

passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

920. Also, petition of Mrs. Ronald Bevis and others, Homestead, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

921. Also, petition of Dover Townsend Club, No. 1, Dover, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

922. Also, petition of Paul Barber and others, St. Cloud, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

923. Also, petition of W. A. Bloom and others, Tampa, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2135 and 2136, known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1949

Rev. Frederick V. Poag, minister, Second Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Grant, we beseech Thee, Almighty God, to these servants who guide our Nation the honor of humility. Grant that they may know they not only pass judgment, but also that they are under the judgment of the Eternal.

Clarify their sense of right so that they may be able to establish the difference between constituent and conscience, between selfish determination and duty.

Grant that they may keep their faith in people. Remind them that a man can be not only shallow and despicable, but that a man is life's only expression of allegiance, love, and worship.

Restore to Thy servants the radiance of a high call so that duty will not become burdensome and monotonous routine will not supplant the ideal which holds them steadfast in their striving for Thy purpose.

These blessings we pray in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LUCAS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 20, 1949, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 21, 1949, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1185) to provide that all employees of the Veterans' Canteen Service shall be paid from funds of the Service, and for other purposes.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day,

1949, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace, and it was signed by the Vice President.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Humphrey	Mundt
Anderson	Hunt	Murray
Baldwin	Ives	Neely
Butler	Jenner	Pepper
Cain	Johnson, Tex	Reed
Capehart	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Chapman	Kem	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Donnell	Kilgore	Sparkman
Downey	Knowland	Stennis
Eastland	Langer	Taft
Ellender	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Ferguson	Long	Thomas, Utah
Flanders	Lucas	Thye
Frear	McCarren	Tydings
Gillette	McCarthy	Vandenberg
Graham	McClellan	Watkins
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McGrath	Wiley
Hendrickson	McKellar	Williams
Hill	Martin	Withers
Hoey	Millikin	Young
Holland	Morse	

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are detained on official business in meetings of committees of the Senate.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. MILLER], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] is absent due to a death in his immediate family.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

### REPORT OF PERSONNEL CEILINGS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Director of the

Bureau of the Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report of personnel ceilings for the quarter ended March 31, 1949, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

### WORLD FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—RESOLUTION OF NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of North Carolina, relating to a world federal government with limited powers adequate to assure peace.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### Resolution 37

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States concerning certain proposed constitutional amendments authorizing the United States to negotiate with other nations relating to a world federal government with limited powers adequate to assure peace

Whereas war is now a threat to the very existence of our civilization, because modern science has produced weapons of war which are overwhelmingly destructive and against which there is no sure defense; and

Whereas the effective maintenance of world peace is the proper concern and responsibility of every American citizen; and

Whereas the people of the State of North Carolina, while now enjoying domestic peace and security under the laws of their local State and Federal Government, deeply desire the guaranty of world peace; and

Whereas all history shows that peace is the product of law and order, and that law and order are the product of government; and

Whereas the United Nations as presently constituted, although accomplishing great good in many fields, lacks authority to enact, interpret, or enforce world law, and under its present charter is incapable of restraining any major nations which may foster or foment war; and

Whereas the Charter of the United Nations expressly provides, in articles 108 and 109, a procedure for reviewing and altering the charter; and

Whereas in 1941 North Carolina was the first of many States to memorialize Congress, through resolutions by their State legislature or in referenda by their voters, to initiate steps toward the creation of a world federal government; and

Whereas several nations have recently adopted constitutional provisions to facilitate their entry into a world federal government by authorizing a delegation to such a world federal government of a portion of their sovereignty sufficient to endow it with power adequate to prevent war: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):*

SECTION 1. That application is hereby made to the Congress of the United States, pursuant to article V of the Constitution of the United States, to call a convention for the sole purpose of proposing amendments to the Constitution which are appropriate to authorize the United States to negotiate with other nations, subject to later ratification, a constitution of a world federal government, open to all nations, with limited powers adequate to assure peace, or amendments to the constitution which are appropriate to ratify any world constitution which is presented to the United States by the United

Nations, by a world constitutional convention or otherwise; and be it further

*Resolved*—

SEC. 2. That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this application to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislatures in the several States, requesting their cooperation.

SEC. 3. That this resolution be in full force and effect from and after its ratification.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified this the 20th day of April 1949.

H. P. TAYLOR,  
President of the Senate.  
KERR CRAIG RAMSEY,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SEIZURE OF STATE LANDS BENEATH NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter I have received from Attorney General of the State of Maine, and a memorial adopted by the legislature of that State, relating to Federal seizure of State lands beneath navigable waters, and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF MAINE,  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,  
Augusta, May 18, 1949.  
Hon. MARGARET CHASE SMITH,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SMITH: On April 22 a joint resolution was passed by the ninety-fourth legislature, endorsing the legislation pending in Congress relating to the Federal Government's quietclaiming to the several coastal States' rights to the submerged lands within the 3-mile limit; and the Secretary of State informs me that he has sent you an authenticated copy with the great seal of the State thereon. I am wondering if you would be willing to have same placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. If you feel that you do not want to do this, would you suggest to Robert Hale, who is very much interested in the tidelands legislation, to do so?

Walter R. Johnson, who represents the National Association of Attorneys General in Washington, wrote to me as a member of the executive committee of that association, on May 2 that he had not seen a copy in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and suggests that I contact you, asking you to put it in.

There is more interest in this matter at the present time in Maine than there has been at any time since this controversial question has been pending before Congress and the United States Supreme Court. Richard Hallet, of the Gannett papers, was in my office this morning and spent considerable time going over this proposed legislation with me and over the background of the States' rights to the tidelands.

It is a fact that our coastal States now fear that the title to their own tidelands may be clouded by the fate of those of California. As you know, the Federal Government has been granted leave by the United States Supreme Court to file actions against the States of Texas and Louisiana similar to that brought against the State of California, which was decided in June 1947; and there is no telling when an action may be filed against the State of Maine, claiming title to all our resources in the sea within the 3-mile belt, which would include lobsters, clams, and other fisheries along our Maine coast. The

decree of the Supreme Court has encouraged opinions which may upset acquired titles and old procedures all along our coast.

As you know, Maine citizens and corporations have invested their capital and energy not in one but in scores of phases of our national economy, and the necessity for some action by the Congress was intimated by the court itself in its opinion in the California case, so that the adoption of the legislation now pending would not reflect in any way upon the prestige or authority of the Supreme Court of the United States, nor would it set up any new precedent.

I feel that Raymond Moley's article in Newsweek, May 2, entitled "Fair Deal Under the Sea," is a fair presentation of his opinion of the 200 Supreme Court decisions and the recognition by the United States of Texas as a Republic when it was admitted to the Union in 1845.

With best wishes and kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,

RALPH W. FARRIS,  
Attorney General.

Joint resolution relating to Federal seizure of State lands beneath navigable waters  
To the Members of the Maine Delegation in Congress:

Whereas the State of Maine owns and possesses more than 2,175 square miles of land beneath navigable waters within its boundaries, subject only to the Federal powers over navigation, commerce and national defense; and

Whereas State ownership of this property has been and will continue to be an important source of revenue for our State, the loss of which would be a great injury to the State and our people for whom it is held in trust; and

Whereas after over 100 years of recognized State ownership without interference with the delegated Federal powers, certain Federal officials are now suing other States for similar property and advocating Federal seizure of the lands: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of Maine (the senate concurring):*

That the State of Maine favors continued State ownership and control, subject only to the delegated Federal powers, of lands and resources within and beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the respective States, and requests Congress to pass suitable legislation to that end;

That the members of our delegation in Congress are hereby requested to give their active opposition to all pending and proposed measures which would create Federal ownership or control of lands, fish, or other resources beneath navigable waters within State boundaries;

That the members of our delegation in Congress are hereby requested to give their active support to legislation which would recognize and confirm State ownership of such property; and

That a copy of this resolution be mailed to each member of our delegation in Congress.

House of representatives, read and adopted, April 21, 1949; sent up for concurrence.

HARVEY R. PEASE,  
Clerk.

In senate chamber, April 22, 1949, read and adopted, in concurrence.

CHESTER T. WINSLOW,  
Secretary.

REDUCTION OF FEDERAL MILITARY EXPENDITURES—RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN TURNER DISTRICT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received this morning from Fred L. Bartels, secretary of the Wisconsin Turner

District, Madison, Wis., a copy of a resolution adopted by the eighty-fourth annual convention of the Turners held in Milwaukee on May 7 and 8. The resolution urges reduction of Federal expenditures for military purposes. Naturally, I too would like to see military expenses reduced to the greatest possible extent consistent with adequate preparedness. In other words, we want to squeeze out unnecessary funds being used for wasteful purposes such as have recently been exposed by the Hoover Commission.

At the same time, of course, we want to be sure that adequate provision is made for our country's defense.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Turners' resolution be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

WISCONSIN TURNER DISTRICT,  
Madison, Wis., May 19, 1949.  
Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We request you as our representative in the Congress of these United States to give earnest consideration to the following resolution passed by our eighty-fourth annual convention held in Milwaukee on last May 7 and 8:

"Whereas the United States Government has set up a budget for the next fiscal year in which over \$30,000,000,000 is allocated for the past and present military expense; and

"Whereas history abundantly illustrates that overgrown military and naval establishments are a menace to our own liberties and the peace of the world: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Wisconsin Turner District call upon the Congress to reduce the expenditures for military purposes to a more reasonable proportion of our national income."

Respectfully submitted.

WISCONSIN TURNER DISTRICT,  
FRED L. BARTELS, Secretary.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

H. R. 1053. A bill for the relief of Frank O. Ward; without amendment (Rept. No. 413);

H. R. 1058. A bill for the relief of Frederick W. Lass; without amendment (Rept. No. 414);

H. R. 1062. A bill for the relief of Lorrain E. Graus; without amendment (Rept. No. 415);

H. R. 1497. A bill for the relief of Ralph A. Wood; without amendment (Rept. No. 416); and

H. R. 2249. A bill for the relief of Al W. Hosinski; without amendment (Rept. No. 417).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring suspension of deportation of certain aliens and I submit a report (No. 418) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 42) was ordered to be placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

A-4331665, Albanese, Ruggiero.  
 A-4197547, Antepligil, Osman Hayrettin.  
 A-5724044, Antoniazzi, Matilde Fadelli.  
 A-6249459, Ayvalopoulos, Harclia (nee Charicilia K. Heizanoglou).  
 A-1323072, Balzan, Nicola.  
 A-5332860, Callahan, Catherine Mary, or Catherine Mary Dowd (maiden name).  
 A-6151538, Callaway, Nieves Buena.  
 A-4995570, Campagnoli, Romildo.  
 A-6642567, Canales-Hernandez, Armando, or Armando Hernandez-Canales.  
 A-6636580, Carriaga-Alvarez, Hilarion, or Hilarion Alvarez-Carriage or Hilarion Careaga.  
 A-6650117, Carrillo, Baldomero.  
 A-6650116, Carrillo, Jose.  
 A-1986991, Chaparro, Epifania.  
 A-1534268, Chatzikostantin, Costas, or Gust Stelles.  
 A-6709236, Clay, George Robert, or George Mozes.  
 A-6577754, Contreras-Vargas, Julio.  
 A-6865971, Correa, Junior, Alejandro Maximo.  
 A-6178549, Dahlseide, Shirley Delores.  
 A-6677647, D'Atri, Lise Claire.  
 A-6261871, De Anda, Cayetano Jimenez.  
 A-5594947, De Araujo, Jose.  
 A-5171994, De Arredondo, Rosaria Banda, or Rosaria Banda.  
 A-6834476, De Flores, Josefina Pena, or Josefina Pena Villegas (maiden name).  
 A-2691031, Del Vecchio, Michele (alias Michael Del Vecchio).  
 A-3046860, De Martinez, Fermina Espinose (nee Mejia) or Fermina Espinosa De Cruz (former marriage).  
 A-6683087, Dewdney, Juliette.  
 A-3343962, De Zuniga, Maria Garza, or Maria Garza-Flores.  
 A-2746308, Divitaroff, Hristo Pavloff, now known as Christ D. Paul.  
 A-4985191, Doerschler, Arthur Ferdinand.  
 A-3707306, Eberhardt, Felipa Maria Lopez de, or Felipa Eberhardt, or Phillipa Mary Eberhardt.  
 A-5418174, Edwards, Phyllis Vivian, or La Belle Bogart or Farmer or Phyllis V. Anderson or Phyllis V. La Belle.  
 A-6811190, Fago, Vincenzo Tommaso (alias Thomas Vincent Fago).  
 A-2778955, Fantini, Arturo, or Arthur Fantini.  
 A-5805711, Ferguson, William.  
 A-6367899, Fernandez, Enrique Romo, or Enrique Romo or Enrique Garraci Fernandez.  
 A-4862365, Figlioli, Mario.  
 A-4150490, Flores, Julia Delfina (nee Torres).  
 A-6238100, Flores, Jesus, or Jesus Flores Sanchez.  
 A-6238101, Flores, Pablo, or Pablo Flores Sanchez or Pablo Flores.  
 A-5535019, Flores-Soto, Alfredo, or Alfredo Flores or Alfredo Soto Flores.  
 A-6343689, Floru, Stergiani.  
 A-6350844, Frangopoulos, Chrisi or Frank (nee Fourkalidos (Fourlkidou)), or Chrisi Frank.  
 A-6400942, Futris, John George.  
 A-6246456, Gardikis, Ourania (nee Economou).  
 A-2484437, Giovara, Alfredo.  
 A-6288108, Goldstone, Anna (nee Leitner).  
 A-2826179, Goulin, Gaston Etienne Joseph.  
 A-6380537, Goyan, Eugenia Jean Jennie.  
 A-5401984, Grenzow, Richard Wilhelm (alias Richard Grenzow).

A-6405590, Hamilton, Edward Herbert (alias Archibald Edward Valentine).  
 A-6170336, Hamm, Remedios Tamayo.  
 A-4557126, Han, Maolin, or Mao Lin Han or Kiu Yueli Han.  
 A-1823731, Hansen, Victor Andrew.  
 A-2895893, Hanttu, Lydia.  
 A-4451747, Harris, Andre Thomas, or Andre Horace or Andre Toussaint Harris.  
 A-6212903, Heiden, Violet Delores.  
 A-6323057, Hernandez, Juan, or Juan Medina Hernandez.  
 A-1835499, Hidalgo, Hilario Marzann.  
 A-5696818, Hipp, Doris Amy Louise (nee Gilvear, formerly Faucett or Fawcett).  
 A-6322459, Hofman, Teunis Baan.  
 A-6816865, Hoy, Martha Smiley (alias Martha Hoy).  
 A-6311774, Issemann, Adriana.  
 A-6811623, Johnson, John Oran, or Andrew John Johnson.  
 A-6671906, Jung, Marlene, or Marlene Yung.  
 A-4796715, Kellegian, Dorothy Michelle, or Elisa Horaks Rodriguez or Elisa Morales.  
 A-6162954, Kernkraut, Charles (Chaim).  
 A-6045024, Keyes, John William.  
 A-1012102, Kowrkounakis, George Konstantinos.  
 A-6429788, Kuoppamaki, Liisa.  
 A-6281597, Lambouris, Constantina (nee Kostanios).  
 A-6715868, La Motte, Goetz Walter de.  
 A-4176832, Lee, Mew Tin, Mrs. (alias Yin Fung Leong alias Siu Bing Bing).  
 A-3310474, Leonard, Mary Frances (nee Industrious).  
 A-3875481, Liang, Mary (alias Liang Mah Lee).  
 A-6024662, Lilland, Torolf Johan.  
 A-6385160, Luana, Ignacio.  
 A-1252627, Lutkes, Mary or Lutkevicius (nee Venlik).  
 A-6509112, Madamba, Helen Marie.  
 A-3164260, Marette, Indu (nee Indu Hari Lewate or Indu Shankar Marathe).  
 A-6397726, Markogiannis, Georgia (nee Pappas).  
 A-9635770, Markogiannis, Michael George, or Mike Markogiannis.  
 A-6166166, Martinez, Mariana, or Alfonso Y Diaz.  
 A-8092340, Marulis, John Efstatios, or John E. Marulis or Ioannis Maroulis.  
 A-5470955, Matthias, Christophena (nee Sparks).  
 A-6551513, Melendrez-Colunga, Francisco.  
 A-6827607, Mertikas, Constantinos.  
 A-3152201, Mezzina, Giovanni.  
 A-5804110, Mika, Jessie Air (nee Jessie Wilkie Air).  
 A-6048520, Mococain, Juan Guillermo (Clark), or John William Mococain.  
 A-7593654, McCann, Doris.  
 A-6316401, McCarthy, Mary Ellen (nee Shallow).  
 A-5137396, McDade, Emma Theresa (nee McNamara).  
 A-5262105, McMurray, Lorenza Cecile.  
 A-6326677, Nolan, Ada Phyllis.  
 A-6827000, Noriega-Bonilla, Blas.  
 A-6050604, Pietralaj, Heronima.  
 A-3708197, Palatin, Julia (nee Julia Schauer or Julia Polatin alias Elizabeth Kocisz).  
 A-6491634, Paneth, Eidel (nee Eidel Moscovici).  
 A-6288475, Pantaleakis, Nicolas Panagiotis.  
 A-7707086, Patino, Jesus Maria Rodriguez y, or Jesus Rodriguez.  
 A-1573671, Patrik, Jan Mike, or John Petrik or Patrick.  
 A-5817429, Pelleck, Jennie (nee Jennie Piala).  
 A-6827105, Pena, Adam Flores.  
 A-5622568, Pesce, Attilio.  
 A-6143858, Pinto, David Edison Maddox.  
 A-6690315, Ramirez, Maria.

A-3886946, Rauch, Anita (nee Steil alias Starick and Antonina Rozalja Steil).  
 A-5190183, Regis, Adelina Ramirez Luna.

A-6437512, Robinson, Julianne Marie (nee Devinckie).

A-1450969, Ryan, Daniel James, or Daniel James O'Ryan.

A-6303971, Sanchez, Clara, or Sara Sanchez or Clara Sanchez de Mendoza.

A-3167966, Santoro, Salvatore, or Salvatore Aniello Santoro.

A-3726899, Schaumburg, June Hadfield (alias nee June Hobson).

A-4588739, Schooff, Wilhelm Emil, or Willie Schoof or Schoff.

A-6268892, Shunda, Olimpia Babu (nee Olimpia Babu).

A-6054882, Silva-Pena, Jose Diego Cecilio De Jesus, or Cecilio Silva-Pena.

A-6054860, Silva, Marciala Calderon Parra De.

A-2726809, Simon, Gladstone Emanuel.

A-5613177, Skytte, Jenny Margrethe (nee Jenny Margrethe Marcusen).

A-6837715, Smales, Thomai, or Thelma Thomas Smales or Thelma Thomai Papa Costa (maiden name).

A-6838267, Smith, Ronald George.

A-1233170, Swaleh, Abdu Ibn, or Edwin Gourick Bey.

A-1990120, Tomecek, Gabriel Vincent.

A-4540102, Vda, De Ruiz, Juana Cristan, or Juanita Tristan.

A-6263031, Villa, Maria Ester Medrano de.

A-6782677, Viner, Gladys (nee Robinson).

A-2749887, Wing, Chew, or Gueng Lai or Slu Hoo or Slu Hoo Wing or Jew Shee or Chew Gee.

A-6145607, Wise, Consuelo Emilia.

A-5468253, Wolfel, John, or Mike Deal or Joan or Johann Wolfel.

A-6610614, Wong, Lee Wai Lan (nee Wai Lan Lee or Wong Lee Shee).

A-5971920, Wong, Lok-Yee Lois (nee Wang or Lois Lok-Yee Wong Nee Wang).

A-6354313, Woods, Colette Levy (nee Collette Marthe Nelly Levy).

A-1689915, Woszcynski, Konstanty, or Konstant Woszcynski.

A-2400433, Tso, Chee Wah, or Gin Lung Tso.

A-2079296, Young, Hew Som.

A-2976738, Yuan, Hyian Yu.

A-1397613, Zajic, Louis, or Ladislaw Zajic.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 23, 1949, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) requesting the President to issue a proclamation designating Memorial Day 1949, as a day for a Nation-wide prayer for peace.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

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

#### By Mr. HOEY:

S. 1914. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the public school authorities of Person County, N. C., in the construction, extension, and improvement of public school facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MUNDT:  
S. 1915. A bill for the relief of Viktor A. Kravchenko; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUCAS:  
S. 1916. A bill for the relief of Edna A. Bauser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request):

S. 1917. A bill to authorize the conversion of the Panama Canal to a sea-level waterway; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

**INVESTIGATION OF NEEDS OF SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA, CALIFORNIA**

Mr. DOWNEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 119), which was referred to the Committee on Public Works:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Public Works, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the needs of the San Francisco Bay area, California, for additional transportation arteries, bridges, causeways, and other facilities designed to advance the commerce, navigation, national defense, land reclamation, and residential and industrial development of the area, including, but not limited to, (a) the extent to which such facilities may be utilized to expand, or be combined or coordinated with facilities for expansion of the fresh water supply of the area; (b) the extent to which such additional facilities will contribute to the national defense, navigation, flood control, irrigation of agricultural lands, the repulsion of salinity and other authorized Federal functions; (c) estimated costs of such works. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$10,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

**APPROPRIATIONS FOR EXECUTIVE AND SUNDRY INDEPENDENT OFFICES—AMENDMENT**

Mr. LUCAS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4177) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

**ESPIONAGE AND SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter which I have received from John Gilland Brunini, editor of *Spirit* magazine, and foreman of a recently convened special Federal grand jury of the southern district of New York.

The letter, which was accompanied by an enclosure, is self-explanatory. I ask that this letter and the enclosure transmitted with it may be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

This material should be of particular interest to Senators in view of the efforts

now being made to secure enactment of legislation to tighten up our laws against espionage and against subversive activities of all kinds.

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

SPIRIT,

*New York, N. Y., April 27, 1949.*

Hon. PAT McCARRAN,  
Chairman, Senate Judiciary Committee,  
Senate Office Building, Washington,  
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR McCARRAN: You may know that the special Federal grand jury of the southern district of New York, of which I am foreman, yesterday handed up a presentment which primarily recommended legislation to tighten espionage laws. The New York Times published the presentment in full this morning. The grand jury particularly wished you to be sent a copy.

This is because we are aware of your speech in the Senate of Monday in which you also spoke very effectively of the need for such legislation.

The grand jury voted on the points made by it a number of weeks ago, and it considers that the publication yesterday might be a valuable assist to you both before your committee and the Senate itself. It would be gratifying to the grand jury if this should prove the case and if you should see fit to insert the presentment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN GILLAND BRUNINI.

**PRESENTMENT**

*To the District Court of the United States  
for the Southern District of New York:*

Whereas the undersigned constitute all the members of the December 16, 1948, special Federal grand jury of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York impaneled to inquire into espionage and subversive activities; and

Whereas there has been presented for the past 4 months, and is being presented, before this special Federal grand jury a volume of testimony concerning activities of both foreigners and American citizens which are directed from within and without against the security of the Nation; and

Whereas this testimony and evidence have led this special Federal grand jury to certain conclusions it deems proper and imperative to be brought to the attention of the executive, legislative, and judicial departments of the United States Government for such action as may be necessary or appropriate, the undersigned members of this grand jury respectfully show and allege as follows:

1. The grand jury is of the unanimous opinion that the safety of this country and its institutions is being jeopardized because—

(a) increasing efforts, since the United States of America has been forced by events to take a dominant position in world leadership, have unlawfully been and are being made by those inimical to the Nation to obtain information relating to the national defense and security—information which could be used to the Nation's injury and to the advantage of foreign nations; and because;

(b) existing laws, applicable to activities aimed at unlawfully obtaining such information, are inadequate and unrealistic in view both of the Nation's position in world affairs and internal menaces from those zealously activating a philosophy hostile to our constitutional form of government.

2. This conviction was arrived at by the grand jury after hearing, over a period of 4 months, the testimony of a large number of witnesses who, irrespective of their widely differing relations to the problems under consideration, have been able to aid its investi-

gations. Many of these witnesses have been summoned by the Department of Justice and some by the grand jury itself acting independently under its own authority as the anciently established representative of the people. They have been examined in that secrecy which is designed not only to determine those who may have violated Federal laws but to protect the rights and the reputations of the innocent.

Among these witnesses have been men charged with ferreting out violations of Federal laws and others who should be classed as Government witnesses.

Others, men and women whose integrity and innocence have not been questioned but who have had valuable information to give, have proven entirely cooperative in the grand-jury inquiries.

Still others—and the number has proven surprisingly large—theirself believed to be guiltless of direct violation of the law as it now exists, have invoked their constitutional rights to refuse to give information they indubitably possess concerning knowledge of violations by others. It has been a matter of grave concern to the grand jury that there are in this category of witnesses certain lawyers who, despite the fact that they are by virtue of their profession officers of the court, have refused to answer questions put to them by the Federal attorneys and the grand jurors on the grounds that the answers will tend to degrade or incriminate themselves. This such witnesses have unquestionably done because they have been alerted through the publicity given by other investigating bodies to the circumstances which the grand jury must examine in secrecy.

Lastly, there have been a certain number of witnesses who the grand jury is convinced, either by their own confessions or by the incontrovertible evidence of others, have violated Federal laws, but who are protected by the operation of the statute of limitations. The grand jury is powerless to indict such an individual so that he can be given a fair trial before a judge and jury with all the safeguards of such legal procedures.

3. The grand jury has been provided with many object lessons of the looseness with which laws governing espionage, the practical application of which it must determine, are at present drawn. In the light of the situations it has had to face, it believes that the safety and welfare of this country require either the enactment of new legislation or the amendment of existing legislation.

4. The grand jury, without making detailed recommendations, is nevertheless convinced that the espionage statutes themselves should be amended and tightened without meanwhile infringing on those civil rights constitutionally guaranteed our citizens. It recommends, therefore, that laws defining espionage be designed to cover all unauthorized transmission of information relating to the national defense which could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation. It further recommends provision be made that those engaged in such transmission can be prosecuted if they know the information may be used for such purposes.

The grand jury holds the crime of acting against one's own country is of such gravity and of such abhorrence to the American people that those so guilty should not be protected in any manner not provided by their constitutional rights. Accordingly it strongly recommends that provision be made to indict at any time any individual guilty of transgressing espionage statutes, now existing or to be enacted, without regard to any statute of limitation as in the case of treason.

Convinced that, despite the vigilance and the efficiency of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, increasing efforts will be made to acquire and transmit information injurious to the Nation, the grand jury holds that

persons trained in espionage or sabotage by any foreign country should be required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act; and that failure to register under the act shall be considered a continuing offense for which the statute of limitations will not be operative. It recommends legislation to this end.

The grand jury is aware of the legislation on these and related subjects which has been proposed on the recommendations of Attorney General Clark. These recommendations were prepared in close consultation with the Interdepartmental Intelligence Committee, composed of representatives of the intelligence divisions of the Army, Navy, and Air Departments and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. It urges the careful study of this proposed legislation by our legislative authorities with the view that laws be passed to achieve these objectives in the proper constitutional framework.

Having seen at first hand the difficulties in arriving at the truth concerning espionage violations when witnesses have been alerted by publicized charges and counter charges, the grand jury recommends that all investigating bodies conduct their inquiries into espionage in secret.

The grand jury further recommends that an investigation be made by the proper authorities, by bar associations and other similar bodies, to determine those measures that may be taken to disbar from practice in the courts any lawyer who, appearing before any grand jury, refuses to answer questions on the grounds of self-incrimination. It is obvious that if such grounds exist the lawyer is not of that integrity which the American people should demand of all officers of the court.

Now, therefore, the grand jury respectfully petitions the court to accept this presentation and order it filed, authorizing the foreman and the secretary of this grand jury to send copies of it to the Members of Congress and to the proper officers of the executive department of the Government, and to permit such other use as may properly be made of this document.

New York, N. Y., April 26, 1949.

John Gilland Brunini, Foreman; John G. Kilbreth, Deputy Foreman; Hugh V. Doran, Secretary; Robert L. Barrows; Joseph P. Christianson; Evelyn Zorn Dingwall; James Sumner Draper; Raymond G. Fowler; Robert Frese; G. Leonard Gold; Henry E. Grant; Harold C. Hahn; Richard Brown Jones; Murray Kanner; Francis Keally; Samuel B. Leight; Sidney Lashen; Herman E. Nathan; Bernhard K. Schaefer; Harry Scherman; John Schreiber; Siegfried Stern; Wheeler Williams.

#### APPRECIATION OF GI BILL OF RIGHTS— LETTER BY WILLIAM M. RAINES

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a young man who is graduating this year from the Nebraska College of Engineering, in which he expressed his eternally grateful appreciation of what his Government had done to assist him in getting a college education. While addressed to three members of the Nebraska congressional delegation, it is equally appropriate to all Members, for the GI bill of rights was sponsored by many of us and supported by practically all Members. The letter comes from Mr. William M. Raines, living in Huskerville, a portion of Lincoln made available to former servicemen and their families while attending school.

The letter is very short, and with the permission of the Senate I should like to read it into the RECORD. It is dated

May 19, 1949, from apartment 307-C, Huskerville, Lincoln, Nebr. The letter is addressed to Senator HUGH BUTLER, Senator K. S. WHERRY, and Representative C. T. CURTIS, Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C., and is as follows:

DEAR SIR: I do not know how to express my appreciation to all the Members of Congress for the GI bill of rights, nor do I remember which Congress it was which, while I was overseas, passed this bill. I do want to express my gratitude to my own Congressmen at this time in the hopes that they will express these sentiments to the other Congressmen responsible.

On June 6 this year I will be graduated from the University of Nebraska College of Engineering. Without the benefits which the GI bill provided I would have been unable to finish my college work, since I had been married during my military service.

This letter is merely a testimonial to the effect that I am eternally grateful to my Uncle Sam.

Yours very truly,

WILLIAM M. RAINES.

#### GOVERNMENT SPENDING—ADDRESS BY FORMER SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER

[Mr. REED asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on Government spending delivered by former Senator Arthur Capper from Topeka, Kans., on May 15, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE BOOGS OF DELAWARE BEFORE THE ASSOCIA- TION OF NEW YORK STATE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUBS

[Mr. WILLIAMS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Representative J. CALEB BOOGS before the seventeenth annual convention of the Association of New York State Young Republican Clubs on May 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN WAR DEAD— SERMON BY MSGR. MAURICE J. SHEEHY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a sermon and tribute to American War Dead delivered by Msgr. Maurice J. Sheehy at the eleventh annual military memorial field mass, Arlington National Cemetery, May 22, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE RECORD DEBT REDUCTION OF 1945-49—ARTICLE BY EDWARD H. COLLINS

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Record Debt Reduction of 1945-49," written by Edward H. Collins, and published in the New York Times of May 16, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### POISON OF PRESIDENTIAL POLITICS KILLS UNEMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1946— ARTICLE BY J. A. LIVINGSTON

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Poison of Presidential Politics Kills Unemployment Act of 1946," written by J. A. Livingston and published in the Washington Post of May 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WHAT'S WRONG WITH MR. BRANNAN'S IDEA?—EDITORIAL FROM THE FARM JOURNAL

[Mr. BUTLER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "What's Wrong With Mr. Brannan's Idea?" published in the June 1949 issue of the Farm Journal, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NO JAIL FOR DEBT IN VERMONT—EDI- TORIAL FROM THE BRATTLEBORO (VT.) REFORMER

[Mr. AIKEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Jail for Debt in Vermont," published in the Brattleboro (Vt.) Reformer of May 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### AWARDS TO COMMUNISTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE HARRISBURG (PA.) EVENING NEWS

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Awards to Communists," published in the Harrisburg (Pa.) Evening News of May 16, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### BUDGET SLASH NEEDED TO HALT FED- ERAL PAY ROLL RISE—EDITORIAL FROM PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Budget Slash Needed to Halt Federal Pay Roll Rise," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of May 20, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### IT CAN HAPPEN HERE—EDITORIAL FROM THE OIL CITY (PA.) DERRICK

[Mr. MARTIN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "It Can Happen Here," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick, of May 17, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### MEMORANDUM TO MEMBERS OF THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS BY AL AN- DERSON AND FRANK LILLY

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD memorandum to Members of the Eighty-first Congress, prepared by Al Anderson, executive secretary, Alaska Miners' Association, Seattle, Wash., and Frank Lilly, executive secretary, Prospectors' and Mine Owners' Association, Spokane, Wash., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### WILL SOUTH ASIA GO RED?—ARTICLE BY HAROLD ISAACS

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Will South Asia Go Red?" written by Harold Isaacs and published in Newsweek for May 9, 1949, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY asked and obtained consent for a subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to meet this afternoon.

#### TRIBUTE TO THE LATE FORMER SECRE- TARY OF DEFENSE, JAMES V. FORRES- TAL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the whole Nation has suffered a great degree of shock in learning of the untimely death of James Forrestal, recently our first Secretary of Defense. Mr. Forrestal came to Washington, I believe, just prior to our entry into World War II, as Under Secretary of the Navy, when the Honorable Frank Knox occupied the position of Secretary of the Navy. From the very beginning he devoted himself with intelligence, comprehension, tenacity, and patriotism to the duties that are inherent in our national defense.

With the passing of Secretary Knox he became the Secretary of the Navy, and both as the Under Secretary and as the Secretary he visited many of the

theaters of actual fighting during the course and conduct of the war, and by his contact with the men in these areas and by the knowledge he gained there, rendered unusual and outstanding service in the direction of the Naval Establishment toward the great successes which crowned its efforts in bringing our enemies to defeat.

When it became advisable, after the war was over, to take new stock of our defense set-up, and when in pursuit of that objective the Unification Act was passed by the Congress, the President sought far and wide for a man who could discharge the extraordinarily difficult duties of this new approach to our national defense. Finally Mr. Forrestal, because of his record, because of his knowledge, and because of his particular talents, was designated to be the first Secretary of Defense and to preside over the initial undertakings of the unification of the armed services.

There was more title than there was power in the original Unification Act. The people assumed all that was needed to achieve unification had been incorporated in that law. This was an erroneous assumption. Naturally the services themselves wanted to be cautious in embracing a new procedure for the defense of our country. So the original Unification Act was largely a matter of give-and-take and compromise. The new Secretary of Defense did not have the authority which the public assumed he had to take many of the necessary steps. But even under those handicaps James Forrestal performed a magnificent service in gradually bringing about much of the unification we have come to know, in the temperate, judicial, and yet hard-hitting manner which was characteristic of all his activities.

This morning I talked with his successor, Mr. Louis Johnson. He indirectly paid Mr. Forrestal a great compliment. He said that since he had been Secretary of Defense, succeeding Mr. Forrestal, he had become aware of many acts which Mr. Forrestal had performed, and many policies he had promulgated, which had never been given publicity, but which in their nature were of great benefit in the unification of the armed services, in the gradual increase of efficiency therein, and in the ability of the armed services to work together in the common defense of the country. He said that Mr. Forrestal kept those things to himself; that while he performed many fine acts, many of them were never made known to the public. I think that is a great tribute to the modesty of a man who occupied one of the highest positions in our Government, who performed outstanding service, and who nevertheless was content to let the service speak for the work he had done, rather than to proclaim that work by his own lips.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee during all the time he served as Under Secretary of the Navy, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Defense, I had many opportunities to work with and observe Mr. Forrestal. He was kindly and patient, never bitter, determined only when determination was essential to the accomplishment of a

worthy purpose. He had a sensitivity that few ever gave him credit for. He was part poet and part warrior. From many angles he was one of the most misunderstood men I have ever seen in public life. He was supposed to have had a rather hard-boiled nature, when in truth he was extremely sensitive. He was always considerate of others, and had a degree of kindness for friend and foe alike that I do not believe I have encountered in any other public servant in my lifetime.

His monument, of course, will be the foundation stone which he himself laid, upon which will be erected, I hope, in this session and in other sessions, a more secure America, which will protect all our people and shed its benign influence over the oppressed, wherever they may be all over the world, giving them hope that, however dark the days they are passing through, whatever burdens they may be carrying, the great, strong, vital United States of America, largely brought to that state by the untiring and patient efforts of James Forrestal, offers promise of a new day and a new concept of the dignity of the ordinary man all over the globe.

Mr. President, I cannot begin to express, I know, what is in the heart of every Member of Congress who had the happy privilege of knowing Mr. Forrestal; the depth of our sorrow, our sense of immeasurable personal loss, and the sympathy which goes out to his wife and son in their great bereavement. But I do feel that with the passing of time, in spite of the "slings and arrows of outrageous fortune" which bedeviled him, particularly in his later years, in the form of unwarranted carping and quite often uninformed criticism, through the mist of prejudice, and perhaps jealousy, the shining example of a man fighting modestly with courage and patriotism to serve his country will emerge in its true proportions, and that more than ever in the passing days we shall come to look upon James Forrestal as not only a great American, but one who contributed in the fullest measure all that he had of talent, heart, and experience to the greatness of the country he loved so much.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I deeply mourn the death of James Forrestal. Although I had known him before the war, I came to have a particularly deep appreciation of his public service when I was sponsoring legislation in 1947 to establish a commission on the organization of the executive branch. At that time I was struck, perhaps more than I have been before or since, by one man's knowledge of government, and was greatly aided by Mr. Forrestal's help to me on that measure. In fact, the testimony which was presented at that time showing the extreme difficulty of controlling expenditure in the individual departments of Government was entirely the result of his analysis and help.

There is tragic irony in the fact that the new provisions for budgetary control which are in the pending bill relating to the armed services, and of which we rightly expect so much in the way of economy, are in a very real sense the product of Mr. Forrestal's thinking.

His work in the Navy Department was in every way superior. As Secretary of Defense he accomplished many fine things, many difficult, challenging things, and laid the groundwork for other fine things to come. In fact, even a bare enumeration of just a few of his achievements as Secretary of Defense is impressive.

He was a man of great intelligence, of extraordinary powers of analysis and penetration. He had courage and vision, rare warmth, unselfishness, and sweetness of nature. By every human standard he was a great success.

My sympathy goes out to his family. The country has lost a brilliant and useful public servant, and I have lost a valued friend.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, it is with the greatest difficulty that I speak of my dear personal friend who has so tragically crossed the Great Divide.

His was a precious soul, which loved the finest things of spiritual culture, and which reveled in the idealism which are our priceless inheritance. His was a brave and humble soul, courageous always in facing the difficult duties he so ably administered—humble always in his mild and gentle relationships with his fellow men. He was a great and reliable public servant, who literally lived his patriotic creed of faithful citizenship, and who literally died for his country.

With eternal affection and respect, and with gratitude for the privilege of his intimate friendship, I bid him hail and farewell. His eternal monument is in our hearts, and in the destiny of his country.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I should like to add a very brief word of tribute to the memory of James Forrestal.

I first became acquainted with him when I was in the War Production Board in 1942. I met him at weekly conferences. I saw him vigorously supporting the views of the Navy Department—but not vigorously in the sense of being narrow-minded. Not only in connection with the problem of the armed services, but in connection with the general problem of supply which developed, I saw him become preeminently the man in those conferences who took the point of view of the whole problem with which we were faced.

I met him later in certain special assignments with which he honored me in connection with the work of the Navy Department. The relationship continued since I have come to Washington. The acquaintanceship was close. I feel it not too much to say that from my standpoint, at least, and I believe from his, it ripened into friendship.

I wish to add to what has been said here my testimony to the fact that this man, who appeared to be a scrappy little fighter—which he was—was also a man of very great sensitiveness. It can be no surprise to anyone who knew him to learn that his last act before death was to copy a passage from one of the tragedies of Sophocles. That was in the nature of the man.

I, too, believe, and wish to put on record my firm conviction, my firm knowledge, that this man gave every-

thing he had to his country, and drained himself dry in the process. More than that, no man can do.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Washington does not consider himself to have been an intimate or family friend of the late James Forrestal; but we were good friends, and I am deeply distressed by his untimely passing. I shall always consider him to have been a noted American who was endowed with a singular and full measure of character, capacity, and courage. My brief time in the Nation's Capital has been made more worth while, enlightened and possessed of purpose because I was so fortunate as to have been reasonably close to Mr. Forrestal.

In this magnetic and magnificent city of Washington, D. C., which is in fact the Capital of our world and in which is blended a mixture of integrity and insincerity, courage and cowardice, character and shallowness, honest words and muck raking, faith and godlessness, purpose and futility, purity and venom, Jimmy Forrestal stood forth in the rigid strength of his character as a giant among pygmies. His patriotism and his devotion to the needs of his country were as unsoiled and without blemish as similar virtues possessed by any American who has ever lived.

Our future is the more promising and secure because of the unselfish contributions which Jimmy Forrestal offered so fully and freely to his Government, which is but a reflection of us all. Jimmy Forrestal was a leader who produced and inspired leadership from others. He was a total man in every conceivable way.

Mr. Roscoe Drummond, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Christian Science Monitor, recently wrote about the case of James Forrestal. This article is warm and sympathetic, but disinterested and objective in treatment. It seems to me that as we think about the future without James Forrestal, we should reflect on the past in which he played a role which was positive and clear. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Drummond's reflections, which may provide a slight degree of satisfaction to a grieving family, be included in my remarks at this point.

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

THE CASE OF JAMES FORRESTAL

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—It is gratifying to be able to report that James Forrestal is making substantial progress toward recovering from the job fatigue which he experienced following his resignation as Secretary of Defense.

The case of Mr. Forrestal may well help all Americans to a better understanding—in-deed, to a somewhat fuller gratitude—for public officials who make great sacrifices to serve the Government and are rewarded in large part by an inverse ratio of abuse and criticism.

It is the most commonplace remark today to say that the American Government is the unquestioned leader of the free world, that its position is one of eminence; that its responsibilities were never so many and so vast.

But what is less appreciated is that it takes leaders to produce leadership; that it takes able, talented administrators to enable the Government to do its job well in justice

to itself and in justice to the world. Eminence cannot be maintained in a vacuum.

James Forrestal was one of those administrators who helped the Nation win the war and who helped to give the Government the talent and the intelligence and the drive to enable it to meet the test of postwar leadership which was thrust upon it.

Along with other Washington correspondents, I have watched Mr. Forrestal at pretty close range from the day he became Secretary of the Navy when the Allied war effort was hardly under way in 1942 until he left the President's Cabinet a month ago to take a well-earned vacation and return to private business. During this period I know of no high official who devoted himself to serving the Government more competently, more tirelessly, more selflessly than Mr. Forrestal. He worked too hard, he worked too long; and when he came to retire, he didn't know how to let up.

Mr. Forrestal would be the last to consider himself a martyr. He enjoyed his job and he found the rewards of accomplishment thoroughly compensating. But through it all Mr. Forrestal was the target of a great deal of purposeful criticism, unsupported, as too many of our public officials are, by any genuine, public appreciation of what it means to serve the Government.

And then, after suffering an acute break-down following his resignation, one broadcaster, whose voice is heard by millions, crassly circulated the rumor that Mr. Forrestal was insane during the latter weeks of his service and that the safety of the Government requires that his decisions be promptly investigated.

Readers of State of the Nation know that I have had my disagreements with the Secretary of Defense and that, therefore, I am not interested in defending any particular actions which Mr. Forrestal may have taken.

What I want to report is that, after the most thorough first-hand investigation, I find no basis whatsoever for the accusation and rumor that Mr. Forrestal's subsequent break-down was reflected at any point to any degree in any of the decisions, actions, or policies which he authorized during the strenuous several months before he felt it necessary to step down.

During these months he worked in close and almost continuous relationship—and harmony—with his successor, Louis Johnson. During this period there is no doubt that Mr. Forrestal grievously overworked himself, remaining at his office from early morning until after midnight day after day in his earnest desire to leave matters as well advanced as possible upon his retirement.

Mr. Forrestal did sacrifice himself—but he did not disserve his Government. Today some underlings in the armed services, responding to the rumor circulated in the broadcast, are insinuating that Mr. Forrestal's latter decisions, which they happened not to like, should be reviewed—in the hope that they can get them reversed to suit their purposes. Such tactics will get nowhere with Secretary Johnson, who is quick to sense what is behind them and who, furthermore, was intimately aware of every action that was being taken in the Department for many weeks before he took over.

Now, Mr. Forrestal will survive his critics and their criticism. What makes his case important is that there is every reason to consider it in degree a symptom of one of the real problems in Government today. The pressure, the strain, the tension are tremendous and, as Mr. Churchill remarked in his *MIT* address, the nerves of our leaders must remain calm and strong if we are to win the battle of the peace.

Spiritual-minded people are aware that our public officials need and deserve our support in the faithful discharge of their office. This is not a partisan duty; it is a human and humane duty. This is the duty which the founder of this newspaper, Mary Baker Eddy,

counseled should be discharged when she urged all to pray that the divine presence should "guide and bless our Chief Magistrate, those associated with his executive trust, and our national judiciary; give to our Congress wisdom, and uphold our Nation with the right arm of His righteousness." (Christian Science versus Pantheism 14:14.)

The need for such support is great today.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, a feeling of tranquillity, contentment, and peace has come at long last to Jimmy Forrestal; and I, in company with his many many admiring and devoted friends, am glad. The poisoned pens and unclean suspicions of those who were mean and little, uninformed and jealous, unpatriotic and destructive, will be heard no more. Those who live like vultures on the red blood of men who are true patriots must look elsewhere now for a new victim. Jimmy Forrestal has left for them, and for our Nation and our world, his legacy of a public record of achievement and good which is wholly unassailable. Jimmy Forrestal has left behind him his friends whose privilege it will be to keep the record straight and untarnished for all time. Jimmy Forrestal has gone to a paradise which no man is better qualified to enter, or more deserving of membership. Those who bid him welcome will find him to be a companion worth having, and better yet, worth knowing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, while driving home yesterday afternoon from a visit to a friend in Maryland, I noticed that the flag at the United States Naval Hospital at Bethesda was flying at half mast. I was shocked when I learned that it had been lowered as a tribute to the memory of a great American, former Secretary of Defense Forrestal.

Shortly after James Forrestal came to Washington and assumed his duties as Under Secretary of the Navy, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] gave a breakfast, one Sunday morning, to which he was good enough to invite me. There, for the first time, I met Jim Forrestal. I was attracted to him. My next contact with him was when he appeared before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in behalf of the Renegotiation Act. I heard all the witnesses who appeared in behalf of the first Renegotiation Act before those of us who were members of that committee; and realizing from my previous study of taxes how difficult and technical it was, I was deeply impressed with the grasp of the subject exhibited by Under Secretary of the Navy Forrestal.

Throughout the period of the war I had more contacts, both officially and socially, with James Forrestal, of the Navy, and John McCloy, of the Army, than with any other two men connected with the war effort. It will be recalled that Assistant Secretary of the Army McCloy was in charge of the training program for the Army. He directed the training of what is now conceded to have been the greatest Army that any nation in all history put on the field of battle. By the same token, Mr. President, James Forrestal, first as Under Secretary of the Navy and then as Secretary of the Navy, helped to develop for us the greatest Navy the world has ever known. Those

two branches of our military force, supplemented, of course, by the Air Force, which was not then an independent unit, fighting against what at times seemed to be insuperable handicaps, won for us the greatest war in which we have ever been involved.

For me the raising of the flag on Iwo Jima symbolizes the type of courage and skill which our Navy and our Marine Corps manifested, as well as the great hardships they endured, during the campaigns of the Pacific. I have seen that battle-scarred flag. I have met two of the Marine sergeants who helped to raise that flag on Iwo Jima. I keep a reproduction of it on the mantlepiece in my office so that I may never forget, so long as I serve in the Congress of the United States, that our freedom was purchased at a price. I shall never forget the Sunday morning when, without knowing what the program was going to be, I tuned in my radio and heard James Forrestal speaking from Guam after we had raised our flag on Iwo Jima. I was thrilled, that Sunday morning, immediately after the successful landing, to hear what he had to say. It showed the spirit of the man, Mr. President—a man who had become a leader in the financial world and independently wealthy before he was 40 years old, a man who had come to Washington to devote his splendid talents, without thought of what it might do to him physically, to the winning of a great war, and to a program to make peace a reality, after the fight for peace that had been waged on the battlefield.

As an evidence of the spirit of the man, of his willingness to give to others credit for an achievement which his leadership had made possible and of the fact that his ambition was merely to excel in service to his day and generation, I ask unanimous consent that James Forrestal's address over the radio that morning, February 25, 1945, from Guam, may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

Up the precipitous side of a 600-foot extinct volcano, so precipitous that it seemed almost vertical, went a platoon of American marines. Even through a glass they seemed tiny figures scrambling skyward against a background of blue. And then a few minutes later, from the thousands of throats, upon ships, on land and on the sea came the sudden cry, "There goes the flag."

That was how the Stars and Stripes went up in the first island of Japan's outer rim of island defenses. It was at 11, Friday, February 23, 9, Thursday night, New York. We saw that flag going up halfway on the journey to shore with Lt. Gen. Holland Smith, of the United States Marines. It was the high point in a week of hard fighting, fighting which continues and will continue for some days to come. The Japs don't want to lose Iwo Jima. It's the first step in a sequence of doom for their homeland. They have put into it every kind of defense and they have had years to plan that defense.

As you know by now, Iwo Jima is a tiny island 5 miles by 2½, coming to a tapering point at its southern end. Its terrain, unlike that of some other atolls we have taken, rises some distance from the sea, Mount Suribachi, where our flag went up on Thursday, being its highest point. Its beaches are soft volcanic ash, so loose and crumbling that one

marine said it was like trying to dig a fox hole in a bag of wheat.

The Japs took full and skillful advantage of that terrain and of the fact that there could be no technical surprise as to where an enemy would land. We had to land on the beaches and it had to be a frontal assault. They had planted mortars, rocket-gun emplacements, and artillery all over that grim and barren island, so that there were streams of converging fire at the beachhead on which the marines had to come scrambling in from the sea.

Iwo Jima had had a powerful working over even before the 800 ships of Vice Admiral Turner's expeditionary force launched their attack 1 week ago today. It had been hit by the bombers of the Army Air Force for 70 days in succession. Three days before D-day our battleships, our cruisers, and our destroyers pounded the island with naval gun fire. Each day since then they have poured thousands of tons of 16-, 14-, 8-, 6-, and 5-inch shells into its defenses. Even the 40-millimeter antiaircraft guns have been employed against that shore line. The escort carriers put on air strikes with torpedo planes, dive bombers, and rockets, sometimes as many as 20 missions a day. And just to help out in between their missions of bombing Japan the planes of the fast carriers of Admiral Spruance's Fifth Fleet, as well as some of the battleships of that same aggregation of power, joined up after their first raid on Japan to contribute to the pounding. All of this tremendous weight of metal thrown at Iwo Jima did not extinguish its defenses.

The Japs, as they had done at Tarawa and at Kwajalein and at Saipan and Guam, had deep burrows under the shelving ridges of Mount Suribachi and caves along the rising shore line to the north. Some of these caves had connecting galleries and they will be taking dead Japs, and some live Japs even, out of them probably for many weeks to come.

But in spite of all the skill of the Japanese defenses, the marines went ashore and they have exacted since a 4-to-1 toll in death from our enemies.

Let me interject here that the tremendous stream of metal thrown on Iwo Jima sharpens again the necessity for the continued output of munitions in our plants at home. Only because of that rain of metal could the island be reduced at all. Because of it our ratio of losses is far less than it otherwise would have been.

As Fleet Admiral Nimitz has said, it was our policy in the past to have an unstoppable margin of power in these attacks—a steam roller, as he puts it. That steam roller saves us many lives. It will take the output, however, of many factories and hard work by all hands in those factories for months to come if we are to keep that edge of power.

I came from Iwo Jima by destroyer to this island of Guam—now, you might say, the Times Square of the Pacific. In the 7 months since we landed Guam has been transformed. The Seabees have built 150 miles of roads. They put in airfields; they built hospitals, and are now building a naval drydock. The Navy has restored the native villages and 20,000 of these amiable people have tramped back from the hills to take up life again in villages that have been made available to them by the Americans. And churches have been reestablished; 6,000 of their children are attending schools with native teachers. They are violently pro-American.

America is on the march in the Pacific—a march back to civilization, order, and decency. You can see it in islands like Guam and Saipan; you can see it in the glad and serene faces of the natives who again are clean and well fed.

The way back is being cleared by fighting men from every State in our Union—blue-jackets, marines, soldiers, and airmen. You can be confident of them (of naval airmen who have done a tremendous job in this Iwo

Jima operation, of the Marines, of the Army forces. And you can be confident of their leaders—of men like Fleet Admiral Nimitz, Vice Admiral Turner, Lieutenant General Harmon, Lt. Gen. Holland Smith, Major General LeMay, of the Twenty-first Bomber Command; and finally of that glorious aggregation of fighting men, the Fifth Amphibious Corps of the Marines, which, under Lt. Gen. Harry Schmidt's direction, is leading the fighting at Iwo Jima.

It's a great team, and Americans can be proud of it and of the country that produced them.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I share the sorrow, Mr. President, of all who knew Jim Forrestal. We do not have enough men like him. His memory always will be green and fresh in my heart. I mourn his untimely passing. Yes; it was a great team, and he was its captain.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, it is very difficult to add to what has already been so well and ably said by my colleagues about James Forrestal. But as one who knew of him through mutual friends long before I had the honor of meeting him, I admired the manner in which he educated himself through his own hard work and intellectual capacity, the manner in which he built himself up to a position of responsibility in the business world, and finally, the manner in which he performed his great work as a public servant in one of the most difficult times in the history of our country.

I first met James Forrestal when he came into the office of the Governor of Massachusetts in Boston on business connected with the Navy, the work of Navy procurement. One thing that has not been mentioned that can be added to his record is the initiation by him and Judge Patterson of the so-called Army and Navy E award in the field of procurement, a simple award which in itself cost the Government nothing but which gave so much honor and prestige to the workers and management of factories, and which added much impetus to the procurement of war material when it was most needed.

After coming to Washington I came to know James Forrestal as a friend and to him I went many times for advice and for his confidential judgment. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services I noticed, with admiration, how unobtrusively but effectively he performed the highly important public duties entrusted to him. I noted his fine judgment and his power of decision.

Mr. President, in the death of James Forrestal not only have we, as Members of the Senate, lost a man whom we respected and admired but one whom we had come to know as a personal friend.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I had never known Mr. Forrestal until he came to Washington, which I think was about 1940. I believe I have never met a finer man. From the very beginning of our friendship, which existed down to the time of his untimely death, he was courteous always, kindly always, helpful always, thinking only of his country, thinking only of doing good to his country and to his fellow men.

As it always seemed to me, the two outstanding characteristics of James Forrestal were, first, perhaps, his courage, and, second, his perfect gentlemanliness. He was a gentleman without fear

and without reproach, if there ever was one. I am proud that I knew him in this life. He was a great statesman, he was a great Secretary of Defense. He was a remarkable man. I take the greatest pleasure in saying I feel that I have lost a great friend, a man whom I admired greatly, a man who was an American all the way through. I am deeply sorry at the loss of such a man.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should feel remiss if I did not avail myself of this opportunity to make public profession of my own tribute to the memory of Jim Forrestal. As the President has so fittingly suggested, another gallant soldier has fallen with his face to the foe, in the service of his country.

I am proud that I could call him friend. If it be not an abuse of confidence, Mr. President, I might say that I am especially proud that not so very long before he left his high office as Secretary of Defense he honored me with the request that I incorporate in the RECORD a refutation of some of the unjust charges which had been made against his integrity and his public service. I was honored to tell him that I would gladly do so, for no man with justice could impugn the integrity, the fidelity, or the patriotism of Jim Forrestal.

Mr. President, it is the happy consolation of our faith that now, on the other side of the River, under the shade of the trees, Jim Forrestal has the tender care of a loving Father, the joyful company of spirits kindred to his sensitive soul, and, finally, peace from his torment which he so eagerly sought.

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, America has lost its foremost guardian of our national defense. It has lost the man who forced the welding of foreign policy and military preparedness. It has lost the man who has done the most to thwart the march of men who dreamed of world conquest. It has lost a man who has done the most to remove the threat of war and make possible the groundwork for realistic peace based upon mutual respect, rather than surrender by appeasement. It has lost James V. Forrestal, preeminent patriot.

An editorial in the March 30, 1949, issue of the Portland (Maine) Evening Express admirably summarizes the great record of James V. Forrestal as the first Secretary of Defense. I ask unanimous consent that it be included with my remarks in the RECORD.

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

#### FORRESTAL'S GREAT RECORD

The ground has been well prepared for America's new Secretary of Defense, Louis A. Johnson, by the able, hard-worked and hard-working man who has just relinquished that post—James V. Forrestal.

Mr. Forrestal, in his 18 months as Defense Secretary, did his job well despite the needlings of petty critics whose sum total of calumnies added up to one of the most virulent smear campaigns directed against any man in public life in recent years.

The yammer boys worked themselves into terrible fits of spite against Forrestal, smearing him as a "Wall Streeter," as an "international banker," as an opponent of many phases of the New Deal—not that there is anything necessarily evil about being any of those things; yet the fact that Forrestal

had indeed done some international banking, that he had undeniably been a "Wall Streeter" and that not all phases of New Dealism filled him with joy and gladness made him a convenient whipping-boy for the more blatantly Russophobe of his commentator-columnist critics.

But what were the solid achievements of this much-smeared "Wall Streeter" during his 18 months as Secretary of Defense? The record shows the following outstanding accomplishments:

1. The working out of a unified procedure for handling defense legislative matters, giving control to the Office of Defense.

2. The issuance of orders abolishing the separate public-relations branches of Army, Navy, and Air Force, and the substitution, for them, of a single office under the Defense Secretary.

3. The ground work laid for a single budget and spending-control system for all branches of the armed forces.

4. The merging of all armed forces' air transport. (The consolidation of sea transport is being effected and similar plans for land transport are making progress.)

5. Good progress has been made toward joint procurement of supplies for all branches of the service.

6. A modern code of military justice for all of the services has been prepared and is currently before Congress.

7. A comprehensive civil defense system has been worked out.

8. A new pay system for the armed forces, basing compensation on responsibility rather than on length of service, has been drafted.

9. A top-level board, under the Defense Secretary, has been set up for the independent evaluation of new weapons and weapon systems sponsored by any one service.

10. There have been the Key West and Newport conferences, to assign roles to the armed forces—as that of responsibility for strategic bombing, to the Air Force, and for antisubmarine warfare to the Navy.

11. A start has been made in the direction of a realistic integrated Reserve program for the armed forces.

12. Army, Navy, and Air Force have been rebuilt from the weakened condition into which they had been permitted to lapse following demobilization. And there has been a healthy soft-pedaling of the West Point-Annapolis old-school-tie rivalry and an emphasis upon replacing that attitude with a broader and deeper loyalty to the armed forces of the United States.

13. Finally, there have been the recommendations for strengthening the Unification Act, and the recalling of General Eisenhower to serve as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Forrestal, while the hate-mongers and two-bit critics were busily trying to smear him, was, for his part, doing a great job for our country. The above record speaks for itself. It provides a solid foundation upon which his successor may build.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to add just a word with regard to the late Secretary of Defense, inasmuch as I served with him in the President's Cabinet for 3 years. It happened that during two of those years I sat side by side with him at Cabinet meetings. I met him on many other occasions, because we had the habit of meeting at the White House for luncheon on Mondays and meeting in a small group again on Thursdays. I can testify that he was not only a brilliant man, but he was a kindly man and a gentleman. I remember many occasions when we were on the river together, and other occasions when we were meeting in conference. I like to remember the pleasant side of him, because if anything hap-

pened in a meeting which had even the slightest possibility of developing a smile, I can remember his turning to me and exhibiting a side of him which reflected the brilliance of his mind and the readiness of his wit.

Mr. President, it is too bad that a man like that should have been subjected to some of the things to which he was subjected.

It happened that on the other side of me sat the former Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schwellenbach. I think I can say to the Senate that I saw Lou Schwellenbach die, not suddenly, as did the Secretary of Defense, but slowly, day by day, as he worked at his task. He died of a broken heart, watching the Department of Labor, which he loved, dismembered and scattered around the Washington landscape.

The passing of Mr. Forrestal was quite different. I think, when full evaluation can be made of the manner in which he approached his duties, the belief he had that people would be brought together in unity when they realized the importance of their combined tasks, that in the judgment of history he will be given the great place in the record of these years of war and peace which I am sure he deserves.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I can hardly add anything to what has already been said in tribute and respect to our departed friend and a great American statesman. I became acquainted with Mr. Forrestal after I came to the Senate, and at a time when I was serving as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. Mr. Forrestal was then Secretary of the Navy. I quickly formed a very high opinion of his qualities and character. This opinion soon grew into a strong personal admiration which has continued to this time. After he became Secretary of Defense, and after the act was passed, creating the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, it was my pleasure to serve with him on that Commission, which has recently concluded its work. In those positions, in which I had opportunity to observe and work with him, I was able to recognize his extraordinary qualities, his great depth of capacity, and his comprehensive knowledge of affairs of state. I know of no one in the executive branch of the Government, occupying a similar position, who, I feel, has made a greater contribution to our Government during the period in which he served it.

I simply add this for the RECORD, because I have said it on a number of occasions to friends, and I have said it in public addresses, that I regarded James Forrestal as one of the most able men in the executive branch of our Government, and one who was wholly devoted and consecrated to his duties and responsibilities as an able and faithful public servant.

I shall miss him. I regret deeply and sorrowfully that he will no longer be with us. But, Mr. President, the work he has done will live on. James Forrestal was a great patriot, a sterling American, and, truly, Mr. President, as was expressed by the President of the

United States, he gave his life in the service of his country.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues, especially those who were the personal friends of James Forrestal, in the tributes which have been paid to him this morning. I also wish to extend to his family my deepest sympathy.

I should like to add just a few words. It seems to me that when the future history books of America shall be written, the life of James Forrestal will occupy a place of glory. He was not only a great statesman and a great public servant, but a great American. Many fine things have been said about his work as an official and his qualities of statesmanship.

I should like to say a few words regarding James Forrestal as a man. After all, it is in our everyday living that we come close to each other, and, therefore, from that aspect I wish to pay tribute to him.

I knew James Forrestal before I came to the Senate. I knew him as one who was in the Government's procurement service. I think scarcely a week went by that the chairman of the Small Business Committee and the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation did not contact his office with reference to some small-business man, in trying to help him to keep his business alive during the period of the war. On all those occasions I was treated with great courtesy by James Forrestal. He never was irritated. He was most cooperative. He gave us great consideration even though the heavy duties which were confronting him required all his time. I considered him then and have since considered him a man of the highest integrity, who was loyal to his convictions. He had deep convictions, which he applied in his daily life. More than that, Mr. President, he was absolutely honest. When James Forrestal gave his word, it was as good as his bond.

Remembering the very fine thoughts expressed by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], let me say today that all is well with James Forrestal. He is in that land of the Great Beyond, and his capacity to enjoy the things of Heaven has been increased because of the personal service he has rendered not only to the administration of the Government of the United States, but the entire American people, in the life and service he has given. He gave his all.

Mr. President, that is my tribute to James Forrestal, and, as I said in the beginning, I should like to be associated with those who extend to his family our deepest sympathy. Our country has lost a faithful, able, courageous leader, but his spirit continues as a beacon to others.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have been inexpressibly shocked and grieved at the passing of our distinguished friend, James Forrestal. It was my good fortune to know him rather intimately. I had a great admiration for his ability and for his administrative capacity in the various high stations which he occupied.

James Forrestal possessed many personal qualities which endeared him to those with whom he was intimately associated. He was a great Cabinet member. He was not a publicity seeker. He gave unstinting devotion to the duties which came to him, and he discharged them admirably and with great ability.

He was a man who made his own way in the world regardless of the criticisms which were directed at him from some quarters. He came from the great middle class, and before he became an officer of the Government he had attained distinction and great prominence in his chosen field.

I wish to pay my tribute to the memory of James Forrestal. I express my deep and abiding sympathy for his family, and I say these few words in tribute to a great man, a splendid citizen, a loyal and devoted friend, one whose memory will be cherished by millions of people in the United States and beyond its borders.

Mr. President, I lay a wreath on the tomb of James Forrestal.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I cannot add to the beauty of the tributes which have already been paid to James Forrestal, but I did not feel that I could let this occasion pass without saying that I, too, had occasion to work with him during his public career, and that I never came in contact with a more intelligent, a more hard-working, a more honest man in public life.

The record of James Forrestal will speak for itself. My great regret at this time is that the beautiful tributes which have been paid him today were not made at a time when he could have known about them, and known what the people and the Congress of the United States really thought about him and about his work.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, in times of great crisis, our country has been fortunate enough to produce great servants of the people—men and women who have given their hearts and their energies to keep the United States of America in the forefront of mankind. Our way of life is strong and secure, because of the service and the sacrifice of those who have carried the terrible burdens of responsibility.

One of the finest of these great servants of our country was James Forrestal, whose life of toil and achievement came to a tragic conclusion early yesterday. He gave everything he had, every ounce of his energy and every thought that came from his brilliant mind, to keep America safe and protected in a chaotic world.

Mr. President, I am moved by a personal grief, because it was my privilege to know Mr. Forrestal during his years of service here in Washington. I first met James Forrestal at the home of William Donovan, who then resided in Georgetown. It came about when the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed the late Frank Knox to be Secretary of the Navy. I was called into conference by Mr. Donovan and Mr. Knox, to decide upon the plan of strategy for Knox's confirmation in the United States Senate. It was at that meeting

that the late Secretary Knox called for the counsel and advice of James Forrestal. I shall never forget that day. I shall never forget the wisdom of some of the decisions Mr. Forrestal made as we discussed the confirmation of Frank Knox. From that day until the day of his death James Forrestal was my intimate and close friend.

Mr. President, James Forrestal was a man who won the affection and admiration of every one in the Government who knew how much devotion and determination he brought to his tasks. He was a man who set the highest standards for his personal and public life, and he lived by those standards.

In September of 1947, James Forrestal took the oath of office as the first Secretary of Defense in the history of the United States. Because of his high ability and his magnificent record, he was selected by President Truman to carry out the immense tasks of unifying the armed forces.

He wrestled with problems no other American had ever faced. He had to decide the ways in which the Navy, the Army, and the Air Force could be pulled together into a single team. He had to have the broad vision and the deep understanding necessary to comprehend the vital importance of each branch and the mission to be fulfilled by each.

James Forrestal was compelled to make heart-breaking decisions. He was under fearful responsibilities affecting the safety and security of the country he loved. Because of that, he exhausted himself in his efforts to be absolutely comprehensive, absolutely thorough, absolutely informed of all the ramifications and repercussions involved in the problems he handled. All these grave decisions were made in the interest of universal peace for all mankind.

No man could have done more than James Forrestal did. No man could have weighed the issues more carefully. No man could have listened more patiently to the views of his advisers and consultants. No man could have shown more bravery as he remained completely silent in taking the criticism heaped upon him.

As Members of the Senate, we know what complex and difficult problems we have before us. We know the agony of heart and soul inflicted upon those who serve the people, and strive to make wise decisions which will bring satisfaction to our fellow Americans.

We know the enormous dangers which surround us on every side. We know that the power of science is changing our world almost beyond recognition. We know that there are unknown forces and unknown weapons which make our age the most dangerous era of mankind.

Mr. President, James Forrestal was shaken and injured by the storms which sweep our world. He fought on, to the last limit of his strength, thinking of the millions of Americans who depended upon him, thinking of his duty to the President and the Congress. He came to the end of his strength, and he could not go on any longer.

Mr. President, the tragic termination of the life of this great man adds an-

other casualty to the long honor roll of those numerous Americans who gave their all in defense of the country they loved. Every heroic soul will mourn his untimely death, because in James Forrestal they found a copatriot and a friend.

To his bereaved widow and other members of his grieving family, I extend my sincere and deep sympathy.

**PROPOSED PURCHASE OF LAND ADJOINING LEAVENWORTH PENITENTIARY**

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not know that I am in order, but I wish to say that from the Committee on the Judiciary there was ordered reported this morning Senate bill 1730, and that I shall ask for unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill. The situation dealt with by the bill is as follows: An option has been taken by the Department of Justice on 600 acres of land adjoining a Federal penitentiary. The appropriation will expire the last day of June. There will probably not be another call of the calendar between now and then. The amount of the option is \$50 per acre for 600 acres of land adjoining the present prison farm. The authorities of the prison claim, and the Department of Justice says, that the land in question is essential for the welfare of the institution, to be used for farm purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1730, which I am reporting from the Committee on the Judiciary, may be laid before the Senate for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1730) to authorize the purchase of additional farming land for Leavenworth Penitentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to ask what is the necessity of placing this bill ahead of the call of the calendar.

Mr. McCARRAN. Inasmuch as there are many Senators on the floor at this time, I thought it would be well to make the request for consideration of the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, still reserving the right to object, it was not my intention when the Senate adjourned on Friday last to permit the call of the calendar from the beginning. Had I known it was the intention of the majority leader to have the calendar called from the beginning, I would have asked him if he would not reconsider, and begin the call of the calendar at the point where the Senate left off on the last call of the calendar. I understand it is the purpose of the majority leader that the call of the calendar today be from the beginning.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. I will say to the able minority leader that that is the intention of the majority leader. However, I should like to state that I hope we can consider only those bills which are unobjectionable, because if a Senator desires to

move to take up a bill which is controversial, he can occupy the time remaining in the 2 hours. I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider only bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. WHERRY. I am quite satisfied that there will be objection to most of the bills on the calendar previous to the point where the last call was completed. I shall not object to giving Senators the opportunity to go back to the beginning of the calendar; but if that is to be done, I feel that there should be a quorum call, because Senators might not know that we are going back to the beginning of the calendar, and would not be here to object. They should be given an opportunity to be present.

If a quorum call is had, I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that his unanimous-consent request should be renewed after the quorum call. At that time I shall not object to consideration of the bill in which he is interested.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Nebraska. Let me say to the Senate that we shall start from the beginning of the calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator from Nevada withdrawn his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARRAN. I withdraw it at this time, but I hope to renew it after the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is concluded.

The next order of business is the call of the calendar under rule VIII.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Hunt	Mundt
Anderson	Ives	Neely
Baldwin	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Pepper
Bricker	Johnson, Tex.	Reed
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Byrd	Kem	Russell
Capehart	Kilgore	Saltonstall
Chapman	Langer	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Lodge	Stennis
Donnell	Long	Taft
Ecton	Lucas	Taylor
Ferguson	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Flanders	McCarthy	Thye
Frear	McClellan	Vandenberg
Gillette	McFarland	Wherry
Graham	McKellar	Wiley
Green	Malone	Williams
Hendrickson	Martin	Young
Hoey	Millikin	
Holland	Morse	

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

Does the Senator from Nevada desire to renew his unanimous-consent request to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1730?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; at this time I renew my unanimous-consent request to have the Senate consider Senate bill 1730. I wish to explain it again.

Mr. WILEY. Will the Senator please state the number on the calendar?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill has no calendar number, because it was voted on in the Judiciary Committee only this morning, and was ordered reported by

the committee to the Senate only this morning.

The bill provides for the acquisition by the Federal Government, through the Department of Justice, of 600 acres of land adjoining a Federal penitentiary, for the purpose of augmenting the land used for penitentiary purposes for farming, so that the inmates of the penitentiary may farm, and thus help to sustain the institution.

I am informed by the Department of Justice that there is an option which expires on May 30—or rather, June 30. It is feared that if the option expires, the price of the land will be increased, and thereby a loss will be sustained by the Government.

For that reason I am requesting unanimous consent that the bill be considered at this time, out of order; and if that is done, I shall hope that the bill will be passed at once so that the Department of Justice may exercise the option.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether I correctly understood him to say that the option expires May 30.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is June 30. If I stated May 30, I was in error.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I notice that in the letter from the Attorney General, which accompanies the report, November 1 is given as the date of expiration of the option. Will the Senator from Nevada check, to ascertain which date is the correct one?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not so understand it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The report says:

The United States presently has an option which expires November 1, 1949.

Therefore, I do not see the need for hurry in this instance.

Mr. McCARRAN. If that be true, I would not insist upon my unanimous-consent request; but I have been informed by word which has come to me from the Department of Justice, by telephone, that the option expires June 30, I shall withdraw the report and check that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I withdraw the request.

**THE CALENDAR**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to call the calendar, under rule VIII.

**BILLS PASSED OVER**

The bill (S. 130) to provide for the demonstration of public library service in areas without such service or with inadequate library facilities was announced as first in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 206) relating to the immigration status of the lawful wives and children of Chinese-treaty merchants was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 88) to amend section 60 of an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 196) for the relief of James G. Smyth was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I object, by request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

**COMPENSATION TO THE SWISS GOVERNMENT FOR WAR DAMAGE**

The bill (S. 612) to provide for the payment of a sum not to exceed \$10,607,000 to the Swiss Government as partial compensation for damage inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is on the calendar a companion bill, House bill 4392, Calendar 354.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senate bill should be substituted for the House bill, and the House bill should be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts move that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill?

Mr. LODGE. No; I wish to strike out the House bill and substitute the language of the Senate bill for the language of the House bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First of all, is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 612), which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments, on page 1, in line 7, before the word "compensation," to strike out "partial"; and on page 2, in line 2, after the word "neutral", to strike out "rights." And insert "rights (which have thus far been adjudicated) in principal amounts as follows:

"(a) Crash-landing claims, arising out of 46 incidents as listed in the report of the Army Claims Mission dated April 26, 1946, Swiss francs 1,107,017;

"(b) Bombing claims, arising out of 28 incidents as listed in exhibit 3 of the report of the Theater Chief of Claims, dated February 12, 1947, Swiss francs 34,868,468.48;

"(c) Bombing claims arising out of seven incidents as listed in the report of the Theater Chief of Claims, dated August 4, 1947, Swiss francs 107,249.25;

"(d) Bombing claims arising out of three incidents as listed in the report of

the Theater Chief of Claims, dated October 22, 1947, Swiss francs 9,277,963.98;

"In all, Swiss francs, 45,360,698.71"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of State is authorized to pay to the Government of Switzerland the sum of \$10,607,000 which the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Army and/or the Secretary of the Navy, has determined to be due to the Government of Switzerland as compensation for losses and damages inflicted on persons and property in Switzerland during World War II by units of the United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights (which have thus far been adjudicated) in principal amounts as follows:

(a) Crash-landing claims, arising out of 46 incidents as listed in the report of the Army Claims Mission dated April 26, 1946, Swiss francs 1,107,017;

(b) Bombing claims, arising out of 28 incidents as listed in exhibit 3 of the report of the Theater Chief of Claims, dated February 12, 1947, Swiss francs 34,868,468.48;

(c) Bombing claims arising out of seven incidents as listed in the report of the Theater Chief of Claims, dated August 4, 1947, Swiss francs 107,249.25;

(d) Bombing claims arising out of three incidents as listed in the report of the Theater Chief of Claims, dated October 22, 1947, Swiss francs 9,277,963.98;

In all, Swiss francs, 45,360,698.71.

Sec. 2. Appropriations are hereby authorized to carry out the purpose of this act.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, this is a bill to provide payment to the Swiss Government as compensation for damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by the United States armed forces.

Mr. TAFT. What is the number of the bill we are considering?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Senate bill is S. 612, Calendar 64; and the companion House bill is H. R. 4392, Calendar 354.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I may say to the Senate that the facts of this claim are not disputed by anyone, I believe. The proposed legislation has been reported unanimously from the appropriate committee of each House. The difference between the House bill and the Senate bill is as follows: The Senate bill provides for the payment of approximately \$10,000,000, and the House bill provides for the payment of approximately \$16,000,000. The Senate bill gives a detailed itemization of the various claims.

I think the facts are definitely established, and there is an unquestioned obligation on the part of the United States Government.

So I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. What bill is before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senate bill 612, Calendar No. 64.

Mr. LODGE. That bill should be passed, and the House bill should not be.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to inquire about the procedure. The usual way to proceed in such cases, it seems to me, is to have the Senate proceed to consider the House bill, and thereafter strike out

all the language of the House bill following the enacting clause, and substitute therefor the language of the Senate bill, and send to conference the House bill as thus amended.

On the other hand, if we pass the Senate bill, each House will have passed a separate bill, and it may not get anywhere.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, that is a matter of procedure.

Mr. TAFT. Yes; that is what I meant.

Mr. LODGE. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the Senate bill be reconsidered, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 4392, Calendar No. 354.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 4392) to provide for the payment of compensation to the Swiss Government for losses and damages inflicted on Swiss territory during World War II by United States armed forces in violation of neutral rights, and authorizing appropriations therefor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I now move that all after the enacting clause of the House bill be stricken out, and that the language of Senate bill 612, as proposed to be amended by the committee, be substituted therefor.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now that the House bill has been amended by inserting the language of the Senate bill as proposed to be amended by the committee, if there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 612 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Nevada has requested that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar of bills to which there is no objection. Does the Senator mean the bills on the calendar in order; or just what else does he propose to do?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood that the request was that the Senate proceed to the call of the calendar, to take up the bills on the calendar in order; and if objection is

made to a bill it will be passed over, and the Senate will proceed to the next measure on the calendar.

Mr. MORSE. I thought that was the business with which we were engaged.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next measure on the calendar.

The bill (S. 45) for the relief of the owners and operators of certain gold mines which were closed or the operations of which were curtailed by War Production Board Limitation Order L-208 was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 11) to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from Missouri present. Although this is my bill, and I should like to see it passed, I know he wants to object.

Mr. DONNELL. I very much appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon. I was momentarily at the desk. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

#### TRANSFER OF LAND IN ROBINSON REMOUNT STATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 314) authorizing the transfer of a certain tract of land in the Robinson remount station to the city of Crawford, Nebr., and for other purposes.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, this is a bill which was introduced by myself and my colleague the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY]. It has been objected to in the past by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] because it did not include the phrase that has been included at his suggestion in a number of similar bills heretofore. I therefore propose an amendment to the bill, to conform with the suggestion of the junior Senator from Oregon, on page 2, line 8, at the end of section 1, to strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "Provided, That the city of Crawford shall pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property as determined by the United States Department of Agriculture."

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to transfer by quitclaim deed to the city of Crawford, Nebr., the following-described tract of land lying within the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr.: Beginning at the northwest corner of the tract of land conveyed to the city of Crawford for public-park purposes by the act of Congress approved June 25, 1906 (34 Stat. 461); thence west along the north line of the said station a distance of one thousand one hundred and seventy-five feet; thence south three hundred and six feet; thence south twenty-seven degrees fifty-two minutes east to the westerly boundary line of the present park, the point of intersection being approximately two thousand six hundred and fifteen feet south of the starting point; thence north two thousand six hundred and fifteen feet to point of beginning, containing an area of approximately forty-three and fifty-seven one-hundredths acres: *Provided*, That the city of Crawford shall pay fifty percent of the appraised fair market value of the property as determined by the United States Department of Agriculture.

Sec. 2. Said Secretary is hereby authorized to grant to the city of Crawford, Nebr., a permanent easement across the lands of the United States comprising the Robinson Remount Station, Fort Robinson, Dawes County, Nebr., for a pipe line to carry water from the White River to the filters and purification plants of the city, which easement shall include all rights and privileges now enjoyed by the city under a revocable license to maintain such pipe line across such lands of the United States.

Sec. 3. The tract of land authorized to be transferred by the first section of this act shall be used by the grantee for purposes of a public park and recreational site or golf course or for similar and related purposes. If the grantee shall fail or cease to use such tract for such purposes, or shall alienate or attempt to alienate such lands, title thereto shall revert to the United States.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 249) to diminish the causes of labor disputes burdening or obstructing interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2663) to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency, established pursuant to section 102, National Security Act of 1947, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 498) to increase rates of compensation of the heads and assistant heads of executive departments and independent agencies was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### PROCEDURE ON JOINT RESOLUTIONS PROPOSING CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 25) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, again I call the attention of the Senate as I did on former calls of the calendar, to the joint resolution proposing constitutional amendments. It is not at all fair that a Senator should be required to rise and object to these resolutions when they come up on call of the calendar. They are of vital importance. They require a two-thirds vote of both Houses, and they must be submitted to the States for approval. It seems to me there should be a rule or an understanding that when a resolution is on the calendar calling for a constitutional amendment it should automatically go over, to be taken up on some special occasion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the joint resolution will be passed over.

#### BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1124) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel to impoverished defendants in criminal cases in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 734) to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished dependents in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts, was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2660) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1878) for the relief of Ben Luke Pond, Shao Hung Pond, and David Yet Wei Pond, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. On behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 528) to amend the Contract Settlement Act of 1944 so as to authorize the payment of fair compensation to persons contracting to deliver certain strategic or critical minerals or metals in cases of failure to recover reasonable costs, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LANGER. I make the same objection, in behalf of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On objection, the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 988) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware will indulge me for a moment, I should like to state that the bill will entail very little if any cost. It relates to the annuities of persons under the age of 60. It is applicable to persons who lost their positions not by reason of any misconduct but because of lack of employment opportunity. I hope the Senator will not object to the bill, for there is very little if any cost entailed in it. It is designed to help persons who have been thrown out of employment by the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill (S. 1359) to repeal the provisions of the Alaskan Railroad Retirement Act of June 29, 1936, as amended, and sections 91 to 107 of the Canal Zone Code and to extend the benefits of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to officers and employees to whom such provisions are applicable, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill (S. 1527) to provide for home rule and reorganization in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### PECOS RIVER COMPACT

The bill (S. 1309) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Pecos River compact was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, Senators are aware of the fact that there has been some objection to this bill in the past, on the part of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. I am happy to say he assures me that, if he were here, he would not object, but he does feel that the Pecos River compact should be considered first.

To show my good faith, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of Calendar 400, House bill 3334, to grant the consent of the United States to the Pecos River compact.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 3334) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ANDERSON, the title was amended so as to read: "An act to grant the consent of the Congress to the Pecos River compact."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1309, a companion bill to House bill 3334, is indefinitely postponed.

#### REHABILITATION OF FORT SUMNER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, NEW MEXICO

The bill (S. 276) to authorize a project for the rehabilitation of certain works of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That, for the purpose of providing water for the irrigation of approximately 6,500 acres of arid lands on the Pecos River in New Mexico, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to rehabilitate, operate, and maintain in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), the irrigation system of the Fort Sumner irrigation district in New Mexico and to construct all necessary works incidental thereto: *Provided*, That the project shall not be initiated until contracts satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior shall have been executed with—

(a) an irrigation or conservancy district, satisfactory in form and powers to the Secretary and embracing the lands of the project as determined by him, obligating the district, among other things, (i) to repay to the United States without interest the cost of rehabilitating and constructing the project, the terms to be such as will secure repayment as rapidly as, in the judgment of the Secretary, the district can reasonably be expected to make repayment and, in any event, within the useful life of the project; (ii) to pay for or otherwise provide adequate operation and maintenance, including replacements, of the project works during the period of the contract; and (iii) to furnish the Secretary with such control over and access to project works which are owned by or within the control of the district as he may require in order to safeguard the investment of the United States in the project; and

(b) the holder or holders of at least 90 percent of the outstanding general obligation bonds of the Fort Sumner irrigation district providing for such refinancing or cancellation of those bonds and scheduling of payments of principal and interest called for thereby as the Secretary believes necessary in order to insure fulfillment of the obligations required under (a) above.

#### BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1008) to provide a 2-year moratorium with respect to the application of certain antitrust laws to individual good-faith delivered-price systems and freight-absorption practices, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2023) an act to regulate oleomargarine, to repeal certain taxes relating to oleomargarine and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 878) to provide certain benefits for annuitants who retired under the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, prior to April 1, 1948, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 997) to extend the benefits of section 1 (c) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to employees who were involuntarily separated during the period from July 1, 1945, to July 1, 1947, after having rendered 25 years of service but prior to attainment of age 55, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 20) to amend the act of August 1, 1947, as amended, to authorize the creation of 10 professional and scientific positions in the headquarters and research stations of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LANGER. On behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) suspending legislative budget pending further study, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let the resolution go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the resolution will be passed over.

## BILL PLACED AT THE FOOT OF THE CALENDAR

The bill (S. 266) removing a limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not see the distinguished Senator from Georgia or the distinguished Senator from Maine, but this bill was approved by the Finance Committee. I suggest that it be placed at the foot of the calendar and called again when we reach that point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be temporarily passed over and will be placed at the foot of the Calendar.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is quite satisfactory.

## SIMPLIFICATION OF PROCUREMENT, USE, AND DISPOSAL OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY, ETC., BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1809) to simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, to reorganize certain agencies of the Government, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President—

Mr. LANGER. I object, on behalf of the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I was asking for recognition. I wanted to be heard on this bill. Did the Senator from North Dakota ask that it go over?

Mr. LANGER. I withhold the objection.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I understood that the Senator from Indiana wished to have time in which to study the bill. I talked with him about it. I was going to ask that it go over. I want to make a brief statement about the bill. The bill was reported by the committee on May 9. It is a measure of considerable importance, a bill to undertake the reorganization and to transfer agencies of the Government. It is one that each Member of the Senate should endeavor to study. I desire to make a brief statement about the bill.

Mr. President, the need for an efficient, businesslike system for procurement, property and records management in the Federal service has long been recognized. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch and students of government have recognized this and have recommended that centralized direction be placed over supply, records management, and the operation and maintenance of public buildings.

The pending bill, Senate bill 1809, Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, was drafted by the staff of

the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and the legislative counsel, in collaboration with representatives of the Federal Works Agency, General Accounting Office, Bureau of the Budget, and other interested agencies.

I may say, Mr. President, that it undertakes generally to follow the recommendations of the Hoover Commission with respect to those agencies.

The bill proposes to establish a General Services Agency at the head of which will be an administrator appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator will be directly responsible to the President and will be vested with broad jurisdiction over procurement of supplies and materials, property management, including identification and cataloging of material on hand, disposition of surplus property, records management, and other related activities which affect the internal operation of all departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

The bill further provides for transferring the Bureau of Federal Supply and the Office of Contract Settlement from the Department of the Treasury, the Federal Works Agency, National Archives, and the affairs of the War Assets Administration, for liquidation, to the General Services Agency.

It is believed that substantial savings will be effected by combining the functions and activities of these agencies into a central service organization which will have clear-cut lines of authority over Federal property because permanent legislation is contained in this bill for the disposition of personal property, including the donation of certain property for educational purposes, and at the same time permit decentralization over the disposition of certain properties such as agricultural products, surplus vessels, and other material to those agencies best suited or which have specific legislative authority to make such disposition.

No changes will be made with respect to the disposition of foreign excess properties; however, this bill does provide for the repeal of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, except sections 13 (a), 13 (g), 13 (h), and sections 28 and 32 (b) (2). Under the terms of this act the priorities and preferences for transferring surplus real property to educational institutions, to public health and hospital institutions, surplus airport facilities to States and political subdivisions, property for public recreational facilities, and the foreign scholarship program will be retained as permanent legislation.

Mr. President, I am not insisting that the bill be passed today. I invite the attention of the Senate to it so that Senators may familiarize themselves with it. I hope, Mr. President, that the bill will pass on the next call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

The clerk will call the next bill on the calendar.

## SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, under existing law, the Attorney General is authorized to suspend deportations. When he suspends them he must report the suspensions to the Congress. If the Congress, by action of both Houses, agrees to the suspension, it goes into effect. We have been passing similar measures right along. I am not advocating them. I look upon them with a great deal of concern, and have so looked upon them; but we are constantly receiving these suspended deportations from the Department of Justice. The Committee on the Judiciary must act on them, must either report them to the Senate or let them die. We have been reporting them to the Senate, and the Senate has been passing them. I do not like the law or the way it operates, but it is the law, and what I have stated is all we can do about it.

Before the committee reports to the Senate a suspension of deportation it is screened as well as possible, with such facilities as are at hand. Each individual whose deportation is suspended is considered. These are persons who are in this country and who are subject to deportation. Their deportation is suspended by action of the Department of Justice, under a specific law passed by the Eightieth Congress. Therefore on each call of the calendar one of these lists will be found. In this instance, I think approximately 60 deportations are suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 36) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:*

A-2657830, Alaimo, Gaspare (alias Antony Curto).

A-6392821, Arroz, Benjamin Floro.

A-4875449, Garibay-Barron, Pedro.

A-5945921, Barden, Bernard James.

A-7584849, Barden, Else Elisabeth (nee Wielputz).

A-7584852, Barden, Ingrid Elisabeth.

A-6761884, Barry, Catherine Maxwell Geraldine (nee Catherine Maxwell Geraldine Fitzgerald).

A-6258481, Bick, Norbert Simon.

A-4783695, Biggest, Bernadine Margaret (nee Mathers).

A-2073409, Bing, Kwan Shun, or Mrs. Lawrence Jong.

A-6318466, Burke, Lillian Victoria (nee Mortley).

A-3043699, Caramanis, Joseph Kyriacos, or John Kyriacos Caramanis.

A-3077041, Cardona, George.

A-3542405, Ching, Mrs. Wah Chong, or Lin Shu Ying (Grace) (alias Grace L. Ching).

A-4583006, Crist, Maria Ragnhild (nee Maria Ragnhild Hindersson).  
 A-1127635, Cuschieri, Anthony Joseph.  
 A-910203, Damsleth, Bjorn Robert.  
 A-6311802, Damsleth, Randi (nee Clifton).  
 A-1481188, Di Meglio, John or Giovanni.  
 A-3713017, Di Nardo, Gennaro (alias Jerry Di Nardo).  
 A-3530018, Faria, Maria Simplicio, or Maria Souto Machado.  
 A-6481284, Fisher, Lena Eileen (nee Dodd).  
 A-3686479, Ford, Newton Isaac, or Newton I. Ford or Newton Becker or Leonard Lee Isaac Newton Ford.  
 A-6458413, Fretwell, Glenda Joyce.  
 A-6765814, Genet, Micheline Marguerite Louise Marie (nee Calsat).  
 A-6594937, Genet, Jean Marie Gabriel.  
 A-6552977, Hansen, Desley Helen.  
 A-6552978, Hansen, Robin Naomi.  
 A-6228065, Henry, Muriel (formerly Muriel Rose and Muriel Harris).  
 A-4917143, Hinkkuri, Veikko Armas.  
 A-4040790, Hoffmann, Zoltan Alex, or Zoltan A. Hoffman or Zoltan Alex Hoffman.  
 A-6344960, Joachim, John.  
 A-8399584, Lacy, Elsa (nee Sturm).  
 A-4942450, Langfeldt, Paul Johan.  
 A-4497419, Leslie, Mabel (nee Kellett).  
 A-3438588, Murphy, Patrick Joseph, or Joseph Murphy.  
 A-6286929, Ochoa, Maria Concepcion Quintero de (nee Quintero).  
 A-7540761, Panerai y Bertini, Camilo Oreste Rafael.  
 A-6322618, Parker, Martha (alias Martina Rivera Lopez).  
 A-4181269, Perez, Arturo Garcia, or Arturo Perez.  
 A-1208046, Pernice, Antonio.  
 A-4734405, Ptucka, Stephan, or Steve Ptucka.  
 A-6396323, Racelis, Elisa.  
 A-6396324, Racelis, Mary.  
 A-6457162, Racelis, Ramon.  
 A-2676821, Redka, John.  
 A-2098470, Renner, Florence May (nee Bailey).  
 A-2454691, Renteria, Jose Anival.  
 A-3475471, Roetto, Gemma, or Gemma Minarelli.  
 A-5800711, Sang, Wong, or Sang Wong.  
 A-3081085, Sartori, Linda (nee Ret).  
 A-3980008, Schlander, Arthur George.  
 A-1236239, Sestan, Arthur, or Stephen (Stephan) Voronoff.  
 A-1025773, Spongia, Frederico Dominick, or Fred Spongia.  
 A-2387594, Szedula, Barbara (nee Kiefer).  
 A-2387595, Szedula, Jacob.  
 A-3497501, Tomczak, Antonina, or Antonette Tomczak (nee Sobczak).  
 A-1204388, Van Den Berghe, Jeanette.  
 A-1204387, Van Den Berghe, John.  
 A-1281125, Wagner, Hartie Mary Pretoria Thompson (nee Thompson).  
 A-6562827, Wardlow, Ada Rodriguez, or Ada de Las Mercedes Rodriguez Pego de Wardlow.  
 A-2084639, Yiannatos, George G.

NORTHWEST MISSOURI FAIR ASSOCIATION

The bill (S. 1054) for the relief of Northwest Missouri Fair Association of Bethany, Harrison County, Mo., was announced as next in order.

Mr. DONNELL. I object.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection, so that I may make a short explanation of the bill?

Mr. DONNELL. I withhold my objection.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to reimburse the Northwest Missouri Fair Association in the sum of \$25,000 for the value of buildings destroyed by fire on September 13, 1931. On the day before the fire occurred the

premises were occupied by a detachment of field artillery of the United States Army moving from Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to Fort Des Moines, Iowa. The possession of the fair grounds was delivered to the Army, quoting from the statement on behalf of the fair association appearing on page 5 of the report, "under a promise that the property would be returned to us in as good or better condition on the following Monday than when received on Saturday, September 12."

The occupation occurred on Saturday. On Sunday a baseball game was arranged between the members of the armed force and a team from a neighboring town. While the baseball game was in progress a fire broke out in the grandstand on the fair grounds. It spread very rapidly to a larger building known as the Liberal Arts Building. The officer in charge immediately ordered the evacuation of the troops, with their fieldpieces. They moved fieldpieces including trucks and tractors over the hose which was laid down to fight the fire damaging the hose and making it impossible to continue efforts to put out the fire. As a result, as I understand, substantially all the buildings of the fair association were destroyed.

The purpose of this bill is to reimburse the fair association.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JAMES A. GORDON

The bill (S. 1080) for the relief of James A. Gordon, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That James A. Gordon, of Columbia, S. C., is hereby relieved of liability for payment to the War Department of the sum of \$861.25, such sum having been charged against the said James A. Gordon by the War Department as a result of the theft of public funds in his custody, without fault or neglect on his part, while he was on active duty as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States.

DIXIE MARGARINE CO.

The bill (S. 1086) for the relief of the Dixie Margarine Co., a Tennessee corporation, of Memphis, Tenn., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly withhold the objection.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, this is not a margarine tax bill, but it involves a case where the particular company involved paid a tax for a number of years, and later another company brought suit for the imposition of the same kind of a tax. The Supreme Court held that the tax was absolutely illegal, and awarded judgment in favor of the taxpayer.

Mr. President, this case is exactly on all fours with the one decided by the Supreme Court. This company paid an

illegal tax, and it is so stated in the report. I hope the Senator will withdraw his objection, because it is a claim which the Government really should pay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, this claim does not seem to have been filed in time. There seems to be evidence in the record itself of neglect and carelessness in filing it. I should like to look into the matter a little further.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That will be entirely satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with and conclude the consideration of measures on the calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

JOHN W. CRUMPACKER

The bill (S. 1138) for the relief of John W. Crumpacker, commander, United States Navy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John W. Crumpacker, commander, United States Navy, the sum of \$135.60, which sum represents the amount which it would have cost had shipment been made at Government expense of certain of his household effects from Accomac, Va., to Michigan City, Ind., following the evacuation of his dependents from Tutuila, American Samoa, in January 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

BANK OF KODIAK, ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I should like to have a brief explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of \$3,000 to the Bank of Kodiak, Kodiak, Alaska, in full settle-

ment of all claims against the United States for reimbursement in the loss of mutilated currency on board the steamship *Yukon* on February 4, 1946.

It appears that the Bank of Kodiak withdrew mutilated currency from circulation and consigned it to the Treasurer of the United States, for redemption, and after the steamship *Yukon*, on which the shipment was moving, sank on February 4, 1946, the bank made claim on the Post Office for reimbursement. The Post Office Department notified the bank that inasmuch as no registry fee was paid for the shipment, no indemnity was payable under the regulations of the Department.

Inasmuch as the currency in this case was shipped by the Bank of Kodiak for its own account and without authorization or direction by the Treasury, the bank was advised that there was no action that the Treasury could take to reimburse it for the amount of the lost currency. Therefore the bill seemed to the committee to have merit.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Why is there an absence of any sworn proof in the record as to this loss? There is an indication that two or three of the inspectors saw the packages, but no sworn proof, nothing to bear out the claim.

Mr. McCARRAN. The letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, which we take to be authentic, without its being under oath, sets forth the details.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder if we should not have a record from the Postmaster General supporting the claim.

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee did not think it was necessary. We thought we had sufficiently authentic evidence to warrant approval of the bill.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Was the committee unanimous in its opinion as to the merits of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would say yes, according to my recollection, the committee was unanimous.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 585) for the relief of Jacob A. Johnson, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### GEORGE A. KIRCHBERGER

The bill (H. R. 650) for the relief of George A. Kirchberger was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Mr. Kirchberger, when he made application for employment with the War Department, stated that he was a citizen of the United States and that he was born in

St. Louis, Mo. He worked for the War Department from March 1941 until September 1945. In September 1945 he was appointed to the Treasury Department by transfer from the War Department as a commercial accountant. An investigation into his character and for other purposes by the latter Department revealed that at the time of appointment he was not a citizen of the United States. Consequently, the salary paid to Mr. Kirchberger was in contravention of the applicable statute. Accordingly, Mr. Kirchberger was suspended from duty on September 11, 1946, and separated on October 6, 1946. A demand has been made upon Mr. Kirchberger to refund these sums to the Government.

The issue simply stated: Should this former employee, because of a misstatement made at the time of application for employment, which the Department concerned considers quite understandable under the circumstances, be required to refund the salary earned? Your committee believes he should not be required to do so. The Department concerned is satisfied that the claimant was guilty of no willful falsehood.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Nevada if it is true that the party concerned in the bill filed a false statement with his application for appointment?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is so alleged.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLOWAY in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

#### LEGAL GUARDIAN OF GEORGE GENERAZZO

The bill (H. R. 681) for the relief of the legal guardian of George Generazzo was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### JOSEPH THOMPSON

The bill (H. R. 692) for the relief of Joseph Thompson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CATHERINE S. TREMAYNE AND A. I. LANG

The bill (H. R. 761) for the relief of Catherine S. Tremayne and A. I. Lang was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LEGAL GUARDIAN OF ANDREW FERDINAND DEWITT III

The bill (H. R. 1098) for the relief of the legal guardian of Andrew Ferdinand DeWitt III, a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### MRS. HOPE IRENE BULEY

The bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Mrs. Hope Irene Buley was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to pay the sum of \$7,912.50 to Mrs. Hope Irene Buley, of Bozeman, Mont., in full settlement of all claims against the

United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident occurring as a consequence of the discharge from a gun of a member of the military police, acting within the scope of his employment, at the Oasis night club, Black Eagle, Mont., on December 25, 1942.

In the early morning of December 26, 1942, two military policemen, while acting within the scope of their employment, became involved in a fight with a group of civilians at the Oasis, a night club near Great Falls, Mont. Badly beaten and reasonably apprehending mortal danger, they drew their pistols. It appears that they attempted to fire into the floor and ceiling to forestall the necessity for further combat. In the resulting melee four civilians were shot, including Miss Hope Irene Dotseth (now Mrs. Hope Irene Buley). Miss Dotseth was struck by a bullet in the upper right arm, which caused a compound comminuted fracture of the right humerus and severed the radial nerve, paralyzing her right arm.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. May I ask the distinguished Senator whether the committee was unanimous in approval of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. The committee was unanimous.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withdraw the objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### HAL W. CLINE

The bill (H. R. 1597) for the relief of Hal W. Cline was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### WILLIAM PRICE

The bill (H. R. 2089) for the relief of William Price was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVA C. NETZLEY RIDLEY, WILLIAM G. STUFF, LOIS STUFF, AND HARRY E. RIDLEY; AND THE ESTATES OF CLYDE C. NETZLEY AND SARAH C. STUFF

The bill (H. R. 2261) for the relief of Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should appreciate very much an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, Clyde C. Netzley and Sarah C. Stuff were fatally injured, and Eva C. Netzley Ridley, William G. Stuff, and Lois Stuff were severely injured, in a collision between the automobile driven by Clyde C. Netzley and a National Park Service truck, on Illinois State Highway No. 54. The sole occupant of the truck was the driver, who was uninjured.

The collision occurred when the driver of the truck, without giving a signal, undertook to make a left-hand turn,

from the right-hand lane of the highway, onto a dirt road which crosses the highway.

It appears that the collision was clearly caused by the negligence of the driver of the truck.

The negligence of the driver of the truck is supported by various statements presented to the committee. I refer especially to the letter of Peyton Ford of the Department of Justice who wrote:

Whether the bill should be enacted presents a question of legislative policy concerning which the Department of Justice prefers to make no recommendations.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Again I ask whether the report of the committee on the bill was unanimous.

Mr. McCARRAN. The report of the committee was unanimous. If the Senator means by his question whether all members of the committee were present I would have to answer in the negative. But there was a legal quorum present, and those present were unanimous in their recommendation to report the bill favorably.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator, and withdraw any objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Nevada a question. I notice that the accident took place in 1935. I wonder why the claim has been delayed.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill has been before Congress previously, but for one reason or another has not been passed. It got into the jam at the close of the last session of Congress and failed of passage then.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2261) for the relief of Eva C. Netley Ridley, William G. Stuff, Lois Stuff, and Harry E. Ridley; and the estates of Clyde C. Netley and Sarah C. Stuff, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOREST L. WEATHERLY

The bill (H. R. 2268) for the relief of Forest L. Weatherly was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2474) for the relief of Frank E. Blanchard, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is a matter pertaining to the bill which I should look into, and for the time being, that is for the call of the calendar today, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ESTATE OF MARION MILLER

The bill (S. 1167) for the relief of the estate of Marion Miller, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Treasury Department has recommended against the bill I should like an explanation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it appears that Pfc Marion Miller, Army serial No. 10600851, served with the Canadian Army prior to his service with the

Army of the United States. As an incident of that service, certain sums were due and owing to him by the Canadian Government. This sum—\$66 Canadian currency, at the then rate of exchange, \$59.58 in United States dollars—was, along with amounts due from the Canadian Government to other enlisted men in the United States Army, paid to this Government by letter of credit dated February 27, 1943.

Apparently faulty identification by an Army finance officer resulted in the sum involved being paid to one Pvt. Milton Miller, who had since been discharged from the Army.

Pfc Marion Miller was killed in action on July 28, 1944.

While it is clear that the estate of Marion Miller is entitled to the amount in question, the Comptroller General states that the payment has not been made because there is no appropriation or fund available from which to pay it.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1167) for the relief of the estate of Marion Miller, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 2, line 6, after the word "claims," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim or claims for payment of the amount due the estate of Marion Miller, private, first class, Army of the United States, deceased, incident to his service in the Canadian Army which amount was paid to the United States by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, February 27, 1943, for his credit but which was erroneously paid by a United States finance officer to another individual of a similar name, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim or claims not to exceed \$59.58. There is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$59.58, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of such claim or claims: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO UNLAWFUL CONVERSION OF MOTOR VEHICLES AND AIRCRAFT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1483) to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 2312 and 2313, so as to include thereunder motor vehicles and aircraft which have been embezzled, feloniously converted, or taken by fraud, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "taken", to insert the word "feloniously", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc., That title 18, United States Code, sections 2312 and 2313, are amended by inserting after the word "stolen" wherever it appears in such sections a comma and the following: "embezzled, feloniously converted, or taken feloniously by fraud."*

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 2312 and 2313, so as to include thereunder motor vehicles and aircraft which have been embezzled, feloniously converted, or feloniously taken by fraud."

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1288) for the relief of certain officers and members of the crew of the steamship *Taiyuan* was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I would offer a number of objections to the bill. It does not seem to be soundly drawn, to begin with. It calls for the payment of a claim to a man whose whereabouts is unknown. I suspect there are some other faults about it. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FRANK J. PATZKE ET AL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of Frank J. Patzke, Archie Mitchell, J. L. Shoemaker, Einar Engen, and N. L. Gifford, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 11, after the word "Dakota", to insert "and Bertha Myrtle Patzke, of Bly, Oreg.); on page 2, line 2, after the word "of", to strike out "his" and insert "their"; and in line 3, after the word "and", to strike out "his" and insert "their."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The bill was amended so as to read, "An act for the relief of Frank J. Patzke and others."

CONTINUATION OF NURSERIES AND NURSERY SCHOOLS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 3967) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950. There is only one amendment to the House bill. That amendment restores the amount to \$150,000, from \$50,000.

The committee is of the opinion that the work of the nurseries and nursery schools fills a vital and needed part in a general program, and that it should be continued with an adequate appropriation until some other provision is agreed upon. With this action the committee recommended that the District Columbia officials confer with the representatives of the various civic organizations in an effort to bring in a recommendation for the care of this group of children at the end of this term. Such a meeting has already been called for June 6, and it is the hope of the committee that the parties may get together and bring in a recommendation to take care of this matter after 1950.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Maine. I have no objection.

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

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask if this type of service, which I know about, is rendered by the public-school systems in other cities, or is it carried on privately?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. This program is what remains of the Lanham Act plan, I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts. The question is whether the service should come under education or under welfare. I think there is a difference in various cities. I believe some cities take care of it under the educational program and some under the welfare program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under both systems it is done with public funds?

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Maine.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3967) to continue a system of nurseries and nursery schools for the day care of school-age and under-school-age children in the District of Columbia through June 30, 1950, which has been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, on page 3, line 9, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

#### ARKANSAS RIVER COMPACT

The bill (S. 1448) to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River compact was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Calendar No. 385, House bill 4151, is a companion bill. Is there objection to the present consideration of the House bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 4151) to grant the consent of the United States to the Arkansas River compact was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1448 will be indefinitely postponed.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1843) to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense; to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill his enlarged responsibility; and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This bill is the pending business.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

#### NATIONAL CAPITAL SESQUICENTENNIAL

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) to authorize the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission to proceed with plans for the celebration and commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the seat of the Federal Government in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like a brief explanation of the joint resolution.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, does the Senator desire an explanation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Yes. What is the amount of salary to be authorized for the director of the Commission?

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, no salary is fixed, because no appropriation has yet been made. The question whether or not there will be a Federal appropriation is now before the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations of the Appropriations Committee. There has been a previous appropriation of only \$15,000, with which all the preliminary plans, with which most Senators are familiar, have been made. In the event there should be an appropriation, no salary will be paid by the Commission in excess of \$15,000. However, there is nothing in the pending measure which appropriates for salaries to anybody. It merely continues in existence the Commission which was authorized by the Eightieth Congress, and directs it to proceed with the plans which it has heretofore made.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In the event this program should operate at a loss, who would bear the loss?

Mr. McGRATH. The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is in charge of the bill.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, it is anticipated that there will be no loss. How-

ever, the only loss that could be sustained would be limited by the extent of the appropriation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. But if there should be a loss, who would assume that loss? Would Congress assume it?

Mr. FREAR. I presume that if there were a loss, probably a deficiency appropriation would be requested.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. McGRATH. I may say that there is no liability on the Federal Government beyond that which it takes unto itself by an appropriation, which we hope will be made. Therefore any loss would be limited to the amount of the appropriation.

This question has been gone into very thoroughly by the Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. I believe that when the District appropriations bill is before us there will be ample time then to discuss the financial soundness and prospects of the Sesquicentennial celebration. The pending joint resolution does nothing more than permit the continuation of the Commission and permit it to go ahead with its plans. In the event we should approve an appropriation with which to operate the Sesquicentennial celebration, the pending joint resolution gives sanction for leasing authority, the taking over of land, and other things that are necessary in that connection.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I feel constrained to object unless the joint resolution provides for the contingency of loss. There is no certainty that there will not be a loss, and I think we ought to provide squarely to meet that contingency should it arise.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. President, I do not believe that this joint resolution is the place to make such a provision. The joint resolution does not give the Sesquicentennial Commission authority to incur any obligations which could possibly run against the Federal Government. The time to make such provision is when and if we decide to appropriate any money for this purpose. In the meantime any obligation which might be incurred would be simply an obligation as between the Commission and those with whom it might contract.

This is not the place to put a limitation on liability. In my opinion, the time to do that is when the appropriation bill is before the Senate. If the Senate sees fit to approve a \$3,000,000 financing of this project, it can very well declare its purpose that that shall be the limit of authority of the Commission. This is not the place to impose such a limitation. In effect, this is nothing more than an authorization. Of course, an authorization is of no value unless it is followed by an appropriation.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I point out that it is an authorization which firmly establishes a commitment.

Mr. McGRATH. I do not quite understand what the Senator means by his last reference.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I mean simply that it is authorization which establishes a commitment on the part of the Congress.

Mr. McGRATH. The only commitment that is established is a commitment that the Sesquicentennial Commission, already established by the previous Congress, shall be permitted to proceed with its work of conducting the sesquicentennial celebration, and that it shall have the necessary power to deal with the authorities of the District of Columbia in conducting the sesquicentennial fair. There is no authority to spend any money or to commit the Government to the spending of any money whatsoever. The Commission will not have such authority unless the Congress sees fit to make an appropriation.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. If the Senator will turn to page 4, line 22 of the joint resolution, he will find an explanation of the situation.

Mr. SALTONSTALL rose.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. McGRATH. I do not believe I have the floor. I think the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] has the floor. With his permission, I shall be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on District of Columbia Appropriations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I should like to ask a question.

Do I correctly understand the Senator from Rhode Island to mean that the joint resolution would merely continue the Planning Commission, and that the Planning Commission must cut its cloth along the lines of any appropriation which later may be made by the Congress? In other words, if we appropriate half the money which the Commission requests, it must make its plans accordingly.

Mr. McGRATH. Yes; it must make its plans in accordance with the appropriation.

I may say that according to the plans for the sesquicentennial celebration, the total budget anticipated for the sesquicentennial celebration will be in the neighborhood of \$9,000,000. A great many projects are planned, including the erection of buildings, the rental of space for scientific displays, admission charges, and so forth. The plan of the Commission is a business venture, in which it is anticipated that the Government will receive back something in excess of the total cost. What is to be asked of the Appropriations Committee is an appropriation in the form of a banking loan of \$3,000,000, all of which, under the plans, will come back to the Treasury. In addition to what comes back to the Treasury in this form there will be returns from Federal taxes as a result of the operation of the Sesquicentennial Fair.

To answer the question of the Senator from Massachusetts fairly, we are dealing with a proposal which, in terms of dollars, will be a \$10,000,000 show, which we shall ask the Federal Government to guarantee to the extent of \$3,000,000, all of which we hope and trust will be returned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So to answer the question of the Senator from New Jersey, theoretically, at this time at least, so far as we can foresee, the ultimate loss to the Federal Government would not exceed \$3,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct, but we do not expect that there really will be any loss to the Federal Government. Instead, we anticipate that there will be a profit to the Government. The \$3,000,000 is being requested in the form of an appropriation, although in a sense it is to be a loan to the Sesquicentennial Commission, for the purpose of permitting it to erect the buildings and to get the celebration under way by enabling the Commission to spend the money which must be expended before any income can be established. The Commission has no place to go to obtain such backing except the Congress of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In other words, neither the residents of the District of Columbia nor the business people of the District of Columbia nor the Government of the District of Columbia are putting up any money at all in this connection?

Mr. McGRATH. No. This project is not to be understood as a project of the District of Columbia. It is the sesquicentennial celebration of the founding of the Capital of the United States, and it is being conducted by a commission authorized by the Congress of the United States. It is not a District of Columbia project. It is to be called "The Freedom Fair," in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the seat of the Federal Government here in the city of Washington. It is a national affair, and is not to be understood as a function of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Has any effort been made to raise money for this purpose from business firms throughout the United States?

Mr. McGRATH. Yes. Space in the exhibition buildings will be leased to large industrial firms throughout the United States, on an industry-wide basis; and many of them have already shown a very keen interest in leasing space.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. But no advance payments have been made. Is that correct?

Mr. McGRATH. No advance payments have been made, and none will be received until the buildings are erected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER obtained the floor.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me on that point, I should like to follow the argument which has been made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island by reading from page 10 of the bill, where it is said:

*Provided*, That all revenues received by the Commission from such source shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation to be made pursuant to the authority contained herein and may be expended and shall be accounted for in the same manner as other funds authorized for expenditures by the Commission.

Mr. McGRATH. That is correct. Every dollar taken in will go into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. And it is the belief of the Senator from Rhode Island that the moneys which will be accumulated from the concessions which will be leased and from other means of raising funds, will be sufficient to prevent the Federal Government from sustaining any expense whatsoever in the final analysis. Is that correct?

Mr. McGRATH. Not only will the Federal Government have no expense in the final analysis, but it is anticipated that the Government will make considerable money from the operations of the Sesquicentennial Freedom Fair.

Furthermore, let me point out that under the plans which the Commission now has, there will be left in the city of Washington, as a permanent improvement, a very beautiful amphitheater, which is planned as the first building to be erected, along with the group of buildings to compose the so-called fair grounds. The amphitheater will be a building of considerable value and will be a permanent as well as a very needed improvement in the District of Columbia.

Moreover, as I have previously pointed out, it is expected that many million people will come to Washington during the 2 years which it is anticipated the Freedom Fair will run. It is expected to have as the central theme of the fair the freedoms which we enjoy here in the United States of America.

I wish to point out how essential it is in these times that we do not lose the opportunity of celebrating an anniversary such as this one, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Federal Government in the city of Washington.

We read last week in the trade magazines that for the city of London the British Government has recently appropriated the equivalent of \$15,000,000 for the running of a fair whose purposes do not begin to be commensurate with the great things the Federal Government stands for in the District of Columbia. It seems to me that if Great Britain under its austerity program, and requiring the help it is receiving from the United States, believes it can afford to devote \$15,000,000 to a celebration of that kind, then certainly here in the United States we can well afford to advance \$3,000,000 in order to help bring home to all the world the great freedoms which are enjoyed by those who live in the United States, and which are symbolized here in the city of Washington.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, so long as the Senate understands that if there is a loss, the Congress of the United States will not have to meet it, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is withdrawn.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Rhode Island for the very fine explanation he has made of the joint resolution.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask whether a loss was sustained from the celebration which was had 50 years ago, on the occasion of the one hundredth anniversary of the

founding of the Federal Government in the city of Washington?

Mr. MCGRATH. I was not here at that time, so I do not know. [Laughter.]

Let me say that a list has been prepared of the contributions the Federal Government has made to fairs of this kind in the United States within the past several decades. As one example, I can refer to the World's Fair at New York. The Congress of the United States appropriated in excess of \$3,000,000 as an outright contribution to that fair.

So we can go down the long list of similar celebrations to which contributions have been made by the United States Government. Those contributions range from \$700,000 to more than \$3,500,000.

Thus it seems to me that if the Congress can make such contributions for the St. Louis Fair, the New York World's Fair, and the Brooklyn Bridge celebration, the Congress should be able to take this step in connection with the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Nation's Capital.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether there was a Federal Government appropriation for the St. Louis Fair.

Mr. MCGRATH. I believe there was a Federal Government appropriation for the St. Louis Exposition. I believe it was called the Electrical Exposition—at St. Louis, in 1903, as I recall the date. I think a Federal Government appropriation was made for that purpose, but I do not recall the exact amount.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell me whether a Federal Government appropriation was made for the Chicago Fair?

Mr. MCGRATH. I am sure there was a Federal Government appropriation for that purpose. If the Senate will excuse a brief delay, I have sent the clerk to the committee to obtain the list which I had prepared for presentation to the Appropriations Committee. I think it will be brought to the floor in a few minutes.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Rhode Island think that \$3,000,000 is a great deal of money, just for a celebration?

Mr. MCGRATH. No; \$3,000,000 is not a great deal of money for this celebration, when one takes into consideration the things we have to celebrate and the emphasis which can be placed on our democracy and our freedoms.

The theme of the Freedom Fair and what we are going to try to demonstrate to the world by means of the fair are the things we enjoy here in the United States of America and the reasons why our way of life is better than the way of life of people elsewhere in the world. The celebration is to be known as the Freedom Fair. It is not to be commercialized in the sense that it is hoped to have a Coney Island midway or anything of that sort. It is to be a fair which will demonstrate the educational, scientific, industrial, and governmental progress of the United States during the 150 years since the National Capital was established here on the Potomac.

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

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the joint resolution has been passed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not been passed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I shall object until I find whether there was such a fair 50 years ago, how much the Federal Government contributed at that time, and whether any of its contribution was eventually returned.

In the present case, if there is assurance that there will not be a fair to the Federal Government, I shall not object; but I do not believe the people of the United States should pay \$3,000,000 to have a fair here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, I hope we do not lose sight of the fact that the joint resolution we are presently considering does not appropriate \$3,000,000. There will be ample opportunity to debate the question of whether \$3,000,000 should be appropriated.

All the joint resolution now before us does is authorize the continuation of the planning. The question of whether the actual expenditure will be made will be placed before the Senate when the appropriation is requested.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to say that the practice of making Federal contributions for such purposes is not new.

The Senator from North Dakota has asked whether there was a celebration of this sort 50 years ago. I do not remember as to that, but I remember that there was one 100 years ago. At that time there was a decision to build a great memorial, and stock was generally sold for the construction of the George Washington Monument. I happen to possess one of the original stock certificates which was sold for that purpose. Of course, the Washington Monument could not be built on that basis, and the Federal Government had to step in and complete the construction of it.

I hope the Senator from North Dakota will withhold objection, because I am satisfied that the opportunity to thresh out the matter before the Appropriations Committee will be sufficient and satisfactory.

The Senator may recall that at one time I was a director of a United States exposition, and in that connection an authorization was obtained. After it was obtained, an appearance was made before the Appropriations Committee, to request funds. I believe that procedure should be followed in this case.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask the Senator a question: If we make the authorization at this time, when the request for an appropriation subsequently comes to us, will it be contained in a general appropriation bill, or will it be presented by itself?

Mr. MCGRATH. We can ask the Appropriations Committee to report it as a separate item. The matter is being considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not know just what the procedure would be, whether the committee would report it as an item in one of its general appropriation bills or report it separately. But I assure the Senator that, regardless of

how it may come before the Senate, the item can be given separate consideration.

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 200) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR THE JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1557) to provide for the appointment of an additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. MCGRATH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota withhold his objection?

Mr. LANGER. I may state that the only reason I object is that the bill does not provide that the judge shall be appointed from the District of Columbia. Under the bill the judge could be brought in from anywhere in the United States. It seems to me the lawyers of the District are entitled to have the judge appointed from the District of Columbia to deal with matters which come before the juvenile court.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, it is provided that the judge must be appointed from the bar of the District of Columbia. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. LANGER. I was talking this morning to a representative of the local bar association. I have not seen the bill myself.

Mr. MCGRATH. I may say for the benefit of the Senator there are two bills pending for the appointment of judges of the juvenile courts, which were before the Committee on the District of Columbia. One is in the nature of a permanent bill which would eventually create two judges for the juvenile court. The pending bill introduced by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] merely attempts to take care of a very dire emergency situation. The juvenile judge for the District of Columbia—and there is only one judge of the juvenile court—has been incapacitated and confined to a hospital for a period of almost a year. There is no hope that that judge can return to her duties. There is no provision of law by which the office of that judge can be vacated. There is no provision of law by which she can be forced into retirement.

The bill merely provides temporary relief. It permits the appointment of a juvenile court judge for the remainder of the term of the present judge. At the expiration of that term, then the authority which is hereby granted for the appointment of an extra judge will terminate. There is before the Committee on the District of Columbia another bill, upon which hearings are being held, by which it is hoped that we can provide permanently for two judges. That will eventually come before the Senate. The

pending bill is merely an emergency measure to put a judge upon that bench, where a judge is very badly needed. The Senator is completely misinformed about the question of residence in the District, or as to being a member of the District bar, because the proposed law does not make any change with respect to the qualification of the judge to be appointed. The law at the present time provides that the judge must be a person of experience in social work, and must be drawn from the membership of the bar of the District of Columbia.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is not misinformed. He has the bill before him, and will read it:

That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, for a term of 6 years, or until his successor is appointed and confirmed, one additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. The position occupied by the present judge of such juvenile court shall be abolished when a vacancy shall occur in said position or at the expiration of the present 6-year term of said judge, whichever shall first occur.

The Senator will see there is no provision which limits the appointment to a resident of the District of Columbia. In other words, the judge could be appointed from anywhere in the United States. Without objection, I should be glad to propose an amendment at the end of the bill—that is, in line 10—to add a semicolon and the words "Provided, That said judge shall be a resident of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MCGRATH. I may say to the distinguished Senator that the pending bill must be read in the light of existing substantive law. We have substantive law which provides that juvenile-court judges appointed in this manner shall be drawn from membership of the bar; so that while the bill does not spell it out, it does not exempt this judgeship from the provision of already-existing law. I have no objection to the Senator putting an amendment on the bill, if he sees fit, but it is entirely unnecessary, because the judge appointed under this authority must be appointed in accordance with the provisions of existing law.

Mr. LANGER. If it adds nothing to it, it at least would do no harm to adopt the amendment. We might as well adopt it.

Mr. MCGRATH. I have no objection whatever.

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

Mr. MORSE. Unless there is language in the pending bill which incorporates by reference the existing law—and it is an independent statute which stands on its own footing—I think the legal point of the Senator from North Dakota is well taken.

Mr. MCGRATH. I disagree with the distinguished Senator from Oregon in his interpretation of the statute, but, be that as it may, it is not the intention to change the existing provisions of law with respect to the appointment of this temporary judge, and I should be very happy to accept the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota in order to make sure that the sub-

stantive law applies to this particular appointment.

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

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question at that point, I understood the amendment to provide that the appointee shall be a resident of the District of Columbia. My understanding of the present substantive law is that it requires him to be a member of the District bar. There are members of the District bar who might live just over the line, but who practice in the District exclusively. I am wondering whether the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota is not in conflict with the present substantive law.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, if I may, I should like to read the existing provisions of the law governing this case. It is from title XI, Judiciary and Jurisdiction, paragraph 11-920, entitled "Appointment, Qualifications, Oath, and Salary of Judge." It reads as follows:

The judge of the court—

Meaning the juvenile court—

shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the consent of the Senate, for a term of 6 years, or until his successor is appointed and confirmed. To be eligible for appointment as judge—

Meaning, judge of the juvenile court—a person must be a member of the bar, preferably of the District of Columbia, and have a knowledge of social problems and of procedure and an understanding of child psychology. The judge shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, take the oath prescribed for judges of the courts of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island a question. Did I hear him read the language "preferably a member of the District bar?"

Mr. MCGRATH. Yes, that is the language of the present statute. It is not sought to change that language at all by the bill under consideration.

Mr. MORSE. Even the present statute does not meet the objection raised by the Senator from North Dakota, and there is nothing in the pending bill that incorporates the language of the present statute. Under the circumstances, the bill would stand on its own footing.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, we are merely trying to meet an emergency situation, and it hardly seems desirable to prescribe one set of qualifications for a temporary position, in order to take care of this emergency caused by the inability of the person holding the office to fulfill the duties.

It hardly seems consistent that there should be one set of qualifications for the incumbent and a different set of qualifications for a person temporarily appointed to fill the position.

I should be very happy to accept an amendment incorporating into the pending bill the provisions of paragraph 920 of section 11 to which I have referred.

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

Mr. LANGER. I still object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from North Dakota for a moment. Will the Senator from North Dakota withhold his objection, so that I may offer an amendment?

Mr. LANGER. Yes; I will withhold my objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment:

After the words "District of Columbia", in line 6, insert the words "who shall, at the time of appointment, be a resident of the District of Columbia."

Mr. LANGER. I withdraw my objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 6, after the words "District of Columbia", it is proposed to insert "who shall, at the time of appointment, be a resident of the District of Columbia."

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to ask how long it takes to become a resident of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer that question.

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

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator what is the law with respect to other judges in the District of Columbia. Are they required to be residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. In the municipal court bill we made provision for a certain number of judges to be selected from residents of the District of Columbia, though there were exceptions made, so that the President could reach into the metropolitan area, as it were, and select them. The reason for that is that a great many lawyers practice law in the District of Columbia and live in Maryland or Virginia, outside the District line. So, if we tie it down too close to the District line we are likely to exclude many who are really residents of the District of Columbia but who happen to live outside the District line.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me, this is what I have in mind. I can well understand that for the position of juvenile court judge it might be entirely appropriate, and, in fact, desirable, that the occupant of the office be a resident of the District of Columbia and familiar with conditions in the city of Washington. But I do not want a general precedent established whereby all judicial officers have to be residents of the District of Columbia. I think any citizen of the United States generally should be eligible for general judicial assignment and appointment in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator would not want that to apply to his own State, would he?

Mr. PEPPER. No; but the District of Columbia, I believe we will all admit, has a different status. It belongs to the people of the country to a degree to which individual areas outside the District do not belong to the whole country. But do I correctly understand the Senator to say that all judicial officers in

the District are not required to be residents of the District of Columbia?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are not required, I am sorry to say. If I had my way, I would write into the law, in indelible language, that they must be residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. PEPPER. It is certainly appropriate in this case.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my idea, and that is why I offer the amendment in this particular case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the consent of the Senate, for a term of 6 years, or until his successor is appointed and confirmed, one additional judge for the juvenile court of the District of Columbia, who shall at the time of appointment, be a resident of the District of Columbia. The position occupied by the present judge of said juvenile court shall be abolished when a vacancy shall occur in said position or at the expiration of the present 6-year term of said judge, whichever shall first occur.

#### UNIFORM LAW CONCERNING COMMON-TRUST FUNDS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1580), concerning common-trust funds and to make uniform the law with reference thereto.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I know something of this bill. It is a good bill. It is to provide a greater diversification of investments than is practicable in cases where sums of small trusts are invested separately. But I think the bill can be improved by a brief amendment. The bill provides on page 2, lines 2 to 8, for the investment of such funds by fiduciaries or co-fiduciaries, and this provision would be strengthened by inserting, before the word "consent", in line 8, the word "written."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*—

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMON-TRUST FUNDS

SECTION 1. Any bank or trust company qualified to act as fiduciary in the District of Columbia may, subject to such rules and regulations as may be promulgated from time to time by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under the provisions of section 11 (k) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U. S. C. 248 (k)), pertaining to the collective investment of trust funds by national banks, establish common-trust funds for the purpose of furnishing investments to itself as fiduciary, or to itself and others as co-fiduciaries; and may, as such fiduciary or co-fiduciary, invest funds which it lawfully holds for investment in interests in such common-trust funds, if such investment is not prohibited by the instrument, judgment, decree, or order creating such fiduciary relationship, and if, in the case of co-fiduciaries, the bank or trust company procures the written consent of its co-fiduciaries to such investment.

#### COURT ACCOUNTINGS

SEC. 2. Unless ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction the bank or trust company operating such common-trust funds is not required to render a court accounting with regard to such common-trust funds; but it may, by application to the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, secure approval of such accounting on such conditions as the court may establish.

#### UNIFORMITY OF INTERPRETATION

SEC. 3. This act shall be so interpreted and construed as to effectuate its general purpose to make uniform the law of the District of Columbia with the law of those States which enact the Uniform Common-Trust Fund Act.

#### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 4. This act may be cited as the "Uniform Common-Trust Fund Act."

#### SEVERABILITY

SEC. 5. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the other provisions or applications of the act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this act are declared to be severable.

#### REPEAL

SEC. 6. All acts or parts of acts which are inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

#### TIME OF TAKING EFFECT

SEC. 7. This act shall take effect July 1, 1949, and shall apply to fiduciary relationships then in existence or thereafter established.

#### REMOVAL OF WEEDS FROM LANDS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 885) to provide for the removal of weeds from lands in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 2, after line 3, to strike out section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. Any person violating the first section of this act shall be punished by fine not exceeding \$25.

And in line 6, to change the section number from "4" to "3", so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That weeds of a height greater than 4 inches are hereby declared to be a nuisance injurious to health, and it shall be the duty of every owner, occupant, and agent in charge of land in the District of Columbia to keep such land free and clear of such nuisance.

SEC. 2. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia, acting through such agency or agencies as they shall designate, may, upon the failure of any owner, occupant, or agent in charge of land to perform his or its duty prescribed in section 1 of this act, enter on such land and destroy or cause to be destroyed, the weeds upon such land by cutting, by applying chemicals, or by other means.

SEC. 3. The act entitled "An act to cause the removal of weeds from lands in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1899 (30 Stat. 595), is hereby repealed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill? From the way in which it reads, if a resident of the District of Columbia fails to weed his garden, until the weeds are 4 inches

in height, the District authorities will weed it for him.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. President, the health authorities feel that weeds are accountable for the spread of certain illnesses, such as hay fever. There is provision at the present time for the destruction of weeds on all public property, but there is no provision by which the District authorities can enter private land and destroy weeds of this nature. The bill merely gives permission to the District authorities, when it is determined that weeds growing on private land constitute a nuisance, to give notice to the owner to have the weeds destroyed. If the owner fails to act within a reasonable period of time, the District authorities may themselves treat the property so as to destroy the weeds. There is no obligation on the landowner whatsoever. The bill merely gives permission to the District authorities to do the work in order to improve the health of the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, what is the Senator's definition of a weed?

Mr. MCGRATH. Noxious plants which are determined to be likely to spread hay fever and other human ailments.

Mr. AIKEN. The bill is not intended to apply to ordinary weeds, is it?

Mr. MCGRATH. No. The Health Department must determine that the weeds are of such a nature as might spread human inconvenience or diseases which would be injurious to health.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it be safe to assume that the bill would apply only to such weeds as ragweed, poison ivy, and weeds of that nature?

Mr. MCGRATH. Yes; weeds of that nature.

Mr. AIKEN. The reason I asked the question is that it would appear that the District had authority to remove all weeds over 4 inches high from citizens' gardens. With the explanation given by the chairman of the District Committee, I have no objection.

Mr. MCGRATH. There are many absentee landowners. A great deal of land is owned by persons who do not reside here, and they, of course, pay no attention to the land, because they seldom come here. The weeds on such land become a nuisance. The bill would permit the District authorities to clean up such land and destroy the weeds.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### TRANSFER OF TOWER TO THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE GARDEN, INC.

The bill (S. 1384) to authorize the transfer of a tower located on the Lower Souris National Wildlife Refuge to the International Peace Garden, Inc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, in 1935 there was erected on the Lower Souris National Wildlife Refuge near West Hope, N. Dak., a steel fire tower. As a

matter of fact, it has not been used for several years. The cost of removal to some other location is \$1,000, and the Fish and Wildlife Service officials think they can build a new tower for approximately that amount of money.

The International Peace Garden Park, situated on the boundary between the United States and Canada; operated by both Governments, want this tower, and will pay the cost of removal. The bill has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I suppose this bill approaches the *de minimis* in regard to the matter of giving away Federal property. However, I cannot see my way clear to make an exception even of a piece of property which may be valued at only \$1,000. This piece of property obviously has some value, or the particular private organization named would not be seeking it. If I am going to continue to object, as I shall object, to the giving away of very valuable pieces of property, I must as a matter of principle object to small gifts also.

After all, I think it is very important that we establish a clear precedent in this body that we are not going to give Federal property to municipalities, States, or counties, or private welfare groups, even for public purposes, without some return to the taxpayers of the Nation as a whole.

Therefore, if the Senator from North Dakota wishes to accept an amendment providing that the International Peace Garden, Inc., of North Dakota shall pay 50 percent of the fair market value of the property as determined by the Wildlife Service, I shall not object.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The International Peace Garden, Inc., is an international organization, founded in peace. It is a nonprofit organization. It is for the benefit of the public in general. As testified by the Fish and Wildlife Service, so far as they know, the tower has practically no value. In their estimation it should be valued practically at cost; but to leave it stand there and rust away would be just a waste of property, in my estimation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it either has value or it has not. If it does not have value, this organization would not be seeking it, and the Federal Wildlife agency had better be selling it for junk rather than giving it away.

It pains me very much to have to apply my objection to such a *de minimis* case as this, but I know that by taking this position during the past 3 years I have saved huge sums of money for the taxpayers of the country. I am told in the Senate cloak room that Senators approve of the principle for which I have been standing, and that principle was adopted by a certain subcommittee of the Senate of which the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was chairman. I have been more or less the runner of the interference in this matter over the years.

I should like to accommodate the Senator from North Dakota, but if this tower is not worth very much, then the Wildlife Service will not get a very high price for it, and if it does not, the purchasers will have to pay only 50 percent of its fair market value.

Only one more word, Mr. President, and I shall be through. I am asking the department which has made assessments during the last 3 years to prepare for me a compilation or report on the assessments it has made, because I serve notice on Federal departments today that I do not make objections of this kind on the floor of the Senate without carrying through with them. I am going to check up to see what sort of assessments the department has been making, to see that the taxpayers are protected. I object.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. This bill merely provides for the transfer of a piece of property practically from one branch of the Government to another. It seems to me it would be different if it were going to a private individual.

Mr. MORSE. The fact is it is not being transferred from one department of the Federal Government to another. It is being transferred from a department of the Federal Government to an agency independent of the Federal Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection has been heard, and the bill will go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I understand that the Senator from Oregon had not objected and would not object if the amendment were agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator from North Dakota yield?

Mr. YOUNG. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon withhold his objection?

Mr. MORSE. I am withholding my objection until my amendment is either adopted or rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I hope the Senator from North Dakota will accept the amendment which has been suggested. I realize there is not very much value involved, that the tower is to be transferred to an organization to be used for public service and in the public good. The Wildlife Service has assured me that it would cost more to tear the tower down and move it than the tower is worth. But I see the point of the Senator from Oregon, that he wants to be consistent, and I hope the Senator from North Dakota will accept the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I appreciate the offer, but I should wish first to consult with those interested in the International Peace Garden. I rather believe the tower is so valueless that they would not want it under such considerations.

Mr. MORSE. Under those circumstances, I object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will be passed over.

#### EMBLEM DAY

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim June 20 of each year as Emblem Day was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the 20th day of June of each year as Emblem Day, calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on such day, and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies in commemoration of the American eagle, the official emblem of the United States, and of the great principles and ideals which it represents and symbolizes, and to renew and rededicate their faith in such principles and ideals.

The preamble was agreed to.

#### COPYRIGHTS OF FOREIGN WORKS

The bill (H. R. 2285) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights" with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyrights of foreign works, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this bill has the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary. I am very happy to give a brief explanation of it.

H. R. 2285 has two parts: One applying to the copyright registration in the United States of all works produced in foreign countries, and the other applying solely to books in the English language.

First. The present United States law requires all foreign authors and publishers to pay a \$4 fee and send to the Copyright Office one copy of their book or other work in order to secure copyright registration in the United States. The bill does not change this but gives an option of sending an additional copy of the work and a library card instead of paying the \$4 fee.

The matter of the library card was discussed thoroughly in the committee. It is generally accepted that getting the card is worth a great deal more than the \$4, because the card itself gives general information which it is sometimes very difficult to obtain unless the card is prepared by the individual who wants to register his book.

As to the second provision, as shown in the report, the present United States law requires all foreign authors and publishers of books and periodicals written in the English language to do two things to obtain copyright in the United States: They must (a) register the book or periodical in the United States Copyright Office within 60 days of publication abroad and (b) manufacture the work in the United States within 4 months thereafter. The bill allows 6 months for registration in the United States Copyright Office and 5 years within which to manufacture in the United States. It also permits the importation into the United

States, subject to duty, of 1,500 copies to test the American market.

Mr. President, the advantages of the bill are set forth very fully in the report, and I feel that this is a bill which should be passed.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Is it not an indication of the need for the legislation that out of some 14,000 or 15,000 books published abroad last year only a hundred-odd were registered in the United States Copyright Office?

Mr. WILEY. That is correct. Fourteen thousand books were published in England alone, yet only 139 written in the English language in England were copyrighted here, as I recall the figures.

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

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask a question, although it may display ignorance.

Mr. WILEY. The Senator never displays ignorance.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What becomes of the second copy of the book that may come in? Does that go to the Library of Congress? Does the Patent Office need to keep two copies, or what becomes of the second one?

Mr. WILEY. One remains in the Patent Office, where it is filed, and one goes to the Library of Congress.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2285) to amend title 17 of the United States Code entitled "Copyrights," with respect to relaxation of provisions governing copyright of foreign works, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 39) favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was considered and agreed to as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-6199026, Arrate, Eusebio Garate.

A-2450463, Arsenio, Damiano.

A-2160439, Bailey, Joseph Benjamin, or Benjamin Bailey.

A-6145949, Bayot, Margarita Chuidian.

A-6151545, Bayot, Raymond Mario.

A-6151544, Bayot, Teresita Maria.

A-6380365, Bolic, Rolando Guiseppe (alias Rolando or Dino Bolic).

A-6846177, Clausen, Lars Ole.

A-5580935, Covarrubias-Padilla, Jose Anas-tacio, or Anastacio P. Cuburrlaz.

A-3216396, David, William Andrew.

A-5225705, Di Filippo, Irene Madeline.

A-6259257, Drodzbob, Joseph.

A-2802280, Edelsbrunner, Caroline.

A-6265454, Engonopoulos, Vasil George (alias Basil George Engonopoulos).

A-3475015, Falconer, Leslie Stewart Arthur.

A-3475018, Falconer, Sara Jane (nee King or Sally Falconer).

A-2486073, Fazakerley, Frederick Precival.

A-6701968, Gage, George Martin, or Georg Martin Strobl.

A-6701967, Gage, Kathleen Kalliope Jose-  
phine, or Kalliope Josephine Strobl.  
A-6780509, Gallardo, Jose.  
A-2888840, Gallo, Salvatore.  
A-6261623, Georgalas, Maria Grigoriou (alias Nee Goudelia).  
A-4399192, Gonzalez, Angelina Morones De.  
A-4370168, Grossman, Morris, now known as Edward Milton Gross.  
A-6261618, Hadgis, Kalliope, or Calliope Hadgis (nee Zias).  
A-4829582, Heid, Michael or Mihaly.  
A-6827148, Hernandez, Alberto Ruiz.  
A-7009803, Hernandez, Hilaria.  
A-2150100, Hoffman, Anthony, or Antoni Hoffmann.  
A-1526789, Huala, Rudolph.  
A-5199601, Huerta-De La Cruz, Victoriano.  
A-3423608, Iglesias, Manuel Antonio.  
A-5751650, Jay, Gee, or Gee Jay Ngon.  
A-4132920, Johnson, Carl Oscar, or Karl Oscar Jonsson or Charles Johnson.  
A-5582883, Kashkin, Anna (nee Litman).  
A-6080991, Kay, Constance.  
A-1843482, Kurzweil, Katharina.  
A-1829087, Kurzweil, Joseph.  
A-5771081, Leader, Josephine Freida, or Josephine Freida Forster (maiden name).  
A-4073996, Leriget, Leopoldo.  
A-3909614, Licos, Harry or Charalambos.  
A-5217397, Lidowitz, Betty (nee Silverberg alias Betty Anenberg).  
A-6654060, Livadas, Nicolaos, or Nick Liva-das or Nicolas Livadas.  
A-2151223, Matiatos, Kostas Anastasios, or Gus Mathelios or Gus Mathews or Constan-tinos Matiatos.  
A-3449928, Meyer, Eva (nee Preminger).  
A-6810173, Michaud, Jean Antoine.  
A-4578274, Nadler, Augusta Julian Marie Pallfelt, or Augusta Julianne-Marie Pallfelt.  
A-3390860, O'Donnell, Murdock, or Morton O'Donnell or Merton O'Donnell.  
A-2180993, Olivo-Alvarado, Pedro.  
A-3990676, Perez De, Maria Perez, or Maria Perez.  
A-5803759, Pernstich, Guiseppe, or Joseph Eduard Pernstich or Joseph Eduard Pernet.  
A-4015208, Petroff, Lulu, or Lulu Bishop or Mary Lulu Baldwin Bishop or Lulu Saunders.  
A-3987370, Pettersen, Nils Christian.  
A-6343137, Psipsikas, Elisabet (nee Manda).  
A-6731207, Ramirez-Hernandez, Clemente, or Clemente Ramires-Hernandez.  
A-3990675, Reyes, Lupe Perez.  
A-3456521, Salgado, Paz Paguia (nee Paz Paras Paguia).  
A-3098893, Sherman, Rose (nee Schwartz-bard).  
A-4025778, Steen, Mary (nee Mewha).  
A-388729, Steevens, Barend Bernardus.  
A-6377728, Tal, Bobbish Pao-Kuang Soong.  
A-6272112, Tal, William Kitong.  
A-3875078, Verfallie, Lucien Andrew.  
A-6799298, Vion, James Alfred Laurent.  
A-6207280, Vitalis, Georgios Kyriacos (alias George Vitalis).  
A-6877269, Weisz, Margarete Henriette.  
A-5422164, Wong, Tong, or Lum Wong or Wong Tong or Wang Tang.  
A-5962228, Zelger, Alfred Wilhelm.  
A-5962227, Zelger, Margarit.

#### SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 40), favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, was considered and agreed to as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months.

A-5912573, Buschbell, Hans George Albert or Thomas Bell or Tommy Bell.

A-9670171, Elgesem, Olav Asbjorn or Elgesen.

A-9836680, Fox, William.

A-6334051, Katsimpas, Fokion (alias Fo-  
kion Intzes alias Frank Katsimpas).  
A-9644210, Nilson, Ragnar.  
A-9831301, Paps, Jan.  
A-6454899, Sarkiss, Marie (nee Marie Takessian).  
A-6049961, Chavolla, Jesus.  
A-6703246, Christie, Lewis George.  
A-5886536, Costa-Ferrandiz, Ricardo.  
A-9541562, Gregorio, Jose Gomes.  
A-9777524, Intartaglia, Michele Antonio.  
A-982484, Kugis, Janis Osvalds.  
A-6709421, McLean, Horace Josiah.  
A-9769285, Micouleau, Guy Jacques, or Guy Micouleau.  
A-6374360, Salomonsen, Frede Therp, or Ole Frede Therp Salomonsen.  
A-6746111, Theodorakis, James, or Dimitros Michael.  
A-6491799, Tsitsinopoulos, Roula (nee Harismagoglou formerly Bolla).  
A-6151590, Andersen, Helge Viggo.  
A-6702832, Delgado, Manuel, or Manuel Delgado Hernandez.  
A-5719288, Di Filippo, Attilio Guiseppe (alias Attilio Guiseppe Defilippo alias Jack Di Filippo alias Di Filippo).  
A-6063721, Espinoza, Nicolas.  
A-6764661, Garbin, Stanko.  
A-9706006, Hamon, Albert Noel.  
A-7552259, Ignatius-Veigelsberg, Lily, or Lily Ignotus (nee Berenyl).  
A-9566153, Kamstra, Gerardus Andreas.  
A-6703255, Lafayette, Benedict Wilberth.  
A-629488, Lianopoulos, Georgios, or George Anastase Lianopoulos.  
A-9745492, Matisons, Dimitrius, or Dimitrius Matisons or Mike Matisons or Mija Matisons.  
A-6642394, Mesa, Jesus.  
A-6642393, Mesa (de) Ysrida Morales, or Ysrida Morales.  
A-6315317, Mora, Jesus Antonio Beltran, or Jesus Antonio Beltran or Francisco Bel-tran Mora.  
A-9552697, Nilsson, Nils Erik Gunnar.  
A-9573925, Paap, Gijbertus Eilhelius.  
A-1807205, Pajaczkowski, Theodore Niko-dem.  
A-6267890, Pang, George (alias Pang Wing).  
A-6639459, Philipou, Dimitrios (alias James Phillips).  
A-9696268, Ricaux, Lionel Fernand.  
A-9610538, Ronning, Kristian Alf.  
A-9526246, Rosand, Ole Martinsen, or Ole Anskar Martinsen Rosand.  
A-6255942, Schneider, Abraham, or Abraham Schneider Feldman.  
A-9759876, Sibilo, Johan Cesar.  
A-6704359, Tolias, Elias Peter.  
A-6743873, De Torres, Maria Luisa Palos, or Severa Palos.  
A-5815123, Drakopoulos, Ioannes, or John Drakopoulos.  
A-9836988, Fook, Cheng, or Tom Fook or Cheng Fu.  
A-6364440, Friedenbach, Marcus.  
A-5971016, Herpmann, Eric Alfonse.  
A-6345769, Jassimides, Georgia (nee Voyad-joglou).  
A-6311453, Lissauer, Nanette Elisabeth, or Elisabeth Elenbaas.  
A-6307257, Medina-Uriarte, Francisco.  
A-6171959, Mooney, Eftychia Toutoulyas, or Eftychia Petrou Modinos or Effie Mooney.  
A-6755851, Nanez, Everardo, or Everardo Nanez-Gallardo.  
A-67558540, Nanez, Mericia, or Mericia Nanez-Ontiveros.  
A-6732250, Salloum, Hanna Elias (alias John Elias Salloum).  
A-6658774, Shields, Hazel Winston.  
A-5919526, Sjogren, Leo Allan.  
A-1231356, Vakirdis, Emanuel or Mike Varkis.  
A-6909071, Vodarek, Anton.  
A-9581661, Wick, Hjordes Elise Olsen.  
A-6611814, Blanco, Refugio.

A-5877886, Brackles, Elsie Alice Verna (nee Elsie Hupchuk or Elsie Hipkins).  
 A-4769437, Christopher, Norval.  
 A-6379881, Dabbiero, Sara De Honestis Caglione (nee De Honestis).  
 A-6341304, Harris, Neil Guy Ridgway, or Neill Harris or John Harris.  
 A-9520275, Johnson, Albert.  
 A-9799882, Leushkanoff, Alexander Alexach.  
 A-5524752, Levin, Floresa.  
 A-6569122, Mears, Wilfred Anthony (alias Willie Mears).  
 A-6286426, Ornert, Saul Stanley.  
 A-5870854, Phipps, Sarah Rebecca.  
 A-5694935, Ramirez, Daniel, Daniel Ramirez Reyes.  
 A-6153759, Ramos-Suarez, Luis, or Luis Ramos-Flores.  
 A-6075268, Rogers, Constancia Viola, or Constancia Viola Robert.  
 A-6596193, Sadez, Olga Genoveva.  
 A-4436548, Salguero-Martinez, Aristeo.  
 A-6435630, Valenzuela, Lino.  
 A-6361178, Westad, Borghild Eugenie Patterson Sheepnes.  
 A-6550865, Collins, Petronella Dorothea (nee Le Roux).  
 A-6438487, Hemmo, Emile, or Haviv Hemmo.  
 A-6407419, Iovine, Marcello.  
 A-6232120, Johnson, Muriel (nee Muriel Bartlett).  
 A-6678271, Pinedo-Valdez, Julian.  
 A-7695210, Terboo, Arend Jan Hendrikus.  
 A-6639352, Torres, Jesus.  
 A-6643321, Torres, de Luz Salinas.  
 A-5017267, Vigni, Giuseppe, or Joseph Vigni.  
 A-6594747, Alatorre, Amado, or Amado De Le Torre or Amado Alatorre Munoz.  
 A-5016270, Rabsatt, Ellice Alexander.  
 A-5932932, Rasbatt, Esridge Minovie (nee Fahie).  
 A-6284045, Spica, Giovanni Rosario, or John Spica.  
 A-6422507, Torres-Espinosa, Fidensio.  
 A-6730881, Torres, Elisia Rojar, or Elisia Rojas De Torres.  
 A-9688512, Van Buren, Arend.  
 A-6151257, Polo, Larry Nicholas, or Larry Mitchell or Frank Wallace.  
 A-6151395, Polo, Rubby Anne.  
 A-6151396, Polo, Softee Wallace.  
 A-6040120, Salinas, Guadalupe Salinas.

## MURPHY &amp; WISCHMEYER

The bill (S. 1296) for the relief of Murphy & Wischmeyer was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the firm of Murphy & Wischmeyer, of 911 Locust Street, St. Louis, Mo., the sum of \$3,323.90, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for increased costs incurred in the performance of its architectural-engineering contract, No. WA-1064, dated January 5, 1942, with the Federal Works Agency, by reason of unavoidable delays on the part of other contractors in the construction and completion of the defense housing project at East Alton, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

## JEPHTHA R. MACFARLANE

The bill (H. R. 603) for the relief of Jeptha R. Macfarlane, was considered,

ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## B. G. JONES

The bill (H. R. 636) for the relief of B. G. Jones, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## MARK B. CRAIG AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 639) for the relief of Mark B. Craig and others, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, it appears that on July 5, 1946, there were several blank money-order forms stolen and issued by using fictitious names for both the remitter and payee and the person stealing these forms filled them in and presented to certain post offices to have them cashed. All were of small amounts, as most of them were \$100 amounts and one for \$300.

It had been the custom to require a payee of money orders to furnish identification before such money orders were cashed. The person who had these money orders presented an Arkansas driver's license and a social-security card; the signatures on these cards were checked with the signatures on the money orders and they were the same, and the claimants have been required to pay the Post Office Department the amount of these money orders.

While the Post Office Department in its report shows that the wrong payments were the result of the employees' failure to secure proper identification before effecting payment of a considerable sum to an unknown person, the Post Office Department does not object to enactment of this bill.

The bill received the unanimous consideration and approval of the committee.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 639) for the relief of Mark B. Craig and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## JOHN P. REILLY

The bill (H. R. 688) for the relief of John P. Reilly, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## ESTATE OF MRS. MINERVA C. DAVIS

The bill (H. R. 738) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the purpose of the proposed legislation is to appropriate the sum of \$1,654.30 to the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the amount of check No. 380977, which was made payable to Mrs. Minerva C. Davis, on account of pension due, but arrived at the post office after her death and was returned to the Treasury.

The facts are that Dr. Charles Davis, during his lifetime, was awarded pension under the various service acts, and at the time of his death, he was receiving \$50 per month under the act of May 12, 1920. A claim for increased pension was filed by the veteran on September 27, 1920, and was pending at the time of his death. This claim was completed by his wife, Mrs. Minerva C. Davis, and an award covering the period from April 4, 1920, through August 12, 1926, was approved. A check for \$1,654.30, the accrued amount due the veteran at his death, was mailed to the widow, but in view of the fact that she died before the check was issued, it was returned and canceled.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, can the Senator explain why action on the bill has been delayed for so many years? I notice from the report that 16 years have passed since the initial correspondence between the veteran and the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. McCARRAN. There is no record in the files of the Committee on the Judiciary which could be cited in answer to the Senator's query, if I correctly understood it. It is one of those cases in connection with which a delay took place in filing the claim. The claim now comes to us and has been acted upon by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Was the committee unanimous in its report?

Mr. McCARRAN. It was a unanimous report of the members who were present and constituted a quorum.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 738) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Minerva C. Davis, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## CITY OF EL PASO, TEX.

The bill (H. R. 967) for the relief of the city of El Paso, Tex., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## SAMUEL ENSLER AND LOUIS PUCCINELLI

The bill (H. R. 1037) for the relief of Samuel Ensler and Louis Puccinelli, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

## JOHN KEITH—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1057) for the relief of John Keith, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] one or two questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not the sponsor of the bill, Mr. President, but I reported the bill on behalf of the committee.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In this case we have an effort to reimburse a contractor in connection with a 1944 contract with the Federal Works Agency to construct a school in San Diego, Calif. The contractor apparently bid too low and suffered a loss, according to the report, of approximately \$19,500, and this particular proposed reimbursement is in the

amount of \$9,000. It is a little difficult for me to understand how the statement of the Comptroller General to the effect that the error was made by the contractor reconciles with the contractor's computation of his actual loss. I wonder if the Senator from Nevada can explain that.

Mr. McCARRAN. It appears from the report that an error occurred when Mr. Keith in submitting his bid for the contract stated that the sum of \$1,000, instead of \$10,000, was his bid for one item in the contract. There was the omission of a cipher. That one item of the contract was completed satisfactorily in spite of the loss of \$9,000. It is admitted by all who have had to do with this matter that there was a loss to the contractor of \$9,000, and that \$10,000 was a reasonable and proper bid, and that undoubtedly there had been a mistake, an error in making the bid.

The total of Mr. Keith's bid was \$22,000 less than the next lowest bidder, and considerably more than \$22,000 less than all other bidders. If this bill is enacted for the reimbursement of \$9,000 loss which he sustained his bid would still be \$13,000 less than the next lowest bidder. Mr. Keith has submitted a sworn affidavit that he sustained an actual loss as a result of this error.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. In view of the fact that this claim represents a case of a contractor who has received a Government contract by reason of a low bid, and who made a mistake, and now later asks Congress to reimburse him for his error, I ask that the bill go over until I may have an opportunity to study it further.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### JENNIE OLSEN ANDERSON

The bill (H. R. 1076) for the relief of Jennie Olsen Anderson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### E. LA REE SMOOT

The bill (H. R. 1471) for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. It appears that on November 13, 1943, a building at the Army air base, Madras, Oreg., in which Miss Smoot was employed by the War Department as a clerk-stenographer, caught on fire as the result of the explosion of a flame thrower. In effecting an escape from the burning building Miss Smoot sustained severe burns.

Dr. R. W. Christiansen makes statement dated November 5, 1947, that Miss Smoot was examined by him a few days ago and he found that she had very extensive scars on the regions of the face, body, arms, and hands. The body scars were covered by clothes but those on the forehead, arms, and hands were quite disfiguring. They also cause some disability.

The Bureau of Employees' Compensation recognized liability. However, it could not compensate her for permanent disfigurement. There is no provision in the Employees' Compensation Act to compensate an employee for disfigurement.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 1471) for the relief of E. La Ree Smoot was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LAWRENCE REVES

The bill (H. R. 3663) for the relief of Lawrence Reves was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CHARTERING OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS BY ACT OF CONGRESS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1290) to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I respectfully request that the able Senator from West Virginia give us an explanation of the bill.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, this bill rose out of several years' study in the Judiciary Committee, beginning about 1941. Congress is constantly besieged to pass special acts creating nonprofit corporations. Some of them are for good purposes, and some, we have frequently suspected, were not so good. There is no set of regulations in the Federal Government which would govern such nonprofit or alleged nonprofit organizations. As a result, back in 1943 the Judiciary Committee asked that legislation be drafted. A study was made, and this bill, with but two minor changes, was introduced and passed in the Senate in the Eightieth Congress. It went to the House and died in the House because it was not brought to the floor.

The bill would establish a set of regulations under which so-called nonprofit corporations chartered by the Federal Government would operate. It provides for audits of their accounts and for deposit of such audits with the Comptroller General so that they may be studied. If they are actually profit organizations, that fact can be ascertained.

The terms of the bill preclude the utilization of a congressional charter for feathering certain people's nests, or for promoting and obtaining contributions, and things of that kind, without a proper check-up. The bill would provide in the Federal Government what the States have done with respect to the State governments. In the States such corporations are placed under one agency.

The bill provides for an investigation by the Department of Justice of the incorporators and the purpose of the corporation, and a report to the Judiciary Committee upon the introduction of the bill.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I inquire of the able Senator from West Virginia whether or not, in the event the Attorney General of the United States should determine that the organization seeking incorporation

under Federal charter is a worth-while organization, and makes a favorable report to the Congress, that would automatically mean that the organization would be chartered.

Mr. KILGORE. No.

Mr. LUCAS. What follows after that?

Mr. KILGORE. Then the Congress must act upon the report of the Committee on the Judiciary, which handles such charters. If the Congress decides to go along with the recommendation of the Attorney General and that of the Judiciary Committee, a charter will be granted. If not, it will be refused. Even in the face of an adverse report, Congress might still decide to grant the charter. The report would not be binding upon the Congress. However, the Department of Justice would have the duty of investigating and reporting to the Congress.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Congress should be very jealous in granting Federal charters to any organizations, even nonprofit organizations, because once the granting of such charters is begun, there will be no end to the number of applications which will come to the Congress for Federal charters.

After the Attorney General's Office has made a thorough investigation, and a report is made to the committee which is studying the application, and the committee determines that the organization has complied with the regulations laid down by the Congress, I am wondering whether or not the combination of those two facts will be tantamount to the approval by the committee and the Congress of the granting of a charter.

Mr. KILGORE. No, Mr. President. I may say to the distinguished majority leader that that is not the intent and purpose of the proposed legislation. The intent and purpose is, first, to lay down a definite course of action, and to prescribe what the charter must contain and what the application must contain. Then the application is submitted to the department for investigation, to see if the purpose is worthy, and if the sponsors are worthy.

Following that, a report is made to the Congress, which is not in any way binding upon the Congress; nor should it be accepted by the Congress as a guide. This is merely an information-gathering service to enable us to pass upon the question.

I understand the point of the majority leader. We in the Judiciary Committee have been pestered to death. Witnesses have appeared before us who have said, "The reason we want this charter is that we can raise money faster if we have a Federal charter."

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that our subcommittee which handled the bill anticipated that it would have exactly the opposite effect from that which is feared by the distinguished majority leader. Everyone who discussed it with us thought it would have a deterrent effect on indiscriminate applications for Federal charters. One of

the purposes of favorable action by the Judiciary Committee is to discourage promiscuous application for such charters.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the distinguished majority leader that while the bill which passed the Senate in the Eightieth Congress was still pending there was a great decrease in the number of applications for Federal charters. Those which were received were in conformity with the provisions of the bill, but even some of those were turned down. Immediately after the Eightieth Congress we suddenly had a flood of applications for charters, none of which were in conformity with the rules laid down in the bill.

The idea is to provide some method by which the granting of Federal charters can be controlled, similar to the method employed in some States for the regulation of organizations which operate under State charters. Under the present arrangement, there is no check-up. We have no way of determining the worthiness of the organization or of its sponsors. Under the terms of this bill, such a method would be provided. Those who contribute to the organization would have a public agency to which they could go for information. There would be a guiding agency. We believe that this legislation would add an additional screen which would eliminate a certain element. We do not believe that it would remove all our difficulties, but it would remove some of the difficulties with which we have been faced.

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

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. If this bill were enacted into law, would not organizations which have made applications in the past and which do not possess the qualifications which the Senator has mentioned, in their enthusiasm to obtain a Federal charter, be able to qualify? If they qualified under these regulations and received the approval of the Attorney General, it seems to me that under those circumstances the Congress would have a very difficult time in vetoing the action of the committee and the Attorney General.

I regret that I must disagree with my friend from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR]. I am still fearful that as a result of this bill we might open the flood-gates for a great number of organizations to apply for Federal charters. They would be able to get the ear of the Congress and the Attorney General, and then would say, "We have complied with the law which you gentlemen have enacted. Here it is in black and white. We have complied with every regulation you have laid down, and the Attorney General of the United States has approved the organization. Consequently we feel that we are entitled to a Federal charter."

The Senator from West Virginia says that, of course, we could still deny a Federal charter. But I am thinking about the pressure which would be brought upon Members of Congress after the conditions had been complied with. I undertake to say that very few Members of Congress would be able to withstand the pressure of such organizations

after they had complied with the requirements.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I should like to say, in reply to the Senator from Illinois—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the Senator from Illinois objecting to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LUCAS. I have not objected yet. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. KILGORE. The committee does not ask, and the bill does not contemplate, a recommendation of any kind from the Department of Justice and the Attorney General. The bill merely directs that the committee shall submit the application to the FBI for a detailed report as to the proponents, the purpose, and other related matters, and that a report shall then be made.

The Congress still will be faced with the same duties it previously has had. But in the bill we provide that certain things which have not been done in the past must be done, and certain conditions met.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. O'CONOR. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the committee does not feel that the Congress will be relinquishing any of its rights or duties, as a result of the passage of this measure, but still will have as much responsibility as heretofore in respect to the determination of what corporations, if any, shall be chartered.

Under this measure nothing more would be done than under a routine bill calling for the Department of Justice to pass upon the matter involved.

After an investigation is conducted by the Department of Justice, which of course has available to it more adequate facilities than the committee has, as of today, we believe that much more information will be available to the committee members, to enable them to determine whether the organization concerned should be chartered.

In voting unanimously to report this measure, the committee did not have the slightest fear that its enactment would result in encroachment upon the rights or responsibilities of the committee or of the Congress, but, to the contrary, believed that it would aid the committee and the Congress in distinguishing between the various applications for charters which might be made.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say that after the bill passed the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, three organizations presented the very arguments to which the majority leader has referred. The applications of all three of those organizations were turned down by the committee, which refused to report the bills drawn up in their behalf. The committee took that position because there was some question as to the motives involved.

So the committee still examines the motives, and the responsibility will still rest upon the Congress in general and the Committee on the Judiciary in particular.

However, this measure will cause additional facilities to be provided, and will require an annual audit, which is vitally important, and cannot otherwise be pro-

vided. The bill also will establish a repository for such an audit.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I cannot agree with my distinguished friend as to the value of this type of legislation, if under it the responsibilities of the committee will in any way be decreased. The Senator has said that the responsibilities will remain the same, regardless of the fact that rules and regulations will be established and a report will be obtained from the Attorney General. Nevertheless, the Senator has said that he considers that the committee's responsibilities will remain the same as they would be if the proposed legislation were not passed.

Mr. KILGORE. Let me say to the distinguished majority leader that when the Senate created its legislative drafting service, that action did not excuse Members of the Senate for introducing bad legislation, but gave them a facility which was badly needed in connection with the drafting of legislation. Likewise, the Legislative Reference Service was a facility which was badly needed. Similarly, the executive assistants who have been provided for Senators have been badly needed; but their appointment did not decrease the responsibility of Senators. Of course, if we were to infer that all Members of the Senate would lie down on the job, that would be a different matter.

At the present time those who have not served as chairman of the subcommittee charged with the handling of this matter can scarcely appreciate the difficulties involved. The Senator from West Virginia was, unfortunately, for 4 years chairman of the subcommittee, and had a painful and bloody experience in finding out these things.

The bill now before us has been drafted in part for the purpose of permitting whoever is chairman of the subcommittee to obtain the information he will need in making a report to the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the Senator's time has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask what would happen to other organizations, under this measure, if enacted.

Section 3 provides that no corporation shall be organized if any part of its income is paid to any of its members. Let me point out, for instance, that the American Legion has some very good persons who serve as its officials.

Mr. KILGORE. But they are paid salaries as employees, not as members of the Legion.

Mr. ANDERSON. But the bill says that no member shall draw any part of the income of the organization, as paid by its members.

Mr. KILGORE. The national commander of the American Legion does not draw a salary.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, but Mr. Taylor does.

Mr. KILGORE. But other Legionnaires may be employed, and they are employees. We feel that that provision would not affect them. I should be glad to have the distinguished Senator from

New Mexico suggest a provision which would protect in that situation. But this measure contemplates that no one shall organize a nonprofit corporation or be a stockholder or member of a nonprofit corporation for his own personal benefit. However, if he becomes an employee of the organization, not an executive of it, he may be paid by the organization.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me refer to the situation relative to the Boy Scouts. I happen to be a member of the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. The person who administers that organization is a member of the Council. Under this measure, he would be prohibited from receiving pay.

Furthermore, this measure contains a provision that the officers of the corporation must be elected by democratic procedures. Many years ago I was elected president of an organization known as the Rotary International. At that time the election was conducted by democratic methods. However, at the present time that organization uses a system which I do not regard as being democratic by a handful of men who serve on its board. Under the provisions of the measure we are now considering, that organization might be prevented from obtaining a charter.

Frankly, I am afraid of the situation in that respect.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am sure the Senator from New Mexico understands that this measure would apply only to future applicants.

Mr. ANDERSON. I understand that; but I realize that if this measure had been in effect in the past, the American Legion could not have obtained a charter.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

#### BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 3181) to provide for more effective conservation in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. THYE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] reported the bill. He does not seem to be present at this moment.

Mr. THYE. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

#### INTERSTATE COMPACT FOR DIVISION OF WATERS OF THE YELLOWSTONE RIVER

The bill (H. R. 2566) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Montana, North Dakota, and Wyoming to negotiate and enter into a compact or agreement for division of the waters of the Yellowstone River was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ADDITION OF LAND TO ABRAHAM LINCOLN NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK, KY.

The bill (H. R. 3259) to add to the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park, Ky., certain land acquired by the United States for that purpose was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### CARL PIOWATY AND W. J. PIOWATY—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 478) for the relief of Carl Piowaty and W. J. Piowaty was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the two Piowatys, Carl and W. J., are farmers residing in Orange County, Fla. They were 2 of 50 farmers who planted certain crops for war purposes in the year 1943, and for that purpose they received certain advances from the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation.

It is my understanding that due to climatic and weather conditions, the crops of the whole group failed; but when it came to obtaining releases from the necessity of repaying the loans—repayment being required under the contract, unless the local war board certified that the losses sustained were not chargeable to poor agricultural husbandry—the other 48 growers obtained acquittals from the war-board members of that county, but these 2 men did not. The members of the local war board refused to certify that these two men had used proper agricultural practices.

The matter went to trial in the Florida courts. It appeared that the members of the local war board had not actually seen the property or visited it, but made their findings upon the report of the field agent of the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation. Judgment went against these two men—the Piowatys—and was appealed to the Supreme Court of Florida, which divided 4 to 3—4 for sustaining the judgment of the lower court on the ground that these two men had not been shown to have used proper agricultural practices, and 3 for reversal on the ground that the Piowatys had used proper practices.

The claim was brought to the Congress last year.

Now, for the first time, this matter comes to the floor of the Senate.

It was the feeling of the Senators from Florida that these two men, being the only ones out of the 50 for whom cancellation of their remaining indebtedness was not permitted, and the question having been found to be as close as it was by the Supreme Court of Florida, the loan should be canceled, which would mean the cancellation of the judgment based upon the suit as upheld by the supreme court by the 4-to-3 decision I have just mentioned. That was also the finding of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the county war board refused the claim, and it has also been denied by two courts, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

#### DISPOSITION OF FARM CAMPS

The bill (H. R. 2906) to provide a 1 year's extension of time for the disposition of farm labor camps to public or semipublic agencies or nonprofit associations of farmers, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida one or two questions, if he will yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I wonder why the Secretary of Agriculture has failed to sell these farm labor camps as he was directed to do by Congress some 2 years ago. Why that lapse of time, when the properties could have been sold on a high market?

Mr. HOLLAND. I may say to the distinguished Senator that a great many of the camps have been disposed of, but there are still undisposed of, as shown by the report, a certain number of the camps. The difficulty has been to sell them to cooperative associations or others who will maintain the camps for the original purpose; that is, for the housing of migratory agricultural laborers. It is the feeling of the Secretary of Agriculture, as reported to our committee, that an additional year's time may enable him to make such disposal of the remaining camps. Failure to pass the pending bill would simply mean that he is under mandatory direction from the Congress to dispose of them, however he may, between now and June 30, which did not appeal to the committee as being a reasonable disposition to make of the matter.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, how many of the labor camps were there originally?

Mr. HOLLAND. I have the number in the report, if the Senator will bear with me a moment.

Mr. MORSE. There were 53.

Mr. HOLLAND. There were 53 originally, of which 14 have been disposed of, 39 are not disposed of. I can speak with assurance only of those which are undisposed of in the State of Florida. They are being operated by associations not for profit, which are using them for the original purpose, but which have not been willing to buy the camps at the prices fixed by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. President, answering further, I should say candidly to the Senator that I understand the Department of Agriculture is endeavoring and proposing to work out an arrangement under which

the camps can be transferred to a housing agency for more permanent operation in accordance with the original purpose. This year's extension however will allow one of two things—either the disposal of the camps, under the purpose of the original bill, or if the Congress so decides, meantime, the turning over of these remaining camps to such objective as the Congress proposes, in connection with a permanent housing program for agricultural labor.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection—

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to ask a further question. I notice in the report that in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture he says:

It has been suggested that the remaining farm-labor camps should be dealt with as a part of the low-rent housing of the Nation-wide housing program.

In view of the fact that that law has not been enacted by both Houses of Congress, I wonder whether he is not a little premature in suggesting this as a part of that program.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry I was unable to hear the Senator's question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was just reading that portion of the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture in which he outlines his plan to use these labor camps as a part of the national housing program, and, in view of the fact that that law itself has not yet been passed by Congress, I was wondering whether he was not ahead of himself a little.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I thought I made it clear that this was simply a hope and expectation and recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture. The extension of the existing bill for 1 year would leave two alternatives; one, the continuing effort to dispose of the camps, or any of them, under the provisions of the existing law; the other, giving opportunity to Congress—not to anybody else—to carry out these recommendations with reference to the transfer to a housing organization, not yet formed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida accept an amendment limiting this to 6 months instead of a year?

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator should insist upon it, of course, I would. But I think the Senator would cut down the opportunity to work out this whole program, because if Congress is to be in adjournment by some time in July, I think it will not allow the requisite time to work out this matter. It was my feeling that the 1 year was the smallest amount of time which would allow a reasonable working out—a working out in two directions, either the sale, the disposition, which has to be one by one, of course, to organized groups of farmers, in the particular localities, of the remaining 39, or the change in policy, which can be effectuated only by the Congress.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. It is true, is it not, that we have already had one extension, because we found it necessary to have an extension not only for the purpose of giving the Department more time to sell the property, but, last year, we had to make use of some of this property in connection with the itinerant-worker problem. I want to say to my good friend, I know the situation on the west coast, and in that area we have been making use of this property to house itinerant workers whom the Congress, in a law which was enacted, authorized us to import, from Florida, for example, to help in the sugarbeet fields and in some of our orchards. I know that at the present time, as the Senator from Florida has pointed out, effort is being made to dispose of these facilities to farm groups, so that they will be available, in the communities in which they are located, for occupancy by transient and itinerant workers. We all know that there is a great need for decent housing for such workers. I may say to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that I think to prescribe a 6 months' limitation in the bill, in view of what is transpiring in that locality at the present time, would allow too short a time for the equitable disposal of these projects.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In view of that explanation, I withdraw the objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2906) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

The bill (S. 1659) granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate forest fire protection compact, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the consent and approval of Congress is hereby given to an interstate forest fire protection compact, as hereinafter set out; but before any province of the Dominion of Canada shall be made a party to such compact, the further consent of Congress shall first be obtained. Such compact reads as follows:

#### NORTHEASTERN INTERSTATE FOREST FIRE PROTECTION COMPACT

##### ARTICLE I

The purpose of this compact is to promote effective prevention and control of forest fires in the northeastern region of the United States and adjacent areas in Canada by the development of integrated forest fire plans, by the maintenance of adequate forest fire fighting services by the member States, by providing for mutual aid in fighting forest fires among the States of the region and for procedures that will facilitate such aid, and by the establishment of a central agency to coordinate the services of member States and perform such common services as member States may deem desirable.

##### ARTICLE II

This agreement shall become operative immediately as to those States ratifying it when-

ever any two or more of the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have ratified it and the Congress has given its consent. Any State not mentioned in this article which is contiguous with any member State may become a party to this compact. Subject to the consent of the Congress of the United States, any Province of the Dominion of Canada which is contiguous with any member State may become a party to this compact by taking such action as its laws and the laws of the Dominion of Canada may prescribe for ratification. In this event, the term "State" in this compact shall include within its meaning the term "province" and the procedures prescribed shall be applied in the instance of such provinces, in accordance with the forms and practices of the Canadian Government.

##### ARTICLE III

Each State joining herein shall appoint three representatives to a Commission hereby designated as the Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Commission. One shall be the State Forester or officer holding an equivalent position in such State who is responsible for forest-fire control. The second shall be a member of the legislature of such State designated by the Commission or committee on interstate cooperation of such State, or if there be none, or if said Commission on interstate cooperation cannot constitutionally designate the said member, such legislator shall be designated by the governor thereof: Provided, That if it is constitutionally impossible to appoint a legislator as a commissioner from such State, the second member shall be appointed by the governor of said State in his discretion. The third member shall be a person designated by the governor as the responsible representative of the governor. In the event that any province of the Dominion of Canada shall become a member of this Commission, it shall designate three members who will approximate this pattern of representation to the extent possible under the law and practices of such province. This Commission shall be a body corporate with the powers and duties set forth herein.

##### ARTICLE IV

It shall be the duty of the Commission to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about the prevention and control of forest fires in the area comprising the member States, to coordinate the forest-fire plans and the work of the appropriate agencies of the member States and to facilitate the rendering of aid by the member States to each other in fighting forest fires.

The Commission shall formulate and, in accordance with need, from time to time, revise a regional forest-fire plan for the entire region covered by the compact which shall serve as a common forest-fire plan for that area.

The Commission shall, more than one month prior to any regular meeting of the legislature in any signatory State, present to the governor and to the legislature of the State its recommendations relating to enactments to be made by the legislature of that State in furthering the interests and purposes of this compact.

The Commission shall consult with and advise the appropriate administrative agencies of the States party hereto with regard to problems connected with the prevention and control of forest fires and recommend the adoption of such regulations as it deems advisable.

The Commission shall have power to recommend to the signatory States any and all measures that will effectuate the prevention and control of forest fires.

## ARTICLE V

Any two or more member States may designate the Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Commission as a joint agency to maintain such common services as those States deem desirable for the prevention and control of forest fires. Except in those cases where all member States join in such designation for common services, the representatives of any group of such designating States in the Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Commission shall constitute a separate section of such Commission for the performance of the common service or services so designated provided that, if any additional expense is involved, the States so acting shall appropriate the necessary funds for this purpose. The creation of such a section as a joint agency shall not affect the privileges, powers, responsibilities or duties of the States participating therein as embodied in the other articles of this compact.

## ARTICLE VI

The Commission may request the United States Forest Service to act as the primary research and coordinating agency of the Northeastern Forest Fire Protection Commission, in cooperation with the appropriate agencies in each State and the United States Forest Service may accept the initial responsibility in preparing and presenting to the Commission its recommendations with respect to the regional fire plan. Representatives of the United States Forest Service may attend meetings of the Commission and of groups of member States.

## ARTICLE VII

The Commission shall annually elect from its members a chairman and a vice chairman. The Commission shall appoint such officers or employees as may be required to carry the provisions of this compact into effect, shall fix and determine their duties, qualifications and compensation, and may at its pleasure, remove or discharge any such officer or employee. The Commission shall adopt rules and regulations for the conduct of its business. It may establish and maintain one or more offices for the transaction of its business and may meet at any time or place but must meet at least once a year.

A majority of the members of the Commission representing a majority of the signatory States shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of its general business, but no action of the Commission imposing any obligation on any signatory State shall be binding unless a majority of the members from such signatory State shall have voted in favor thereof. For the purpose of conducting its general business, voting shall be by State units.

The representatives of any two or more member States, upon notice to the chairman as to the time and purpose of the meeting, may meet as a section for the discussion of problems common to those States.

Sections established by groups of member States shall have the same powers with respect to officers, employees, and the maintenance of offices as are granted by this article to the Commission. Sections may adopt such rules, regulations, and procedures as may be necessary for the conduct of their business.

## ARTICLE VIII

It shall be the duty of each member State to formulate and put in effect a forest-fire plan for that State and to take such measures as may be recommended by the Commission to integrate such forest-fire plan with the regional forest-fire plan.

Whenever the State forest-fire control agency of a member State requests aid from the State forest-fire control agency of any other member State in combatting, controlling, or preventing forest fires, it shall be the duty of the State forest-fire control agency of that State to render all possible aid to the

requesting agency which is consonant with the maintenance of protection at home.

Each signatory State agrees to render aid to the Forest Service or other agencies of the Government of the United States in combatting, controlling, or preventing forest fires in areas under their jurisdiction located within the member State or a contiguous member State.

## ARTICLE IX

Whenever the forces of any member State are rendering outside aid pursuant to the request of another member State under this compact, the employees of such State shall, under the direction of the officers of the State to which they are rendering aid, have the same powers (except the power of arrest), duties, rights, privileges, and immunities as comparable employees of the State to which they are rendering aid.

No member State or its officers or employees rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be liable on account of any act or omission on the part of such forces while so engaged, or on account of the maintenance or use of any equipment or supplies in connection therewith.

All liability that may arise either under the laws of the requesting State or under the laws of the aiding State or under the laws of a third State on account of or in connection with a request for aid, shall be assumed and borne by the requesting State.

Any member State rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact shall be reimbursed by the member State receiving such aid for any loss or damage to, or expense incurred in the operation of any equipment answering a request for aid, and for the cost of all materials, transportation, wages, salaries, and maintenance of employees and equipment incurred in connection with such request: Provided, That nothing herein contained shall prevent any assisting member State from assuming such loss, damage, expense, or other cost or from loaning such equipment or from donating such services to the receiving member State without charge or cost.

Each member State shall provide for the payment of compensation and death benefits to injured employees and the representatives of deceased employees in case employees sustain injuries or are killed while rendering outside aid pursuant to this compact, in the same manner and on the same terms as if the injury or death were sustained within such State.

For the purposes of this compact the term "employee" shall include any volunteer or auxiliary legally included within the forest-fire-fighting forces of the aiding State under the laws thereof.

The Commission shall formulate procedures for claims and reimbursement under the provisions of this article.

Aid by a member State to an area subject to Federal jurisdiction beyond the borders of such State shall not be required under this compact unless substantially the same provisions of this article relative to powers, liabilities, losses, and expenses in connection with such aid are embodied in Federal laws.

## ARTICLE X

When appropriations for the support of this Commission or for the support of common services maintained by the Commission or a section thereof under the provisions of article V are necessary, the Commission or section thereof shall allocate the costs among the States affected with consideration of the amounts of forested land in those States that will receive protection from the service to be rendered and the extent of the forest-fire problem involved in each State, and shall submit its recommendations accordingly to the legislatures of the affected States.

The Commission shall submit to the governor of each State, at such time as he

may request, a budget of its estimated expenditures for such period as may be required by the laws of such State for presentation to the legislature thereof.

The Commission shall keep accurate books of account, showing in full its receipts and disbursements, and said books of account shall be open at any reasonable time to the inspection of such representatives of the respective signatory States as may be duly constituted for that purpose.

On or before the first day of December of each year, the Commission shall submit to the respective governors of the signatory States a full and complete report of its activities for the preceding year.

## ARTICLE XI

The representatives from any member State may appoint and consult with an advisory committee composed of persons interested in forest-fire protection.

The Commission may appoint and consult with an advisory committee of representatives of all affected groups, private and governmental.

## ARTICLE XII

The Commission may accept any and all donations, gifts and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from the Federal or any local government, or any agency thereof and from any person, firm, or corporation, for any of its purposes and functions under this compact, and may receive and utilize the same, subject to the terms, conditions, and regulations governing such donations, gifts, and grants.

## ARTICLE XIII

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to authorize or permit any member State to curtail or diminish its forest-fire-fighting forces, equipment, services, or facilities, and it shall be the duty and responsibility of each member State to maintain adequate forest-fire-fighting forces and equipment to meet normal demands for forest-fire protection within its borders.

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to limit or restrict the powers of any State ratifying the same to provide for the prevention, control, and extinguishment of forest fires, or to prohibit the enactment or enforcement of State laws, rules, or regulations intended to aid in such prevention, control, and extinguishment in such State.

Nothing in this compact shall be construed to affect any existing or future cooperative relationship or arrangement between the United States Forest Service and a member State or States.

## ARTICLE XIV

This compact shall continue in force and remain binding on each State ratifying it until the legislature or governor of such State takes action to withdraw therefrom. Such action shall not be effective until 6 months after notice thereof has been sent by the chief executive of the State desiring to withdraw to the chief executives of all States then parties to the compact.

Sec. 2. Without further submission of the compact, the consent of Congress is given to any State to become a party to it in accordance with its terms.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

## CARSON NATIONAL FOREST, N. MEX.

The bill (H. R. 55) to include certain lands in the Carson National Forest, N. Mex., and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LUCAS. Was Calendar 385, H. R. 4151, called?

The VICE PRESIDENT. House bill 4151 was passed when we reached a similar Senate bill, Calendar 353, S. 1448.

**SALE OF LAND AT SOUTH NAKNEK, ALASKA, FOR CEMETERY PURPOSES**

The bill (H. R. 2812) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land at South Naknek to the Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church of North America, was announced as next in order.

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

Mr. MORSE. May we have an explanation of the bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon requests an explanation of the bill. The Senator from Wyoming reported the bill. He does not seem to be present.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not find the bill at the moment, but I am familiar with it, and I am sure it is a bill to which the Senator would not object, if he had an explanation of it.

Mr. MORSE. I have the bill in front of me, I may say to my good friend from New Mexico, but I do not see anything about the price. It says "that upon the filing of an application and the payment of \$10 within 1 year from the date of this act."

How much does the applicant in fact get for the \$10?

Mr. BUTLER. He gets sixty-one one-hundredths of an acre.

Mr. MORSE. It provides "that upon the filing of his application and the payment of \$10 within 1 year from the date."

How much land is involved in connection with the payment of \$10?

Mr. BUTLER. It is sixty-one one-hundredths of an acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the practice in Alaska makes the acquisition of title to real estate extremely difficult, as the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] knows better, I am sure, than does any other Senator on the floor. The bill was drawn to direct the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land there. It was thought proper to provide a complete title, and it was felt there would never be occasion for reversion of this particular piece of land to the Government.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I understand from my good friend from Nebraska that this fraction of an acre of land will be used for cemetery purposes, and I have no objection.

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

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 2812) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**BILL PASSED OVER**

The bill (H. R. 2931) to provide for the conveyance by the United States to Frank C. Wilson of certain lands formerly owned by him was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming not being pres-

ent, all the information I can give is what is contained in the report, which amounts to this, that Mr. Wilson donated to the Government of the United States a certain tract of land, the same tract which it is now proposed that the Government give back to Mr. Wilson. The donation was for the purpose of a wild fowl refuge, but the plan was not successful, and the Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of the Interior are anxious to get the land off their hands and return it to Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Does the Senator from Nebraska know how much money has been expended on it?

Mr. BUTLER. Very little money has been expended. I think that is one reason that Mr. Wilson is willing to take the land back.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

**TIMBER OPERATIONS ON MENOMINEE INDIAN RESERVATION, WIS.**

The bill (H. R. 3396) to amend the law relating to timber operations on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Wisconsin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

**SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS TO ALASKA COUNCIL OF BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1337) to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America for recreation and other public purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment on page 2, after line 14, to insert a new section 3, as follows:

Sec. 3. That such conveyance shall contain the further provision that if the Alaska Council of Boy Scouts of America shall at any time cease to use the property so conveyed for recreation and other public purposes title thereto shall revert to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

**CLARIFICATION OF OVERTIME COMPENSATION PROVISIONS OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 858) to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, as applied in longshore, stevedoring, building, and construction industries, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "employee", to strike out "employed in the longshore, stevedoring, building, and construction industries"; and on page 2, after line 19, to insert a new section, as follows:

Sec. 2. No employer shall be subject to any liability or punishment under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (in any action or proceeding commenced prior to or on or after the date of the enactment of this act), on account of the failure of said employer to pay an employee compensation for

any period of overtime work performed prior to the date of enactment of this act, if the compensation paid prior to such date for such work was at least equal to the compensation which would have been payable for such work had the amendment made by section 1 of this act been in effect at the time of such payment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill is not in my book. I have no personal objection to it, but I believe it should be explained or that we should have a copy of it.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this bill passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 230 to 7. It is for the purpose of clarifying the Fair Labor Standards Act. Is the Senator familiar with that act?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know what the bill is now, and I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to clarify the overtime compensation provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended."

**LIQUIDATION OF TRUSTS UNDER TRANSFER AGREEMENTS**

The bill (S. 930) to provide for the liquidation of trusts under the transfer agreements with State rehabilitation corporations, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill provides for transferring back to the States approximately \$50,000,000 worth of assets, representing money originally granted for rehabilitation purposes in 1934, 1935, and 1936. The funds were granted to the States.

Transfer agreements were entered into between the individual State rural rehabilitation corporations and the administrator of the Resettlement Administration.

The Senator from North Dakota is extremely interested in this bill. He came to the Department some time ago and tried to get a transfer to the States. Some officials feel that the assets should remain in the Federal Government and be given to the Farm Credit Administration. The States believe the money should go back to them and be used for rural rehabilitation within those States. The Senator from North Dakota was very persuasive when he came to see me in another capacity. I tried at that time to get a bill reported, but it did not then seem possible. Since then we have tried to bring the matter to a head and make it possible for the funds to get out of the situation in which they are at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the feeling of the Department?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is against this bill. It feels that the funds should be retransferred to the Farm Credit Administration, but it is the feeling of the Senator from North Dakota and it is

my feeling, and I think, the feeling of some other persons, that the funds should be transferred back to the States to whom they were originally granted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do I understand that the Senator is in favor of the bill?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

There being no objection.

The bill (S. 930) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That this act may be cited as the "Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act."

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is hereby authorized and directed to take such action as may be appropriate and necessary to liquidate, as expeditiously as possible but within 5 years from the effective date of this act, trusts under the transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations, and is hereby authorized and directed to negotiate with responsible officials to that end.

(b) The Secretary, insofar as is necessary to protect the interests of the United States, and the corporations shall proceed forthwith to the conversion to cash of investments constituting the trust assets by sale of real and personal properties, and by collection of loans and accounts receivable according to the tenor of such obligations.

(c) An application for the return of such properties shall be made to the Secretary by the State rural rehabilitation corporation pursuant to appropriate resolution of its board of directors. The application shall contain a covenant, binding upon the corporation when accepted by the Secretary on behalf of the United States, that the corporation will abide by the determinations and apportionments of the Secretary provided for in this act and the payments made by the Secretary pursuant to this act, that the returned assets and the income therefrom will be used only for such of the rural rehabilitation purposes permissible under the corporation's charter as may from time to time be agreed upon by the corporation and the Secretary; and that not to exceed 3 percent of the book value of the corporation's assets will be expended by the corporation for administrative purposes during any year, without the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. If the rural rehabilitation corporation of any State has been dissolved and is not revived or reincorporated or, for any other reason, is unable to make such application or to accept and administer such properties, the application and subsequent agreements may be made by such other agency or official of that State as may be designated by the State legislature. The Secretary may transfer the trust funds or properties of such corporation to such successor agency or official if adequate provisions are made by the State legislature for holding the United States and the Secretary free from liability by virtue of the transfer to such successor agency or official.

(d) Except as hereinafter provided, upon receipt of appropriate application meeting the requirements of this act, the Secretary shall do all things necessary to return to each such applicant all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to all cash, real and personal property, or the proceeds thereof, held on the date of the approval of this act by the Secretary as trustee for the account of such State corporation, except that the Secretary may deduct from the funds of each such State corporation the expenses incident to com-

pletion of such transfer: *Provided*, That such transfer shall, insofar as possible, be accomplished in a manner consistent with the provisions of the trust agreement with each State rural rehabilitation corporation.

(e) In the event no application is made, as provided for in this act within 5 years from the effective date hereof or disclaimer or release of interest under the trust transfer agreement by any State through its legislature, the Secretary shall cause all proceeds from assets held under or for the account of the transfer agreement with that State to be covered into miscellaneous receipts in the United States Treasury.

Sec. 3. The provisions of this act shall apply also to all properties and assets of State rural rehabilitation corporations held by Federal agencies other than the Department of Agriculture under the provisions of Executive Order No. 9070, or otherwise. For the purposes of this act the assets of other corporations, derived through the use of Federal Emergency Relief Administration funds, and made available to them through State rural rehabilitation corporations or otherwise acquired by them for rural rehabilitation purposes, shall be considered as a part of the trust property of the State rural rehabilitation corporations in their respective States.

Sec. 4. For the purposes of this act, the Secretary shall have the power to—

(a) employ on a contract basis (without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, but the contract shall in each case specify what civil-service and related laws, if any, shall be applicable to the employment after it has been made) such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel as he may deem necessary, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, to aid in the liquidation and transfer of the properties and assets pursuant to this act, and in the entering into of agreements with the corporations, or other agencies or officials, designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, regarding the rural rehabilitation purposes for which the property and assets shall thereafter be used by them, and in determining that such agreed purposes are being carried out. The fees, salaries, and expenses of such appraisers, accountants, attorneys, and other personnel shall be equitably apportioned by the Secretary among the respective corporations and the amount so determined to be applicable to each such corporation shall be paid by the Secretary from the trust fund of such corporation until the trust is liquidated, and thereafter by the corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof. Attorneys so employed, and their fees and expenses, shall be subject to the approval and under the supervision of the Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture;

(b) accept and utilize voluntary and uncompensated services, and, with the consent of the agency concerned, utilize the officers, employees, equipment, and information of any agency of the Federal Government, or of any State, Territory, or political subdivision;

(c) make such rules and regulations and such delegations of authority as he deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

Sec. 5. None of the properties or assets held on the date of the approval of this act by the Secretary as trustee pursuant to trust agreements with the various State rural rehabilitation corporations may be used by the Secretary for any purpose after the effective date of this act, except for the purposes authorized under section 2 (d) of this act, and for loans made prior to July 1, 1949, and to be repaid in full no later than May 1, 1952, but otherwise consistent with the provisions of title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. A.

1007), where necessary to supplement credit already extended to borrowers from corporation trust funds.

Sec. 6. (a) The determination of the Secretary with respect to the assets to be returned to each State rural rehabilitation corporation or other agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof including, but not limited to interests in properties held jointly for such corporation and the United States, the partition of real property, the expenses incident to each transfer, the liabilities applicable to such properties, and all other phases of the transfer shall be final and conclusive upon each State rural rehabilitation corporation or such successor agency or official designated pursuant to section 2 (c) hereof, and upon all officers and agencies of the United States.

(b) The Secretary shall be saved harmless against any personal liability he may incur in carrying out the provisions of this act.

Sec. 7. Section 2 (f) of the act of August 14, 1946 (60 Stat. 1062), is hereby repealed.

#### EXTENSION OF TIME FOR COMPLETION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 1754) extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949, was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, inasmuch as certain phases of this bill are under consideration, may I ask that it go to the foot of the calendar?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

#### AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1944

The bill (S. 1760) to amend section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734; 7 U. S. C. 429), was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 101 (b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 734; 7 U. S. C. 429) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cooperate with State authorities and with the authorities of the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico in the administration of regulations for the improvement of poultry, poultry products, and hatcheries."

#### AMENDMENT TO DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ORGANIC ACT OF 1944

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1749) to amend section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to combat blackfly, white-fringed beetle, and the Hall scale, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment on page 1, line 8, after the word "beetle", to insert "wheat-stem sawfly," so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (act of September 21, 1944, 58 Stat. 735; 7 U. S. C. 147a (a)) be amended by deleting the word "and" immediately following the word "borer"; by adding a comma and the words "citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, wheat-stem sawfly, and Hall scale"

between the word "weevil" and the immediately following colon; and by adding the words "citrus blackfly," immediately following the comma after the word "fruitflies" in the proviso.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out operations to combat the citrus blackfly, white-fringed beetle, wheat-stem sawfly, and the Hall scale."

**TEMPORARY DEFERMENT OF ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS—BILL PASSED OVER**

The bill (H. R. 3754) providing for the temporary deferment in certain unavoidable contingencies of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go to the foot of the calendar.

**BILL PASSED OVER**

The bill (S. 1464) to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask that this bill go over until the next call of the calendar. I do not know that I shall object to it at the next call.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

**MODIFICATION OF FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT ON THE HEART RIVER, MANDAN, N. DAK.**

The bill (S. 1324) to provide for the modification of the Corps of Engineers flood-control project on the Heart River at Mandan, N. Dak., was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if we may have a statement of cost in connection with this contemplated modification.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, it would relieve the city of Mandan of a cost of approximately \$76,000. The original requirement was much higher than is the case in the usual flood-control project. The Army engineers testified before the Appropriations Committee that over the years this little town of 7,000 persons had suffered damages totaling more than \$5,000,000. The average loss and damage since 1943 amounted to \$175,000 a year. For the past 3 years and for several years previously the east-west Federal highway has been under water in the town of Mandan for approximately a period of from 10 to 12 days or longer when there has been a flood. There has been water on the main floor of the post office during most of the floods. The city of Mandan is not able to meet the costs. Its levies are limited and its bonds are limited.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1324) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the project for flood protection at Mandan, N. D., on the Heart River, authorized substantially in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in House Document No. 294, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, by the Flood Control Act of 1946 (60 Stat. 641), is hereby modified to provide that the United States shall construct the necessary works and alterations to provide for interior drainage.

Sec. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

**MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGES, IOWA AND ILLINOIS**

The bill (S. 1577) to revive and re-enact, as amended, the act entitled "An act creating the City of Clinton Bridge Commission and authorizing said commission and its successors to acquire by purchase or condemnation and to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa, and at or near Fulton, Ill., approved December 21, 1944, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the act approved December 21, 1944, authorizing the City of Clinton Bridge Commission to acquire, construct, maintain, and operate a bridge or bridges, including approaches thereto, across the Mississippi River at or near the cities of Clinton, Iowa, and Fulton, Ill., be, and the same is hereby revived and re-enacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void insofar as it authorizes the construction of a bridge or bridges unless the actual construction thereof be commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of approval hereof: *And provided further*, That section 5 of said act, approved December 21, 1944, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 5. The commission and its successors and assigns are hereby authorized to provide for the payment of the cost of such bridge, or bridges as may be acquired, reconstructed, or constructed, as herein provided, and approaches (including the approach highways, which, in the judgment of the commission, it is necessary or advisable to construct or cause to be constructed to provide suitable and adequate connection with existing improved highways) and the necessary land easements and appurtenances thereto, by an issue or issues of negotiable serial bonds of the commission, bearing interest, payable semiannually, at the rate of not more than 6 percent per annum, the principal and interest of which bonds shall be payable solely from the funds provided in accordance with this act, and such payments may be further secured by mortgage of the bridge or bridges. All such bonds may be registered as to principal alone or both principal and interest, shall be payable as to principal within not to exceed 25 years from the date thereof, shall be in such denominations, shall be executed in such manner, and shall be payable in such medium and at such place or places as the commission may determine, and the face amount thereof shall be so calculated as to produce, at the price of their sale, the cost of the bridge or bridges, ac-

quired or constructed, and approaches and the land easements, and appurtenances used in connection therewith, when added to any other funds made available to the commission for the use of said purposes. The commission may reserve the right to redeem any or all of said bonds before maturity in such manner and at such price or prices not exceeding 105 and accrued interest as may be fixed by the commission prior to the issuance of the bonds. The commission when it deems it advisable may issue refunding bonds to refund any outstanding bonds at maturity or before maturity when called for redemption: *Provided*, That such refunding bonds shall mature within not to exceed 20 years from the date thereof and shall not exceed in principal amount the principal amount of outstanding bonds replaced by such refunding bonds. The commission may enter into an agreement with any bank or trust company in the United States as trustee having the power to make such agreement, setting forth the duties of the commission in respect to the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, repair, and insurance of the bridge or bridges, the conservation and application of all funds, the security for the payment of the bonds, the safeguarding of money on hand or on deposit, and the rights and remedies of said trustee and the holders of the bonds, restricting the individual right of action of the bondholders as is customary in trust agreements respecting bonds of corporations. Such trust agreement may contain such provisions for protecting and enforcing the rights and remedies of the trustee and the bondholders as may be reasonable and proper and not inconsistent with the law.

"Said bonds may be sold at not less than par after public advertisement for bids to be opened publicly at the time and place stated in such advertisement and at the price bid which will yield the greatest return to the commission for the bonds to be sold. Such advertisement for bids shall be published at least once each week for four consecutive weeks in a newspaper or financial journal having recognized circulation among bidders for bonds of the type and character offered. The price to be paid for the bridge or bridges acquired hereunder shall not exceed the reasonable value thereof as determined by the commission at the time of acquisition. The cost of the bridge to be constructed as provided herein, together with the approaches and approach highways, shall be deemed to include interest during construction of the bridge and for 12 months thereafter, and all engineering, legal, financing, architectural, traffic-surveying, condemnation, and other expenses incident to the bridge and the acquisition of the necessary property, including the cost of acquiring existing franchises and riparian rights relating to the bridge. If the proceeds of the bonds shall exceed the cost as finally determined the excess shall be placed in the fund hereafter provided to pay the principal and interest of such bonds. Prior to the preparation of definitive bonds the commission may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or may, under like restrictions, issue temporary bonds or interim certificates without coupons, of any denomination whatsoever, exchangeable for definitive bonds when such bonds that have been executed are available for delivery."

Sec. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Three bills went to the foot of the calendar, and the clerk will report the first of the bills.

**PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF INCOMPETENT VETERANS**

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 266) removing a limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or

retirement pay payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That the second proviso of subsection (B) of the first section of the act entitled "An act relating to veterans' pension, compensation, or retirement pay during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care, and for other purposes," approved August 8, 1946 (60 Stat. 908), is amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That in any case where the estate of such incompetent veteran derived from any source equals or exceeds \$1,500, further payments of such benefits shall not be made until the estate is reduced to \$500, but the amount which would be payable but for this proviso shall be paid to the veteran as provided for the lump sum in the preceding proviso but in the event of the veterans' death no part thereof shall be payable."

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I was not on the floor when this bill was reached on the calendar, and that is why it was put at the foot of the calendar. I shall be glad to give a brief explanation of the bill.

The purpose of the bill is to correct an inequity in the present law relating to payment of compensation to veterans who are mental cases.

Under present law, a veteran who is mentally incompetent and has no dependents does not receive his pension, compensation, or retirement pay while he is hospitalized or cared for by the Veterans' Administration. The same is true for a veteran who is mentally competent but is hospitalized for some physical reason. However, in the case of a veteran suffering physical disability, who is mentally competent, the amounts of pension or compensation withheld during hospitalization are paid to him in a lump sum as soon as he is discharged from the Veterans' Hospital. Under present law, however, the mentally incompetent veteran does not receive the same reimbursement, and if he is discharged as cured, receives nothing at all on account of the pension or compensation withheld during his period of hospitalization.

In some cases, hospitalized veterans who are mentally incompetent have been required to pay certain necessary expenses during the hospitalization period out of their own small savings which may have been acquired prior to their entry into the hospital. In such a case, a veteran who is cured of mental illness may find on his discharge from the hospital that everything he has saved has been absorbed by his personal expenses during his period of hospitalization. None of his withheld compensation would be repaid to him, and he would be forced to make an entirely new start, and without funds.

This bill will correct such a situation, but it is surrounded by safeguards to make sure that the Government is protected against any abuse. Such withheld pension or compensation would be repaid to such a veteran only in the case where the veteran is discharged as mentally competent. No payment would be

made in those cases where the veteran dies while still under care. This provision is to prevent sizable estates being built up during a prolonged period of care which would finally go to remote relatives of such a veteran upon his death. Furthermore, the reimbursement would not be paid until the expiration of 6 months following the finding of competency. This waiting period is considered necessary in order to make sure that the discharged veteran is competent, and that no mistake has been made in granting his discharge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill modifying a limitation affecting the pension, compensation, or retirement payment payable on account of an incompetent veteran without dependents during hospitalization, institutional or domiciliary care."

#### BILLS PASSED OVER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the second bill passed over, which was Calendar No. 393, House bill 1754.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1754) extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I am requested by another Member of the Senate to ask that this bill go over. I understand there is a time element involved which may require its being voted on soon, but for the time being I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. The clerk will state the next bill which went to the foot of the calendar.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3754) providing for the temporary deferral in certain unavoidable contingencies of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States.

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, for the same reasons given in connection with the bill just passed over, I request that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. That concludes the call of the calendar.

#### EXTENSION OF RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1211) to extend the authority of the President under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask that House bill 1211, which is the unfinished business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate resume the consideration of Senate bill 1843, the bill reported by the distinguished Senator from Maryland.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1843) to convert the National Military Establishment into an executive department of the Government, to be known as the Department of Defense; to provide the Secretary of Defense with appropriate responsibility and authority, and with civilian and military assistance adequate to fulfill the enlarged responsibility; and for other purposes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, before I explain the bill, I send to the desk two amendments and ask for their immediate consideration. The amendments have to do only with typographical errors, a misspelling of the word "combatant," and insertion of the word "Security" before the words "Resources Board."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 3, it is proposed to strike out the misspelled word "combatan" and insert in lieu thereof the correct spelling, "combatant."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 7, before the word "Resources", it is proposed to insert the word "Security."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this bill was termed this morning by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. Louis Johnson, as the top priority defense bill requested by the Military Establishment at this session of the Congress. Mr. Johnson made the statement that he considered the bill more important to the Military Establishment, called under the bill "The Department of Defense," than any other single measure sent up by his Department, and I believe he was well within the bounds of good common sense in making the statement.

The bill comes from the committee in its objectivity practically unanimously. It is true that in the committee the vote was 12 for the bill and 1 against it, but the negative vote was not against the bill in principle, but one of the members of the committee felt that we should go even further than the bill goes. So that so far as the philosophy of the bill is concerned, I think I may say with accuracy that the committee is unanimously for it. The difference is as to the degree to which we should go. It comes from the committee with 12 of the 13 members favoring the method provided.

The bill itself is divided into two main parts. The first part has to do with the National Defense Establishment as an institution. We nominate it an executive department, under the terms of the bill. The Cabinet officer who presides over this Department is called "The Secretary of Defense." The executive department itself is called "The Department of Defense."

Under the Department of Defense, there is the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force. In other

words, there are the three separate military departments combined into one executive department presided over by the Secretary of Defense.

Under the Secretary of Defense, as an administrative officer, is the Deputy Secretary of Defense, then under the Secretary of Defense and the Deputy Secretary of Defense is the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer that I wait until a little later?

Mr. TYDINGS. I would rather sketch out the bill in its broad outlines, and then we will later fill in the places I have not touched.

Mr. LODGE. Very well.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator. I have stated the basic set-up of the bill, which I am going to present again, in about three sentences, for fear I did not make it explicit the first time.

The bill takes the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, which we now call the Military Establishment, and puts them all into an executive department of the Government called the Department of Defense. Therefore, hereafter, if the bill shall be enacted, we will have a Department of Defense, with a Department of the Navy, a Department of the Army, and a Department of the Air Force, the three tripods which make up the Department of Defense, which becomes the sole executive agency of the Government in this field.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield after I finish the sentence. As I said, the presiding Cabinet officer is called the Secretary of Defense, and under him is the Deputy Secretary of Defense, and under those two are the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force.

I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the question I have in mind is with respect to the clarification of the status of the Marines. Where and in what manner will they be fitted into the over-all picture, in order that we may not lose the Marine Corps as an organization and that glorious military unit may not lose its identity in the entire set-up? That is the matter I have in mind.

Mr. TYDINGS. I share the Senator's high regard for the Marine Corps, and, in a sentence, I will say that their status is not touched directly or indirectly by the bill, and cannot be touched directly or indirectly by the bill. Nothing is provided in it that would change the present status of the Marine Corps.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. In other words, the Marines will continue to maintain their own identity, and it will not be lost. I personally am a former air service man; yet I have a great admiration and respect for the Marines, and I should like to see them continue to retain their identity in some manner so that they will not be lost

to the Nation as a great military organization.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can assure the Senator from Minnesota that the identity of the Marine Corps and, indeed, their role and mission will not be lost by this bill. The bill rather removes every reason for fear, and every possible misunderstanding which may have prompted the Senator's question.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is proper to ask at this point my first question of the Senator from Maryland, which is, Why do we have the military departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force? Why not have the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force on the same footing with regard to the Secretary of Defense that the Marine Corps has always been to the Secretary of the Navy? Why do we have separate departments at all?

Mr. TYDINGS. In reply to the Senator from Massachusetts, I would say that we have to call the executive function or the administrative function of the Army something, and so, in the over-all picture we call it the Department of Defense and we decided to call the Army, and the Navy, and the Air Force, the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively. In the Navy the Marines have their separate department.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not true that the Marines have done very well without having a separate department of their own?

Mr. TYDINGS. They have a separate administrative head and department.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; but they do not have a secretary of the Marine Corps.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; but the trouble is that the gentlemen who administer the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force must be called something. What would the Senator call them?

Mr. LODGE. Would it not be enough to have General Bradley administer the Army, Admiral Denfeld the Navy, and General Vandenberg the Air Force, under the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, I would say to the Senator, and I doubt if the Senator would propose it seriously if he had the time to give it more thought, for this reason: that the essence of the bill is to keep the military under the civilian. In this whole bill we have separated with great care the military functions from the civilian functions. We have kept the civilian from telling the military how to make plans for battle, and so forth, and we have stopped the military from telling the civilian how to run the purely administrative features of their establishment.

Mr. LODGE. I will say to the Senator from Maryland that I quite agree that we ought to keep the military under the civilian, but I think if we have 3 or 4 civilians—I think we have 13 civilians now at the secretarial level—it is much easier for the military to avoid civilian control than if we fix the responsibility in a few individuals, so that the military would not be able to play one civilian against

the other if they wanted to do such a thing. That is my thought.

Mr. TYDINGS. I see the Senator's point. But I believe we have eliminated some of the civilian personnel. For example, my recollection is that we used to have a Secretary of War. He is the Secretary of the Army. Then we had an Under Secretary of War. Then we had one, two, or three Assistant Secretaries of War. The witnesses came before our committee and testified that all these Assistant Secretaries were not needed. Therefore we set up a Secretary of the Army and an Under Secretary of the Army and either one or two Assistant Secretaries. Whereas before there were probably one or two more administrative personnel in each department than are provided for under this bill.

I think maybe I can anticipate the point of view the Senator from Massachusetts has in mind, which is a very proper point of view—the elimination of unnecessary personnel—by saying that no witness who appeared before our committee advocated that the Department of the Army should be administrated by the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Bradley. As a matter of fact, General Bradley himself would be opposed to that. I know that from his testimony. What they wanted, however, and what the Senator from Massachusetts wants, and what the committee wants, is when we get down to purely military operations to let the military officers conduct them, without interference from the civilian end, and that, I think, is what the Senator from Massachusetts has in mind.

Mr. LODGE. I notice at the bottom of page 5 of the committee report the statement is made:

Subsection 201 (b) of the present act is amended to convert the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force from their present status as executive departments to the status of military departments within the Department of Defense. This subsection is regarded as of basic importance, since it retains the three-department concept for administering the services, as opposed to a single-department administration.

Then on the top of page 7 of the committee report appears the following:

The proviso following paragraph (4) is intended to emphasize the adherence to the three-department principle, referred to in the declaration of policy in section 2 of the 1947 act, by insuring that each of the three military departments shall be administered as departments and not merged into one administrative grouping.

In other words, that statement is asserted and reasserted, and I cannot see the reason for it. If we were to have assistant secretaries to conduct the civilian administrative functions of the departments and were to leave General Bradley, General Vandenberg, and Admiral Denfeld to direct purely military operations, then we would eliminate that whole third wheel which is provided in the bill, and which seems to me to be superfluous.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think I understand what the Senator is driving at. I should like to reemphasize again that the mili-

tary men, General Bradley, General Vandenberg, and Admiral Denfeld have complete and uninterrupted sway over the military functions of their respective branches of the defense establishment without interference in any manner, shape, or form in purely military functions by the civilian personnel therein. However, the three branches, while parts of the national defense establishment, have different roles to perform, different equipment to use, many differences which I shall not take time to hunt out and picture, and therefore the administration has to be different in some respects, while tied into the whole picture.

Insofar as administration is concerned, the military has nothing to do with the administration of the Department per se. When it gets over into the military side, what the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force are to do, and so forth, then the military is supreme in its field. But so far as budgeting and things of that sort are concerned, the civilians are preeminent in that field. That decision is carried down all the way through. That was recommended to us unanimously by Admiral Denfeld, General Bradley, and General Vandenberg. What they wanted to make sure of was that the civilians would not tell them how to conduct a war. And we told them that we certainly were in accord with them on that point. I think it was Admiral Denfeld, speaking for the three chiefs, who said that they wanted civilians to administer the Department, but they wanted the military planning and military direction to be under the chiefs.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the able Senator that I think this is a good bill in that it goes in the right direction. It represents a step forward. In particular, I think the last part of the bill, which sets up budgetary control, is a very fine piece of work indeed. It reflects precisely what the Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch wanted to do. It recalls the testimony before the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments in 1947, which brought to light a very wasteful condition. This bill really provides some machinery to eliminate waste.

As the Senator well knows, 34 cents out of every dollar that goes to the Government goes to the Pentagon. I have seen figures showing that in the case of a stenographer who received \$2,000 a year, \$68 of her tax went to the Pentagon. I think this bill, in establishing a budgetary control structure, would accomplish a very fine result. So when I ask the Senator these questions, I am looking at things that perplex me, and which may represent defects in the bill; but on the whole I think the bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will place a pin in his thought for the moment, so that he may carry on as soon as my interruption is completed, I may say that the primary reason for having three Departments for the Department of Defense is, among other things, that the

over-all functions of the entire Defense Department are so complex, so varied, so ramified, and so far-reaching that it is necessary to have three branches for proper administration, just as four infantry regiments, as a rule, are placed in an infantry division, and two or three infantry regiments in a brigade, including the artillery.

Mr. LODGE. There is a triangular division at present.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are three heads for proper administration. That is the reason why we retain the three departments, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. This is not a merger. This is unification. The identity of the three services is maintained, but their general administration is unified into a singleness of purpose.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Am I not correct when I say that the committee considered very carefully the difference between the wording "Secretary of the Army," "Secretary of the Navy," and "Secretary of the Air Force," and the wording in section 204 (a) on page 7, providing for special assistants? As I understand, the special assistants to the Secretary of Defense are the performance men under the Secretary, about whom my colleague [Mr. LODGE] is asking. The purpose of retaining the Secretaries of the three departments, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force—at least in my mind, as one member of the committee—was to provide civilian power over the budgets of the respective forces, as set forth on page 19 of the bill. Furthermore, in my mind at least, it was important to call them Secretaries, because of the prestige involved in other countries. I ask the chairman of the committee if that was not an additional reason?

Mr. TYDINGS. It was one of the reasons.

Mr. President, without wishing to be discourteous, let me say to my colleagues that I believe that if they will allow me about 15 minutes without interruption, I can sketch the organization, so that the questions which will then follow will be more in line with what they want to learn about the bill.

I have already stated that henceforth there will be one Department. There will be no Department of the Army, Department of the Navy, and Department of the Air Force, as three separate executive departments. They will be combined—unified, but not merged—into a single executive department called the Department of Defense, administered by the Secretary of Defense. Under him there will be the Deputy Secretary of Defense, with three branches, three military departments—not executive departments—known as the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of the Air Force, each with a Secretary. They are charged, under the terms of the bill, with administrative duties.

I invite attention to page 4 of the bill, which I believe will clear up, in large measure, the civilian purpose of the bill.

I invite the attention of the Junior Senator from Massachusetts particularly to the following language:

under the direction of the President, he—

That is, the Secretary of Defense—shall be responsible for exercising direction, authority, and control over the Department of Defense, including the performance of the following duties:

(1) Establishment of policies and programs for the Department of Defense.

(2) Exercise of direction, authority, and control over the affairs of the Department of Defense;

This is the milk in the coconut:

(3) The taking of appropriate steps, including such coordination, transfers, and consolidations as may be necessary, to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, research, and personnel, and in such other fields, as he may deem proper—

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], I invite his attention especially to the following language. This is what he asked me about, and I want him to know that it is specifically in the bill—

but this shall not be construed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to reassign the combatant functions assigned to the military departments by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof—

The latter having reference to the Marine Corps—

or to make transfers of military personnel from one military department to another or to make details or assignments of military personnel in a manner substantially to affect or change such assigned combatant functions.

I merely point that out because I want the Senator to know that we have specifically reemphasized the point which he raised.

Mr. THYE. I had read that language in the bill, but I wanted to be certain to have the question discussed and debated so that there would be no doubt in the minds of those who are vitally concerned with the future of the Marine Corps.

Mr. TYDINGS. We have for the first time given to the civilian administrator power over a variety of activities which I mentioned, such as supply, transportation, storage, health, and research, and so forth. He has never heretofore had such power.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will permit me to proceed and make a note of his question—

Mr. THYE. The Senator mentioned supply. I think it is vitally important that we obtain a complete unification of the service of supply; also the use of runways for both the Army and the Navy. There are a thousand unification problems which must be faced.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. I may say that already, under the impetus of the hearings and the bill, a vast amount of unification is taking place along the very lines indicated by the Senator. Indeed, Mr. Hoover testified before our committee that this bill ought to save the Government \$1,500,000,000 a

year. Mr. Louis Johnson stated that he believed it would save between \$1,000,000 and \$1,500,000,000 a year. The Senator from Maryland is a little more modest. He will settle for four or five hundred million dollars a year. I believe that that is well within the realm of possibility, without forcing anyone to the wall or cutting out anything that is essential. It can be done in line with what the Senator from Minnesota has suggested.

For example, there is the matter of having three hospitals at a particular point, one for each of the services, with two of them filled and one empty. The continuation of personnel costs and supply costs for all three of them is not good business administration. Other examples could be cited in various fields. This time we are placing in the civilian administration the power to deal with such problems.

For the moment I shall pass over the other civilian functions.

When we get over to the military, on page 7, there is the title: "Creating the Position of Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Prescribing His Powers and Duties."

There the committee was up against a rather serious proposition. We already have the Chief of Staff for the Army, the Chief of Staff for the Navy, and the Chief of Staff for the Air Force. They are three separate men, each standing in his own particular domicile, so to speak, and beyond the influence of the other two. If they cannot agree on some matter, they simply wrangle, and there is no one to settle the dispute.

We wondered what we could do to expedite the reaching of decisions which might be important to the national welfare. We wondered how that could be done without destroying the relative independence of the Chief of Staff for the Navy, the Chief of Staff for the Army, or the Chief of Staff for the Air Force.

We had the Joint Chiefs of Staff before us. They made this recommendation to us, and we adopted it pretty much in full. They said, in effect, "We have no objection to having a Chief who would preside over the Joint Chiefs; but we do not want him to have military control over us; because if that occurred, there would be one Chief of Staff running all three departments, and he might not like the Navy or the Army or the Air Force, or vice versa, and it might not be a good thing for the country in given circumstances. So give us a certain amount of freedom of action, but put someone in a position to make us be good."

So what we did then was to provide for the creation of a Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, without military control over the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but to be the presiding officer and the representative of the Secretary of Defense or the President, as the case might be, when the Joint Chiefs of Staff had something to decide. If they could not decide, he would have no vote. The vote in the Joint Chiefs of Staff might be 2 to 1, but then the presiding Chief, although having no vote, could take the dispute to the Secretary of Defense or to the

President, and could say to either of them, "Here is what went on. Here are the two sides to the controversy." Then the President or the Secretary of Defense would decide the matter. He would say, in effect, "So and so will be the case," and the dispute would be ended.

I understand that heretofore there have been disputes which have gone on for weeks, or even for months in certain cases, and could not be settled because there was no appropriate source for settling them.

In meeting that difficulty, certain men, such as Admiral Leahy, have acted; and after Admiral Leahy, General Eisenhower acted. They served more or less as umpires between the three services, and took such disputes to the President for ultimate decision.

Therefore we now propose the creation of this office, without giving the holder of the office a vote, but making him the presiding officer over the Joint Chiefs of Staff, but with no power to vote in any controversy. Although he would have a high rank, he would be simply a representative of the President, and would take the dispute to the President, and have it settled there. The official we here propose would not be able to settle the dispute himself. In that way we would get away from one-man control of the three branches of the armed services.

This is what the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force wanted. They made out a good case before us, and that is the procedure we adopted.

Moreover, the Joint Chiefs of Staff said to us, "Listen, gentlemen; you expect us to have the Navy and the Army and the Air Force ready for an emergency, don't you?"

We said, "Yes, we do."

Of course, Mr. President, I am not quoting the conversation verbatim, but I am giving the gist of it.

They said, "You are holding us responsible for having the necessary weapons available and for having men in readiness who will be trained to use those weapons, and for meeting that responsibility to the best of our ability, in connection with the expenditure of the money you give us for that purpose; and you expect us to have plans prepared in order to be able to meet any reasonable emergency which may confront our country."

We said, "That is right. That is what we expect you to do, and we expect you to do it well."

They said, "All right. In this bill, as introduced, power and authority are given to the Secretary of Defense to appoint the presiding officer of the Joint Staff."

Of course, Mr. President, the Joint Staff is the working organization which prepares all the battle plans, and so forth.

Then they said, "If you are expecting us to make the plans and assume that responsibility, don't you think we are entitled to appoint the presiding officer?"

We said, "You have something there."

So we made that change in the bill, so as to keep the military functions under the military men, and to have the civilian functions under the civilian men.

I think we worked out that problem fairly well; and the Joint Chiefs, I believe, were rather highly pleased with the way we handled it.

We increased the number of officers who would be on what is called the Joint Staff, who are those who work under the Joint Chiefs of Staff and prepare the plans for the organization, and so forth. We increased that number from 100 to 210, with an equal number, perhaps, to come from the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. They are the ones who handle all the problems involving logistics, personnel, planning, and what not, and work them out.

So I think we have a fairly good bill so far as the military side of the problem is concerned.

Now I have finished outlining briefly the general civilian side of the bill and the general military side, without coming to the budgetary features of the bill, which are incorporated in title IV. I hope no Senator will ask me about that part of the bill for the moment, because it should be discussed as a separate subject.

I should like to ask whether there are any questions relative to all other parts of the bill except title IV, before I proceed to describe title IV.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have a number of questions which I should like to ask the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. First, let me say that the able Senator from Maryland has said that no witness was in favor of abolishing the three Secretaries. I think the Senator from Maryland spoke a little hastily, because former Secretary of War Patterson is on record in that respect.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator from Massachusetts mean abolishing the names of those positions or abolishing those offices?

Mr. LODGE. I mean abolishing the executive departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force and abolishing the posts of Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of those Departments.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think what former Secretary of War Patterson recommended was a change in nomenclature, rather than a complete removal of civilian control of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

In effect, he recommended that the title of what we call "Secretary of the Army" be, in effect—I do not recall the exact recommendation—changed hereafter to "Under Secretary of Defense for Army," and, so far as the other services are concerned, that the titles be changed to "Under Secretary of Defense for Navy," and "Under Secretary of Defense for Air"—thereby carrying the control, by means of a change of nomenclature, back to the single head.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Maryland will permit me to do so, I should like to read from a memorandum dated November 9, addressed by Secretary Patterson to Ferdinand Eberstadt, chairman of the Committee on National Security Organization. The

memorandum was published at the time. I read a part of the memorandum:

(1) That the three branches of the armed forces be placed in a single executive department (to be called the Department of Defense). The branches themselves would not be merged, but would exist as the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

The abolition of the three executive departments would abolish also the posts of Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of those Departments.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what I just said.

Mr. LODGE. It would abolish the posts of Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is right.

Mr. LODGE. I mention that simply because the able Senator from Maryland said, I think, that no witnesses of repute were in favor of that idea; and I simply wished to state that former Secretary of War Patterson was in favor of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; he was not, except in the nomenclature field. He did not advocate the elimination of the civilian heads of the three Departments. All he wanted was for them to be called Under Secretary of Defense for the Army, Under Secretary of Defense for Air, or some similar name.

Mr. LODGE. He favors the abolition—I am quoting—"the abolition of the three executive departments."

Mr. TYDINGS. So do we. In the bill, we make it into one.

Mr. LODGE. And abolishing the post of Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is what we did.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has the Secretary in it.

Mr. TYDINGS. Go on and read a little further.

Mr. LODGE. That is his recommendation on that subject.

Mr. TYDINGS. Read on. Let the Senator read what he read before.

Mr. LODGE. I will read it over again.

Mr. TYDINGS. Very well.

Mr. LODGE. It reads:

That the three branches of the armed forces be placed in the single executive department (to be called the Department of Defense). The branches themselves would not be merged, but would exist as the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

The abolition of the three executive departments would abolish also the posts of Secretaries, Under Secretaries, and Assistant Secretaries of those Departments.

Then he goes on, paragraph 2:

That the Secretary of Defense be the head of the Department, with full authority and power to direct activities of the Department—

To the same extent that the Secretary of State directs the State Department, or that the Secretary of the Treasury directs the Treasury Department.

There shall be a Secretary and two Assistant Secretaries. Their duties shall be department-wide, as the Secretary may direct, and they should not be tied to boosting the interesting or pressing the advantage of any particular branch of the armed forces.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can answer the Senator, and I think now I can clarify it a little more, because as he reads the

Secretary's testimony, it comes back to me. Here was the difference between the Secretary's recommendations and the provisions of the bill. Secretary Patterson wanted the civilian control all under the Secretary of Defense. He wanted the Secretary of Defense to have such number of Under Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries as would take orders from the Secretary of Defense for the operation of that Department. What the bill does is not to put them up under the Secretary of Defense, per se. It puts them over each one of the three branches. But the net result is that no matter what system is followed, there is a civilian administration over the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force in the civilian field.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will permit, if we have a Secretary over there with the Army or the Air Force or the Navy, instead of having him up here with the Department of Defense, he is bound to boost and promote or press the partisan advantage of the particular branch, and he will not have the loyalty he should have to the over-all concept of an over-all integrated American defense.

Mr. TYDINGS. My point is there is a choice there, of course. We were rather unanimous—almost, at least—in having this division as I have outlined it. But what I wanted to make sure is that the Senator from Massachusetts understood that at no point did Secretary Patterson advocate that the administration of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force should be taken out of civilian hands.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no. Oh, no.

Mr. TYDINGS. He simply wanted the administrators, who would have charge of that work to be Under Secretaries of Defense. What we did was this: We left them all under the Secretary of Defense, but we assigned one to the Army, one to the Navy, and one to the Air Force.

Mr. LODGE. I brought this point up because the Senator made me feel a little lonesome when he first said that nobody was in favor of the idea of abolishing the Secretaries, and I just remembered that Secretary Patterson did agree with me completely on that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I reemphasize the fact that nobody is in favor of abolishing the Secretaries. I have tried to sell that to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. I just read from the recommendations of Secretary Patterson that he is in favor of abolishing the posts of Secretary, which is just as plain as English could be.

Mr. TYDINGS. Secretary Patterson agreed there should be one department called the Department of Defense, presided over by the Secretary of Defense. I think he was willing, although I do not remember specifically, to have a Deputy Secretary of Defense. Then he wanted Under Secretaries—one, two, or three in number—with assistants who would administer the whole Department of Defense for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. So that at no point did he advocate that the administration of these three departments would not be under civilian administration.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, of course, that is true. The Senator from Maryland, when he introduced Senate bill 1269, on page 6, had a provision for three assistant secretaries of defense, who would help the Secretary of Defense administer these departments from the over-all defense viewpoint.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is right.

Mr. LODGE. I notice that that section is omitted from Senate bill 1843.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes. Let me tell the Senator why that was left out. I think we had probably 20 or 25 witnesses, and, with one or two exceptions—and probably Secretary Patterson was one, because he was for the strongest kind of unification, amounting almost to merger in the eyes of some persons, though not in mine—every other witness felt that the prestige that would attach to having a man called the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of Air, rather than Under Secretary, would attract better men of higher caliber, and if the salary were only to be \$14,000 a year, and they were going to administer branches of the Government that were costing about \$6,000,000 or so a branch, it would be rather hard to attract the kind of men they would want to get, unless at least they were given the title. So that with the exception of Mr. Hoover, I believe, all the other witnesses thought we should keep the old titles, because they carried great prestige in the eyes of the American people and would be an added inducement to getting the caliber of men we desire.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not correct, I ask the chairman, that we argued for a long time in the committee as to what to call the Deputy Secretary under the Secretary of Defense, and that we finally created the title of Deputy Secretary to cover the point that my colleague from Massachusetts has been making. We discussed that. I understand that the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are under the Deputy Secretary and are subordinate to him. In that way we tried to get unification. If I am correct in my memory, and I am not sure—

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct so far, I am sure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I was going to say was, Judge Patterson went further perhaps than any of us were willing to go. He was for a direct merger of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, putting them all together. We said no, we did not think that was practical at the present time, that we would get greater unification under a Secretary of Defense with Deputy Secretaries. But we were not willing to merge them, except where things could be done properly in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense. And so we gave him the powers contained in subparagraph 3, at the bottom of page 4 of the bill, but eliminated his power to transfer. In other words, we gave him all the other power, but not the power to merge.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. I am calling on my memory. I would say to the Senator that these hearings went on, I suppose, for 5 weeks. We had 17 hearings; I think 14 of them in the morning, 3 of them in the afternoon. We had Mr. Eberstadt, who had a very fine experience here in various fields of government, and particularly in the armed services. We had Mr. Forrestal. We had Mr. Louis Johnson. We had the three chiefs of staff. We had President Truman. We had President Hoover. We had various other members, all of whom, with the exception perhaps of Mr. Patterson, who, as the senior Senator from Massachusetts said, went a little further than the others, all of whom generally took the position now embodied in the committee bill.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I stated that Mr. Symington advocated calling these men Under Secretaries, but he was the only Secretary that went that far.

Mr. TYDINGS. But Mr. Symington likewise said that he would be satisfied to settle for the bill, unless the others would go along. He did not want to take a different point of view.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. LUCAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will yield first to the Senator from Vermont, who, I think, rose first, then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if my understanding is correct, that the bill S. 1843 removes the present authority of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Air Force to bypass the Secretary of Defense and deal directly with the President.

Mr. TYDINGS. It would be rather hard to answer that question categorically. I should have to answer it "Yes," and then qualify it with this statement: There is nothing in law to stop any of them from coming to Congress or from going to the President or from going anywhere they want to go.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. The witnesses before our committee said that, on a point of great principle or great difference, they ought to go, and either resign or get a decision. But answering the Senator as candidly as we can, the appropriate purpose of the bill is to give a great degree of unified administration; and substantially the Senator is correct in his assumption.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in understanding that the Secretaries are responsible to the Secretary of Defense or the Under Secretary of Defense in the absence of the Secretary?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask one further question with regard to the Munitions Board. I am not quite sure what is meant by the language on page 11, to the effect that the Board shall be composed of a chairman who shall be the head, and an Under Secretary or Assistant Secretary from each of the three military departments to be designated in each case by the Secretaries of their respective departments. What is meant

by an Under Secretary or by an Assistant Secretary in that case? Are those the correct words to use?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, they are, for this reason, that under the bill there would be a Secretary of the Army, an Under Secretary of the Army, and maybe one Assistant Secretary.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the bill provide for an Under Secretary of the Army?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. That answers my question.

Mr. TYDINGS. It had to be phrased in the alternative.

Mr. AIKEN. A member of the Munitions Board from each Department, then, shall be chosen from the higher levels?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield, first, to the Senator from Illinois, and then to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER].

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to ask the able chairman of the committee a number of questions. I should like, first, to ask him this question: Is there anything in the bill which would prevent the Navy from continuing to run the Navy, the Air Force from continuing to run the Air Force, or the Army from continuing to run the Army?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not a thing. On the contrary, we have reemphasized by specific provisions that all the roles and missions they have had heretofore shall be preserved.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there anything in the bill which would give a veto power to one service over the other services or the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Joint Chiefs of Staff could not resolve a dispute involving the three services. If the three Chiefs of Army, Navy, and Air Force fail to agree, the Chief of Staff would be duty bound to carry the dispute to the Secretary of Defense or the President, and the President would make the decision, and that would be binding. He is the Commander in Chief. But I think I have made it specific—

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator has made it specific.

Mr. TYDINGS. In order to emphasize what I have said, the Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has no vote.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator believe, from evidence before his committee, that the Naval arm of the United States is in any peril whatsoever, so far as the Army and the Air Force are concerned, or so far as the persuasive powers of those who are connected with our military establishment are concerned?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not. All three of the chiefs of staff and, so far as I can recall, every witness, testified to the point that it would be folly to trust the defenses of the United States to any one of the three branches or to eliminate any one or two of the three branches; that we must at all times have a balanced defense, an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force; that if we rely on one, it might fail and we would be powerless. Further than that, we might have to use either the Army or the Navy, and

not the Air Force per se, if we were fighting in certain areas, under certain conditions, where the Navy or the Army would be needed, and not the Air Force singly.

So we have to have a defense for every conceivable situation. That means we must have an Army, a Navy, and an Air Force. The Senator from Maryland would resist with all the emphasis and power at his command any attempt to seek to destroy any one of the three branches or to weaken its relative position materially in the national defense establishment.

Mr. LUCAS. I wholly agree with the able Senator from Maryland. The last answer probably answers my next query, but in order to make it clear and without any question about it, I wish to ask this question: Is there anything in the bill, or anything in the thinking of military minds, from what the Senator has found in the evidence disclosed before his committee, which would lead him to believe that the amphibious warfare as perfected by the Marine Corps is in any danger of being eliminated?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not so far as I know. I would not be in favor of seeing it happen, because the Marine Corps has made a tremendous contribution to the science of warfare. So far as I am concerned, they are in safe hands. Some future Congress may look at the question differently and may deny money to one branch or the other of the services. But I am talking about the legislation before us this afternoon. The service deserves, with all its magnificence, grandeur, and tradition, the role and the mission of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, plus the Marine Corps in the case of the Navy.

Mr. LUCAS. I have a letter from a very prominent constituent of mine in Illinois—

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator speak a little more loudly? It is impossible to hear him.

Mr. LUCAS. I shall try to speak loudly for the benefit of the Senator from Massachusetts.

My constituent makes this statement:

Before going further, I may as well toss out for your consideration that the American population think our air arm alone will win the next war.

Mr. TYDINGS. He asserts that?

Mr. LUCAS. He asserts that. I ask the Senator from Maryland, who is chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, whether there is any testimony along the line that the air power alone is sufficient to win the next war.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator from Maryland is a little out of his bailiwick in attempting to answer that question, because he does not desire to pose as an authority on how to win wars. But I can say this, which I think will not be immodest on my part, that we feel, as a committee, and I think we are reinforced in that feeling by the military men who have appeared before the committee, that in certain contingencies, and with respect to certain countries, if we were to have a war the Air Force would be a tremendously vital and determinative factor, perhaps, but that in no case can anyone conceive that before the struggle was over

all three branches would not be employed, just as they have always been employed. However, if in some happy circumstance the Air Force could save the Navy and the Army the loss of life and treasure that would be necessary by their employment, I do not think either of the two branches would object. But no one is willing to put all his eggs in one basket, from the highest military man I know of in this country, down to the highest civilian charged with the responsibility, believing that a balanced Air Force, a balanced Navy, and a balanced Army, with the Marine Corps, are the only safeguards we can have for our welfare in the future.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to thank the able Senator from Maryland for the last statement, because it seems to me that it clears up a great deal of muddling in the public thinking throughout America as a result of a tremendous amount of propaganda that has gone out from different sources in Washington, which states definitely, for instance, that the air power is the one thing that will win the next war. Then those of our constituents who are interested, for instance, in the Marine and Naval Air Forces, are wondering whether or not the Naval and Marine Air Forces are going to be merged ultimately with the United States Air Force, and whether finally they are to all be under one head. That is the question a great many people who are interested in this problem are asking the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the last question would be a very venturesome thing for the Senator from Maryland to embark upon, but I am going to take the chance again, purely as an assumption, and I think it is an important question.

In World War I various regiments of Marines were put in the Second Division and fought alongside the Army, the Ninth Infantry being one of the Army outfits in that very famous infantry division, the Second Division, which performed such good work at Chateau-Thierry. There the Marines and the Army fought side by side in one division.

I remember that in the last war on Okinawa certain elements of the Army, I believe, and of the Marine Corps, under General Buckner of the Marines—who lost his life on that island—fought together under a Marine general.

Mr. LUCAS. My colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was there.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; our eminent and able and renowned friend the junior Senator from Illinois was one of that great band of patriots, and we are all glad to have him a Member of the Senate, to carry on the traditions of the great Marine Corps. These incidents happened in World War I and World War II. The branches did not merge, but they joined together for a common purpose, and fought perhaps under one or the other branches.

I do not doubt for a moment that if we were to have a war, and if the Chiefs of Staff thought it was wise to take the Marine aviators, as they have taken the Marine foot soldiers, order them to fight alongside the Army; they would take the

Army aviation and put it with the Air Force aviation, that would be done if it were in the country's interest; and why should it not be done, if it would win the war? But no one is advocating that that be a permanent arrangement, or that there be any real transfer of functions.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the last answer of the able Senator is one that is important. I certainly agree with the Senator that under certain emergency conditions, these branches could well be merged for the purpose of winning a battle, but the moment it is over, and the moment peace times return, or even in wartime, the particular branch of the service that is merged with another would return to its natural status.

The Senator tells the Senate and the country now that there is no evidence before the Senate committee at the present time, and it is not the thought of any member of the committee that, for instance, the naval and the marine air force would be merged as one, as was the case under Goering in Germany, and in England, where there was an air corps under one unit.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is perfectly correct. It is my recollection that in the landing of the American forces in Europe General Eisenhower had charge of the Navy, which supported the landing. The naval admiral over there and General Eisenhower, I suppose, worked together more or less as partners, but technically General Eisenhower had charge of the whole show. But as soon as the event was over, as soon as the landing was effected, as soon as the naval support was no longer needed, then the Navy went back to its role, and the General went along with the land operations.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I wish to ask a question with respect to the budgetary end of the bill now being discussed in the Senate.

The Senator made the statement a moment ago that in his opinion a minimum of three or four hundred million dollars could be saved, and he also stated that former President Hoover indicated that a billion or a billion and a half dollars could be saved if this bill became a law. I am wondering whether or not the moment this bill became the law, the effecting of economy in the Government service would be accomplished under the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should like to say, in answer to the last statement of the Senator, and I hope I am not extravagant in the statement, that I consider this bill as important a piece of legislation as has ever come before the Congress dealing with our domestic scene in my lifetime, for two reasons: I believe there is a great deal of accuracy in the statement of former President Hoover that tremendous savings will be effected by the machinery set up in the bill. I furthermore believe that the efficiency which will follow from the unification of our armed services, as provided, will be marked. I do not see any prospect of abolition of the rivalry between Army, Navy, and Air Force, and no one wants

it abolished, it is a worthy thing, but if the powers given to the Secretary of Defense and the President, and the military, for that matter, are carried out with reasonable wisdom and power over a period of time, it ought to result in \$500,000,000 a year being saved. Five hundred million dollars is a bigger saving than anything I have ever been connected with since I have been in the Congress, and I think it will be a tremendous achievement for the Eighty-first Congress, and for all those who are associated with it, either in the executive department or in the legislative department, all who give it their support.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CAIN. Does the pending bill represent progress in the improvements and evolution which are demanded by the defects which have become obvious as a result of experience with the unification bill which the Congress passed about a year ago?

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we took the first step with some caution, to determine whether or not we were going in the right direction, and we prohibited ourselves from going very far until we could see ahead a little more. That one step has shown that further steps will be advantageous, that it would almost be better not to have taken the first step at all than to linger in the twilight zone of not doing one thing or the other.

Mr. CAIN. The steps we are about to take will be in a real way a realization of some of the ambitions of the late Mr. Forrestal, who hoped we would go slowly but surely in consummating a far greater unification than was possible a year ago.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. It will be regretted that Mr. Forrestal will never know the effectiveness of this proposed legislation which I believe was close to his heart, and if it had been passed sooner, before he lost his grasp upon events, perhaps he would be alive today. Mr. Forrestal had the responsibility and the authority in the public mind to do what the bill permits the Secretary of Defense to do, and which the original law did not permit him to do.

Mr. CAIN. I had a number of personal conversations with Mr. Forrestal on this subject, partly because we were close friends, and in mentioning to him some of the things I as an individual Senator had been hoping for, Mr. Forrestal merely said, "Let us take our time." He said, "Those improvements will become the more readily obtainable and successful if we permit the services themselves to determine some of the defects in the original piece of legislation."

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. I should like to say to the Senator from Washington that there will always be certain fears. Whenever we have two independent agencies—and we now have three—whose functions are to be merged somewhat into a unification scheme or proposal, there is no way by which to prevent such fears. But so far as we are able to foresee them and deal with them, they are absolutely unjustified.

Now I should like to yield to the junior Senator from Illinois, who has been very

patient while I have been talking with other Senators.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Maryland if he would object to an amendment to section 211 on page 10, the insertion of a new subsection—

Mr. TYDINGS. To follow (d)?

Mr. DOUGLAS. To follow (d). It would provide that when questions dealing with amphibious warfare were under consideration the Commandant of the Marine Corps should be a voting member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have a great deal of sympathy with the thought that prompts the interrogation, but I hope the Senator will not offer his amendment, for the reasons I shall state.

When we passed the first unification bill, in order to meet certain points of view of Members of the Congress, we wrote into the bill some roles and missions of the Marine Corps, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is section 206 of the organic law.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. I think there is a division now in the military department among the military men themselves as to whether or not the Congress should set itself up to tell the military how to conduct a war. When we write roles and missions, to a small extent at least we attempt to tell them how they must operate. My point is that having already done that, and there having been a recession away from that point of view, I should dislike very much to have such a provision in the bill, when its present provisions are satisfactory. I am afraid that if the Senator offers the amendment he may do the cause harm, and I know he does not want to do that. I hope seriously he will not offer his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should appreciate it if the Senator from Maryland would look at section 206, the basic organic law, because a fundamental issue is involved. I refer to the National Security Act of 1947, section 206 (c), on page 8. I refer to the second sentence, which defines the combat mission of the Marine Corps:

The Marine Corps shall be organized, trained, and equipped to provide fleet marine forces of combined arms, together with supporting air components, for service with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced—

And I emphasize that word "advanced"—

naval bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign.

Now, it lies within the power of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to define a naval base, and to define a naval campaign.

Mr. TYDINGS. They would have to agree unanimously.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would they have to agree unanimously, or could it be by a vote of two to one?

Mr. TYDINGS. No, it could not be. Under the law, if the Joint Chiefs disagree then the matter would go to the President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. How does this differ, then, from the supposed decision in the case of the super carrier?

Mr. TYDINGS. That decision went to the President.

I think what the Senator from Illinois wants to accomplish—and I say this with my words pretty well measured, because I do not want to deceive the Senator in the slightest way—I think what he wants to accomplish is already provided for. I do not think that the Navy would surrender any function of the Marine Corps without carrying the dispute to higher authority. I can assure the Senator that, in my opinion, he will not add anything to the law by putting his amendment in the bill, and he may, by doing so, incur certain opposition to the whole proposal.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. On that point I should like to remind the Chairman that the Joint Chiefs recommended in line 3, on page 10 of the bill the insertion of the words "as such" in order to assure what the chairman of the committee has just said, namely, that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would act "as such"—that is as chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He would have to report to the President any disagreement that existed and present both sides of the picture. Upon that recommendation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the committee adopted the language and placed those two words in the bill in order to protect any minority service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would it not be helpful if—

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me interrupt the Senator to show him where he would arrive at if he were to attempt to write his amendment into the bill. There is always a dispute as to land-based planes, as to whether the Navy shall operate them to effect the destruction of submarines along our coasts or whether the Army shall operate the planes for that purpose. The Army takes the position, roughly—I do not mean every Army officer, but pretty much every one of them—that inasmuch as the planes take away from the land, from the United States, and fly out over the water, the Army should have charge of the antisubmarine campaign insofar as it applies to that type of destruction. The Navy says, "No, sir, we want our own airfields on land, and the hunting of these submarines is our baby." The truth is that we are glad to have them both hunt down submarines, but if an attempt were made to write in the roles and missions of the Navy and of the Army, then perhaps more harm would be done than good.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is also true that the Marine Corps is a very small organization, and if a large organization does not want a small organization to continue, it frequently is not too difficult to use terms or interpret terms not only to restrict its activities, but to shrink its assigned missions.

I wondered if there would be any objection to amending section 206 (c) so as to say that it is the function of the Marine Corps to serve with the fleet in the seizure or defense of advanced military and amphibious bases and for the conduct of such land operations as may

be essential to the prosecution of an amphibious campaign. So that the functions of the Corps would not be restricted to the immediate beachhead, but would continue for the combined operations as the Corps pressed inland. As the Senator from Maryland is well aware, it is not merely an academic question. It can be of great practical importance in the conduct of a military campaign.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, we had amphibious landings at Salerno and Anzio, and we had them at the Omaha Beach in Normandy, and they were made by the Army. It is not the Senator's thought, I know, to confine all amphibious operations to the Marine Corps and to no others. Is it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; that is true.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is why the Army should be permitted to land if they want to land. I do not see why we should be killing marines all the time. I do not see why we should not let the Army in on some of these fights.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If we stick to the principle of specialization it would seem as though the marines should be given the predominant share in amphibious operations.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can say to the Senator that my knowledge of the Navy is such that the Marine Corps is not going to be hurt so long as the Navy is there. Furthermore, I do not believe the Congress would let it be hurt; and moreover, I do not believe anyone wants to hurt it.

The Senator from Maryland the other day in committee meeting made the statement, and I am glad to make it in the presence of the Senate, that there may be some justification here and there for the merger of these three services. There may be some justification for the Marine Corps losing its status. The Senator from Maryland would resist as strongly as he could any attempt to have the Marine Corps lose its status for the reason that no amount of efficiency or economy could ever compensate for the glorious traditions that would be sacrificed if we should lose the Marine Corps. Under no circumstances would the Senator from Maryland consider that he had been contributing to the defense of his country by having such an organization, with all its great accomplishments, with all its great traditions, wiped out. The Marine Corps represents something in efficiency which cannot be obtained by the mere passage of laws nor can money buy. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I do not believe he need have any fears about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I deeply appreciate the statement of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I so stated in the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that that is the general opinion of the country. I have no doubt about the Secretary of Defense or the Chief of Staff of the Army, in both of whom I have great confidence. But times change. Service jealousies frequently endure. We cannot be sure that General Bradley will always be Chief of Staff of the Army, or that Mr. Johnson will always be Secretary of De-

fense. In another administration we may find that the new General Staff which is being created will want to carry out what it regards as logic, and confine the Marine Corps to guard duty. I have read statements from some leading Army officers who have said that the Marine Corps should be confined purely to guard duty at naval stations. Let me say that if that were ever contemplated I would prefer to have the Marine Corps abolished rather than to make it purely a noncombatant organization.

Since the Marine Corps is a small group, I am very frank to say that many marines are fearful that under merger or unification gradually the functions of the Marine Corps will be taken away, and that it will cease to exist, or will exist in such crippled form that it will not survive as a combatant force.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me try to assist the Senator in giving a little detached attention to the question, if I may. I know of his great loyalty and deep feeling for the Marine Corps, of which he was such a valuable, brave, and outstanding member. Let me give him this thought, and I think he will see the problem from a legislative standpoint rather than from a human or sentimental standpoint.

Before we had unification we had the Army and the Navy. The Air Force was a part of the Army. The Navy had its own aviation, but the Air Force, as we came to know it, was a sort of bureau largely attached to the Army.

There was agitation for unification of the three branches, the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. The Army, faced with that contingency, was called upon to make a tremendous sacrifice. The Army, which had control over this great giant, the romantic and traditional Air Force, was told, "Give up this glamorous, fine tradition that has been built up in World War II, and to some extent in World War I. Give it all up. We are going to take it away from you. We are going to take away your favorite child, the one which has brought so much luster to your service, the one about which stories and motion pictures are made, the one which thrills young men in all the high schools and colleges of America. You must give it up. You are going to be bereft of your Air Force. All we are going to let you have is some reconnaissance planes and some photographic planes. But when you need an air force, send over to the Air Force and they will send planes to help you."

If the Senator will look back into the committee hearings on unification, he will find that the Senator from Maryland said this, in effect:

I cannot understand the generosity of the Army, when I think that an Army officer may be commanding a corps made up of three or four divisions, or an Army made up of three or four corps composed of hundreds of thousands of men, and have no air support of his own, no tactical air support, no strategic air support. He must go into battle absolutely dependent on what forces are assigned to him.

The Army made that sacrifice. I think General Bradley and General Eisenhower were two of the witnesses.

I said to them that they were making the greatest sacrifice of any branch of the service. They said, "We believe that, by and large, this is in the interest of the defense of the United States, as we see the unfolding picture of military science."

Frankly, if we are to write missions into the bill, from where I sit I think the Army is entitled to have at least its tactical air force as a part of the Army, so that a general who is in command of a corps or an army will have his own force to support the attack of his group, at least in a tactical way, without having to call for planes from any other source. That is the reason why I am giving this illustration, and asking the Senator not to try to write roles or missions in the bill. Let us see if we cannot work out the problem without trying to determine on the floor of the Senate what each branch of the service ought to do. I assure the Senator that so long as I am here—and I believe the same statement can be made of my successor—and so long as this measure is on the statute books, there need be no real fear about any amphibious operation being taken away from the Marine Corps, in the sense that the Senator is discussing.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. FLANDERS. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that what he has been saying in the last few minutes, to which I have listened with a great deal of satisfaction, covers the spirit of the problems presented by the Senator from Illinois. However, I should like to ask whether we may not get down to that disagreeable thing, the letter of the law, and ask ourselves a question. I refer again, in section 206 of the fundamental law, subsection (c), on page 8, to the words which the Senator from Maryland read to us a few minutes ago:

And for the conduct of such land operations as may be essential to the prosecution of a naval campaign.

I am wondering whether, if this fundamental law had been in existence during the early part of World War II, and if it had been obeyed, the operations on Guadalcanal would have been possible.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that it is one of the great geniuses of democratic administration, and particularly as we have it in the United States, that no matter how strictly we write or interpret a law which we enact in the best of faith, when the national honor or integrity or safety is in danger we find ways of getting together and doing the bigger job that is ahead, without, in our conscience or in our spirit, having violated the law.

Men need these small assurances from time to time, so that they will feel that in the calmer days of peace, schemers will not take advantage of them. But in the great days of warfare schemers do not infest the ranks of the armed services of our country, thank heaven. Somehow or other, as has been so well described, we find common ground on which we can go forth and achieve whatever must be achieved for the defense of the United States.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say to the Senator from Maryland that I approach this problem from a slightly different standpoint from that which I understood the two Senators from Illinois and the Senator from Vermont, as well as the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYEL], to emphasize. I do not feel at all like being tender with service prides and jealousies. I am not at all worried about some service having an opportunity to express itself. I am worried about whether we have a bill which will enable us to get prompt decisions and actions. That is what wins or loses wars. In my judgment, if we make mistakes in this bill we are going to pay for them in the blood of our sons. There could not be a more serious piece of legislation before us than that which we are now considering.

Mr. TYDINGS. Personally the Senator from Maryland is not at variance with anything which the Senator from Massachusetts has said. If the Senator from Maryland could write the bill and insure its passage through the Congress, he would wipe out all references to missions in the bill. I have said so frequently. I do not believe that they are proper in such bills. They are military problems. They are things that ought to be decided by the military.

Likewise I say to the Senator from Massachusetts, who has had an able and very distinguished career in one of the three services covered by the bill, that we are dealing here with human relations, which must be reasonably satisfied if there is to be any legislation.

We cannot achieve our own independent course completely without regard to the ideas of others. This measure is an attempt of that sort. Without real sacrifice of principle, it has been possible to accomplish the objective, without losing the essential ingredients thereof.

Mr. LODGE. I appreciate that a problem of human relations is involved; but I think experience shows that in military organizations, things are accomplished by giving an order, and then setting a time certain by which the order must be carried out. That is the method by which the gentlemen in the Pentagon have lived all their lives, and it is a method they understand.

If we depend upon evolution, certainly we shall have to wait a long time.

I should like to call attention also to page 8, section 211, in which the statement is made that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall have no vote. Does that mean that unanimous-consent procedure will continue to be the rule in the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. TYDINGS. No. Of course that is a very proper question.

That provision means that the three Chiefs of Staff will have a means of reaching a decision.

Let me explain what happened: The three Chiefs of Staff came before us. Admiral Denfeld was the spokesman.

We had told them that as the law now stood, if the three of them could not agree, nothing would be done; there would be a stalemate. Yet we said there had

to be a means of reaching agreement in all such cases. We told them we were not satisfied with the existence of a situation which would permit of inability to reach agreement, and we said we were sure that something had to be done in that respect. They said that basically they were not satisfied with such an arrangement, either.

We said to them that if the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the one who was put over the three Chiefs of Staff, happened to have come from the Navy, if he were given a vote, he could vote with the Chief of Staff representing the Navy; and those two, coming from or representing the Navy, would be opposed by the other Chiefs of Staff, those representing the Army and the Air Force, and thus there would be a stalemate; or if the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff happened to come from the Army, in a controversy he perhaps would side with the Chief of Staff of the Army, and the two of them would be opposed by the Chiefs of Staff representing the Navy and the Air Force; and thus there would also be a stalemate.

So we asked for suggestions as to a solution of the problem existing in such a situation.

As a result of our suggestion, they were unanimous in making the recommendations which now are included in the bill, to wit, that there will be a Chairman or Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, representing, in effect, the President and the Secretary of Defense; that he shall have no vote, so that he cannot dominate the arrangement or get it out of gear.

Mr. LODGE. Is it not out of gear now?

Mr. TYDINGS. This provision is made so that he will not be able to get it out of gear; because if he were to have a vote, he would become a participant in the dispute, and the result would be to throw the Joint Chiefs of Staff organization out of gear.

We wanted him to be a conciliator, an umpire, a representative of the President. In addition, we did not want him to have any military command over the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They themselves wanted that arrangement, above everything else; they did not want some Army man, who for the moment was acting as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to tell the Navy or the Air Corps what to do—or, vice versa, to have a Navy man tell the Army or the Air Corps what to do.

That is why this language was used, and I think I am well within the field of accuracy when I say that all three of the Chiefs of Staff—General Vandenberg, Admiral Denfeld, and General Bradley—were in accord and were satisfied with the language of the bill.

Mr. LODGE. Am I correct in my belief that the Joint Chiefs of Staff will still operate by unanimous consent?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. LODGE. Will they operate on the basis of a 2-to-1 vote?

Mr. TYDINGS. No.

Mr. LODGE. How will they vote or operate? How will they decide or meet the various issues?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall tell the Senator how the arrangement would work.

Let us assume that a matter had been referred to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for decision, and let us assume that the Chief of Staff for the Navy and the Chief of Staff for the Air Force voted one way, and the Chief of Staff for the Army voted the other way. Presiding over the Joint Chiefs of Staff would be the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a man representing the President. If the Chiefs of Staff of the three services could not agree, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would carry the dispute to the President, and would explain both sides of the dispute to the President, and the President himself would make the decision. His decision would become the official order of the day, so far as that matter was concerned.

Mr. LODGE. That would be a good thing, but I doubt whether the President would have a great deal of time on his hands to settle such matters.

I do not believe the Senator from Maryland read the language of the bill to which I have referred, and I should like to record my dissent from the point of view expressed on page 8 of the report, where reference is made to in section 6:

The committee would point out that the War Council is one of the most important checks and balances in the Military Establishment.

Mr. President, when was a war ever won by checks and balances? Winning a war is not the same thing as preserving the civil rights of the citizens. When was it ever considered a tactical and strategic asset to have checks and balances in the conduct of the Military Establishment?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator give me the page reference again?

Mr. LODGE. Page 8, section 6. There are two sentences. The first is:

The committee would point out that the War Council is one of the most important checks and balances in the Military Establishment.

I am referring to the third and fourth sentences there.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; I see them.

Mr. LODGE. The next sentence is:

Since all Secretaries and all of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are members, it would appear impossible for the views of one or more services to be denied expression.

But there is no statement about what would be done to obtain a prompt decision. Certainly that is fundamental. It is far more important, in my opinion, for our Joint Chiefs of Staff and our War Council and our Secretary of Defense to be able to reach a prompt decision, than it is to be able to run this thing like a town meeting, in which we wish to give everyone a chance to be heard. War cannot be won under any such procedure, in my opinion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is proceeding under a false assumption. He assumes that there is to be no power of decision. To the contrary, the Secretary of Defense will have the power of decision; and if he does not decide, the President will have the power of decision.

Mr. LODGE. But the Joint Chiefs of Staff first will have the power to decide.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; they will not. The Chairman or Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff will take the dispute to the Secretary of Defense or to the President, and one or the other of them will decide.

Let us consider the so-called carrier incident: Question arose in the Joint Chiefs of Staff, "Shall we build an aircraft carrier, or shall we not build one?" The Joint Chiefs of Staff could not agree. Of course, there was nothing to stop the Navy from going ahead and building the carrier, under those circumstances; there was no one to make a decision.

So the dispute was carried to the Secretary of Defense and to the President, and there it was decided that the carrier should not be built.

So the present proposal is that the dispute be carried to the Secretary of Defense and to the President by the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for he will represent the Secretary of Defense and the President. However, he will have no vote. That is where the checks and balances come in. If we gave him a vote, there would be two potential votes for the branch of the service from which he came, as against the two votes by the Chiefs of Staff representing the other two branches of the armed services; and then there would be a stalemate.

After all, as has been pointed out, the President is Commander in Chief of the armed forces; and he can make whatever decision he wishes to make, and no one can prevent him from doing so, for under the Constitution he is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces.

Mr. LODGE. But of course the whole reason for the present proposed legislation originally was, as I understand, that the President, although Commander in Chief, had so many other things to do that it was thought that it would be advisable to have him delegate some of his power as Commander in Chief.

However, under the arrangement proposed in this measure, when there would be a running back to the President all the time, it seems to me that a poor job of delegating that power would be done.

Mr. TYDINGS. Of course, in the first instance we set up the Secretary of Defense, to shield the President from all such matters.

Under the pending proposal, the Chairman or Chief of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would, in the first instance, go to the Secretary of Defense to settle the controversy.

Mr. LODGE. I suppose that "Chairman" is the correct title.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. What I am trying to do is build up the loyalty to an over-all defense structure, loyalty to the armed services as a whole. That is why I wanted to do away with the positions of Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of the Air Force—not because I want to get rid of civilian supervision, for, on the contrary, I want to have civilian supervision; but I wanted to get away from the "old school tie"

business, and contrariwise, build up an over-all loyalty to the armed services.

So I hope we can build up the Joint Chiefs of Staff to a point where there is a loyalty that is above caste consciousness.

Mr. TYDINGS. I can appreciate the Senator's viewpoint; but the Joint Chiefs of Staff want the arrangement set forth in the pending measure. Certainly if we come to the floor of the Senate with a provision dealing with military conduct that the Joint Chiefs of Staff oppose, we shall have a rather difficult time getting it enacted, because, after all, I think General Eisenhower and General Vandenberg and Admiral Denfeld know more about such matters than we do.

Mr. LODGE. Of course there is no question about that, and I think the Senator from Maryland in making such a suggestion is attempting to throw a red herring across the trail.

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I am not.

Mr. LODGE. Because of course no one questions the knowledge of those gentlemen about military matters. I do not think General Bradley or General Eisenhower or General Vandenberg or Admiral Denfeld would disagree with a word I say about the necessity of developing a loyalty to the armed services as a whole.

Mr. TYDINGS. Neither do I.

Mr. LODGE. That is what we are talking about. That is why I was a little bit perplexed when I saw that in the committee bill the language of subsection (c) of section 211 had been modified from what it had been in the original draft, S. 1269, because in the bill as it stands here it reads:

Subject to the authority and direction of the President and the Secretary of Defense, it shall be the duty of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to perform, in addition to such other duties as the Secretary of Defense may direct, the following duties—

That, as I see it, is a step toward what I am talking about. Is it not a step toward placing more authority and more influence in the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is dependent on how one looks at it. I would say to the Senator from Massachusetts they have been performing traditionally the very thing set forth in the bill. But we thought it wise, insofar as we could to give reassurance—and in all these unification measures there is a large dose of reassurance in every program, because that is one of the things we have to work with. We have to let everybody know how there can be unification and to give reassurance at the same time. So far as I am concerned I should simply have written into it that the Joint Chiefs of Staff shall be charged with the military functions of the Department of Defense.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator what the significance is in the limitation of "not to exceed 210 officers," in section 212? I noticed that the original bill the Senator introduced provided for practi-

cally an equal number of officers from each of the three armed services. Now, the Senator has changed that to a limitation of 210 officers. What is the importance of that?

Mr. TYDINGS. I was in favor of not having any limitation on it. I was confident that the general Chiefs of Staff would not want the Joint Staff any larger than they felt was necessary in order to deal with whatever the exigencies were, and I introduced the bill in that shape, as I remember. But when it came up in committee, certain Senators, whose names I shall not mention, said they might desire to have 1,000 or 2,000 or 5,000 men, even, and therefore we should put a limitation on it. So 200 was suggested, and then 210. That figure was adopted, and it was supposed there would be an approximately equal distribution of one-third for each service. Personally the Senator from Maryland favors no limitation on it. I figure that if we charge the general Chiefs of Staff with the responsibility of preparing the Nation for any possible war, if they want a joint staff, of a certain size, they ought to have it, and I do not see why the Congress of the United States should tell them how large a staff they need or do not need. There are many things we can tell them, but how many men they need to prepare the battle plans against country X, for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, with the atomic bomb and the guided missile and the buzz bomb and everything else, is a little bit more than I am in a position to state. It is only 100 in the present law.

Mr. LODGE. Yes, I think that is very true.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think the Senator from Massachusetts and I see eye to eye on that proposition.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask whether there is any limitation on the size of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force staff?

Mr. TYDINGS. Not in this bill.

Mr. LODGE. Is there anywhere, does the Senator know?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, yes. We have what we call the composition bill which tells the number of personnel, officers and men, who are authorized in the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. My recollection is that none of them is up to strength at the moment. They are all below the authorized strength.

Mr. LODGE. Are not the Army, Navy, and Air Force staffs larger than the Joint Chiefs of Staff?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not follow the Senator's question.

Mr. LODGE. There is a limitation on the General Staff of the United States Army. Without that limitation—

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no limitation on who may be on the staffs of the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I am asking.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is a limitation on the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. But the separate staffs combined, in my opinion—and, I think, accurately—are not as large as the Joint Staff.

Mr. LODGE. I think it is a pity to put a limitation on the size of the staff of

the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when there is no limitation on the size of the individual staffs for the individual services. I think it still gives the idea that this loyalty to an integrated whole is still pretty much of a stepchild.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not want to make this a partisan debate, but we thought so, too. I would say to the Senator, we could not convince some of our friends who sat on the opposite side of the table, and they put this in over the protest of those on the other side.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, so far as I am concerned, there is no partisan politics in this at all.

Mr. TYDINGS. I say that humorously, because I know they were acting from the best of motives, as we were, in opposing this limitation. But I could not convince them they were making a mistake, so we went along with them.

Mr. LODGE. This is a dreadfully serious matter, as I said a moment ago. For the mistakes we make here, we are going to pay, not with dollars but in blood. There is no place for any kind of partisanship in it.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should be glad to have the Senator offer an amendment to strike out the 210. While I would feel in duty bound not to support the amendment, I would not be displeased—and I hope I am not equivocating—if it were adopted.

Mr. LODGE. I shall react to that suggestion, I can assure the Senator. I do not know how much longer the Senate wishes to continue in session. I have four or five more questions, and I shall be glad to go on asking, if the Senator is willing.

Mr. TYDINGS. I should be delighted to answer them, as long as the Senate cares to sit, and as long as the Senator from Massachusetts desires to ask them.

Mr. LODGE. What is the desire of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LUCAS. The desire of the Senator from Illinois is to take a recess as soon as the Senator from Massachusetts finishes his inquiry of the Senator from Maryland. As I understand, the Senator from Maryland may not be here tomorrow, and would like to finish his statement tonight.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want to impose on anybody. If the Senator is tired—

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is not imposing on me. I think the Senator from Massachusetts is evolving a thought on this that is very useful to all of us. So far as I can contribute the answers, I shall be delighted to endeavor to do so.

Mr. LODGE. I have, then, three or four more questions, and I think they are important. I notice that on page 9 there are listed seven duties which the Joint Chiefs of Staff are to perform.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is the same as the existing law, let me say to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. There were nine duties listed in the committee print.

Mr. TYDINGS. I think we went back to the original wording. I think we took the original wording, but I forgot the nuances which motivated us in that conflict.

Mr. LODGE. I should like to know whether the Joint Chiefs of Staff, under this new legislation, will be able to make plans for the employment of the total military manpower of the country, or whether the different services, the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps, are all going to go into a higgledy-piggledy competition for recruiting, enlistment, and so on, as they have done in the past, with of course, enormously wasteful consequences. Will the Joint Chiefs of Staff under this bill be able to make a thorough and scientific determination as to the allocation of our supplies of manpower?

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator mean in time of war, or now?

Mr. LODGE. Either, or both.

Mr. TYDINGS. All they can do now, of course, is to determine by the amount of money we appropriate for pay of the officers and personnel in the three services. That will be a definite sum of money, and it will in effect fix the number of officers and men in each of the three services; which I apprehend will be less than enough to bring the three services up to full strength. In time of war or at the approach of war, we would probably not only have a draft act but we would enforce it and see that we got enough men. We would appropriate the money, so that between all our actions we would have in time of war enough men and officers to man the three services. However, as the Senator well knows, the National Security Resources Board is supposed to make plans for a division of the population between the Army and the civilian functions, so that the supply may be ample for those we have in the service, so that the food may be ample for those we have in the service, so that the workers may make the consumers' goods for those who are not in the service and who are making things for the service. All of that requires a great deal of planning. That function per se in its initial stages is performed by the National Security Resources Board for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for the President, and for the Secretary of Defense. Within that recommendation, the Joint Chiefs of Staff then, if they have the money, can have all of the forces that they require, that are authorized by Congress. That is the best way I can answer that question.

Mr. LODGE. Let me put it to the Senator in a realistic manner. Take the last war as an example. Young men wanted to go into the Marine Corps, they wanted to go into the Air Corps, they wanted to go into the Navy. Practically nobody wanted to go into the Infantry. We simply could not win the war without large quantities of infantry. It became a very serious problem. The boys did not want to go into the Infantry.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is the best branch, the most deserving branch, in all three departments. It is the branch with which the Senator from Maryland was formerly identified in World War I. Without that branch, I doubt if the Republic would be in existence, because from George Washington to the present time the boys in the Infantry have been

the boys who have slugged it out and have brought home the bacon.

Mr. LODGE. That is just it. When I say Infantry I include the Marine Corps because it is the rifle companies which take the heavy losses. They are very much heavier than in any other kind of warfare. I believe that is borne out by statistics.

So we confront a situation in which we cannot win wars without having many young men in rifle companies. That has nothing to do with what people want to do; that is the way it is. If we are going to place a great many young men in rifle companies, the least we can do is to provide them with good leadership, good young officers, and there is only so much young military leadership available. If that leadership goes where it wants to go, it will go into the Air Force, into the Navy, or into the Marine Corps, and there would not be sufficient young leadership assigned to the Infantry. They are entitled to good leadership when they come up against the grim facts of war.

Are the Joint Chiefs of Staff to have a right to study that problem and make recommendations with reference to it, so that this precious nucleus of young military leadership, which is always very limited in any country—it is like radium; it is the lodestone of our whole military effort—so that this precious leadership is allocated where it will do the most good, and not necessarily where it wants to go?

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure I can answer the Senator's question. The way it would work out would be as follows: There would be a balance struck between those who might be required to work for the war effort and those required to work in the war effort, in uniform. Once that balance was struck and the number of men fixed, the Joint Chiefs of Staff would open the allocations in the Air, the Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Army. They could go further and include the Artillery, the Infantry, the Quartermaster Corps, the Signal Corps, the Transport Corps, or what not. They could fix the number and could regulate it entirely by siphoning the men who would come in under the draft to that branch of the armed services best fitted for the defense of the country.

Mr. LODGE. Is it planned to do that?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; because the National Security Resources Board is specifically charged with making such a study and being always ready for the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the event war comes upon us or we are threatened with war.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. It has always been that way. In World War I the Senator from Illinois had an experience of that kind. In other words, at Fort Griffin, Ga., I was selected, depending upon the abilities I had. But certainly no one would want to take away from any enlisted man the right to enlist in any branch of the service he preferred, until the quota was filled.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct. I think the Senator from Illinois may be under the impression that the colloquy between the Senator from Massachusetts and me may have left someone with a false impression. We want a man to go into whatever branch of the armed services he chooses, so far as the need of the organization and his own talents will permit. As I understood the Senator's question, it was that that probably could be fixed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. LUCAS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am sure there is nothing in the bill which would prevent that. All the machinery is established to accomplish the objectives mentioned by the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. It is highly desirable for a man to go into the service he wishes to enter, but there is nothing like enough men who want to go into the Infantry. That is where the problem arises.

I should like to ask one more question. The Senator has been very patient with me, and I hope I shall not wear him out.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad to have the Senator's questions, because I think they have brought out many points we did not have time to bring out previously. Further, we think the bill is so good that within the limitations of possibility it is probably as far-reaching and valuable a piece of legislation as we can put through affecting the Military Establishment in time of peace.

Mr. LODGE. In the committee print, page 4, appears paragraph (3) of section 202. Beginning in line 19 there is added language some of which was not in the committee print, and some of which was; but the last part of it was not. I should like to read the whole paragraph. These are the duties imposed on the Secretary of Defense:

Taking of appropriate steps, including such coordination, transfers, and consolidations as may be necessary—

There is where we save money in time of peace, and there is where we get the most out of the manpower in time of war—

to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, health, research, and personnel, and in such other fields as he may deem proper—

One would think there would be a period at that point; but here comes a "but." We must always look out for the word "but"—

but this shall not be construed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to reassign the combatant functions assigned to the military departments by sections 205 (e), 206 (b), 206 (c), and 208 (f) hereof, or—

Here comes the "or"—

or to make transfers of military personnel from one military department to another or to make details or assignments of military personnel in a manner substantially to effect or change such assigned combatant functions.

That is the part to which I wish to invite the attention of the Senator from Maryland. I should like to ask him why it was necessary to put in that "but" and that "or." Is there anything in the law now which enables the Department of Defense to transfer those functions?

Mr. TYDINGS. That is in the law now.

Mr. LODGE. Why was it put in?

Mr. TYDINGS. Again?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just to reassure people who had to be reassured in order to get enough votes to get a proper law through the Congress.

Mr. LODGE. Who are the people who have so many votes and so much influence that they have to be reassured by a repetition of the law? I should like to know that.

Mr. TYDINGS. There are some on both sides of the aisle who wanted that reassurance.

Mr. LODGE. I am not speaking politically.

Mr. TYDINGS. If the Senator will talk with his colleagues on the other side of the aisle who served on the committee, he will find that some of this reassurance was pretty strongly urged by Members on this side and on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. LODGE. I should really like to know who it is who has so many votes and so much influence that we have to restate the law in order to get this bill passed.

Mr. TYDINGS. Does the Senator want me to call names?

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I do not say names of Senators, but names of the one for whom they speak.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts, to show him that I do not think these things are as serious as cold type appears, that today in executive session the Secretary of Defense appeared before our committee and told us of a highly confidential consolidation which had just taken place in the three branches of the service, of the very highest priority—and I cannot be any more specific—which saves thousands of men, and I believe, and he stated verbatim, millions and millions of dollars. That was done with the approval finally of the three branches of the service. They like to be reassured.

One branch will have a sort of a patent on a certain function. Then the others want to duplicate that function so that they will not have to use the function of the branch which originally set up this particular performance. After a while the three of them have the function. We will liken it to the use of an automobile. Each branch has an automobile. The Secretary says, "You fellows don't need three automobiles. You are all going to the same place. I am going to do away with two of these and you can all ride in one vehicle." That was all disclosed today, for reasons which cannot be publicized. I have no doubt in the world that by unification many hundreds of men will be turned loose and made free for use in other services, and millions of dollars are going to be saved in equipment and everything else connected with the operation.

To read the language, one would almost assume that that could not be done, but I can tell the Senator that to my certain knowledge Secretary Forrestal made several of these proposals, and gave them no publicity, some of them in the

classified realm, and already Mr. Johnson has made several, and they are saving men and saving money. If we are to have an adequate national defense we have to save money in order to get the defense we must have. We cannot spend any more.

Mr. LODGE. That is what I am arguing for, and I think it is very extraordinary that as able a Senator as the Senator from Maryland, as brilliant as he is, as quick-witted as he is, and as conversant with the subject as he is, can give me only one answer, and say that it is because of influential people who have votes up here. That is the only answer he gives. As able as the Senator is, if there were a good answer, he would give it to me.

Mr. TYDINGS. I say this to the Senator from Massachusetts—and I have a smile on my face because I see several of the members of my committee on the floor, for which I am grateful—that the Senator from Maryland tried for 3 weeks, on a proposition which he initiated, to get his committee to go along with him, and his committee would not do so, but left him stranded high and dry after 3 weeks of pretty stiff argument. So that there are points in the minds and convictions of men which it is not possible to get them to surrender.

Mr. LODGE. I wish they would come out and say these things on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS. Whether they are right or wrong, they believe in them intensely.

Mr. LODGE. What do they believe?

Mr. TYDINGS. And when one works and works and whittles away at the arguments and cannot accomplish what he seeks, there is only one thing to do, and that is salvage everything possible.

Mr. LODGE. I know about that, and the Senator is very practical in salvaging, and I honor him for it. But what are these convictions? Why, if it is so important, does not someone rise and show its importance?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Secretary of Defense, Mr. Johnson, came before the committee and recommended this language.

Mr. LODGE. This language?

Mr. TYDINGS. The "but" language.

Mr. LODGE. The Secretary of Defense?

Mr. TYDINGS. The Secretary of Defense, because he told us very frankly that he doubted whether the bill could pass both Houses without it.

Mr. LODGE. This was on his recommendation?

Mr. TYDINGS. On his recommendation. There are those who did not want it, and I was one, but felt that we should not insist on 10 percent and lose the whole bill, because it has so many good things in it which would save money.

Mr. LODGE. This is one of the bad things which I would like to take out.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator can offer an amendment on the floor, and I cannot vote with him, because I am for the committee bill, but my sympathies will be with him.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator to refer me to the page of the record

where the Secretary of Defense asked for that language?

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe I owe my committee an apology. I believe that was in executive session.

Mr. LODGE. If the Secretary of Defense wants that language in—and I am sure he is man enough to come and say so openly, though I should be surprised if he did—then I should like to have him come and say it openly.

We recall how the engineers engaged in lobbying against any reorganization law. They were afraid. They did not have to be afraid. Their Corps has a marvelous standing, a wonderful reputation. They do not have to be pried or jimmied into the law by some special act. By the same token there is not a single branch of the service that is worth its salt that needs to have this type of artificial, legalistic limitation written into the law. I think that if we were to spend the national defense money the way the Senator and I spend our own money, we could have, not \$500,000,000, not a billion, not a billion and a half, but two and a half billion, easily, in my judgment, and we would probably have just as much fighting strength, just as much fire power, when we got through. Some feelings would be hurt, but not at the taxpayers' expense. But to ask the Secretary of Defense to make all these savings and all these economies and then to put a big "but" in there, that he cannot take Joe Doakes here and put him over somewhere else where he is needed, to my mind is a contradiction in terms. And that is in time of peace.

In time of war, are we to say, "We want the land battle, and now we are fighting a sea battle. We have 40 divisions, but they are going to do squads right and squads left, although they are badly needed to go into the Navy, and swab the decks. But they cannot do it because we must not transfer men to the posts where they are needed." During the last war I think fully one-third of the junior officers were taken out of the division in which I served in order to enter the Air Force. It was smart and realistic. We had to win the air war. Then in 1945 the Army got to the point where they were running short of men for the Infantry and they took fellows out of the Air Force and put them into the Infantry. They said, "This is not a private club. It is a war, and we have to win."

When I first went to Libya in 1942 it was common talk all through the British Army—I do not vouch for the accuracy of the details—but the general talk was that the British Army was so divided up in watertight compartments that the replacements would come out from England for the Coldstream Guards, for instance, but they could not take a boy out of the Coldstream Guards and put him into the Queen's Hussars because of those limiting laws and regulations.

Mr. TYDINGS. We do not have that trouble in our Military Establishment.

Mr. LODGE. If we had had this system in the last war we would not have been able to shift the men all around.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is entirely wrong.

Mr. LODGE. No, I am not. I wish I were, but I am not.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is nothing in the bill which prevents a transfer of marines to the Army, or of the air men to the Army, or of Army men to the Navy, unless it destroys the Marine Corps, destroys the Navy, or destroys the Army.

Mr. LODGE. Where does the Senator read that?

Mr. TYDINGS. This was put in because it was assumed that so many could be transferred in homeopathic doses that the whole business could be done. The bill itself provides that transfers can take place, but they cannot take place to such an extent that it would destroy the organization from which a transfer is made.

Mr. LODGE. Where does it say anything about destroying? I thought we were trying to destroy the enemy, not to destroy ourselves.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me read it to the Senator. It is subsection (3), line 15, page 4:

Taking of appropriate steps, including such coordination, transfers, and consolidations as may be necessary, to eliminate unnecessary duplication or overlapping in the fields of procurement, supply, transportation, storage, personnel, health, research, and in such other fields as he may deem proper, but this shall not be construed to authorize the Secretary of Defense to reassign the combatant functions assigned to the military departments and other roles and missions—

Mr. LODGE. The Senator has left out the words "or to make transfers of military personnel." Am I reading from the wrong bill? I am reading from page 4 of Senate bill 1843. The words appear therein, "or to make transfers of military personnel from one military department to another."

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes, but I am showing the way the Secretary of Defense sent it over to us and asked us to pass it.

Mr. LODGE. That does not answer my question as to why it was done.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I want to make with the Senator, and I want to make sure that he understands it, is that you can take men out of the Marine Corps and put them in the Army, or you can take men out of the Army and the Navy and put them in the Marine Corps under the existing law.

Mr. LODGE. You cannot transfer them. They have to resign, do they not?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; they can be transferred temporarily. A company or a battalion can be transferred and work together with the Army.

Mr. LODGE. Yes. That is different. I am not talking about attaching a company. I know that a certain number of men can be detailed and attached to another group. But during the war we took men out of the Army and actually placed them in the Air Force.

Mr. TYDINGS. First of all, legally a man could not be taken from one branch and placed in the other if he did not want to have it done. Let me explain to the Senator. When a man is commissioned in the Army of the United States no one can transfer him out of the Army. His commission is a binding contract between him and his Government.

Mr. LODGE. I know that. I myself was commissioned.

Mr. TYDINGS. He is commissioned for one particular purpose, and he cannot be transferred without his consent. John Doe receives a piece of parchment showing that he is hereby commissioned a lieutenant or a captain or a colonel or a general in the Army of the United States. But he can be transferred, he can be attached, he can be assigned to recruiting service, to training with the Navy, to any one of a number of functions, to serve with them. But his home, his parent organization, in spite of the fact that he may serve with the Navy, is the Army, if he is commissioned in the Army of the United States.

Mr. LODGE. That I think is old-fashioned and out of date, and I speak as a man who has a commission in the Army. I have such a parchment as the Senator speaks of. I think that is old-fashioned. I think the whole thing must be more fluid.

Mr. TYDINGS. So long as he is commissioned he cannot be transferred.

Mr. LODGE. It can be done in the future. This provision of the bill is a military monstrosity, I will say very candidly, and it goes against all the experience and the realism of war. Although the Senator from Maryland has been very tactful, and he has not given away the hand at all, and he has not betrayed any confidences on the part of his colleagues, and he has not come out and said what the real reason for this thing is, it looks to me as though it were a device to protect some particular interest.

Mr. TYDINGS. Just a minute, Mr. President. The Senator from Maryland is not withholding anything from the Senator from Massachusetts. I want to get that plain. If the Senator has gained the impression that there is any deceit in anything the Senator from Maryland is saying—

Mr. LODGE. No; I do not think it is deceit. I think it is discretion.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, even discretion. If I am to be criticized for not being frank, I will say that I have nothing to hide. I will say frankly that I am for this bill, though there are parts of it with which I do not agree. But I can go through, with the help of my committee, in framing a piece of legislation that will save a billion or one billion and one-half dollars a year, as former President Hoover says, and contribute immeasurably to unification. Even though it is not a perfect measure, I am willing to make a few minor sacrifices to make the saving.

Mr. LODGE. I have not criticized the Senator at all. And I am in favor of saving a billion and a half dollars. I think this bill is a step in the right direction. I think it falters here and there. I think if the bill were amended in one or two particulars probably an extra billion dollars might be saved. I do not think we have the idea in our head realistically that there has got to be a loyalty to the armed forces as a whole, there has got to be a recognition of the fact that this country is very short of manpower, that in any war in the future we

cannot waste our manpower for sentimental reasons, but will have to use it where it does the most good.

Mr. TYDINGS. I hope the Senator will offer an amendment at the proper place, when we have the matter under consideration; and if he can induce Congress to wipe out these roles and missions, in view of the strength that I know will develop in opposition thereto, I shall be glad to support him.

Mr. LODGE. I am not making any bets as to my success, because when the Senator from Maryland speaks about the influences that control so many votes here, I am sure he is correct. I know the case I plead has no glamor to it. It is based on the reality of war, and war is a very ugly thing, and there is no attraction to it, but I shall offer the amendment in any case.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point a short explanatory statement dealing with the budget provisions.

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

Section 10, which begins at the bottom of page 16, contains the provisions which call for a complete overhaul of the budget and accounting practices in the National Military Establishment. This section sets up in the Office of the Secretary of Defense a Comptroller, who is made responsible to the Secretary for all budgeting and accounting policies and practices. A similar arrangement is prescribed within each military department, with the added provision that the practices and policies in each of the three military departments shall be patterned after those prescribed by the Comptroller in the Department of Defense.

The section also provides that future budget estimates submitted by the Military Establishment shall be on a performance, or functional, basis, rather than on the present "things to be acquired" basis.

Provision is also made in this section for necessary program adjustments within each military department so as to permit of a better utilization of appropriated funds. The establishment of working-capital funds for all three services in the manner similar to that now prescribed for the Navy stock fund is also authorized. Provision is also made for management funds in the three services, similar to the naval emergency fund established in 1945.

All of the provisions of this section have the approval and the enthusiastic endorsement of the Hoover Commission. They are also concurred in by the General Accounting Office, the Department of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Defense. I must admit that some of the provisions of this section might be accomplished without specific statutory direction, but the committee felt that it was necessary that some affirmative stand be taken by the Congress to direct that these necessary measures be undertaken without delay. The authority has existed for years, but nothing constructive has happened in this field. The committee therefore feels that the Congress should direct that these necessary reforms be gotten under way by enacting this type of amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to say, following that statement, that one of the reasons I did not explain in more detail the budget provisions is that they are highly technical. The provisions must be read, and it is necessary to have face to face conversa-

tion in order to explain them in all their ramifications. But I should like to say before leaving this phase of the subject, that they were worked out with Mr. McNeil, who has been the budget expert in the Department of Defense, Mr. Eberstadt in the committee, and numerous others. I believe that without further explanation the Senate will be very wise to accept them.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. During the course of the debate something was said to the effect that former Secretary of War Patterson was in favor of merger. I have just looked up his statement under date of November 9, in his capacity as member of the national security organization:

The War Department proposal was to have a single department of defense, under a single secretary. The single department was to have three branches of equal status—Army, Navy, and Air.

That is not a merger. It is the exact opposite.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate has been considering Senate bill 1843. The Senator in charge of the measure, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], estimates that by passing the bill a saving can be made of \$1,500,000,000. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] stated that if we accept a couple of amendments he would propose, an additional \$2,000,000,000 could be saved. The Senator from Massachusetts did not seem to be encouraged over the success of his amendments. I hope he offers his amendments. I think that any amendment which will result in saving \$2,000,000,000, and at the same time keep the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force strong fighting organizations, is worthy of the attention of the Members of the United States Senate. Even though the Senator's amendment may be lost now, the cause is not necessarily lost in the long run.

This afternoon there was reported from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a bill entitled "A bill making appropriations for foreign aid for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950." This is the so-called ECA appropriation bill. The bill has not been passed by the House, but I should like to say for the benefit of the Members of the Senate that the amount which would be allocated under that bill, compared with the \$5,580,000,000 authorization the Senate passed and sent to the House for the 1 year for which the appropriation is effective, beginning next July, is \$4,288,000,000. One quarter of the year would already be gone. There is no use trying to save anything for that period. But the \$4,288,000,000 would be the full amount of the House ECA bill for the year beginning July 1, 1949, and ending on June 30, 1950. The House made a searching investigation of the ECA needs, and what might be saved. I hope the same will be done in connection with the national defense.

No Senator has done more to support national defense than has the junior Senator from Nebraska. The junior Senator from Nebraska was one of the Sena-

tors who last year took the lead to have a force of 70 air squadrons established. I want to follow the advice of the military men, because I think when it comes to military matters a layman must give way to the judgment of military men. We must take the advice of military men respecting national defense. Even the national defense appropriations should be scrutinized. If two and a half billion dollars can be saved, I think the amendments should be offered, even though they are not approved in the Senate at this time.

Let me tell the Senate what the Appropriations Committee of the House did in connection with the ECA bill. First, a subcommittee went over the appropriation of \$4,288,000,000, and reported to the full committee a recommendation for the appropriation of \$4,015,900,000. Then the full committee considered the recommendation and, believe it or not, it reported the bill to the House in the amount of \$3,569,470,000. That is 17½ percent less than what was authorized by the Senate several weeks ago.

Mr. President, I do not want to stand here and say "I told you so," or to defend the amendment which I offered, providing for a reduction of 15 percent. That amendment was lost, there being only 14 or 15 votes for it. The point I make is that the House Appropriations Committee did a good job. It investigated the subject, and reconciled earlier prices with today's prices, and recommended a reduction of 17½ percent from the amount of the authorization passed by the Senate.

I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the committee [Mr. TYDINGS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I have enjoyed every moment of this debate. But I hope the Senator from Massachusetts will offer his amendments. I think they are worthy of consideration. I certainly feel that in the interest of economy we must reduce appropriations all along the line. I admit that we must have an adequate national defense, but I hope that members of the Armed Services Committee will bring their amendments to the floor of the Senate and give us an opportunity to hear the debate pro and con. I hope the Senate will follow the example of the House in connection with the ECA bill. We should appropriate enough, but we should give the subject full consideration, so that we may keep the financial policy of the United States Government sound. We must cut the cloth to fit the pattern, so that we can avoid increasing taxes and deficit spending. I believe that all Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle can subscribe to that philosophy and those recommendations.

#### WORLD ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I have a brief statement to make, and an invitation to offer to Members of the Senate.

In connection with the Foreign Ministers meeting on Germany in Paris, the general concern about the future of our policy in western Europe, which has been highlighted in recent days by the lifting of the Berlin blockade, the return of

General Clay, and the extended hearings on the North Atlantic Pact, I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a forthcoming conference in Europe which, I believe, will make a decisive contribution in our efforts to expand the frontiers of freedom.

Many of my colleagues know that the junior Senator from Washington was one of a Congressional delegation who last year attended the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament at Caux, Switzerland. In recent years many Senators and Representatives have visited this beautiful spot and found it to be one of the most hopeful developments in postwar Europe. As I wrote to General Clay last fall, I found there "the only available and reasonable answer to the sweeping tide of communism."

Before attending this conference I was far from satisfied that appropriating billions of dollars for European aid was going to do the job. After seeing what was going on in Europe I can say with conviction that material things, when provided within reason and when properly administered can give us a legitimate run for our money, because behind them, and more important, the spirit, first of Europe and then of the world, is being rejuvenated and revitalized.

When present at the conference I urged that the program be given fullest scope in Germany itself. I am very happy to learn that the French Foreign Minister has been so impressed with the results achieved in that country that he has asked to meet with the leaders of western Germany at Caux in early June. This conference, which is scheduled from June 4 to 12, gives a unique opportunity to Senators to confer with German leaders and to explore and mold German opinion at a moment most critical for the west. Already the minister-presidents of most of the states of the western zones have accepted, along with Dr. Konrad Adenauer, president of the constitutional assembly at Bonn; Hans Boeckler, chairman of the trade-union council, British zone; Alfred Hartmann, finance director of Bizonia; and August Schmidt, president of the Ruhr mine workers. Among the representative statesmen who are planning to take part in the conference are members of the cabinets of France, Switzerland, Greece, and Japan, and parliamentary delegates from Italy and other countries.

In light of the caliber of the delegates from other countries it is of extreme importance that the United States be adequately represented. It would take months of travel to meet these men, and may I say from experience that they would never be so accessible anywhere else.

Statesmanship today demands the seizing of an occasion like this to build relations in an atmosphere which these statesmen feel—and I can confirm their judgment to be the one hope for Europe's future. This opportunity taken in the early twenties might have prevented war. Now it can unite the leadership of the democratic nations in a fight for a free world. I believe this is a historic opportunity for Members of this body not only to meet world leaders and know

conditions from these authentic sources, but also to report to America what they find and kindle nationally the fight for democracy's inspired ideology as the one hope for peace in the new world.

There will be a special plane for Members of Congress and other American citizens leaving LaGuardia Airport June 2 for Geneva and the Caux Conference. Although, as I have said, the conference is from June 4 to 12, Members of Congress could attend for a shorter period. I myself was gone from this country last fall for only 6 days, and found it eminently worth while. That visit is still so rich an experience for me that I urge my colleagues to give a thoughtful and cordial welcome to any invitation they may receive for this forthcoming conference.

I want to think, Mr. President, that the Chair might find it convenient and proper to appoint an unofficial committee of Senators from both sides of the aisle to attend this conference and to report back in an informal way its results.

I believe it would be of immense value in our deliberations to have in our midst and at our disposal a first-hand knowledge of the thinking and insight afforded by the statesmen who will be gathered in Caux.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks the body of the invitation which has come to hand.

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

**THIS IS A PERSONAL INVITATION — WORLD ASSEMBLY FOR MORAL REARMAMENT — THE IDEOLOGY OF INSPIRED DEMOCRACY**

(R. S. V. P. Philippe Mottu, the Mountain House, Caux-sur-Montreux)

(June 4-12, 1949, Caux-sur-Montreux, Switzerland)

ROBERT SCHUMAN, FOREIGN MINISTER OF FRANCE

In the economic field we have the Marshall plan. In the political and military field we have the Atlantic Pact. Now we need to give ideological content to the lives of the millions of Europe. We must reach the people so that the pact will be sustained by a deep change in the way of life of the western world.

DR. KARL ARNOLD, MINISTER-PRESIDENT OF NORTH RHINE-WESTPHALIA, GERMANY

We must reeducate people in democracy. Make a citizen aware he has as much responsibility for the actions of the state in which he lives as he has for his own personal action. "As I am so is my nation."

Moral rearmament has a tremendous part to play in this program. It is something that people trust. It wins their hearts and gets inside their minds. It can be the means of thawing our frozen hearts. That is our great task today. The basis of European unity is not political or economic or industrial. We have to begin at the spiritual end. We Europeans have forgotten how to think organically. What is the use of a head or a hand on its own? When you have all the parts working together, then you have a body. That is the philosophy of moral rearmament.

IGINO GIORDANI, MEMBER OF THE ITALIAN PARLIAMENT AND EDITOR OF FIDES

Barriers of race and class have been banished from Caux, this home of hospitality, and in their place has been discovered the spirit of simple human understanding. Moral rearmament breaks down individual-

ism on the one hand and materialism on the other and creates that universal love which is an essential part of Catholic religious life. Dr. Buchman has succeeded with fearless determination and consistence in achieving the aim of the Catholic Englishman, Chesterton—to mobilize the forces of good to do battle against evil.

GEN. HENRI GUISAN, WARTIME COMMANDER IN CHIEF OF THE SWISS ARMY

Switzerland, Europe's most ancient democracy, understands moral rearmament, and that is why we are proud to think that its European headquarters is situated in our country.

During the last decades Switzerland has tried to give the best she had to assuage the misery and sufferings caused by war. Through moral rearmament a new opportunity opens before our people to bring to Europe the secret of a living democracy inspired by Almighty God.

SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, AS COCHAIRMAN OF THE SMITH-MUNDT COMMITTEE, UNITED STATES CONGRESS

Our committee paid a visit to Caux to the Moral Rearmament Conference which in some ways comprised the brightest star for the future we have witnessed in all Europe. Some of its achievements to date are little short of miraculous. There we met Dr. Frank Buchman, the sponsor of moral rearmament, and saw the world premiere of the new dramatic review, the Good Road.

Europe and the world today need moral revitalization and rearmament. No man could attend the conference in Caux and watch the emotions of a new hope light the faces of the people there and not come away convinced that the organized forces of good in this world can defeat the organized forces of evil.

SIR ZAFRULLAH KHAN, FOREIGN MINISTER OF PAKISTAN

I am convinced that moral rearmament is the world's supreme need at the moment. Only through sustained effort in that direction can mankind win through to its true redemption.

SIR PATRICK DOLLAN, EDITOR OF THE SCOTTISH DAILY HERALD

In the shipyards, steel works, and factories of Clydeside, moral rearmament is providing men and women with a new dynamic. What I have seen, not only in my own country but among the ruined cities of Germany, has convinced me that this inspired Christian ideology can bring about the rebirth of nations. It is the one sure hope for a crumbling civilization.

DR. HANS BOECKLER, CHAIRMAN OF THE TRADE-UNION CONGRESS OF THE BRITISH ZONE, GERMANY

If men are to be free from the old and the outmoded, it can only happen as they set themselves a new goal, and place in the forefront humanity and moral values. I believe that moral rearmament can bring about a definite improvement for mankind in many areas of life. When men change the structure of society changes, and when the structure of society changes men change. Both go together and both are necessary. The goal which moral rearmament strives to reach is the same as that for which I am fighting as a trade-unionist.

DR. FRANK N. D. BUCHMAN IN A WORLD BROADCAST FROM CAUX

A generation ago the force of moral rearmament began fighting. On a world front it has been answering plan with plan, idea with idea, a militant godless materialism with a militant inspired ideology for democracy.

The idea caught hold. It armed men. It impacted nation after nation. Now it girdles the globe. Today at the moral rearmament assembly at Caux we see this force in action

with the answer, available for service. At a time when statesmen realize the lateness of the hour, it freely offers the fruit of 25 years of toil. A force in the war of ideas, with the training and experience which, under God, can equip the statesmen and the ordinary man with an ideology adequate to remake the nations—now.

The assembly will be attended by political and industrial leaders from many nations. Cabinet Ministers from the various countries have already intimated their desire to be present.

During the assembly the world preview will take place of the film the Good Road, now being made in Lausanne by one of Hollywood's ablest directors, Edward Griffith, assisted by a corps of Hollywood artists. The film will go out to a world market in the language of each country.

Performances of the Forgotten Factor and other ideological weapons will be features of the assembly. There will be songs by the Mackinac singers.

MR. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to underline the statement of Foreign Minister Robert Schuman when he says:

In the economic field we have the Marshall plan. In the political and military field we have the Atlantic Pact. Now we need to give ideological content to the lives of the millions of Europe. We must reach the people so that the pact will be sustained by a deep change in the way of life of the Western World.

**EXTENSION OF TIME FOR ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON MINING CLAIMS**

MR. LUCAS. Mr. President, this afternoon when the calendar was being called, House bill 1754, Calendar 393, a bill to extend the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims, was objected to by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. Later in conversation with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and after a full explanation of the bill, the Senator from Nevada agreed to withdraw his objection.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1754) extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian July 1, 1949.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

MR. WHERRY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I do not wish to disappoint the distinguished majority leader, but I do know that the junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is very much interested in this proposed legislation. I believe that at the time the bill went over it was the junior Senator from Maryland who made the objection.

MR. LUCAS. No; the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] made the objection, but later, in conference with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], he withdrew his objection. That is the only reason I am bringing it up at this time. If there is any other objection, I am not aware of it.

MR. WHERRY. I should like very much to get in touch with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr.

MILLIKIN]. I know that he wanted to be present when the bill was considered. I am informed that he favors the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN entered the Chamber.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the Senator from Colorado is now present in the Chamber. I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I have learned with great pleasure that the objection to this bill has been withdrawn. There is a very essential time element involved. If our miners are to do assessment work, they must get it done before the end of June; and if they are not to do it, they must make their plans accordingly. So I wish to express my appreciation for the withdrawal of the objection to the bill, and I am delighted that action can be taken on it now.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I am making this report for the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], who was compelled to leave the Chamber before this hour.

There is a slight amendment to be made on page 2, in line 11.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1754) extending the time for the completion of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States for the year ending at 12 o'clock meridian, July 1, 1949, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, which requires on each mining claim located, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than \$100 worth of labor to be performed or improvements aggregating such amount to be made each year, be, and the same is hereby suspended as to all mining claims in the United States until the hour of 12 o'clock meridian of the 1st day of July 1949: *Provided*, That every claimant of any such mining claim in order to obtain the benefits of this act shall file, or cause to be filed, in the office where the location notice or certificate is recorded, on or before 12 o'clock meridian of July 1, 1949, a notice of his desire to hold said mining claim under this act.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of any act of Congress to the contrary, any person who hereafter prospects for, mines, or removes any minerals from any land included in a stock raising or other homestead entry or patent, and who had been liable under such an existing act only for damages caused thereby to the crops or improvements of the entryman or patentee, shall also be liable for any damage that may be caused to the value of the land for grazing by such prospecting for, mining, or removal of minerals. Nothing in this section shall be construed to impair any vested right in existence on the effective date of this section.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I move to amend the committee amendment on page 2, in line 11, by striking out the date "1949" and inserting in lieu thereof "1950."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the fact that the same date appears in line 15.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct; and I move that the committee amendment be amended, in line 15, so as to change the date "1949" to "1950."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and third reading of the bill.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States and enlarging the liability for damages caused to stock raising and other homesteads by mining activities."

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished majority leader. If the Senate completes action on Senate bill 1843 tomorrow, of course the unfinished business will be the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act. What does the distinguished Senator from Illinois intend to do about it, in the event the Senator from Georgia is not able to present that measure tomorrow?

Mr. LUCAS. In response to the inquiry by the distinguished minority leader, I wish to say that we shall proceed to the consideration of House bill 2663, Calendar No. 90, an act to provide for the administration of the Central Intelligence Agency. I am sure that will be the order of business in the Senate, because in conversation with the able Senator from Georgia today, he indicated that he would not be able to present the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not attempting to get a commitment from the able majority leader; but in the event that Calendar No. 90, House bill 2663, is taken up and disposed of tomorrow before the end of the day, does the able majority leader have any idea that it might be possible for the Senate to take up the measure providing for the 15-month so-called moratorium, as provided in the Myers bill relating to the freight-rate basing-point issue?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; there is a good possibility that that measure will be taken up.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. Senators on both sides of the aisle have manifested considerable interest in the bill, and I hope the majority leader will give consideration to having the Senate take it up, in the event the able Senator

from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is not in a position to present the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Extension Act tomorrow.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, there is considerable interest in the Myers bill on the part of a number of Senators, and I hope it will be possible for the bill to be considered by the Senate tomorrow, in the event the developments just mentioned occur.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator.

#### RECESS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, out of respect to the memory of the late James Forrestal, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 33 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 24, 1949, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 23, 1949:

#### IN THE ARMY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY  
The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1949, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 508 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.):

Louis Edward Abele  
Charles Milton Adams  
Boyd Winston Allen, Jr.  
Harold Raymond Anderegg  
Curtis Langford Anders  
Alfred Julius Anderson  
Robert Benjamin Andreen  
John Quirn Arnette  
Charles Thompson Baker  
Jesmond Dene Balmer, Jr.  
Thomas Fuller Bamford  
Samuel Lyman Barber, Jr.  
Raymon Clay Barlow, Jr.  
Raymond Ripley Battrell, Jr.  
Louis Pintard Bayard  
Clyde Beauchamp Bell, Jr.  
John Arthur Bender  
Earl Craig Betts  
John Howard Birrell  
Robert Woolfolk Black  
Herman Theodore Boland, Jr.  
David Endicott Bolte  
Donald Richard Bonwell  
Marcellus William Bounds  
Robert Louis Bradley  
Donald Vincent Braun  
Adrian Beecher Brian  
Dan Austin Brooksher  
Allan Gregory Brown  
Robert McHugh Brown  
William Cavett Brown  
Goble Watson Bryant  
Clay Thompson Buckingham  
Ralph Maurice Buffington  
Richard Nichols Bundy  
Charles Nixon Bunn  
John Charles Burkart  
Thomas Hannah Burt  
Louis Stanton Bush  
William Douglas Bush, Jr.  
Roy Thomas Byrd  
Howard Hollis Callaway  
John Louis Carr  
Bruce MacDonald Carswell  
Anthony Cavalcante, Jr.  
Edmund Harwood Cave  
David Jarrett Chandler  
John Palmer Chandler  
Gilbert Xavier Cheves, Jr.  
Frank Payne Clarke  
James Joseph Coghlan, Jr.

David James Colgan  
 Charles Sidney Colson  
 Richard Martin Connell  
 Judson Jerome Conner  
 John Joseph Costa  
 Thomas Black Coughlin  
 Ranald David Council  
 Samuel Streit Coursen  
 Cleatus Jack Cox  
 Richard Stirling Craig  
 George Michael Crall  
 Henry Turner Croonquist  
 Barnard Cummings, Jr.  
 William Alexander Cummings  
 Robert Kirk Dalrymple  
 Courtenay Chirm Davis, Jr.  
 Bartley E. Day  
 Seth Sears Day  
 Leon Luscher deCorrevont  
 F. William Dederich  
 Fred Blaine Deem, Jr.  
 Ernest William Denham, Jr.  
 Dean Berkeley Dickinson  
 Hillman Dickinson  
 Andrew Shumway Dilts  
 Patrick Joseph Donohoe  
 Arthur Roy Driscoll, Jr.  
 Richard Tracy Dunphy  
 Joseph Alban Eagers, Jr.  
 William Fletcher, Earthman, Jr.  
 Frederic Nathaniel Eaton  
 Stanley Vernon Ellerthorpe  
 Allan Jackson English, Jr.  
 Robert Louis Erbe  
 Robert Kent Estes  
 Alfred Erck Fagg  
 Robert Thomas Fallon  
 John Joseph Fatum  
 Philip Robert Feir  
 Roger Lee Fife  
 Marcus Bartlett Finnegan  
 Harold Carlton Fitz, Jr.  
 Richard Arthur Fitzgerald  
 Paul Charles Flerl, Jr.  
 Earl Paul Ford  
 John Franklin Forrest  
 David Franklin Frech  
 David Gray Freeman  
 Frederick John Fritz  
 Avery Skinner Fullerton  
 Frederick Slocum Gallagher  
 William Alfred Gardner, Jr.  
 Arthur Louis Gerometta  
 Robert Harley Gess  
 Joseph Thomas Gibson  
 Joseph Attwood Giddings, Jr.  
 Joseph Hiram Gilbreth, Jr.  
 Richard Eugene Gillespie  
 Robert Johnson Gilroy  
 Ward Currey Goessling, Jr.  
 William Hayward Goodwin  
 Donald Norton Gower  
 Bernard Greenbaum  
 Harry Augustus Griffith  
 Joseph Aloysius Guthrie, Jr.  
 Alfred Bradford Hale  
 Thomas Gray Hardaway  
 John Glennon Hayes  
 Jack R. Hayne  
 Harvey Tipton Heckman  
 Charles Kenneth Heiden  
 Meredith E. Hendricks  
 Theodore Ernst Hervey  
 Pennell Joseph Hickey  
 William Charles Hiestand  
 Paul Ray Hinckley  
 Edward Roy Hindman  
 John Taylor Hodes  
 William Harry Hoffmann  
 George Christian Hoffmaster, Jr.  
 James Harmon Holt  
 Herbert Leslie Hoot, Jr.  
 Norman Barton Hopkins, Jr.  
 Edward Brinkley Howard  
 Martin Damon Howell  
 Robert William Howell  
 Leo Kay Huber  
 William Edward Huber  
 Julian Perry Hunnicutt, Jr.  
 Marc Raphael Jartman  
 Reed George Jensen  
 Robert James Johnson

Ross LeRoy Johnson  
 Ogden Sherman Jones, Jr.  
 Irving Neal Judd  
 Donald Raymond Keith  
 Roger Joseph Kelly  
 Charles Robert Kemble  
 William Stanley Kempen, Jr.  
 Uilmont Redvers Kendree, Jr.  
 William James Kennedy  
 Patrick Kimball  
 Arthur Joseph Kingdom  
 Joseph Paul Kingston  
 Gilbert William Kirby, Jr.  
 Leslie Whittington Kirkpatrick  
 Theron Westcott Knappe, Jr.  
 John Krasko  
 Roger Ray Kuhlman  
 Maurice Keyes Kurtz, Jr.  
 Kirby Lamar  
 Russell James Lamp  
 Matthew David Lampell  
 James Lampros  
 John Brandt Latimer  
 Jerry Bennett Lauer  
 Charles Bopes Lee  
 Charles Royal Lehner, Jr.  
 Malcolm Kingsley Lewis  
 Robert Ernest Liichow  
 Arthur Herman Lindeman, Jr.  
 Earl James Lochhead  
 Harold Frederick Lombard  
 Homer Samuel Long, Jr.  
 Willis Homer Lowrey  
 William Frederick Luebbert  
 Robert Orren Lynch  
 Thomas Ralph Mackenzie  
 John Rodway Mackert  
 John Harvey Madison, Jr.  
 John Francis Magnotti, Jr.  
 Munro Magruder  
 Harry James Malhafer  
 William Eugene Marfuggi  
 Edwin Saul Marks  
 John Tilton Marley  
 Herbert Edgar Marshburn, Jr.  
 William Henry Marslander  
 Stuart Fonda Martin  
 Amos Clark Mathews  
 John Albert Maurer  
 Joseph Arthur May  
 Arthur James Mayer  
 John Francis McArdle  
 Cosby McBeath, Jr.  
 Dean Jay McCarron  
 John Vincent McDonald  
 Kenneth Edwin McIntyre  
 Eugene Burlingame Mechling, Jr.  
 Carroll Stickney Meek  
 Lucien Eli Messinger III  
 J. Hayes Metzger  
 Stanley Arthur Meyerhoff  
 Dean Winston Meyerson  
 Kenneth Ward Miller  
 Robert Charles Miller  
 John Dickerson Mitchell, Jr.  
 Lawrence Paul Monahan, Jr.  
 William Thornton Moore  
 Clayton Louis Moran  
 Richard Lew Morton  
 Thomas Lyons Moses  
 Joseph Edward Muckerman II  
 James Marshall Neil  
 Robert Babcock Nelson  
 Robert Charles Nelson  
 Willis Charles Newby  
 Cecil Earle Newman, Jr.  
 George Anthony Nigro  
 Robert Wilson Noce  
 William Henry Nordin  
 William Clinton Norman  
 Charles Kilbourne Nulsen, Jr.  
 Stephens Watson Nunnally  
 Tom Christian Oberst  
 Robert Thomas O'Brien  
 Fenton McGlachlin Odell  
 Lawrence James Ogden  
 Charles Gunter Olentine  
 George Soliday Orton  
 Jerome Jay Paden  
 Charles Dana Palmer  
 Loren Scott Patterson  
 Paul Allen Paulson

Roland Eustace Peixotto  
 William Robert Penington  
 Elmer Bruce Peters  
 John Joseph Petranck  
 Joseph Mario Pingitore, Jr.  
 George Adams Pollin, Jr.  
 James Edward Poore III  
 Terence Andrew Powers  
 Ralph Puckett, Jr.  
 John Joseph Ragucci  
 William Addison Rank  
 John Wilhelm Rasmussen, Jr.  
 Raymond Joseph Rasmussen  
 Robert Bolenius Ritchie  
 Ernst Edward Roberts  
 Charles Gray Roebuck  
 David Benjamin Rogers, Jr.  
 Robert Alexander Ronald  
 Robert Murrell Rose  
 Bernard Solomon Rosen  
 Richard David Rosenblatt  
 Edgar Blair Ross, Jr.  
 Marion Collier Ross  
 Bill' Joe Rountree  
 Elwyn Phillips Rowan  
 John Laurence Rust  
 John Edward Ryan  
 Bernard Charles Sabel  
 Robert Cannon Sanders  
 Alexander Vincent Sarcione  
 Francis Leo Sarsfield  
 John Milton Sayler  
 Joseph Louis Schmalzel, Jr.  
 Norbert Otto Schmidt  
 James Henry Scholtz  
 Gerhard Wilhelm Schulz  
 Robert Henry Schwarz  
 Joseph Frank Seney  
 Henry Bennet Sheets, Jr.  
 Keith Eugene Sickafoose  
 Albert Walker Singletary  
 Charles Lee Smith  
 Duane Howard Smith  
 Simeon Mozart Smith, Jr.  
 Wayne Carleton Smith, Jr.  
 Orton Flournoy Spencer  
 Charles Louis Spettel  
 Robert Montgomery Springer, Jr.  
 James Wrathall Spry, Jr.  
 Joseph Paul St. Clair  
 Joseph Richard Stauffer  
 James Harris Steel  
 Joseph Benton Steffy, Jr.  
 Douglas Penn Stickley, Jr.  
 Thomas William Stockton  
 St. Clair Streett, Jr.  
 Howard Lynn Strohecker.  
 George Stukhart, Jr.  
 George Donald Summers.  
 Lee Eli Surut  
 Albert Benjamin Suttle, Jr.  
 John Earl Sutton  
 Trevor Washington Swett, Jr.  
 Richard Joseph Tallman  
 Dean Mount Teece  
 Paul David Terrien  
 Jack Dawson Thomas  
 Donald Eugene Thompson  
 Richard Emmett Tobin  
 Joseph Daniel Toomey, Jr.  
 George William Tow  
 Edwin Stuart Townsley  
 George Warner Tracy  
 Joseph McLaughlin Turley  
 Albert Farrant Turner  
 Arthur Rutledge Underwood, Jr.  
 William Steven Vargovick  
 John Otto Vogel  
 John Pat Vollmer  
 William McCoy Wadsworth  
 Richard Henry Wagner  
 Charles Walz  
 Harry Winfree Ware, Jr.  
 William Oscar Ware  
 Donald Eugene Whistler  
 Stephen John White  
 James Alexander Whitmarsh, Jr.  
 John David Wightman  
 William Hale Wilbur, Jr.  
 Tilton Lee Willcox  
 Murray Winn Williams  
 Thomas Hutchins Williams, Jr.

Dan Hugh Williamson, Jr.  
James Alexander Willson III  
Francis Anthony Wolak  
J. Carver Wood, Jr.  
James Henry Wroth.  
Everett Jacob Yacker  
Joseph Jones Yeats, Jr.  
Edward Keler Yelman  
John Howard Yepsen  
Lewis Lowenstein Zickel

## APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the line of the Navy:

Paul B. Niblecker      Stuart H. Ingersoll  
Heber H. McLean      Richard H. Cruzen  
John A. Snackenberg

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Clarence J. Brown

The following-named officer for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Stephen R. Edson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the line of the Navy:

Paul M. Curran      Benjamin S. Custer  
Diggs Logan      Eugene T. Aldridge  
Douthey G. McMillan      Ralph B. Randolph  
Frederick C. Stelter, Jr.      Chester A. Swafford  
Otho P. Smoot      George W. Bains  
Thomas F. Conley, Jr.      Ralph E. Mills  
Orlin L. Livdahl      Maurice M. DeWolf  
Guy B. Helmick      Dale E. Collins  
Joe B. Cochran      Randolph M. MacKinnon  
Hamilton W. Howe      Philip W. Snyder  
Donald McGregor      Robert A. Hinnens  
Solomon D. Willing-  
ham      Allan L. Dunning  
Harry D. Johnston      Herbert J. Pfingstag  
William T. Kenny      Herbert C. Zitzewitz  
John D. Sweeney      Lawrence R. Daspit  
Duncan C. MacMillan      Samuel H. Crittenden,  
DeWitt C. E. Ham-  
berger

Fred C. Fluegel      James H. Hogg  
Raymond S. Lamb      Paul H. Ramsey  
Joseph W. Callahan      Henry T. Koonce  
Dwight M. Agnew      George W. Anderson,  
Benjamin F. Tomp-  
kins      Jack S. Holtwick, Jr.  
Gale E. Griggs      Eliot Olsen  
Leonard Branneman      Welton D. Rowley  
Charles L. Carpenter      Shirley S. Miller  
John F. Walsh      Francis C. Manville  
Marshall B. Gurney      Allen M. Zollars  
Carroll B. Jones      James E. Cohn  
Maxwell F. Leslie      Richard H. Phillips  
Lewis R. McDowell      Leonard S. Mewhin-  
ney  
Herbert C. Behner      Warner R. Edsall  
William S. G. Davis      Clifford S. Cooper  
Elbert L. Fryberger      William P. Chilton  
Philip R. Coffin      William M. Nation  
Roland P. Kauffman      William H. Organ  
Harry A. Dunn, Jr.      William T. McGarry  
Lee R. Herring      Earl B. Patterson  
Charles H. Perdue      Cornelius S. Seabring  
John W. Marts, Jr.      William C. Bryson  
William B. Tucker      Henry H. Caldwell  
Ronald D. Higgins      Cecil T. Caufield  
Frederick F. Sims      Joseph R. Hamley  
Leonard B. Jaudon      Joseph N. Murphy  
Chester A. Kunz      Leroy V. Honsinger  
James H. Ward      Charles M. Heberton  
John F. Gallaher      Harold S. Harnly  
Eugene M. Waldron      William H. Leahy  
Seth A. Shepard      Robert H. Rice  
Rowland H. Groff      Harlan M. Thorpe  
Frank A. Munroe, Jr.      James F. Benson  
Paul Jackson      John B. Smyth  
Edward A. McFall      Carl F. Stillman  
Marvin J. West      Benjamin E. Moore,  
Henry E. Bernstein      Jr.  
Morton K. Fleming,      Leonard C. Chamber-  
Jr.      lin  
Theodore H. Kobey      Delbert F. Williamson  
Charles F. Hooper      James A. Haley, Jr.  
Clifford T. Corbin      Frederic A. Berry, Jr.

John B. Taylor      Leland R. Lampman  
Earl K. Van Swear-  
ingen      Jack P. Monroe  
Carl J. Pfingstag      Herbert L. Hoerner  
David B. Young      John F. Henkel  
Roger F. Scott      Argyll E. Buckley  
Frederick Funke, Jr.      James T. Brewer  
Herbert F. Eckberg      Gill M. Richardson  
William C. Specht      John T. Corwin  
James A. Jordan      Clayton R. Dudley  
Miles H. Hubbard      Richard D. Zern  
John C. Zahm      Charles J. Zondorak  
Harry R. Horney      James A. Prichard  
Charles D. Griffin      Tyrrell D. Jacobs  
Samuel G. Mitchell      Howard W. Gordon, Jr.  
Edward M. Condra, Jr.      Paul R. Drouillet  
Brooke Schumm      Creed C. Burlingame  
Richard W. Smith      Robert H. Speck  
George K. Fraser      James W. Blanchard  
Hilfort C. Owen      John W. Schmidt  
Kenton E. Price      John A. Edwards  
Harold T. Deuter-  
mann      Harold D. Jacobs  
Arthur S. Born      Charles L. Melson  
Allen Smith, Jr.      Edwin W. Herron  
Thomas B. Klakring      Arnold W. McKechnie  
Alexander M. Kowal-  
zyk, Jr.      Harold M. Zemmer  
John L. Ewing, Jr.      Theodore O. Dahl  
Timothy F. Donohue      Liles W. Creighton  
James M. Roberts      David C. White  
Alden D. Schwarz      Gerald R. Dyson  
Rawson Bennett II      Joe W. Boulware  
Sylvius Gazzé      Emmett J. Sullivan  
Harold M. Briggs      Charles K. Bergin  
Fritz Gleim      Robert E. Dixon  
Andrew H. Bergeson      Richard B. Levin  
Raymond J. Moore      Frank Turner  
Robert C. Brixner      Ulysses S. G. Sharp,  
Christian H. Duborg      Jr.  
Otis C. Gregg      Robie E. Palmer  
William E. Ferrall      Monro M. Riker  
Martin J. Lawrence      Robert Brodie, Jr.  
Robert S. Quacken-  
bush, Jr.      Frederic S. Habecker  
Walter H. Price      Robert F. Martin  
Martin R. Stone      Farar B. C. Martin  
Daniel J. Weintraub      Hysell P. Cooper  
Howell J. Dyson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Edward C. Kenney      Cecil H. Coggins  
Garland A. Gray      William M. Silliphant  
Benjamin N. Ahl      Robert W. Babione  
James R. Sayers      Alain S. Chrisman  
William C. Baty, Jr.      Calvin B. Galloway  
Hilton W. Rose      Frank P. Kreuz, Jr.  
James D. Viecelli      Christopher C. Shaw  
George C. Thomas      James R. Reid, Jr.  
Donald E. Dement      Austin J. Walter  
Robert L. Gilman      Eugene V. Jobe  
Raymond W. Murray      Harry H. Haight  
David D. Greene      Albert H. Staderman  
Harry C. Oard      Alton C. Abernethy  
Leonard S. Mewhin-  
ney      Earl F. Evans  
Warner R. Edsall      Clinton K. Higgins  
Clifford S. Cooper      Walter H. Schwartz  
William P. Chilton      Harold J. Chapman  
Van C. Tipton      George N. Raines  
Gerald A. Hopkins      William V. Clark  
John P. Denneen      Edward T. Knowles  
Charles L. Ferguson      Lyle A. Newton  
Arthur W. Eaton, Jr.      James L. Holland  
George F. Blodgett

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

George E. Duffy      William L. Knicker-  
Hugh J. McManus      bocker  
Harney W. Stover      Donald B. Hilton  
Frederic W. Hesser      James J. McKinstry  
Frederick L. Hetter      Joel D. Parks  
Kenneth R. Miller      Noble W. Lowrie  
Charles G. DeKay

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Robert E. Miller      Martin W. Kehart  
Luther F. Gerhart      Edward E. Saunders  
Leonard C. Chamber-  
lin      Martin W. Kehart  
Delbert F. Williamson      Edward E. Saunders  
James A. Haley, Jr.      Martin W. Kehart  
Frederic A. Berry, Jr.      Edward E. Saunders

Joseph F. Jelley, Jr.      Kenneth A. Godwin  
Wesley H. Randig      Archibald D. Hunter  
Herndon P. Coloney      Hunt V. Martin

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of captain in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Walter P. Caruthers      Charles F. Lynch  
Dale L. McKee      Curtiss W. Schantz

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the line of the Navy:

Widmer C. Hansen      Charles S. Minter, Jr.  
Vincent F. McCormack      Everett G. Sanderson  
Thomas D. Davies      John R. Madison  
William F. Bringle      John M. De Vane, Jr.  
Dwight L. Johnson      Howard W. Baker  
William R. Stevens      Maurice W. Shea  
James B. Denton      Walter J. Stencil  
Frederick E. Daily      John E. Pond, Jr.  
Fillmore B. Gilkeson      John C. Kelly  
Jesse P. Robinson, Jr.      Rexford V. Wheeler, Jr.  
Theophilus H. Moore      Walter J. Barry  
Joseph F. Dalton      Joseph T. Yavorsky  
John C. Dyson      William S. Stewart  
John B. Hess      John B. Carroll  
James H. Cruse      Robert M. Ware  
William R. Smith, Jr.      Franklin S. Rixey  
James B. Cresap      Francis W. Ingling  
Walter L. Phaler      Alfred W. Gardes, Jr.  
Peter G. Molteni, Jr.      Sanford E. Woodard  
Fred E. Wexel      Jack E. Gibson  
William D. Hudgins      Walter S. Reid  
George C. Ellerton, Jr.      Eugene P. Rankin  
Charles A. Burch      Fay E. Wilkie  
Byron D. Voegelin      Frederick E. Janney  
Theodore M. Peterson      James G. Ross  
George L. Street III      William R. Lowndes  
Donald L. Mehlhop      Robert B. Ery  
Frederick H.      Edward B. Gibson, Jr.  
Schneider, Jr.      Maurice Ferrara  
Guy J. Anderson      Geoffrey P. Norman  
Nelson P. Watkins      James A. Pridmore  
William L. Fey, Jr.      Edward P. Madley  
Charles F. Putman      Franklin D. Buckley  
Talbot E. Harper      William B. Brown  
Robert F. Farrington      Edwin C. Finney  
Ralph H. Benson, Jr.      Richard S. Rogers  
Stockton B. Strong      Lewis D. Tamny  
Anthony P. Zavadil, Jr.      Charles R. Dodds  
Kenneth E. Hanson      Frank M. Eddy  
Robert B. Lander      John J. Becker  
Warren C. Hall, Jr.      Edward S. Fleming  
Ralph W. Cousins      Frederick W. Kuhn  
Leonard E. Ewoldt      Nathaniel B. Davis,  
Jr.      Maurice B. Brown  
Francis C. Rydeen      George A. Crawford  
Lawrence G. Bernard      William R. Wallis  
John R. Wedeligh      George T. Baker  
Henry D. Sipple      James F. McFadden  
Donald "G" Baer      Luther L. L. Dilley  
Thomas D. Cunningham      Eugene H. Maher  
Richard G. Colbert      John K. Knapper  
Fletcher Hale      Merrill M. Sanford  
John S. Schmidt      Erickson W. Russell  
Hugh W. Howard      Ivan Monk  
Rawdon Libby      Hugh H. Lewis  
John L. Nielsen      John A. Quense  
John F. Morse      George M. Grening  
Harry H. Barton      Harry P. Muller  
Lloyd F. Jakeman      Frederic D. Riley, Jr.  
Robert L. Savage, Jr.      Robert H. Thomas  
Frank A. Patriarca      Joseph E. Johnson  
Richard Holden      Conrad W. Craven  
Jack C. Whistler      Francis W. Larson  
Simon E. Ramey      Arthur R. Johnson  
Ellis H. McDowell      Charles F. Concannon  
Alfred F. Gerken      Guy E. O'Neill, Jr.  
Guy E. O'Neill, Jr.      Franklin C. Snow  
Donald Gay, Jr.      Ralph J. Michels  
William R. Crenshaw      Philo Wood  
Burton H. Shupper      Kenneth L. Butler  
Edward W. Hessel      Harold V. Chisolm  
William L. Brantley      Frederick H. White  
Henry F. Burfeind      Richard A. Bevernick  
Harold S. Bottomley, Jr.      Frank L. Fullaway  
Albert O. Vorse, Jr.      Edward W. Knepper  
Leonce A. Lajaunie, Jr.      William S. Kirkpat-  
rick, Jr.      rick, Jr.  
Clifton W. Fleniken, Jr.      Edmond B. Pugsley  
John E. Pace      Thomas F. Howe  
Robert C. Huston

Henry L. Waliszewski Daniel Bontecou  
 James G. Thorburn, Jr. Francis L. DuBois  
 Victor F. Wadsworth John A. Ferguson  
 Desmond K. O'Connor Frank H. Browning, Jr.  
 Edward S. Arentzen Claybrook B. Cottingham  
 Frederick C. Seyford Neil C. Porter  
 John "D" Reese, Jr. Robert W. Slye  
 John P. Currie John Sinkankas  
 Albert S. Fuhrman Curtis L. Tetley  
 Francis G. Blasdel, Jr. Carl D. Simonsen  
 Craig C. Angel Robert G. Dose  
 George W. Snider Charles M. Brower  
 Harold A. Sommer Sam E. Clark, Jr.  
 Joseph R. Wood Bruce S. Weber  
 Howard S. Roberts Bernard W. Dunlop  
 Edward Sternlieb Walter L. Curtis, Jr.  
 Raymond L. Smith Vincent L. Hathorn  
 Carl W. Brown Gerald R. Pearson  
 William F. Brewer William R. Crutcher  
 William E. Calder III Herbert K. Bragg  
 Prescott H. Currier John W. Higgins, Jr.  
 Aaron F. Beyer, Jr. James E. W. Whiteney  
 Hinton I. Smith Willoughby Mercer  
 Kenneth W. Hines Roger R. Hedrick  
 Otto A. Finley William J. Scarpino  
 Hugh K. Laing Thomas E. L. McCabe  
 Donald C. Higgins Frank G. Reynolds  
 Charles Wayne Edward M. Morgan  
 Douglas G. Parker Gerard S. Bogart  
 Gilbert J. Frauenheim Elwood N. Chase 2d  
 Kenneth E. Wright Herbert N. Houck  
 Roger C. Santee Arthur B. Sweet  
 Warren D. Gaboury Walter M. Vincent  
 Paul K. Blesh John M. Kipp  
 James C. Skorcz Robert C. Thorburn  
 William H. Keighley Jack A. Eady  
 Isaac J. Heizer, Jr. Reed K. Henderson  
 William R. Lipscomb Eric A. Lohmann  
 Roland L. Willett William A. Hood, Jr.  
 Frank R. More Lawrence C. French  
 Parker E. Cherry Frank A. Escobar  
 James W. Darroch Arthur M. Ershler  
 Samuel B. Purdie James L. Hunnicutt  
 Edward C. Spencer

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Henry T. Gannon Harold W. Fleischer  
 Simon W. Eyer Victor C. Stratton  
 John E. Gorman Henry C. Hunley, Jr.  
 David F. Hightower Richard W. Worthington  
 Richard B. Williams, ton, Jr.  
 Robert A. Freyling  
 James G. Kurfees Arthur L. Schultz  
 Robert A. Welch Edward A. Kearney, Jr.  
 Richard B. Brodrick Horace L. Jones, Jr.  
 Deane S. Marcy James T. Fowler, Jr.  
 Bernard G. Geuting Harry S. Etter  
 Jesse H. Sutor Everett J. Celenick  
 William H. Drucke-miller Joseph P. Pollard  
 Donovan G. Wright Marion T. Martin  
 Herbert A. Markowitz Fred A. Butler  
 William F. MacKoske Robert A. Mount  
 James L. Fuelling Walt R. Griswold  
 Peter J. Giotta Gerald W. Hurst  
 William M. Snowden Mark R. Rhea  
 Evan C. Stone, Jr. Leonard A. Becker  
 Philip C. Guzzetta, Jr. John P. Dobson  
 Rodney R. Gleysteen Eugene E. Siess  
 Harry J. Alvis Joseph O. M. Thatcher  
 James C. Luce Harvey E. Reitz  
 Marion L. Connerley Earland E. Hedblom  
 John S. Cowan Ross B. Lautzenheiser

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Clifford A. Messen-Marion D. Sims, Jr.  
 heimer Boyd Shafsky  
 Paul S. Burt, Jr. Albert E. Pallon  
 Edward K. Scofield Jerry H. Taylor, Jr.  
 John B. Kackley Lawrence V. Hallberg  
 Phillip D. Chubb Max Schliewe  
 William H. Haeuser Lathrop B. Clapham,  
 Jr.  
 Duncan J. McNab Ernest S. Tharpe  
 James T. Mathews, Jr. Bert S. Beasley  
 George L. Bennett Oswald B. Porter, Jr.  
 Robert A. Williams John Vinn, Jr.  
 Portus D. Boyce Albert B. Howden

Harry W. Leiser Frederick A. Fielding  
 Herman R. Fahibusch Frederick A. Kaufman  
 Bruce Owens Carlton R. Eagle, Jr.  
 Harold A. Stockenberg

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Merle N. Young William J. Kuhn  
 Howard M. Day Hansel H. Tower  
 Lawrence R. Schmie-Arthur F. McQuaid  
 der Donald F. Kelly  
 Abner R. Cook Eric H. Arendt

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Howard F. Curren James R. Bollinger  
 Thomas J. White Edwin E. Gibson  
 Wilfred J. Williams Peter Corradi  
 William F. Weaver Edward J. Quinn  
 John J. Albers Ralph C. Jensen  
 Norman M. Martinsen Luther H. Hartung  
 Frank E. Swanson Jack W. Schwartz  
 Charles G. Prahl Albert H. Boggs  
 Harry N. Wallin John Koleszar  
 William J. Thompson James S. Marsh  
 Martin L. Rutter John F. Mulgrew, Jr.  
 Kenneth C. Abplanalp Charles O. Reinhardt  
 Ralph C. MacDonald Jack J. McGaraghan  
 Harry F. MacKay John A. Dominy  
 William E. Davidson

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Harlan K. Muth Charles H. Bercier  
 Ernest L. Purdum Howard T. D'Arc  
 Robert P. Steed Frank K. Etter  
 Gerald H. Bonnette Albert P. Leisz  
 George O. Stead William M. Thomas  
 Leslie M. Wallace Earl A. Goldsmith  
 Howard B. Halsch Wallace B. Chesterfield  
 John V. Niiranen William E. Ludwick  
 James P. Donnelly James L. Bradley  
 Donald E. Carlson William C. Wohlfarth,  
 Jr.  
 Robert D. Lindelof Walter W. Dann  
 William H. Lieser Wade H. Morgan, Jr.  
 Henry A. Collett, Jr. Ralph B. Haynes  
 Charles A. Giermann Leonard E. Johnson  
 George M. Denny Frank T. Wais  
 Merrill G. Wheatcroft Lynn H. Rodenbarger  
 Morgan F. McAfee, Jr. Eugene T. Nealon  
 Samstone Holmes Cline O. Williams  
 James C. Cherault

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Line of the Navy:

Theodore E. Gerber Robert G. Mills  
 William E. Betzer William C. Bender  
 John S. Bowen Raymond A. Boyd  
 Vernon E. Binion Edward A. Heflin  
 William L. Newton George G. Halvorson  
 William A. Schoenfeld Ariel L. Lane  
 Richard Riley Francis S. Knight  
 William E. Heronemus Richard W. Arey  
 Forrest E. Houston Alfred B. MacKown  
 James F. McGuire Robert F. Sweek  
 Robert D. McWethy Charles J. Burton  
 Robert C. Gooding Crawford D. Winner  
 William M. Montgomery William F. Vose  
 William R. Werner William D. Spiegel  
 Edwin E. Kintner Richard B. L. Creecy  
 John G. Osborn, Jr. Garrison Brown  
 John J. Hinckley George F. Britner, Jr.  
 John G. Wallace Leslie R. Olsen  
 William W. Ennis Cecil D. Kephart  
 William H. Cross Edwin T. Rae, Jr.  
 John J. Ebnet Mark W. Woods  
 Frank S. Quinn, Jr. William E. Underwood  
 Kenneth E. Guldlege Thomas N. Coppedge,  
 Jr.  
 Robert R. Brafford Arthur G. Hamilton,  
 Jr.  
 Charles A. Hill, Jr. Richard B. Varley, Jr.  
 Walter M. Vincent Charles B. Bishop  
 Raymond G. Herzberger, Jr. Robert A. Martin  
 Lewis J. Stecher, Jr. George E. Kemper  
 Charles N. Payne, Jr. James B. Osborn  
 Wallace H. Garrett, Jr. Charles N. McKenna  
 Charles B. Momsen, Jr. James D. Mooney

Christian Fink John P. Hobson III  
 Adolf C. Schirmer Max C. Duncan  
 Alvin L. Gallin William A. Engdahl  
 George H. Mahler III Kevin E. Byrne  
 Frank M. Blanchard John C. Hill II  
 Kendall W. Simmons John W. Maddex  
 Charles A. Wickersham Armistead Dennett  
 Harold E. Fry Carl E. Olson  
 William B. Hosey Thomas W. Kennedy  
 Volker B. Veeder Edward F. Gallagher  
 Jonathan A. Barker Thomas Turner  
 Alexander D. Byers Leonard Erb  
 Walter P. Robinson, Jr.  
 William A. Arthur Robert H. Harwood,  
 Jr.  
 John A. Morrison Charles W. Pittman,  
 Jr.  
 Claude L. Reeves Richard L. Corkran,  
 Jr.  
 Philip P. Cole John C. Parry  
 Mervin O. Slater William E. Griffin, Jr.  
 Thad R. Williams Stephen J. Riordan,  
 Jr.  
 George T. Weems Eugene Madden, Jr.  
 William J. Rusch, Jr. Richard H. Buck  
 James D. Hazard Harry M. Brinser  
 George L. Bliss, Jr. Jay A. Easton, Jr.  
 Eugene C. Barnhardt III  
 John C. Parry Ernest L. McClintock,  
 Jr.  
 Jack M. James John C. Mullin  
 Harry M. Thompson Ray F. Smith  
 Elias M. Padgett, Jr. Herbert J. Ward  
 Richard M. Sewall Gordon A. Miller  
 James W. Conger James D. W. Borop  
 Leo A. Garland James D. Schnepp  
 Griffith P. Stokes Raymond W. Baker  
 William F. Farrell, Jr. Gerald J. Scott  
 Arthur C. Mullen Marvin S. Brown  
 Ray F. Smith Richard F. Yarborough, Jr.  
 Herbert J. Ward Allen B. Catlin  
 Gordon A. Miller LeRoy W. Vance  
 James D. W. Borop Leopold Weidlein  
 James D. Schnepp Carl A. Klug  
 Raymond W. Baker Isaac C. Kidd, Jr.  
 Gerald J. Scott Kenneth W. Miller  
 William S. Brown Ernst Hoefer, Jr.  
 Edwin T. Osler Marcy M. Dupre III  
 Marvin G. Lee Arthur D. Sullivan  
 Raymond Wiggins Frank G.  
 Scarborough James W. Salassi  
 James T. Alexander, Jr.  
 Charles A. Allsopp Robert S. Eastman  
 Robert S. Day Harold E. Shear  
 Thomas C. Harbert, Jr.  
 William B. Tichenor Harold S. Howard  
 Walter B. Woodson, Jr.

Raymond C. McGrath Reginald L. Workman  
 John R. Welsh Albert G. Hillberg, Jr.  
 Arthur H. Warner, Jr. Robert J. Hanson  
 Arne J. Tervo Alton B. Grimes  
 Charles H. Liebhauser Richard F. Hofer  
 John T. Oleksy Lewis W. Squires  
 William D. Houser Harborough I. Lill, Jr.  
 Paul H. Durand John L. Hansen  
 Corliss W. Adams Robert F. Reilly  
 Lewis W. Jennings Milton E. Stewart  
 Harold H. Ellison Leslie R. Skidmore, Jr.  
 John H. Burt Ronald J. Obey  
 John N. Fitzgerald, Jr. Travis O. Tabor III  
 Robert D. Nye Norman C. Nash  
 Eric E. Hopley William E. Simmons  
 Paul L. Ruehrmund, Jr. John A. Gommengenger  
 Robert G. Tower Dott E. Zook, Jr.  
 Daniel E. Bergin, Jr. Robert E. Seguin  
 Alden W. Whitney Albert F. Betzel  
 Ross A. Knight William G. Weber  
 Edward H. Winslow John L. Neff  
 Ralph G. Johns, Jr. Andrew J. Rucker  
 Samuel G. Jones Chester M. Lee  
 Roland G. Mayer, Jr. Charles M. Young  
 George O. Atkinson, Jr. John M. Rickabaugh  
 Henry C. Turner John A. Lindbeck  
 Edward B. Herndon William R. Easton  
 III James D. Nickerson James W. Wyrick  
 Carol A. Turner Michael A. Censale  
 Joseph A. Bachhuber John J. Rowan  
 Ward S. Miller Richard E. Curtis  
 Robert B. Poage Walter H. Esworthy,  
 Robert E. Whitehurst, Jr. William A. Shonerd  
 David L. House, Jr. Gordon S. Wiley  
 Peter S. Smith Laurence B. Green  
 Albert B. Hall, Jr. Norman L. Tate  
 Willard L. Nyburg John P. Gutting  
 Clifford P. Mason Dreyer R. Wilhite  
 Francis J. Berry Perry W. Johnson, Jr.  
 William M. Robinson Donald C. Richards  
 Kenneth B. Brown Robert E. Doherty  
 William E. Carver Walter W. Price, Jr.  
 Thomas E. Williamson, Jr. Douglas C. Plate  
 William C. Dozier, Jr. Harry C. Allendorfer,  
 Robert J. Knox James M. Ashley, Jr.  
 Gordon C. Buhler Charles E. Wood, Jr.  
 Gustave W. R. Ehrke, Jr. Joseph M. Tully, Jr.  
 William A. Robie Justin A. O'Neill  
 Robert R. Carter

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Supply Corps of the Navy:  
 Frederick D. Muir, Jr. Sewell T. Kauffman  
 Erwin N. Thode Louis F. Washburne,  
 Niels H. Anderson, Jr. James L. F. Hennessy  
 Rodney A. Stanton Jack L. Graham  
 Radford H. Severance Fred C. Winkels  
 Fred C. Winkels Theodore E. Sharp  
 Robert H. Ryan Frank A. Whitaker  
 Bert Smith Hunter W. Stewart  
 Madison L. Beall Peter M. Lindsay  
 Dwight M. Botkin John E. Fahrenbach  
 Rex A. Bradley George L. Voegeli  
 John F. Culp III James M. Brogan  
 Robert H. Tobias Willis T. MacKinnon  
 Richard S. Balch George W. Harper, Jr.  
 William B. Gregg Henry D. Linscott, Jr.  
 Frank E. Crane, Jr. Howard G. Luyendyk  
 George J. Braun, Jr. Allan B. Zerfoss  
 James J. Seelig Benjamin S. Gantz,  
 Henry H. Hirsch Jr.  
 Francis C. Rutherford

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Chaplain Corps of the Navy:

Thomas S. Severtson Max G. Beck  
 Edwin W. Bryant James R. Marks  
 Henry J. Beukema Herbert C. W. Al-Herman J. Schnurr brecht

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy:

Robert B. Childers Joseph J. Smisek  
 Robert R. Graham, Griswold L. Moeller  
 Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy:

Thomas "J" Ownby Melvin R. Leonard  
 Edwin B. Tharp George M. Smith  
 Hewitt J. Beauvals, William A. Aldridge  
 Jr.

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Service Corps of the Navy:

Kenneth L. Knight Frederick E. Batterson  
 Ellsworth B. Cook Sidney Goren

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Arlia Pembroke Norma L. Buttke  
 Jessie E. Crump Rosalia Jorgenson  
 Ouida A. McCoy Ethel P. Himes  
 Ida M. Ildstad Erma A. Richards

The following-named officers for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line of the Navy to correct the spelling of the name as previously nominated and confirmed:

William J. Moran

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 23, 1949

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Our Father in heaven, who hast led Thy children through fire and cloud in ages past, today lead us through the maze of questions before us.

Be with the foreign ministers as they strive to bring peace to this weary earth. Whatever hinders concord among nations, show unto them the beginning of a new day, in which righteous achievement shall overcome unrighteous ambitions.

Today our Nation mourns the untimely death of one of its foremost statesmen. Grant that the memory of his devotion to duty may be a blessed heritage to our country.

O Lord of love, spread Thy guiding wings over the Speaker and the Congress; may the labors of this day be worthy in Thy sight. Through Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 20, 1949, was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the fol-

lowing title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1184. An act to encourage construction of rental housing on or in areas adjacent to Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

S. 3734. An act making appropriations for civil functions administered by the Department of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. GURNEY, and Mr. FERGUSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

### THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES FORRESTAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise, with heavy heart, to pay my last respects to one of the finest men I have ever known—a great American, a man who as surely gave his life in the service of his country as did the thousands of splendid young men during the fighting days of the war.

I speak of my close and admired friend, James Forrestal, a man whose tragic and untimely death early Sunday morning took from our people, and from official Washington, as competent a mind, as objective an outlook, as abiding a concern for the public interest as the Nation can ever hope to have.

And his passing takes from me as close a friend, and as respected an associate in public affairs, as I ever hope to have.

The annals of our times will assuredly accord James Forrestal the great place he filled in time of national crisis. He served with outstanding distinction in position after position in this capital of the world, positions of such responsibility and of such moment to the destiny of our Nation that only a man of great fiber could have carried them through.

That he performed so admirably perhaps could have been expected of any top-flight public servant. But that he met each increasing responsibility with ever-growing evidence of unquestionable integrity and objectivity in places of enormous public trust—places fraught with controversy in which lesser men would have brought ruin and havoc in public affairs—is testimony to this unusual man, this man whose sudden death costs all of us more than we, his contemporaries, can ever hope to comprehend.

I have known James Forrestal since his first days in Washington. He came first in 1940 as special assistant to President Roosevelt. Soon thereafter he became Under Secretary of the Navy, a post he undertook in full knowledge that