers and attendance officers in the employ of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

527. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to require settlers on public lands in Alaska to record notice of their settlement claims in the land office for the district in which the lands are situated, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Public Lands.

528. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Works Agency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Federal Works Agency for the Fiscal Year 1948; to the Committee on Public Works.

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. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2753. A bill to amend section 2 of the act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 527; 43 U. S. C., sec. 213), relating to additional homestead entries; without amendment (Rept. No. 434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PETERSON: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 3576. A bill to repeal certain obsolete laws and parts of laws relating to the sale of public lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 435). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARENDS: Committee on Armed Services. S. 796. An act to establish the grade of General of the Air Force, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 436). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GORSKI of Illinois: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1953. A bill to increase the fees of witnesses in the United States courts and before United States commissioners, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 437). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GARMATZ: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 438. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. McSWEENEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 185. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 2989; a bill to incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 439). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ENGLE of California: Committee on Public Lands. H. R. 2702. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey by quitclaim deed certain mineral rights in certain lands situated in the State of Oklahoma to Alfred A. Drummond and Addie G. Drummond; without amendment (Rept. No. 433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. R. 4225. A bill to provide for compulsory retirement from active service of judges and justices of the United States upon reaching the age of 70 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 4226. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4227. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FURCOLO (by request):

H. R. 4228. A bill to establish a Connecticut Valley Authority to provide for unified water control and resource development on the Connecticut River, its tributaries and watershed, to prevent floods, encourage agriculture, stimulate industrial expansion, develop low-cost hydroelectric power, promote navigation, increase recreational possibilities, protect wildlife, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 4229. A bill to amend section 17 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

H. R. 4230. A bill to authorize the appropriation of funds to assist parents of children in elementary and secondary schools to provide transportation, library facilities, textbooks, and other reading materials, visual aids, and other instructional materials, recreation facilities, and school health programs and facilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H. R. 4231. A bill to reserve certain land on the public domain in Utah for addition to the Goshute Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 4232. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of Congress approved June 28, 1906, relating to the Osage Indians of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. NORBLAD:

H. R. 4233. A bill to authorize the issuance of a stamp commemorative of the sixtieth anniversary of the American edition of Izaak Walton's Compleat Angler and subsequent establishment of the Izaak Walton League in America; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RANKIN (by request):

H. R. 4234. A bill to amend further the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of California:

H. R. 4235. A bill to name the Veterans' Administration hospital now under construction at Fresno, Calif., the Bertrand W. Gear-

hart Veterans' Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4236. A bill to promote the economic recovery of the Blackfeet Indians and better utilization of the resources of the Blackfeet Reservation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska:

H. R. 4237. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (by request):

H. R. 4238. A bill to provide that unclaimed animals in the pound of the District of Columbia be made available to licensed institutions for scientific purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. R. 4239. A bill to amend section 6 of the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 4240. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4241. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to make an allowance in lieu of headstones or markers for certain graves; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGLE of California:

H. R. 4242. A bill to give former owners of certain Government real property a right to purchase such property if and when it is offered for sale; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4243. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1944, so as to provide annuities for certain remarried widows; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DAVIES of New York:

H. R. 4244. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINEHAN:

H. R. 4245. A bill to provide for the general welfare by enabling the several States to make more adequate provision for the health of school children through the development of school health services for the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of physical and mental defects and conditions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WEICHEL:

H. R. 4246. A bill to raise the limit on individual postal savings accounts to $5,000; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER:

H. R. 4247. A bill to amend section 2136 of the Internal Revenue Code, relating to drawback on the exportation of tobacco, snuff, cigars, and cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4248. A bill to permit partially disabled World War II veterans to reenlist in the armed forces of the United States, including the Coast Guard, for limited duty; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COLMER:

H. R. 4249. A bill to transfer the trawlers *Alaska* and *Oregon* from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4250. A bill relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SADOWSKI:

H. R. 4251. A bill to amend section 4 (g) of the Communications Act of 1934 to permit the Federal Communications Commission to make expenditures for land for radio monitoring stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

H. R. 4252. A bill to transfer the trawlers *Alaska* and *Oregon* from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to the Fish and Wildlife Service; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Res. 186. Resolution providing for holding memorial services on Wednesday, May 25, 1949; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to minimum-wage legislation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take the initiative in requesting amendments to the United Nations Charter strengthening the United Nations into a limited world federal government capable of enacting, interpreting, and enforcing laws to prevent war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to strengthening the United Nations and limited world federal government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

H. R. 4253. A bill for the relief of John Irvin Clifford, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 4254. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Sidney Blackhair; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. KARST:

H. R. 4255. A bill for the relief of Gertrude Becherer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4256. A bill for the relief of James A. G. Martindale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 4257. A bill for the relief of Fred Ericson, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 4258. A bill for the relief of James Starozynski, Brucha Laja Starozynski, his wife, and their daughter, Reveca Starozynski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAURIELLO:

H. R. 4259. A bill for the relief of Louise Benedict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 4260. A bill to authorize the appointment of Col. Kenneth D. Nichols, O17498, professor of the United States Military Academy, in the permanent grade of colonel, Regular Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WHITTINGTON:

H. R. 4261. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to L. J. Hand a patent in fee to certain lands in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WIGGLESWORTH:

H. R. 4262. A bill for the relief of Kyra Kite Riddle; 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:

571. By Mr. HALLECK: Petition of citizens of Tippecanoe County, favoring repeal of the wartime tax on toiletries and cosmetics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

572. By Mr. HORAN: Petition of B. H. Jennings and 37 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging Congress to repeal the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

573. Also, petition of S. Mitchell and 42 other residents of Spokane, Wash., urging Congress to repeal the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

574. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of 38 residents of Bogota, N. J., urging the repeal of the 20-percent excise tax on toilet goods; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

575. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Wayne R. Lausterer, Omaha Pharmaceutical Association, Inc., Omaha, Nebr., affirming their unqualified opposition to S. 5 and H. R. 783 and any other form of national legislation that would permit further regimentation of any class of people or professions of the United States of America; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

576. Also, petition of Myrtle Ramos and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

577. Also, petition of Julian Acosta and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

578. Also, petition of Charles E. Bordeaux and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

579. Also, petition of I. C. Ellis and others, Orlando, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

580. Also, petition of S. R. Freeman and others, Clearwater, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

581. Also, petition of Mrs. E. E. O'Hara and others, Mount Dora, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 14, 1949

(Legislative day of Monday, April 11, 1949)

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

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

Eternal Father, in the holy pilgrimage of this sacred week we fain would join the devout multitudes under every sky