

Col. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479, United States Army.

Col. John Simpson Guthrie, O18228, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U. S. Army).

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 11, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

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

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, in whose peace our restless spirits are quieted, the fierce storms sweeping across our world have left us weary with watching; these testing times are revealing our every weakness. In these times of tension and clamor, anxiety and uncertainty, we turn to the infinite calm of Thy changeless love that we may find inner sustenance, wells of living water springing up, courage in battling for truth and serenity under strain. Give us a readiness for the severe disciplines of self-control demanded by these days of crisis and destiny. So gird the lives of Thy servants here in the ministry of public affairs that they may make all decisions greatly, walk on the high levels of noble purposes and with kindling sympathies as wide as human need in all things quit them like men. In the Redeemer's blessed name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 8, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 652. An act for the relief of the estate of Mattie Mashaw; and

H. R. 2918. An act for the relief of Peter E. Kolesnikoff.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

On request of Mr. MCKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

TIDELANDS—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, MASSACHUSETTS BAR ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Massachusetts Bar Association, at Boston, Mass., on May 16, 1951, relating to the confirmation of the rights and title of Massachusetts within its boundaries.

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

MASSACHUSETTS BAR ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., June 6, 1951.

The President of the United States and the Honorable Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States:

As members of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Bar Association we respectfully submit for your consideration the following resolution (adopted May 16, 1951):

"Resolution on tidelands

"Whereas Massachusetts received title to its submerged sea lands from the English Crown by the Colony Charter of 1629 subject to certain reserved rights of the Crown, and said title and that of persons holding thereunder were confirmed by the Crown by the Province Charter of 1692 and all reserved rights of the Crown were released and ceded to the Commonwealth by the Definitive Treaty of 1783 and protected by the Constitution of the United States, especially by the tenth amendment, and were recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States in *Harcourt v. Gaillard* (12 Wheat. 524), and many other cases as specifically set forth and explained in the Massachusetts Law Quarterly for March 1950; and

"Whereas by chapter 289 of the acts of 1859 (now sec. 3 of ch. I of the General Laws of Massachusetts) the territory was specifically defined as follows:

"Sec. 3. The territorial limits of the Commonwealth shall extend one marine league from its seashore at extreme low-water mark. If an inlet or arm of the sea does not exceed two marine leagues in width between its headlands, a straight line from one headland to the other shall be equivalent to the shore line; and

"Whereas the United States never acquired any title to the submerged sea lands of Massachusetts, one of the Original Thirteen States, except by express cession, but the Supreme Court of the United States, in recent cases to which Massachusetts was not a party, has confirmed a claim of the United States to such submerged sea lands of all of the Original Thirteen States and thus

clouded the title of Massachusetts land, which claim is called 'paramount rights in and power and dominion over' the sea lands 'an incident to which is full dominion over the resources of the soil under that water area.' (See *U. S. v. California* (332 U. S. at p. 38), and these rights are asserted to transcend those of a mere property owner (see p. 29).)

"Now, therefore, the members of the executive committee of the Massachusetts Bar Association urge upon the Congress the passage of pending legislation to confirm the rights and title of Massachusetts within its historic boundaries."

This resolution supplements the memorial of the Massachusetts Legislature of March 18, 1948 (partly reprinted in the Massachusetts Law Quarterly for March 1950) and the resolution of this committee in support of similar legislation then pending in Congress, which was sent to the President and all Members of Congress in April 1949.

Samuel P. Sears, President; Reuben Hall, Vice President, Newton; Thomas M. A. Higgins, Lowell; Paris Fletcher, Worcester; Fredric S. O'Brien, Lawrence; Bennett Sanderson, Littleton; Frederick M. Myers, Pittsfield; Inez Di Persio, Belmont; Fletcher Clark, Jr., Middleboro; William B. Sleight, Jr., Marblehead; Frank W. Grinnell, secretary, Boston.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 684. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act so as to provide a more effective distribution of mortgage loans insured under title I, to give holders of such mortgage loans preference in the refinancing of loans on a noninsured basis, to adjust the loan limitations governing title II loans so as to provide more effective assistance to production and subsistence loan borrowers, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 387).

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

S. 885. A bill for the relief of Wong Thew Hor (Rept. No. 388);

S. 1417. A bill for the relief of Lefrancois & Chamberland, Inc. (Rept. No. 389);

S. 1442. A bill for the relief of Marie Louise Dewulf Maquet (Rept. No. 390);

S. 1443. A bill for the relief of Rev. Thomas K. Sewall (Rept. No. 391);

H. R. 389. A bill for the relief of the State of Maryland (Rept. No. 392);

H. R. 616. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Zafiriadis (Rept. No. 393);

H. R. 740. A bill for the relief of John Reginald Leat (Rept. No. 394);

H. R. 1268. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jiri Liska (Rept. No. 395);

H. R. 1791. A bill for the relief of Joe Tortolinni (Rept. No. 396);

H. R. 1799. A bill for the relief of Bella and Archie Kennison (Rept. No. 397);

H. R. 1844. A bill for the relief of Capt. William Greenwood (Rept. No. 398);

H. R. 2107. A bill for the relief of Edward M. Chapman, Roland P. Davis, and the Fidelity & Casualty Co. of New York (Rept. No. 399);

H. R. 2363. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Emil Sbarbori, Edna Perfetti, and Anthony Perfetti (Rept. No. 400);

H. R. 2372. A bill for the relief of Michael Post-Posniakoff and Zinaida Post-Posniakoff (Rept. No. 401);

H. R. 2453. A bill for the relief of John R. Harris (Rept. No. 402);

H. R. 2852. A bill for the relief of Quon Mee Gee, also known as Loui Siu Lin (Rept. No. 403); and

H. R. 3133. A bill for the relief of Chin Yuen Ling, minor unmarried Chinese child of a United States citizen (Rept. No. 404).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 530. A bill for the relief of Gerhard H. A. Anton Bebr (Rept. No. 405);

S. 580. A bill for the relief of Jean Marie Newell (Rept. No. 406);

S. 674. A bill for the relief of Arthur Koestler (Rept. No. 407);

S. 1009. A bill for the relief of Ella Maria Nyman (Rept. No. 408);

S. 1242. A bill for the relief of Salomon Henri Laifer (Rept. No. 409);

H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Sidney Young Hughes (Rept. No. 410);

H. R. 3229. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Albert W. Lack (Rept. No. 411); and

H. R. 3576. A bill to amend the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, as amended (Rept. No. 412).

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

S. 17. A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies (Rept. No. 413);

S. 1390. A bill to amend sections 1505 and 3486 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to congressional investigations (Rept. No. 414); and

H. R. 1800. A bill for the relief of Lucy Kong Lee (Rept. No. 415).

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

H. R. 1746. A bill to amend subdivisions d and e of section 58 of the Bankruptcy Act, approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 417).

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 34), favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 416) 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. 34) 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-4828658, Barclay, Harry Louis or Samuel Barclay formerly Harry Louis Fredman.

A-5233113, Barclay, Lily or Lily Fredman or Leah Lily Barclay.

A-5398969, Barclay, Virginia Esther or Esther Virginia Barclay or Esther Virginia Fredman.

A-6843506, Baum, Gizella (nee Gizella Jakabovits or Jakabovitz).

A-2292547, Chang, Chai Chu.

A-6848605, Chang, Ko Nan.

A-6847892, Chang, Emily C. C. Chen (nee Chen).

A-6857745, Cipresso, Salvatore.

A-1641711, Dario, Tomaso Genero alias Thomas Jerry Dario or Tomaso G. Dario or Thomas Genero Dareo.

A-4151075, Doria, Salvatore.

A-6197800, Enomoto, Taketaro.

A-7358981, Feliciano, Roswitha Anna.

A-7750394, Fountain, Eric Arthur.

A-7351116, Franklin, Rose Marie.

A-7351115, Franklin, Rene.

A-4685496, Galdi, Anna (nee Maddaloni).

A-7356368, Gazzola, Lodovico or Nick or Nico Gazzola.

A-1520684, Gonsalves, Christiano Fernandes.

A-5999281, Groshans, Anna (Anna Lola) (nee Schmidt) (Schmidt or Anna Schmidt de Kardos or Anna Binder or Charlotte Leiter).

A-3171177, Guseloff, Asen or Asen Gusef.

A-7197984, Guzman, Marta or Martha.

A-1795886, Handas, Constantinos Leonidas or Gus Handas or Constantinos Hantas or Costas Leonidas Handas or Costas Handas or Gus Leonidas Handas.

A-7199031, Hernandez-Vera, Ramon.

A-5029822, Heron, Owen Leonard.

A-5356280, Hisayama, Yoshio.

A-4010890, Hronicich, Nick Anthony or Nicola Hronicich.

A-7363567, Kilian, Karin Evelyn.

A-4499146, Koch, Joseph or John Monte.

A-3390092, Lee, Shee Kwan.

A-7264236, Lemos-Saldana, Margarito.

A-7034609, Leonor, Alicia Elena.

A-7023557, Leonor, Ana Isabel Melida Luisa.

A-4992202, Lin, Che-Fun or Che-Fun Lum, alias Stanley Che-Fun Lin alias Lum Chi Fun or Chi Fun Lum.

A-4325764, Ludwig, George.

A-4193674, Ludwig, Eva.

A-7059961, Malatek, Renate.

A-3739789, Marchian, Giuseppe or Joseph Stephen Marchian.

A-4399058, Massas, Abdel Kader.

A-4920115, Meertens, Peter Jacob.

A-3899061, Morizawa, Teruo or Harry Morizawa.

A-6972087, Mortti, Fanny Sofia or Fanny Sofia Kallama.

A-7240194, Navarrete, Narciso or Narciso Navarrete-Zapata.

A-5966623, Nishioka, Aiko or Aiko Fukuchi or Aiko Yoshida Fukuchi or alias Aiko Kumagai or Alice Aiko Yoshida or Alice Aiko Fukuchi.

A-7476335, Noroyan, Ardavast.

A-6409626, Ortiz-Ayala, Salvador.

A-4069850, Panorgios, Vasilios or Vasilios Nick Panorgios or Vasilios Nicolosee Panorgios or Billy Panorgios or Vasilios Nicolosee or Billy Panorgios.

A-6528279, Phillips, Sita Teresa or Teresa Sita Phillips.

A-7362999, Pivrotto, Giovanna.

A-3641028, Romeo, Giuseppe or Joseph.

A-3586643, Salomon, Rudolf Julius.

A-4485793, Schellenkens, Wilhelmina (nee Kunze).

A-4310316, Schneider, John or Johan.

A-4419878, Schneider, Elizabeth (nee Schmalz).

A-3625373, Schummer, Rachel (nee Harris).

A-6855798, Shew, Yau Woo or Mrs. Yau-chang Foo or Yau Woo Yan Yu.

A-7051312, Simon, Jean Claude.

A-6612674, Simpson, Merle Jean.

A-3901179, Spiros, Emanuel or Emanuel Costas Spiros.

A-6483079, Spitzer, Bela.

A-7416004, Stein, Judith (nee Judit Loeflier).

A-1558544, Stravelakis, Nicholas or Nick or Nicolaos Panagiotis Stravelakis.

A-6611003, Struth, Aileen Emily or Aileen Emily Scott Plunkett.

A-6199583, Thomas, Antonia Sunecia Benito.

A-6965417, Thomas, Marjorie Mona (nee Shortland).

A-7127546, Tom, Sam Lee or Tham Cham.

A-4640409, Uyeno, Giyu or Yoshio Ueno or Joe Uyero (or Ueno).

A-5461127, Yamakishi, Masui Shirichi or Ben Yamakishi.

A-2994930, Yuzuki, Katsuto or Sadao Yuzuki.

A-5545734, Adamovich, Samuel or Samuel Adamovic.

A-5834216, Aleksovich, Stojan or Steve Alex or Stojan Trifunovich.

A-6897669, Allen, Sonja Mildred Christel Natacha (nee Fuhrmann).

A-7647958, Ashman, Gertrude Ione (nee Hunt).

A-5367284, Bellinson, Lillian or Kellar (nee Galica).

A-7759521, Benezra, Elias.

A-7247974, Bentley, Peter or Peter Kapic.

A-4651822, Berger, Seloma (Solomon) or Aleph Sol Berger or Sol Berger.

A-6079543, Browne, Nancy Angelina or Nancy Henry Browne.

A-6079548, Browne, Robert Henry.

A-6079550, Browne, Jean Marie.

A-6079553, Browne, William Henry Browne, Jr.

A-5345849, Burstien, Pauline or Pauline Westler.

A-6080949, Cammack, Antonia Nolasco nee Antonia Nolasco Estrero formerly Corales.

A-4699162, Capra, Pietro or Peter Capra.

A-4399802, Duncan, Alice Isabel (nee Wilson).

A-5963167, Evans, Wilfred Eric or Wilkie Evans.

A-4762161, Fernandez, Adriano or Andriano or Andrew Fernandes Toni or Tony or Antonio Gomes or Andriano Amorin or Amron Fernandez.

A-6873340, Godoy, Juana Dolores or Juana Dolores Guerrero.

A-4015738, Grin, Jakovie or Jacob Green.

A-7890876, Hahalls, Stamatis George.

A-6880795, Hanck, Doreen Isabel (nee Doreen Isabel Adam).

A-201037, Hoshijima, Kikuko (nee Morimoto).

A-5484193, Katz, Bertha.

A-6514872, Kehnemuyi, Muzaffer.

A-6358004, Kessenides, Tavita or Tavitha Kessindis (nee Pavlidou).

A-5121511, Klesewald, August or August Frederick Klesewald.

A-7180825, Klein, Rainer Ewald.

A-4863171, Gonokawa, Asae.

A-6172744, Koumpas, Marika or Marica (nee Marica Gallos).

A-6236702, Kushin, Jean (nee Monson).

A-5404389, Laurenzi, John.

A-3640989, Lum, Gee Fay.

A-7197341, Macias, Alejandro Alejandro.

A-7242614, Malagon, Olga Roickamp or Olga Roickamp Riegwenoff.

A-7240506, Troncoso-Martinez, Magdalena or Magdalena Troncoso.

A-6970684, Men, Lum Kwai (Mon) or Norman Hong Lee.

A-4036288, Monteiro, Carolino Taveres.

A-3797268, Moy, Tee Jing.

A-3698086, Moy, Sue Wah.

A-6453060, Muller, Rosa or Rosa Miller or Ruzena Mullerova or Ruzena Weber.

A-2245105, Nakagawa, Toshihiko or Bin Nakagawa.

A-6799307, Ochoco, Simeon Del Rosario.

A-5956352, O'Rourke, John.

A-3915065, Pendergast, Amy or Prendergast.

A-4073592, Policelli, Donato Antonio alias Donato Palumbo.

A-3208302, Ramirez, Apolonio Estrada nickname Gene Ramirez.

A-7675982, Ribas, Juan or Juan Ribas Farinas.

A-7679485, Ribas, Junior, Antonio or Antonio Ribas Farinas or Antonio Ribas Calderon.

A-5769630, Sach, William F. or Wilhelm Sack alias Fred Sacks.

A-6771749, Saryan, Armine (nee Manoukian).

A-7115235, Schuler, Mary Josephine.

A-5469051, Seaward, Arthur Denis.

A-6341603, Slepniokoff, Christine Alice or Christine Alice Klitz.

A-6794745, Somay, Suleyman.

A-6870332, Somra, Kartar Singh.

A-4690316, Toikacz, Rosa or Rosa Pugatch.

- A-7112639, Trotman, Walter Lambert or Rufus Tait or Taitt or Rufus Adolphus Taitt.
 A-7264789, Vasquez, Aurora.
 A-6732401, Veski, Leonhard.
 A-6732402, Veski, Hilda Alice (nee Humberg).
 A-4855514, Wallus, Maria Flora Vanegas or Maria Venegas Clarte.
 A-4515267, Williams, Arthur Victor.
 A-7450296, Williams, Georgette Jeanne.
 A-6169090, Young, Soledad Ruiz.
 A-6169094, Young, John Robert.
 A-2771405, Zung, Ming Kwai Max.
 A-7280025, Zybarth, Ingrid.
 A-5015321, Amann, Jakob or Jacob Amann or Jack Amann.
 A-6077507, Ashton, Hilda Olive (nee Tomkins).
 A-4826626, Balla, Hargit (nee Schonberger) or Margaret or Marget Balla.
 A-7188716, Barker, Harry Paine.
 A-7188717, Barker, Kenneth Arthur.
 A-7188718, Barker, Marry Edgar.
 A-1222188, Bartig, Walter George.
 A-5665545, Bienkowski, Frank Joseph.
 A-6873359, Bouzios, Efstathia Theodore (nee Drouzia).
 A-9623979, Corros, Theocharis Andre.
 A-4821853, De Segobia, Juanita Gomez or Juana Gomez.
 A-5315619, De Souza, Jose da Rocha.
 A-1525776, Drombrowsky, William.
 A-4809078, Donato, Giuseppe or Joseph Donato.
 A-9783230, Dos Santos, Antonio Rodrigues.
 A-5387185, Duncan, George Frederick William.
 A-5024915, Ellerman, Helene Elsabe.
 A-6568210, Foseid, Einar Lorang.
 A-6505601, Foseid, Anne Lise (nee Hansen).
 A-6764710, Gofidis, Dimitrios or James Gofidis.
 A-1080551, Greenberg, Sigman or Sam Greenberg or Sam Green.
 A-5495968, Karttunen, Pola (nee Jurkin).
 A-5396466, Kolofiejczyk, Anton or Anton Pils.
 A-4955142, Kunisawa, Yaemi Taketa.
 A-6806528, Leckie, Annie (nee Anna Adams).
 A-5378992, Lewin, Maria Anna Rieg or Mary Rieg or Maria Kellner.
 A-6008182, Lo, Anna Yin-Chu.
 A-5606375, Lopes, Alberto Goncalves.
 A-2551627, Lunzer, Frank or Franz Luntzer.
 A-7394046, Lumpe, Gertraude Berta.
 A-7392163, Lumpe, Christa Maria.
 A-7457939, Lynn, Grace Chung-Yu.
 A-1867226, Ly-Yuen, Ho or Ly Yuen Ho.
 A-7196292, McClean, John Gerald.
 A-4948044, Michalski, Sephanus (or Szczepan or Szczechan) or Steve Malek.
 A-5547061, Miller, Fanny (Fannie) (nee Burstock) (Berstock).
 A-4817498, Monforte, Joaquin Cebamanos or Jack C. Monfort.
 A-4616715, Monforte, Francisca Anso Vera or Frances Monfort or Francesca Anso Vera.
 A-4698604, Mulzet, John.
 A-4298118, Muscatelli, Vito or Vito Dellso.
 A-4999273, Nakamura, Tadashi.
 A-5424946, Nekat, Emma.
 A-5142722, Perrotta, Antonino.
 A-5142535, Perrotta, Giuseppina or Gluseppa Di Malo.
 A-9836240, Porterlor, Crescencio or Crescencio Portelro Y Rial.
 A-1470595, Pessetto, Anita Gemma.
 A-7203416, Ramondette, Blanca (nee Casas Y-Pando).
 A-6668104, Sapountzakis, Themosticles.
 A-7203618, Serrato-Rodriguez, Jesus or Jesus Serrato.
 A-4026346, Spitzwieser, Ferdinand or Fred.
 A-4213572, Spitzwieser, Amalia (nee Aigner).
 A-4817136, Springmann, Dorothea (nee Frick).
 A-7274106, Stennett, Beresford.
 A-3499104, Talariol, Felix or Felice Talariol.
 A-7802691, Tatsumi, Hanaco.
 A-3141636, Vanvuris, Gust Manolis.
 A-6170648, Villanueva, Ana Altuve or Ana Altuve Villeneuve (nee Ana Bautista Altuve Carrillo).
 A-7137379, Voujoukas, Nicholas George or Vougioukas.
 A-6378734, Wang, Boardman Cheng or Cheng Want.
 A-6663076, Wang, Mary Dah-Gin Hung or Mary Dah-Gin Hung.
 A-6504785, Welch, Mary Wong.
 A-6978770, Wesell, Heldemarie Barbara, formerly Hiedemarie Barbara Lachenmaler.
 A-5127146, Wong, Mon Ben or Wong Ton.
 A-3484705, Kang, Bun Po.
 A-7606671, Kang, Dora (nee Zoen-Kwang Hwa).
 A-4199987, Ades, Farida (nee Esses).
 A-7140360, Alaniz-Cerventes, Olivia.
 A-5471138, Avakian, Hagop or Jack Avakian or Jack Jacobian.
 A-5629276, Bandriak, John.
 A-7137904, Batista, Carlo.
 A-6613077, Bedrylo, Wladyslaw.
 A-6306476, Bello, Elsa Altigracia (nee Dominguez).
 A-7133036, Berry, Christel Erna (nee Christel Erna Matke).
 A-7022485, Biggar, Sterling Russel or Sterling Russel Brown.
 A-7955663, Brandon, Dora, formerly Dora Bounatian.
 A-1854085, Bowen, McAulay or Bowen McAulay.
 A-6985335, Bruneau, Marie Therese Mona Alice Hoogstraten.
 A-7119160, Busetti, Simone Canton (nee Canton).
 A-5571043, Caldarella, Maria Angelina Dinardo.
 A-6794834, Cardelli, Aldo Bruno.
 A-9764820, Carmichael, Adolphus Standiford or John Charles or John Richardson Charles.
 A-5882693, Carmosin, Eric Otto Albert.
 A-3409250, Chan, Chun Fai or Paul Chun-Fai Chan or Paul Chan.
 A-5450305, Chang, Sunru or Sun Ru Chang or Mrs. Jack T. Chao.
 A-6513590, Coumantaros, George Polychronis.
 A-4230984, Cozzarin, Emelia.
 A-7081477, Delahaye, Eric St. Anthony Livingston or George H. Williams or John H. Ainsley.
 A-7350992, De Molina, Isabel Marrufo.
 A-7125347, Dovalis, Evelyn or Eftichia Konstantinos Kyriakopoulos Dovalis.
 A-7249029, Elliott, Pauline Inge.
 A-7173007, Engstrom, Reuben Walfred.
 A-7140632, Eubanks, Michael Milton formerly Cadd.
 A-5058166, Folz, Anna Marie (nee Anna Marie Muth).
 A-6618067, Fuentes-Vallejo, Manuel.
 A-7886714, Gaeta-Perez, Jesus.
 A-7117920, Gouke, Etheline or Etheline Grant.
 A-5123965, Greenberg, Ida.
 A-5614658, Guerricaechevarria, Nicholas or Nicholas Guerricaechevarria or Nick Echevarria.
 A-6361051, Haines, Mignon Christine.
 A-1562641, Hayashi, Masao or Masao Francis Hayashi or Paul Hayashi.
 A-7188375, Jung, Chee Ping or Jung You.
 A-5618249, Kahn, Warris.
 A-3743579, Kanzaki, Shigeo or Shigwo Konzaki or Shigews Konzaki.
 A-5878142, Kmicki, Bronislaw.
 A-5448366, Kodani, Fumi (nee Azazuma).
 A-4384367, Kozlowich, Andrew Boris or Andrew Bria Kozlowich or Andrew Kozlowick alias Henry Boris Kozlowski.
 A-5568820, Kropik, John.
 A-4633123, Kropik, Anne (nee Wickie).
 A-4855966, Kubota, Ryohei or Ryohei Kubota.
 A-7366932, Landis, Mary Ann (nee Campbell).
 A-2158807, Lavey, Ira Francis.
 A-6432134, Layton, Carrie Marie.
 A-1506131, Lozano, Emilio Flores.
 A-7126177, Machis, Nancy Amy (nee Galvin).
 A-7137730, Martinez, Lucrecio.
 A-7286255, Martinez, Pablo.
 A-7096161, Masters, John.
 A-6685210, Mata-Villegas, David.
 A-7934359, Merder, Ara Serkiz.
 A-7139568, Metzger, Lina (nee Lina Guenther).
 A-9616577, Molina, Guillermo or Guillermo Lazaro Antonio Ramon Molina Y Galan.
 A-7350991, Molina-Rivas, Antonio.
 A-4967947, Mosisch, Walter William.
 A-5573980, Moustakas, Jean Leonidas or John Moustakas.
 A-7131017, Niapas, Demetrios Nickolaos or James N. Niapas.
 A-9670771, Nilsen, Karsten Martin.
 A-4774990, Nishimura, Hisayoshi alias Heikicki Masa.
 A-4959036, Nishimura, Mitsuru or Frank M. Nishimura.
 A-7014143, Palka, Mary or Marja (nee Zaetz or Zajac).
 A-2307139, Pantelas, Kostas Manolis or Gus Pantelas.
 A-6352418, Papavassiliou, George Christos.
 A-6441371, Pena, Vilmo Garcia.
 A-6268905, Penniston, Chunchi Nying or Nying Chun Chi.
 A-1484192, Pessetto, Domenico Emilio.
 A-1645625, Pessetto, Eliza (or Elizabeth) (nee Morosini).
 A-3814843, Petrou, Theofanis or Theofanis Petron or Thero Petron.
 A-6343135, Pordes, Paul or Paul Pordes Groshler.
 A-7280069, Ramsey, Rudolph Leofrice.
 A-7188169, Randall, Laura Bell (nee McDonald).
 A-7795656, Ravelo, Fernando Augusto or Fernando Augusto Ravelo y Franco.
 A-7203619, Rivera, Salvador or Salvador Terrazas.
 A-5568043, Robinson, Benjamin Augustus.
 A-1553113, Russo, Dolland Alice (nee Therriault).
 A-6238479, Sanchez, Roberto or Roberto Sanchez-Aguirre.
 A-6089788, Schell, Anna Bubryak (nee Anna Bubryak).
 A-5625284, Schulzek, Frederick William or George Willig.
 A-4099180, Shizuko, Otera or Hirasawa Shizuko.
 A-7299343, Shofelinov, Alexander Dimitrov or Alexander Dimitrof Chofelinov.
 A-7203559, Skinitis, Christostomos.
 A-5152147, Sou, Yee Wing.
 A-5808715, Stipanov, Dragutin Emil or Charles Papin.
 A-7240158, Stoebr, Richard Emil Walther or Richard Emil Walther Stohr.
 A-7203119, Telfer, Joanne.
 A-7203575, Telfer, Junior, Charles Wilson.
 A-7112572, Torres, Hector Justino or Hector Justino Torres y Rodriguez.
 A-2131966, Touloumbas, Nickolas or Nickolas Touloumbas alias Nickolas Chellis or Nickolas Vagelis or Nickolas Mavri Touloumbas.
 A-6924758, Vandenberg, Jacob.
 A-6339069, Vandenberg, Ellen Alice (nee Elias).
 A-5707014, Vera, Marcial Asebes or Bera.
 A-7249863, Villar de Torres, Maria Reyes De.
 A-7249864, Torres, Jose.
 A-7704339, Wachsmuth, Berta (nee Wunner).
 A-7390748, Watson, Vincent.
 A-6760385, Wessellink, Leonard or Robert Wesley.
 A-5180738, Wicker, Jack or Jankiel Wichnes.

A-9836721, Wiitainoja, Urho Ruben or George Erickson.
 A-7134530, Wood, Anne Fernande or Anne Fernande Payot Meyer.
 A-7138114, Woods, Edward Andrew or Edward Andreas Woods or Edward Woods or Charles Woods or Ed Woods.
 A-3603217, Yung, Chiu Ging or Chiu Sheung Ming or Herbert Chew.
 A-3066328, Chiu, Lee Gam Yoke or Lee Gam Yoke.
 A-1474387, Yutaka, Yelsai or Jack Yutaka or Kesal Toyo.
 A-6073384, Zaplen-Reynosa, Conrado.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 1639. A bill for the relief of Osvaldo Castro y Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOODY:

S. 1640. A bill for the relief of Cathy Dana Besser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1641. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Lee Vance Sanders; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1642. A bill to amend the Armed Forces Leave Act of 1946 to increase to 120 days the amount of leave which members of the Armed Forces may accumulate; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1643. A bill for the relief of Rowab Ullah, Abdul Khalique, and Aklui Miah; and

S. 1644. A bill for the relief of Gulam Khan, Ghulam Khan, Khur Shad Wazeer, Mohabit Khan, Ali Khan, Shear Bader, Zarif Khan, Rahim Shah, Noroz Khan, Alah Dad, Abdul Razak, Havel Khan, Waras Khan, Rahim Shah, Said Miah, and Merullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1645. A bill to amend the act incorporating the American University; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1646. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Richard Best; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1647. A bill to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 1648. A bill for the relief of Jan de Bakker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the amendment of Mr. FERGUSON to the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for the other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EDWARD A. TOWSE, TO BE CHIEF JUSTICE, SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, June 18, 1951, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Hon. Edward A. Towse, of Hawaii, to be chief justice of

the supreme court, Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Samuel B. Kemp, retired. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF INGRAM M. STAINBACK, TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Monday, June 18, 1951, at 9:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, upon the nomination of Ingram M. Stainback, of Hawaii, to be associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Territory of Hawaii, vice Hon. Edward A. Towse, elevated. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

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

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

By Mr. FERGUSON:

Statement by him paying tribute to Mrs. Loleta Fyan, State librarian of Michigan.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

Statement by Senator Ives on June 5, 1951, before the Subcommittee on Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, in support of Senate bill 1166, providing for the appointment of a commission to study the administration of the overseas activities of the Government.

Editorial entitled "Shipping and Fisheries," published in the Nippon Times, of Tokyo, Japan, April 19, 1951, dealing with shipping and fisheries in Japan.

Letter written by William L. Marbury and published in the Baltimore Sun of June 4, 1951, relating to universal military service.

By Mr. BENTON:

Article written by Lowell Mellett and published in the Washington Star of June 7, 1951, and letter from Senator BENTON, both having to do with control of prices.

By Mr. GILLETTE:

Address on the subject "The Effects of Beef Cattle Price Roll-Back," recently delivered by Nelson G. Kraschel, former Governor of Iowa and for 6 years general agent of the Farm Credit Administration of Omaha.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

An editorial entitled "The 'Real Cost' of Meat," published in a recent issue of the Cambridge (Nebr.) Clarion.

Editorial entitled "Alaskan Statehood," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of June 7, 1951.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "It Happened One Day on Wake Island," published in the May 10, 1951, issue of the Sussex Countian, of Georgetown, Del., relating to the reporting of the conference on Wake Island between President Truman and General MacArthur.

By Mr. KILGORE:

Editorial entitled "President Must Have Controls Law," published in the Parkersburg (W. Va.) Sentinel of June 7, 1951.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Article entitled "The Critical Shortage of Scientific and Technical Personnel," written by William G. Torpey, and published in the Personnel Administration, bimonthly journal of the Society for Personnel Administration.

By Mr. KERR:

Discussion between Senator KILGORE and Point 4 Administrator Henry G. Bennett on the point 4 program and its contribution to United States security.

THE FORTY-THIRD DIVISION AND CAMP PICKETT

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement relating to the Forty-third Division and conditions at Camp Pickett.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Vermont may proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, much comment has been aroused over the article on the Forty-third Division and Camp Pickett which appeared in the June 4 issue of Time magazine. It is unfortunate that the publishers of Time magazine saw fit to print this story at this time. Had it been used 8 months ago, the description of conditions prevailing at Pickett would largely have been accurate.

The Forty-third Division was called into Federal service last September and ordered to Camp Pickett for training. During the first 2 or 3 months there was a state of great confusion. The camp itself was completely unready for occupancy. Supplies of all kinds, even proper food, were lacking for the first few weeks. The post was overcrowded within a short time. Arrangements for family dependency allowances were faulty and many families did not receive their allotments for weeks or months after the men were called into service. Members of Congress from Rhode Island, Connecticut, and Vermont received hundreds of complaints about conditions at Camp Pickett.

The situation which prevailed at that time, however, was in no way the fault of the Forty-third Division or its officers. The Pentagon had simply ordered the men into Federal service without making preparations to receive them. This situation can be multiplied many times over.

When the Forty-third was ordered into Federal service, it was generally believed that the United States might become involved in world war III within a few months' time. The commanding general of the division, Maj. Gen. Kenneth F. Cramer, was directed to have his men ready for combat service in 28 weeks.

Possibly with a view to toughening his men in the least possible time, General Cramer issued many restrictive orders. Some of these orders appeared to be petty and childish restrictions which were strongly resented by the men of the Forty-third. Opportunities of the men to visit their families in nearby towns were severely restricted, although the general himself did not comply with the order which limited the opportunity

of his men to be with their families. The fact that the general's own family was ensconced upon the post grounds probably resulted in more dissatisfaction among his officers and men than did any other cause. It was only natural that the men of the Forty-third Division resented any order issued by the commanding general which he himself was not willing to observe.

During the time the Forty-third Division has been at Camp Pickett, I have been in almost daily communication with members of this division. Early this spring I spent a day at the camp, having meals with the men and talking with possibly a hundred different members of this division. I am happy to say that the food at Camp Pickett appears to be excellent, that the training the men have received is good, as reported by men far more familiar with military practices than I am. This is evidenced by the fact that already considerable numbers of officers and men have been sent into service in the Pacific area.

The restrictions originally imposed upon the men have been somewhat eased. The morale of the division, at least as far as the One Hundred and Seventy-second Vermont Regiment is concerned, is quite high—as high as can be expected from any group of men who have left their homes and businesses to spend months in an Army training camp. Recreational facilities still appear to be inadequate and there seems to be a considerable shortage of ordinary equipment.

On the whole, the Forty-third Division appears to be amply able to defend its tradition. No division of the American Armed Forces made a more glorious record during World War II than did the Forty-third Division in its progress from Guadalcanal to the Philippines under the leadership of a truly great Vermonter, Maj. Gen. Leonard F. Wing.

As for the Time magazine reference to the appellation of "cry-baby division" which the Pentagon is rumored to have applied to the Forty-third, I had not heard of such name calling until the article appeared in Time magazine. That name calling within the services does exist would not be surprising. It is common knowledge that professional military men look down upon National Guard men. It is common knowledge that Major General Cramer is not and has not been in favor with the top levels at the Pentagon.

It is my understanding that shortly after the termination of hostilities in World War II a directive was issued by the service departments prohibiting the practice of name calling within the services. This directive, I understand, was brought about by the use of the term "trade-school boys" as applied to graduates of our service academies. I have called the attention of Secretary Pace to the premise that prohibition against name calling should be a two-way proposition.

It is also common knowledge, as has been strongly evidenced during recent weeks, that our Military Establishment, from the Commander in Chief down, strongly resents a freedom of expression

or communication with members of Congress by members of the Armed Forces. It is an indisputable fact, however, that our Armed Forces today are in much better condition than they would have been had the men in service not communicated with their Senators and Representatives in Congress.

The extremely deplorable conditions existing at the Lackland Air Base and the correction of such conditions following an investigation by an Armed Forces Subcommittee of the Senate is a striking example of this.

When the time comes that men and officers in the armed services cannot communicate with Members of Congress, then we may consider that democracy in America has come to an end.

TROUBLES STEMMING FROM TEHRAN AND YALTA—STATEMENT BY JAMES A. FARLEY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, Mr. James A. Farley says that the problems of the world stem from Tehran and Yalta. He addressed the graduating class at St. Anselm's College at Manchester, N. H., on June 8. An Associated Press dispatch reporting this statement reads, in part, as follows:

James A. Farley, a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, said today it is his "solemn conviction that many of the problems besetting the world would not be with us if we had a vigorous, alert, and forceful leader at Tehran and Yalta."

I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

FARLEY SAYS PROBLEMS OF WORLD STEM FROM TEHRAN AND YALTA

MANCHESTER, N. H., June 8.—James A. Farley, a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet, said today it is his "solemn conviction that many of the problems besetting the world would not be with us if we had had a vigorous, alert, and forceful leader at Tehran and Yalta."

Speaking at St. Anselm's College commencement, the former Postmaster General said:

"There the peace was lost while we were winning the war. And the peace was lost because our leader (President Roosevelt) was no longer the gallant warrior against fear, but a weary, overburdened man who had given his all in a supreme effort to not only solve the problems of our Nation but of the world.

"We all know that there is a limit to the endurance of body and mind—and for 16 years, starting in 1929, our late President carried a back-breaking, heart-breaking burden in Albany and Washington. It was a miracle that he was able to carry on physically and mentally throughout that long period."

The former National Democratic Committee chairman said that "in the vital realm of politics . . . it is essential that the torch of leadership be passed on to others, preferably to younger men."

"If younger men are not trained step by step to take over leadership there is danger that the race may be set back or lost," he added.

"Leaders do not spring full grown into public office . . . but must patiently climb to eminences of trust through accomplished performance in positions of trust whether private or public."

Mr. Farley said that he opposed a third term for the President in 1940 because he feared Mr. Roosevelt was "listening to courtiers and coattail riders."

"I could see nothing but danger to the party and to the Nation by continued occupancy of office in contradiction to the expressed wisdom of founding fathers. I was impelled by deep conviction to take the course of opposition. I knew it was a losing fight, but felt that the fight had to be made.

"Every passing day, especially as I look upon a world torn by strife, has convinced me that I was right. I do not rejoice in my rightness. I would rather be wrong and the world happier."

St. Anselm's conferred the honorary degree of doctor of laws on Mr. Farley.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McFARLAND. 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	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Moody
Benton	Hennings	Morse
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Connor
Byrd	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Duff	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworschak	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Eastland	Lehman	Sparkman
Eaton	Long	Stennis
Ellender	Malone	Thye
Ferguson	McCarran	Underwood
Frear	McCarthy	Watkins
Fulbright	McClellan	Welker
George	McFarland	Wherry
Gillette	McKellar	Williams
Green	McMahon	Young

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has asked me to announce that he is absent from the Senate today because of the necessity of filling a long-standing commitment to speak at the annual meeting of the board of the United Seamen's Service in New York. This commitment was made over 3 weeks ago.

As most Senators know, United Seamen's Service is an organization dedicated to the welfare of American merchant seamen throughout the world. Through this organization, management and labor have sought to provide in the most important ports of the world centers where seamen can meet their friends or spend leisure hours in a wholesome atmosphere.

It is one of the most commendable efforts undertaken by the shipping industry for the welfare of our merchant seamen.

Within the past few months this organization has staffed, equipped, and opened a center in Japan.

It was only logical that the Board of Directors of the United Seamen's Service should request the Senator from Washington to appear as chief speaker at their annual meeting being held in New York today, as he is one of the outstanding members of the Congress on merchant marine matters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr.

ANDERSON], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senators from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER and Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee which reported this bill, I fully realize and appreciate the fact that the Senate is passing on the bill, but I wish all 96 Senators to realize what is before them before they take action. For that reason, I have prepared a short statement in regard to the effect of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan.

I want all Senators to realize that the budget estimates for all agencies embraced in this bill amount to \$2,744,253,760, approximately \$270,000,000 more than was appropriated for the current fiscal year for these purposes. I should like to have all Senators to follow these figures with me.

The substantial increase in the estimates over the 1951 appropriations is explained, first, by the abandonment of the contract authority provisions, for which in the 1951 bill there was provision for \$100,000,000-plus, whereas in this bill the provision for new obligatory authority is in the form of cash; second, by the increase of \$124,000,000-plus for payment to the railroad retirement trust fund; and, third, by a \$20,-

000,000 increase requested for public assistance.

By the way, Mr. President, the committee has recommended \$150,000,000 less than the amount of the estimate for grants for public assistance.

Of the total of \$2,744,253,760, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 is for grants and benefits. Senators should not think that all of the \$2,744,000,000 is payroll funds. I want Senators to understand the facts about these matters, and then do what they think is proper and fit. If Senators wish to cut these funds by 10 percent, that is up to them; but, first, they should understand what the Senate is acting on.

As I have just said, \$2,500,000,000 of the total amount is for grants to States for administration of the employment services and unemployment compensation programs; for grants for public assistance; for the employees' compensation fund; for hospital construction; for school construction, maintenance, and operation; for grants dealing with public health matters; and for payments to the railroad retirement trust fund. The total for these purposes is \$2,577,431,968.

One hundred and ninety-nine million eight hundred and twenty-eight thousand and seven hundred and eight dollars is for the Department of Labor. When compared to the total amount of appropriations carried in this bill, the appropriation for the Department of Labor is infinitesimal.

One billion seven hundred and sixty-four million six hundred and three thousand two hundred and sixty dollars is for the Federal Security Agency.

Six hundred and thirteen million dollars is for the Railroad Retirement Board.

On Friday, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] said the committee has made very minor reductions in the appropriations carried in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives; he said that the \$112,867,530 by which the committee has voted to reduce the allowances made by the House is of little moment. Mr. President, the bill as reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee carries appropriations amounting to \$112,000,000 less than the allowances made by the House of Representatives. When a reduction of \$112,000,000 is made in the committee, I do not think it can be said that such a reduction is of very little moment.

Let us reflect on the charges made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BENTON. Is it not fair to say that the contention made by the senior Senator from Illinois was that these were actually bookkeeping transactions, rather than reductions in fact in the budget, and that they represented adjustments which could have been made next year or the year after that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; we are talking about Uncle Sam's dollars, \$112,000,000 of them.

Mr. BENTON. But the contention of the Senator from Illinois was, if I prop-

erly understood him—he is not now on the floor, and that is the only reason why I rise to ask the question—that these were bookkeeping adjustments which could be made 2 years or 3 years from now or at any other time in the future, and are not, in fact, reductions in expenditures.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. Of course, they could be made 2 years or 3 years or 10 years from now, but the fact remains that the committee did it now.

Mr. BENTON. I am sorry the Senator from Illinois is not here to interpret his speech, but that is the way I understood it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I remember when the Senator from Connecticut sought to have an appropriation made for civil-defense activities, and at that time he did not think so much about economy. However, when it comes to a question of allowing sufficient funds for a hospital or for cancer research or for mental health activities, the Senator from Connecticut is very economical. I am glad of that; that is all right.

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator has understood my question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I decline to yield at the moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico declines to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let us now reflect on the charges of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, let me ask the able Senator from New Mexico whether both the subcommittee and the full committee carefully considered the subject which the Senate is now discussing?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not only did we do that, but the Senator would be surprised to know that nine members of the committee privately, in the committee room, voted to report the bill. Notwithstanding that, only the other day nine members of the committee voted for cuts in the appropriation. That, of course, is their own business, and no one is complaining about it, except that I desire to give them a little factual information. The committee cut repeatedly. As a general rule, as the Senator from West Virginia knows, it is expected that the Senate committee will restore cuts made by the House. In this instance, we cut \$112,000,000 more than did the House.

Mr. NEELY. Is it not true that the Senator from New Mexico and his subcommittee also decided, in effect, that the matter to which the Senator from Connecticut has referred is one of reality instead of bookkeeping hocus pocus?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, in the circumstances, since the Senator from Connecticut, in defending the opposing argument made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has indicated that it is so incomprehensible that the Senator from Connecticut, even with his unlimited education and unsurpassable ability, is unable to interpret it without the assistance of its eminent author, I must support the committee's

comprehensible, logical, and impressive recommendation instead of the amendment which is designed to impair it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. President, let us now reflect on the charges of the Senator from Illinois. The total estimates for grants and benefits, not merely grants and benefits to Alabama, Connecticut, Illinois, Arizona, New York, New Mexico, or Arkansas but the total grants and benefits—and I repeat, we are not now talking about payrolls—are, as I outlined before, \$2,577,431,968, leaving for all other objects of expenditure—that is, for travel, personal services, communications, the transportation of things, for rents and utility services, printing and reproduction, other contractual services, supplies and materials, equipment, and for taxes and assessments—a grand total of \$166,000,000 plus. I repeat that the appropriation for grants to the 48 States and our possessions is \$2,577,431,968; while for personal service and other objectives, to carry on the functions of Government as provided in laws which we have passed, the appropriation is only \$166,000,000. Had we disallowed all requests for funds for these items, we would have saved \$166,000,000, compared with the estimates. But we reported a bill appropriating \$215,000,000 under the estimates, which to the Senator from Illinois is a minor savings. Possibly it is a minor saving; but after complete hearings to determine the amounts necessary in order to carry on the functions of Government, or at least in order to enable it to try to function, and in order to have the various branches of the Government do what they say should be done, we allowed a sum which is \$215,000,000 under the estimates. Perhaps the strongest objection to the committee action is that it left for some of our vocal proponents of economy very little ground for public demonstrations.

The committee instructed the Department to tell us where to cut, informing them that, if they did not tell us where to cut, the committee would do the cutting. But it appears that the only way by which it is possible to save money is to allow the amounts of the budget figures, and then refer the matter to the Senate, and let the Senate make whatever reductions it may see fit. But when we provided \$215,000,000 under the estimates, I submit that when any Senator says that very little was done in the matter of saving money his statement is not well taken.

The committee held lengthy hearings, deliberated for more than a week before the full committee on the individual items, and finally reported a bill \$215,000,000 under the estimates, and \$112,000,000 under the appropriations provided by the House. I ask Senators who have been in this body for some time, When has it occurred before that the Senate Appropriations Committee has not restored cuts made by the House? But in this instance not only did we restore them but we reduced the figures of the House bill \$112,000,000. What more can be expected of a committee?

After all, the Government must carry on. Of course, it would be possible for us to save the entire amount. We could save the entire amount, but I ask Senators, do we not desire to do our duty? We took an oath of office that we would, under the Constitution, do certain things, including providing funds for the operation of the Government. Yes; it would be possible to save every penny appropriated by this bill, but would that be desirable? On the contrary, do we not want to carry on the orderly processes of government, without waste?

The full committee deliberated for more than a week on the individual items, and finally approved a bill appropriating \$215,000,000 less than the estimate of the Budget Bureau and \$112,000,000 less than contained in the bill as passed by the House. It appears now that it would have been better, had the bill not been referred to the committee, but, instead, placed on the calendar to be considered on the floor of the Senate, to be subjected to delicate surgical operations on the part of advocates of economy, provided the move for economy is publicized, so that due credit may be received by Members on this floor. The amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] was presented to the full committee, where it received some support. The Senator gave notice that he would offer such an amendment from the floor. That was entirely proper, and there is no complaint in that regard.

But there was no move in the committee to allow a lesser amount for the two items already reduced by floor action—the immediate office of the Secretary of Labor, and the Office of the Solicitor of the Department of Labor. For the office of the Secretary the estimate was \$1,475,000, of which the House allowed \$1,425,000, and the committee \$1,400,000. I repeat, no member of the committee suggested that more should have been cut from this allowance. For the Office of Solicitor, the estimate was \$1,750,000, of which the House allowed \$1,650,000. The subcommittee, of which I am chairman, allowed an increase of \$50,000, or \$1,700,000. The full committee first disagreed to this raise, by a tie vote, but on reconsideration the subcommittee action was approved, allowing \$1,700,000. There was not one word spoken to advocate less than the House allowance. Yet, the Senate on Friday, by a vote of 47 yeas to 29 nays, agreed to a motion to reduce the appropriation for the Solicitor's Office to \$1,575,000.

I find that nine members of the Committee on Appropriations voted in the affirmative, but none of them stated that they felt that too much was being allowed to the Office of the Solicitor. I have no complaint about that. All I am doing today is to advise the Senate about it. I believe in the majority of this body controlling matters. Even if it is against a committee recommendation, I am in favor of majority rule.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the junior Senator from Rhode Island correct in assuming that the subcommittee has already reduced the appropriation by 5 percent?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The subcommittee, joined in by the full committee, is recommending that kind of an amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] is to the effect that 5 percent of the payroll items be deducted.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. That does not include hospital services.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are trying to make an exception of them. I think the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] is trying to make an exception in that case.

Mr. PASTORE. While it may be a very expeditious way of accomplishing the result, what is the logic in recommending a reduction across the board? I am not trying to be critical at all; I am seeking information. There may be some offices in the Department which have 20 percent more help than they need. We would tolerate in such an office a 15 percent overstaffing, but there might be other offices which were understaffed. It strikes me that that is a very unwise way of reducing personnel appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is not a question of whether it is even sound. I agree completely with the remarks of the Senator from Rhode Island, but I still believe in supporting committee action. The committee approved the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] to place a cut of 5 percent on the payrolls as to individual items. The Senator did not want to have the amendment apply to the public health items. They are the only ones that would have been protected. But, outside those exceptions, the cut is 5 percent. The committee reported the Cordon amendment, and I think that is as far as we should go. That is why I am objecting to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] that would make a cut of 10 percent.

Mr. PASTORE. If I correctly understand the senior Senator from New Mexico, he takes the position that that would render the whole program ineffective.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would appear to me to mean complete ruination.

Mr. PASTORE. If we sacrifice 5 percent we do not render it ineffective. Why does the addition of 5 percent to the 5-percent cut recommended by the committee make all the difference?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It makes this difference: It would impose a limitation on the amount of money that could be used for for the services affected. Under the Cordon amendment each and every item in the bill is cut 5 percent. As between the two amendments, the Senator from New Mexico feels that the one providing for a 5-percent cut is sounder. I did not agree, but the committee did, that we should cut the items 5 percent, but something had to be done, and the committee took that action. I feel that a cut of 10 percent would be not only unsound, but

would be ruinous in the effort to carry on the functions of Government.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a moment.

It seems to me that the holding of lengthy hearings on appropriation bills is a meaningless task, and that the subcommittee markup and the full committee markup are a waste of time, if the recommendations of the committee are not to be followed. As the markups are in executive session, perhaps due notice is not given of motions to reduce appropriations. It cost \$1,996.40, just under \$2,000, for the stenographic report and transcription of our hearings. It cost not less than \$15,000 to have printed 750 volumes of the hearings, consisting of 1,232 pages.

Mr. President, I make these few remarks, without complaining about what the Senate may do, but, in reflecting upon the action of the Senate on Friday, and what appears to be a foregone conclusion of what will happen today, I have come to the conclusion that it is useless to spend time in committee on these bills. Members make no objection to the approval of an amount for a particular item, but in the well of the Senate, under the eyes of the press and the public, support is given to cuts proposed from the floor.

I know what the Senator from Michigan has in mind. He wants to cut waste, as does the Senator from New Mexico. But there is such a thing as cutting improperly. Of course we can cut the number of employees on the floor of the Senate; we do not have to appropriate for them. But could the Government efficiently carry on? Of course we can cut the number of Senate pages. Of course we can cut the number of elevator operators. Of course, we can make cuts in many instances. But that is not the point. Cuts should be made on a sound basis. We can cut the number of our office stenographers and save money, but does any Senator feel that if we should do that in the case of one who answers the mail and the requests from back home, we would operate as efficiently as we do? We should get away from waste, yes; I am in favor of that. But let us try to behave as persons with reason.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. The question of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] was a practical one, and while I feel that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee gave a very plausible answer, I think it should also be said, especially in the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Cordon], that the question asked by the Senator from Rhode Island was asked scores of times by members of the full committee. The question was, "Why do it in this way?"

I desire to say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that the chairman of the subcommittee worked out a modified version of the Jensen amendment in an attempt to make it practical. That was very difficult to do, for the very reason stated by the Senator

from Rhode Island, that there might be one bureau in a department which did not have sufficient personnel, and in another case there might be plenty of personnel. In the final analysis, I believe it was felt that if we cut the appropriation for the whole department 5 percent, the administrator could make allowances to meet the very problem suggested by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Even though many of us felt that a personnel cut was the way to accomplish the objective, it seemed that that was not so practical as the way which the Senator from New Mexico has discussed.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Let me make another suggestion to the Senator from Rhode Island. The Jensen amendment is easy to understand. If through retirements, deaths, resignations, or otherwise, positions become vacant, under the Jensen amendment only one out of four such positions could be filled. The subcommittee tried to devise a formula that would not be so violent, and we worked out a formula providing that only one out of every two vacancies should be filled. But, for the reason which the Senator from Rhode Island has called to our attention, we finally came to the conclusion that in order to leave some discretion as to what particular positions a department should fill—it might not need a stenographer, but an analyst, or it might not need an analyst, but a stenographer—we would make the cut in dollars and cents, and leave discretion to the particular department. It was finally decided that instead of filling one out of two or one out of four of the positions which became vacant, 5 percent for personnel should be deducted under the bill, and that it should be left to the department to decide how it would use the money it obtained.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. What formula was used in reaching the 5-percent figure?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The formula used in reaching the 5-percent figure is strictly one of limitation, that out of the total amount appropriated for personal services no more than 95 percent can be used for payment of employees. That was the formula which was used.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to have the Senator from Rhode Island know that the reason some Senators supported the Cordon amendment—and I think I shall support the Ferguson amendment—was that the total saving in dollars and cents contemplated by the full application of the Jensen amendment would result in approximately a 10-percent reduction in appropriation for personnel. There was no measuring stick, as I understand, but it was thought that result might be accomplished. In order to go at least a part of the distance the committee accepted the 5-percent proposal. At least that was the basis on which I

voted. There is no measuring stick so far as I know except in the minds of those who would like to see the Jensen amendment agreed to. It was their idea that the resultant saving, if advantage were taken of the Jensen amendment, might reduce the appropriations in dollars and cents by approximately 10 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we favor a saving. Of course, we do not want the personnel situation to be thrown out of gear in some particular places. We figure it would be best to save in dollars and cents without interfering with the administration, if the necessity should arise some time, of employing a stenographer or an analyst or some one for a classified position.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the Jensen amendment was not considered or recommended by the House subcommittee, and was not considered or recommended by the full committee of the House?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. It was attached to the bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. CHAVEZ. On the floor; yes.

Mr. HILL. An examination of the RECORD will show there was very little debate and very little consideration given to it by the House. Is that not true?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. The subcommittee which is handling the bill at this moment did pay some attention to the matter, and made some suggestions. First, instead of one out of every four there would be one out of every two.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is it not a fact that the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee interviewed and contacted the Comptroller's Office and the Bureau of the Budget?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. And labored rather assiduously to try to modify the Jensen amendment so the personnel limitation could be worked out on a practical basis. This situation was encountered: It was stated that one office in the Department was more important than another, or that one office was short of help or long of help. The subcommittee was granted certain additional days to work out a practical formula.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Six days.

Mr. WHERRY. It is my opinion that the majority of the committee voted for the Cordon amendment because they felt in the final analysis it would be more practical. I will say that I voted for the Jensen amendment in an effort to make a saving.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. It was felt the Cordon amendment would result in less damage.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I merely wanted to obtain information. I did not wish to appear critical.

EMERGENCY FOOD AID TO INDIA—
CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I submit the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 872) to furnish emergency food aid to India, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That this Act may be cited as the 'India Emergency Food Aid Act of 1951.'"

"SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized and directed to provide emergency food relief assistance to India on credit terms as provided in section 111 (c) (2) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including payment by transfer to the United States (under such terms and in such quantities as may be agreed to between the Administrator and the Government of India) of materials required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources. The Administrator is directed and instructed that in his negotiations with the Government of India he shall, so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials particularly those found to be strategic and critical.

"SEC. 3. For purposes of this Act the President is authorized to utilize not in excess of \$190,000,000 during the period ending June 30, 1952, of which sum (1) not less than \$100,000,000 shall be made available immediately from funds heretofore appropriated by Public Law 759, Eighty-first Congress, for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended; and (2) \$90,000,000 shall be available from any balance of such funds unallotted and unobligated as of June 30, 1951: *Provided*, That if such amount unallotted and unobligated is less than \$90,000,000 an amount equal to the difference shall be obtained from the issuance of notes in such amount by the Administrator for the Economic Cooperation Administration, who is hereby authorized and directed to issue such notes from time to time during fiscal years 1951 and 1952 for purchase by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to purchase such notes and, in making such purchases to use, as a public debt transaction, the proceeds of any public debt issue pursuant to the Second Liberty Loan Act as amended: *And provided further*, That \$50,000,000 reserved by the Bureau of the Budget pursuant to section 1214 of Public Law 759 of the Eighty-first Congress from funds appropriated by that Act for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, shall not be available for purposes of this section.

"SEC. 4. (a) Funds made available for purposes of this Act shall be used only for the

purchase of food grains or equivalents in the United States.

"(b) No procurement of any agricultural product within the United States for the purpose of this Act shall be made unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall find and certify that such procurement will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States.

"(c) The assistance provided under this Act shall be for the sole purpose of providing food grains, or equivalents, to meet the emergency need arising from the extraordinary sequence of flood, drought, and other conditions existing in India in 1950.

"(d) The assistance provided under this Act shall be provided under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, applicable to and consistent with the purposes of this Act.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, to the extent that the President, after consultation with appropriate Government officials and representatives of private shipping, finds and proclaims that private shipping is not available on reasonable terms and conditions for transportation of supplies made available under this Act, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for these purposes: *Provided*, That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other Act, from receipts from vessel operations: *Provided further*, That pending such repayment receipts from vessel operations may be placed in such funds or accounts and used for activating and operating vessels.

"SEC. 6. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, the Administrator for Economic Cooperation is authorized to pay ocean freight charges from United States ports to designated ports of entry in India of relief packages and supplies under the provisions of section 117 (c) of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, including the relief packages and supplies of the American Red Cross. Funds now or hereafter available during the period ending June 30, 1952, for furnishing assistance under the provisions of the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, as amended, may be used to carry out the purposes of this section.

"SEC. 7. (a) Any sums payable by the Government of India, under the interest terms agreed to between the Government of the United States and the Government of India, on or before January 1, 1957 as interest on the principal of any debt incurred under this Act, and not to exceed a total of \$5,000,000, shall, when paid, be placed in a special deposit account in the Treasury of the United States, notwithstanding any other provisions of law to remain available until expended. This account shall be available to the Department of State for the following uses.

"(1) Studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States and in its Territories or possessions (A) for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of India, and (B) with the approval of

appropriate agencies, institutions, or organizations in India, for students, professors, other academic persons, and technicians who are citizens of the United States to participate in similar activities in India, including in both cases travel expenses, tuition, subsistence and other allowances and expenses incident to such activities; and

"(2) The selection, purchase, and shipment of (A) American scientific, technical, and scholarly books and books of American literature for higher educational and research institutions of India, (B) American laboratory and technical equipment for higher education and research in India, and (C) the interchange of similar materials and equipment from India for higher education and research in the United States.

"(b) Funds made available in accordance with the provisions stated above may be used to defray costs of administering the program authorized herein.

"(c) Disbursements from the special deposit account shall be made by the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department, upon vouchers duly certified by the Secretary of State or by authorized certifying officers of the Department of State."

And the House agree to the same.

G. M. GILLETTE,
ERIE MCMAHON,
J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT,
B. M. M. (proxy),
ALEXANDER WILEY,
H. ALEXANDER SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JAMES P. RICHARDS,
A. A. REICOFF,
BROOKS HAYS,
JOHN M. VORYS,
LAWRENCE H. SMITH,

Managers on the Part of the House.

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

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, and to recall to the minds of the Members this particular measure, I shall make a brief statement.

On May 16 the Senate amended and passed Senate bill 872. The House of Representatives subsequently amended and passed the bill and asked for a conference.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Three or four Senators who are intensely interested in the measure are absent from the floor. Although a quorum call was had a short time ago, I ask the Senator from Iowa if he will yield in order that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, so it will not be necessary for him to repeat his statement.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for the purpose of the Senator from Nebraska suggesting the absence of a quorum, without losing the right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, as I stated before the quorum call was started, I have a brief statement to make with reference to the conference report, to refresh the minds of Senators as to some of the provisions of the measure.

On May 16, the Senate amended and passed S. 872. The House of Representatives subsequently amended and passed the bill and asked for a conference. The conferees met three times to resolve the differences between the two Houses.

In reporting to my colleagues, I am glad to tell them that the differences between the two versions were not very great and they were resolved without difficulty by the conferees.

LOAN OR GRANT

On the basic question of whether our help to India should be in the form of a loan or a grant, the two Houses were in agreement. Both versions of the bill provided for a loan.

It will be recalled that the original bill presented to the Senate and reported by the Foreign Relations Committee provided for half loan and half grant, but we amended it in this body to make it all a loan.

As Senators will recall, S. 872 authorized the Administrator of the ECA to negotiate the loan of \$190,000,000 to the Government of India for the purchase of food grains, or their equivalents, in the United States. The only difference between the House and Senate in this respect concerned the source of the funds to be loaned. The House version provided funds by means of a public-debt transaction, whereas the Senate bill provided that at least \$100,000,000 of the amount should come from funds heretofore appropriated to the ECA, the balance as necessary coming from a public debt transaction. The House conferees accepted the Senate language embodied in section 3 of the report before us.

REPAYMENT IN STRATEGIC MATERIALS

The language of the House and Senate bills differed with respect to providing for partial repayment of the funds loaned by the shipment of strategic materials to the United States. The Senate version referred to "the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of monazite and manganese" required by the United States. The House language did not refer to these materials by name, but instead called for the transfer of materials "required by the United States as a result of deficiencies, actual or potential, in its own resources." The House language directed the Administrator of the ECA to "so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials particularly those found to be strategic and critical."

While the language of the two bills differed, the conferees felt that there was no difference as to the basic intent of the provisions. It was our belief that the Administrator of the ECA in negotiating the loan of funds to India should make every reasonable effort to seek repayment of the loan in part in strategic materials needed in the United States. We did not believe that specific mention should be made of monazite, a material whose export is embargoed by the Indian Atomic Energy Act. The mention of manganese in the Senate bill seemed unnecessary because at the present time the United States receives about three-fourths of all the manganese which India exports.

For these reasons the House language on strategic materials was included in section 2 of the report. For my part, however, I should not want the Administrator of this program to assume that the acceptance of the House language by the Senate conferees in any way lessens his duty to do the best that he can to acquire the strategic materials mentioned in the Senate bill.

MUNDT AMENDMENT

The Senate will recall that during consideration of S. 872, we adopted an amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. That amendment provided that interest received from India on or before 1957 should be deposited in a special account for use in encouraging the exchange of information, technicians, and academic persons between the two countries. It would also have provided funds for the use of American educational and philanthropic institutions operating in India.

No similar language was contained in the House bill, although a similar proposal was submitted but ruled out of order.

The conferees gave most careful attention to the Mundt amendment. The language finally agreed upon is in section 7 of the report before us. It limits the funds to be available to \$5,000,000 instead of the sum of \$23,000,000 which it was estimated would have accrued as interest prior to 1957, and as provided in the bill as passed by the Senate.

Therefore, instead of approximately \$23,000,000 being provided, the sum was cut to \$5,000,000.

That part of the amendment which would have provided funds for American institutions operating in India was also stricken. One or two clarifying amendments of the section were adopted.

In view of the vigorous opposition of the House conferees to the Mundt amendment and the fact that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee did not have an opportunity to give careful study to the proposal at the time it was considering S. 872, it seems wise to me that we have been able to agree upon language which will provide limited funds for a trial period. It may well be that if this program develops successfully and to the mutual advantage of the United States and India that additional sums could be made available in the future.

There are a number of other minor changes in the bill which passed the

Senate, but upon which I do not think it necessary to comment at this time.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator has concluded his statement with reference to the so-called Mundt amendment, I should like to ask him a few questions with reference to it.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. MUNDT. First of all, I desire to congratulate the Senator from Iowa and his fellow conferees, especially the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], who has been interested in the amendment for a long time, on the very vigorous and successful battle which they made to retain the major portion of the Mundt amendment in the bill. I realize, in view of the fact the House had not acted on the subject matter, and because the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations had not had an opportunity to consider the amendment, that under such handicaps the Senate conferees achieved a major victory for the position supported by the Senate. I should like to inquire, if I may, as to the reasons which induced the conferees to take out of the original so-called Mundt amendment the provision dealing with the availability of money to American eleemosynary institutions in India.

Mr. GILLETTE. In reply to the question of the Senator from South Dakota, let me say that, as he will recall, his amendment contained three subsections with reference to the use of the money. The first one was the section to which he has referred, namely, the allocation for designated educational, agricultural, experimental, scientific, medical, or philanthropic activities to American institutions engaged in such activities in India.

Subsection (b) provided for studies, instruction, technical training, and other educational activities in the United States, and for students, professors, and other academic persons and technicians.

Subsection (c) provided for the exchange of certain technical books, and so forth.

The feeling in the conference committee, which the Senator from Iowa shared, was that the language of subsection (a) was so broad in its terms that it could include educational, agricultural, experimental, scientific, medical, or philanthropic activities on the part of any American institution, without limitation as to the type of institution. Because it seemed to the conferees that there would be provided an open field for abuse of the purpose of the section, it was eliminated.

Mr. MUNDT. I recognize that the language of the amendment could have been defined and clarified. It was drawn in haste. The Senate acted on the bill 24 hours earlier than I thought it would act.

I should like to ask one further question. As the Senator from Iowa knows, the money is to be administered by the division of the Department of State which functions under Public Law 402, commonly known as the Smith-Mundt Act, which provides that the Department of State shall have authority, whenever possible, to utilize American volunteer

and philanthropic organizations in carrying out the terms of the act.

On the basis of what the Senator from Iowa has stated, I do not believe it was the desire of the conferees to preclude that type of administration of funds in the event the Department of State should decide that it could do it more effectively than it could be done by other governmental agencies.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am sure that such was not the purpose of the conferees. It was their purpose that the comprehensive language contained in the subsection referred to should not open the door further.

Mr. MUNDT. Precisely. In other words, the conferees were perfectly willing to have the present type of administration used, but it did not wish to open the door any wider.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. I was very happy to hear the Senator from Iowa say that this was a sort of trial run. That statement is also included in the statement made by the managers on the part of the House. It leads me to hope that if the work is satisfactorily and constructively carried out, as I hope it will be, in subsequent legislation, either through appropriation measures or some other device, it may be possible to project it beyond the \$5,000,000 limitation.

Mr. GILLETTE. That was in the minds of the conferees. In view of the fact that the Senator from South Dakota was kind enough to speak in approving terms with reference to the work of the Senate managers, I may add that for a time it appeared that their House counterparts would not accept the amendment in any form whatever, because of the fact that it had been stricken out in the House on a point of order. We felt quite pleased that we were able to draft a compromise which the House managers were willing to accept and which would open the door for what the Senator from South Dakota is attempting to do.

Mr. MUNDT. I wish again to congratulate the Senate conferees for their fine work. However, lest it be understood that the entire House was adamantly opposed to the amendment, it should be stated that there were a few valiant gladiators, members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, especially Representative Judd, of Minnesota, who were in agreement on the purport of the amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is absolutely correct. On behalf of my associates I wish to thank the Senator from South Dakota for his complimentary reference to them.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I notice that the only difference in the arrangement is that under the Senate version, available appropriations would be used, as distinguished from a public debt transaction. However, if at a later time the ECA required a restitution of these funds, the impact on the public debt will be exactly the same. Is not that the Senator's estimate of the matter?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that is a fair statement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to ask a question in regard to the amendment which was offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. As I remember the text of that amendment, it made rather specific provision that we could expect something by way of importations of monazite sand and manganese; I think those were the two particular items which were mentioned.

However, the conference report simply provides, in that regard, that—

The Administrator is directed and instructed that in his negotiations with the Government of India he shall, so far as practicable and possible, obtain for the United States the immediate and continuing transfer of substantial quantities of such materials particularly those found to be strategic and critical.

According to that provision, the transaction will not really be on a quid pro quo basis, as we have heretofore expected that it would be. In other words, the matter including, of course, the repayment of the loan, will be wholly within the discretion of India. It will be wholly within India's discretion whether we get any of those materials finally.

Mr. GILLETTE. It will not be wholly within the control of India, because under the negotiations which are to be arranged for the culmination of this transaction, the Administrator of ECA is directed by action of the Congress to make this effort. What will actually be obtained of course will be a matter under his control.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, the point I make is that if Mr. Nehru or if the Government of India were to say, "We are sorry, but it is not practicable to send you any jute or any monazite sand"—which is thorium-bearing, and which we need in our country at the present time—"and it is not possible or practicable, because we may get into difficulty with some of our oriental neighbors if we do it, to send you any manganese," that would end the story, so far as we were concerned, and we would not get a pound of those critical materials, notwithstanding the largesse of the American people.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is true, but then India would not get the loan. We provide that these negotiations shall be carried on "so far as practicable and possible." That is one of the conditions under which we make the loan. We direct the Administrator of ECA to obtain these materials "so far as practicable and possible."

Mr. DIRKSEN. How are we to express the matter so that it can be put on a quid pro quo basis, so that we shall be sure that we shall get some of these materials, which we need today?

Mr. GILLETTE. It cannot be pressed under the terms of this measure, because as reported by the conference committee, it is simply a directive that the ECA Administrator, from whom the loans will come, shall work out "so far as practicable and possible" an agreement for the repayment of some of these funds in such materials as are in short supply and

of which we are in need. It is a directive, and it has behind it the full force of action by both Houses of Congress. If that cannot be worked out, the loan does not have to be put into effect. It is an attempt to protect the loan insofar as we can do so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the Senator that it seems to me this general language presents the very problem which disturbed the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and which disturbed me, at the time when the bill was before us on the floor of the Senate, prior to its passage by the Senate.

If the Government of India is going to carry out its intention and is simply going to say, "We are sorry, but in this atomic age we cannot afford to develop any trouble with our neighbors, and consequently you should not press us on this point," then, according to all the practical processes in Government with which I am familiar, the net result will be that we shall not get any of these materials, whether we like it or not, notwithstanding the fact that the words "directed and instructed" are to be applied to the ECA Administrator, because Mr. Nehru and the Indian Government have indicated before now in their messages which have come here that they do not propose to liquidate this undertaking with critical materials.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am not quite so pessimistic as is the Senator from Illinois, Mr. President. The fact remains that we are making available funds of the United States, at the request of India, as a loan to India, under terms which we specify, for the use of their starving people. We had a perfect right to include in the bill as it passed the Congress, as we have done, certain provisions directing the Administrator of the ECA in negotiating the loan to request and demand that repayment be made in certain materials. If India does not want the loan, India does not have to take it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. However, it is, in my judgment, a foregone conclusion that India will get the loan and that we shall not get the things we need most.

Mr. GILLETTE. Again I am not so pessimistic as is the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there are two other questions which I should like to ask in this connection, if the Senator will yield further.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Subsequent to the consideration of this bill in the Senate and when it was passed by the Senate I saw a statement by a responsible Indian official to the effect that the famine in India had been overemphasized and was not nearly so bad as had been represented to the House of Representatives and the Senate. Did that come to the attention of the conferees?

Mr. GILLETTE. Not during the meetings of the conference committee. It was not discussed in the conference committee. It came to my attention thereafter. I have been disturbed about that matter, and I shall refer to it later in the day.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Then the Senator from Iowa did see the statement and was disturbed about it, as I was; was he?

Mr. GILLETTE. I saw the statement subsequent to the conference committee's meeting.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are the concessions in regard to ocean freight and the advances which may be made by the RFC for shipping, in case vessels are not available, to be added to the amount, or are they included in the \$190,000,000? From the language of section 5 of the conference report I cannot tell whether they are included or are in addition to the \$190,000,000.

Mr. GILLETTE. Does the Senator refer to the \$20,000,000 item?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. I now read from the conference report, in section 5:

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances not to exceed in the aggregate \$20,000,000 to the Department of Commerce, in such manner, at such times, and in such amounts as the President shall determine, for activation and operation of vessels for such transportation, and these advances may be placed in any funds or accounts available for such purposes, and no interest shall be charged on advances made by the Treasury to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for these purposes: *Provided*, That pursuant to agreements made between the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Department of Commerce, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be repaid without interest not later than June 30, 1952, for such advances either from funds hereafter made available to the Department of Commerce for the activation and operation of vessels, or, notwithstanding the provisions of any other act, from receipts from vessel operations.

When this matter was before the Foreign Relations Committee, at the hearings, the evidence we had was that there was little doubt that the entire cost would be repaid from the earnings of these vessels with return cargoes and future charges.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But the repayment provisions in section 5 relate only to repayments and reimbursements made by the Department of Commerce to the RFC; do they not?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am wondering whether there are to be reimbursements for the carrying charges, in addition to the \$190,000,000 that is involved?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is difficult to tell.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly the language of the conference report is not clear as to that.

Mr. GILLETTE. My honest personal opinion is that they would not be included, but I do not possess sufficient knowledge to be able to answer that question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I simply wish to make this concluding observation, Mr. President: First, I say to my friend from Iowa that I think the conferees have done a good job.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But, on the other hand, I have not been divorced from the sense of distress which I previously had with respect to what we are going to get in return. When this bill was under consideration on the floor of the Senate, prior to its passage, I said that it seemed

to me that we had been following a course of conduct by means of which we would scarcely receive our fee while the situation was emergent, and then later the debt would be blithely forgotten and our people would be left to hold the sack.

So, Mr. President, if there were to be a record vote on this measure—although I shall not press for one—I doubt very much whether I would support it in its present form.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not wish to belabor the conference report, but I am very much interested in section 2, which was just brought to the attention of the Senator from Iowa by the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. That section is the so-called Bridges amendment with respect to the procurement of strategic materials.

I remember that the Senate very strongly favored that amendment. There was considerable sentiment in favor of it, and it was accepted. The vote was unanimous; there was not one vote against it.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. It was taken to conference. As the Senator from Iowa well knows, I have a deep respect for him, and I know that conferences are held in the attempt to resolve differences. But, with a unanimous vote, I ask the distinguished Senator why it is that we must recede a long way from the Bridges amendment, and write into the bill merely a pious hope? I think it comes to that. Upon what basis did the conferees on the part of the Senate recede from the Bridges amendment, and upon what basis are we now asked to accept a provision which, to my mind, is certainly permissive and not mandatory, a provision which, as I have said before, expresses merely a pious hope, if it does anything at all?

Mr. GILLETTE. Answering the distinguished minority leader, I may say that I believe he is in error with reference to the vote.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator refers to the vote on the Bridges amendment, I take it.

Mr. GILLETTE. There was no yeas-and-nays vote. In addition to that fact, there was colloquy on the floor, in which the Senator from New Hampshire, the author of the amendment, asked the Senator from Iowa whether he would accept the amendment. The Senator from Nebraska said, "I understand the Senator from Iowa is accepting the amendment." The Senator from Iowa said, "No, I am not accepting the amendment, but if the Senate directs that it be taken to conference, I am willing to take it to conference."

Mr. WHERRY. And so we had a vote.

Mr. GILLETTE. The question was put.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. And, without a dissenting vote, the amendment was taken to conference.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Wherein, then, was the Senator from Nebraska incorrect? The vote was unanimous, was it not? It was a voice vote, it is true.

Mr. GILLETTE. It was a voice vote, and there was no dissenting vote, as I recall.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. To my mind, that was as strong a vote as there would have been had a yeas-and-nays vote been taken, in view of the fact that there was not a dissenting vote.

I do not want the Senator to feel that I am critical. I have participated in conferences, and I know that is sometimes very difficult to resolve a situation. But this amendment is so important that I am wondering whether the conferees might not have come back to the Senate to request further instructions on it. It seems to me the Senate is completely abandoning its position. Was any new evidence presented to the conference, or anything of that kind?

Mr. GILLETTE. No, there was not. Of course, the conferees on the part of the Senate had in mind the circumstances under which the amendment was included in the bill on the floor of the Senate. They also had in mind the fact that there was a question as to the availability of monazite, and the fact, which was presented to us in conference, that the Government of India had a specific prohibition against the exporting of monazite sands. In view of that fact, the conferees feel that they assisted in working out in conference an amendment which meets the purpose which the Senator from New Hampshire had in mind, namely, the purpose of insisting, and of expressing the intent of the Congress to the effect, that in the negotiation of this loan the fullest consideration should be given to strategic materials, without at the same time naming the materials.

Mr. WHERRY. Except that the amendment is certainly permissive in nature. The matter is left really to the decision of ECA, under the foreign-aid program.

I merely wish to make my position clear. Time and time again an amendment on the subject of strategic materials has been offered on the floor of the Senate, not only in connection with this bill, but in connection with other measures. Each time it finally results in the adoption of a permissive amendment, an amendment which really means nothing so far as reciprocity is concerned, or so far as the maintenance of a two-way street is concerned. I supported and voted for the India food program, but one of the important considerations which influenced my decision was the Bridges amendment. To me, the report of the conferees puts an entirely different aspect upon the situation; and I have to adopt a new approach in order to support the conference report.

Mr. GILLETTE. It is true, as the Senator from Nebraska has said, that the language adopted by the conferees is not compulsory.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. But it certainly constitutes a directive; it expresses the intent of the Congress that the adminis-

trative officer, in the negotiation of the loan, shall try to carry out the wishes of Congress.

With reference to the shipment of monazite sands, I do not believe there is a Member of the Senate who would agree that we should take a position by which we would knowingly consent to a violation of the plain intent of our Atomic Energy Act by permitting the shipment of plutonium or uranium out of this country. That is analogous to what we would be requiring of India as the basis of a loan, before we would make food available to her.

Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. FERGUSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. GILLETTE. I agreed to yield to the Senator from New Mexico. When I have first yielded to him, I shall then yield to the Senator from North Dakota, and then to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The country as a whole is interested in monazite sand. It so happens that in my State we are interested in jute. Does the directive which has been written into the bill by the conference have anything to say in regard to jute?

Mr. GILLETTE. It covers all strategic materials. It covers jute, as well as other materials.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Before I yield to the Senator from North Dakota, I desired to call attention to the language which the Senator from Iowa used at the time the Bridges amendment was pending. From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 16, 1951, page 5411, I read:

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Iowa whether he will be willing to accept my amendment.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I am not willing to accept the amendment. I think it is fully covered in the general terms of the amendment submitted by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], for himself and other Senators. However, I am willing to take the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to conference, to see if the language can be worked out.

Mr. WHERRY. Then there was a vote on the amendment, was there not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes, there was then a vote on the amendment, because of the fact that the Senator from Iowa did not accept it. The Presiding Officer put the question to the Senate on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. There was a voice vote.

Mr. WHERRY. It had the same effect as though there had been a ye-and-nay vote, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. GILLETTE. I think there is no doubt about that. I yield now to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Has not the situation in India changed very materially since this bill was passed by the Senate?

Mr. GILLETTE. The Senator from Iowa has no direct information, but, judging from published reports, it has changed.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the very fact that Red China has taken over Tibet make a big difference?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that is undoubtedly true.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not also true that today the Government of India is in power simply because the Communists of India, up to the present time, have not overthrown the government?

Mr. GILLETTE. I do not believe the conclusion is justified, I may say to my distinguished friends, that the present Government of India is in power simply because of that factor. It is a factor, undoubtedly, of its continuance in power.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is familiar, is he not, with some of the articles which have appeared recently in the newspapers, stating that Nehru has lost practically all of his power, and that India is rapidly becoming a Russian satellite?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is very disturbing to the Senator from Iowa, and to every other citizen of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. In view of that situation, does the Senator believe that we should send \$190,000,000 to India?

Mr. GILLETTE. That, of course, is a decision which the Congress must make. I know that the Senator from Iowa, and I feel sure every other Member of the Congress, has had in mind, more than anything else, humanitarian needs.

While I have a deep interest in governmental philosophies and ideologies, I also have a profound interest in aiding starving children. There was a need in that regard which was presented to us as being of extreme moment, and out of our resources I think the people of the United States, and I know the Members of Congress, are willing to contribute.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator from Iowa be willing to send \$190,000,000 worth of grain to starving children in Russia?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is a very tough question to ask the Senator from Iowa. If it could be sent to them without contributing to the Russian effort to communize the world, I think I would be willing to contribute food out of my own limited resources.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would join the Senator.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the conference report stipulate that our Government will assume the transportation cost of the wheat, or whether the expense shall be included in the \$190,000,000?

Mr. GILLETTE. The reports of both committees, I think, make it clear that India is to assume the cost of transportation from our port of embarkation.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the bill as embodied in the conference report, the money involved is all a loan, and not a grant. Is that correct?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under the wording of the conference report, or, at least, according to the statements made on the

floor today, those who are to negotiate are instructed to keep in mind that American needs certain strategic materials, and that in negotiating the loan there should be an understanding between the two nations that the loan is to be repaid by permitting exports of jute, magnesium, and certain other materials—

Mr. GILLETTE. Strategic materials.

Mr. FERGUSON. Without naming them?

Mr. GILLETTE. Without naming them.

Mr. FERGUSON. When I first drafted my amendment, which was designed to provide a loan instead of money, I used the words "so far as practicable," in connection with furnishing strategic materials.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the identical language of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. But that was amended by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who proposed to name the particular commodities, and to make it mandatory. If our negotiators have the interest in America which they should have and if India has in mind the fact that what is provided is a loan and represents an endeavor by America to furnish wheat for India's starving population, does the Senator feel that, with these instructions, they would agree there is no conflict with a basic principle? For instance, the Senator indicated that if some nation tried to make a deal for a loan with America, they should pay the loan by furnishing strategic materials, if possible, or work out an arrangement for providing monazite sand if it would not interfere with a fundamental principle. Does not the Senator from Iowa feel that something of that kind should be worked out, if India really wants wheat? At times the Senator from Michigan has had some doubt that India wants really to make a contract in relation to wheat, which might be for the reason that the great need in India today is for rice. For centuries the Indian people have been accustomed to a diet of rice. When a person gets very low on calories, he is better able to digest and to assimilate a rice diet than a wheat diet. Therefore, what the Indians really need is rice, but they cannot get it from Burma, China, Indonesia, and some other countries, and they probably will want the money proposed to be loaned in order to buy wheat from America because of the condition of famine in India at the present time. Does the Senator feel that there is something to that statement?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think the Senator from Michigan has made a very sound and helpful statement, but I should like to amplify the statement he has just made by reference to what I have said on the floor of the Senate with reference to the directive in the bill. In addition to that, the report of the House managers to the House, and our report to the Senate, state as explicitly as language can state what we want done, and I do not believe any executive officer would refuse to carry out a directive which is so clear and concise as is the directive we have included.

Mr. FERGUSON. Whether a deal is made between India and the United States will depend upon whether India can really use the wheat and must have it, and whether we desire to serve the interests of America.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is correct. While carrying on this colloquy with the Senator, I should like to say that his amendment with respect to the requirement that the President proclaim that private shipping is not available before additional ships are broken out of the reserve fleet was taken to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to know that.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I wish to express my appreciation for the splendid leadership which the Senator from Iowa has shown. I have been closely identified with him, and I am very glad to endorse the report of the conferees. I appreciate the splendid exposition which the Senator from Iowa has made on the floor.

We considered the monazite question very carefully, and feel that the way the House and Senate conferees reported the final bill is in the interest not only of India, but of the United States of America as well. It was dealt with in a most effective manner in order to protect our interests, as well as those of the Indian people.

I again desire to emphasize the importance of feeding the women and children of India, who are in no way to blame for the actions of their government. We should think in terms of feeding women and children, and endeavor to work out a program so that our negotiators can deal with the Indian negotiators in reference to the way in which the loan can be paid.

I again commend the Senator from Iowa for his splendid exposition.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. Since the Senator from New Jersey was kind enough to pay me a compliment, I desire to say, without reservation, that the proposed legislation would not have reached its present stage if it had not been for the insistent, persistent, and consistent efforts of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator expect any part of the \$190,000,000 ever to be repaid?

Mr. GILLETTE. Judging by our experience with loans made in the past, there is no occasion for any enthusiastic optimism.

Mr. LANGER. We have been considering a 5-percent cut in an appropriation bill through an amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan. I understand a similar amendment is to be offered to another appropriation bill, providing for a 10-percent cut with respect to independent agencies. Does not the Senator believe we should have

a record vote on the question of giving away \$190,000,000 of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. GILLETTE. We are not proposing to give it away. It is a loan. Regardless of our sad experience with the older nations of the world, India is a new Republic which may be anxious to keep its credit good. We are making a loan for a wonderful purpose. I think there is ground for entertaining a hope, not based on the record of some of the nations to whom we have loaned billions of dollars, but on the purpose behind the loan and on the reasonableness of our expectation, that some of it will be repaid.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Illinois that he will not ask for a record vote, I may say that I am going to vote against the report, because I believe in first taking care of the destitute in the United States. Does not the Senator think we should have a record vote when we are to give away \$190,000,000? Does he not believe that we should go on record?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am willing to go on record. I am not speaking for other Members of the Senate. That is within their province.

Mr. LANGER. The distinguished Senator from Illinois stated that while he is opposed he will not ask for a record vote. I want to say that the Senator from North Dakota is going to ask for a record vote.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan feels it is rather unfortunate that it is indicated on the floor of the Senate that while we are making a loan, in effect we do not expect to be paid back; we believe another nation will sign a note, take upon itself a solemn obligation to repay a loan, yet that we upon the floor of the Senate are passing the measure with the mental reservation that the loan will not be paid back.

When it was proposed that this transaction be in the nature of a loan, as a Senator from Michigan I had sincerely in mind that it would be an obligation of a nation among the family of nations, which was duty bound morally and legally to repay the money.

I believe that America's future conduct in international relations will depend upon how we distribute money to the four corners of the earth, and whether other nations believe we want them to keep their obligations as members of the family of nations; whether they will believe that we expect every other nation, when it signs a treaty, when it undertakes an obligation, to keep it.

We can honestly anticipate that Communist Russia, which uses words merely for the purpose of covering up, and says, "loan," when it does not mean "loan," and "grant," when it does not mean "grant," will not carry out the provisions of a treaty into which it enters. We can honestly expect that such a nation will not be expected by the community of

nations to keep a treaty. But I hope that every other nation that gives lip service to democracy will feel that it is obligated to do as Finland has done, keep its obligations. Finland has kept its obligations under the severest of conditions.

Mr. President, I hope that what we say on the floor today will mean to India, whether Mr. Nehru is in power, or whether there be some other ruler or government, that we think she should repay her debt and keep her obligation.

The Senator from Michigan has great respect for the Indian people and likes them, having been in India on several occasions, he believes that if they are given the power to speak, they will repay this loan as soon as possible, and will not look upon it as a gift from America.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. LANGER addressed the Chair.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, before I yield I desire to say that I endorse the statement just expressed by the Senator from Michigan. As a Senator from Iowa I may add that I have not abandoned hope that there are in the community of nations, in the international association of nations, some remnants of the same principles of morality and honor and respect for obligations which I believe still exist in the vast majority of the individuals composing this Nation. Even in the face of the fact that we see individuals violate their spoken word, and fail to carry out their obligations I am not willing to believe that all individuals subscribe to that course of conduct. While there are instances in which there seems to be a denial of obligation under international compact, I am not willing to admit that there is not a sense of honor and decency among civilized nations. God forbid that we should ever reach the point where we must make such an assumption.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely wish to say, in response to what the Senator from Michigan has stated, that I have known a great many citizens of India. I have met many of them. I worked closely with many of them during the years when I was Director General of UNRRA. It gives me great satisfaction to say that I know of no people who have a higher sense of honor, who are more proud, who are more sincere, who are more honest and more concerned not only with their own ills but with the ills of the world, than the people of India.

During the years I was Director General of UNRRA, India, even though many of its people were underfed, though many were starving, made available \$30,000,000 for the international fund which was dispensed by UNRRA, and that money was used to relieve the suffering, the starvation and illness of people in the war-stricken countries. Not 1 cent of that money was used in India. The Indian people did not ask UNRRA for 1 cent. They were willing to make sacrifices so as to make available to UNRRA

and to the people of the suffering countries of the world the great sum of \$30,000,000.

I conclude by again saying that I know of no people who have a higher regard for their commitments, who are more honorable, who are more sincere, who have a deeper sense of pride and of conscience, than the people of India.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the junior Senator from New York for his timely contribution.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota is just as charitable and, I think, as big-hearted as is the average man in this country. I call the attention of Senators to the fact that in this case we are not asked to give away our own money. We are asked to vote to give away the money of the taxpayers. The Senator from Michigan, the Senator from Iowa, and the Senator from New York can dream on and dream on; but after World War I we went through the same procedure. We know what happened. Finland alone paid. Yes, Finland alone paid. We have gone through a similar experience before. We have talked about civilized nations and talked about honor. During World War II, for example, we were associated with many countries that today will not even send one soldier to Korea. We are financing the war in Korea and doing overwhelmingly the greatest amount of the fighting.

So far as I am concerned, I shall wait until we receive some quid pro quo before I vote to take the American taxpayers' money and give it away. We are giving away billions upon billions of dollars. We are talking about giving away \$190,000,000 more, and the senior Senator from Iowa says we are not going to get it back.

Mr. President, the position of the senior Senator from North Dakota has been stated. I hope we may have a yeand-nay vote on the report.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota in a moment. In reply to the very able Senator from North Dakota, I wish to say that when he suggests that the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from New York, and the Senator from Iowa may dream on, I hope he will leave us our dreams. There are many factual situations with which we are faced, but I trust we can continue to hope, I trust we can dream, I trust we can continue to have a little faith in humanity as individuals and humanity as associations of individuals. Let the Senator from North Dakota leave that with us. Do not take it away on the basis of the foundation to which he has alluded.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that the words of the distinguished Senator from Iowa remind me of the words of William Gibbs McAdoo after World War I. The words are identical. After that war was over billions upon billions of dollars were given to country after country after country. The recipients said they were going to pay us back,

but when we asked them to pay back some of the money they called us Uncle Shylock. I think Senators will find that human nature has not changed.

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

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I thank the Senator from Iowa for yielding.

In connection with this loan to India—and it is a loan—I believe that we can expect that nation to pay it back, either in merchandise or in materials which we can use, or in credit or currency.

There have been times in the history of the various States of the Union when their credit was strained and they were unable to honor their obligations. Yet history has shown that when the time arrived that they were able to do so, they paid their obligations, with past-due interest, and reestablished their credit so that they might again have a market for their bonds, which were issued for roads and other improvements.

So, as we have seen instances of financial difficulty within the States of our great Nation, we can expect to see financial difficulties in the affairs of the nations of the world. In this particular instance, so far as India is concerned, I think there is dire need for this loan. There is dire need for food grain. I sat through all the committee hearings. All the information which I received indicated that India needs this aid, and should have had it at an earlier date than this.

I certainly hope that we shall have no further difficulty in approving the conference report.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I sincerely thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very helpful and pertinent remarks. I wish to add just two paragraphs to the statement which I was making when I was interrupted by various Senators.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to the fact that his amendment requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to find and certify that the procurement of agricultural products will not impair the fulfillment of the vital needs of the United States before any food is shipped, is still in the bill.

I should like to say to the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR] that the language which makes the relevant provisions of the ECA Act, as amended, applicable to this legislation, is still in the bill, thereby assuring that 50 percent of the commodities shipped will be carried by American-flag vessels.

The junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] will be glad to know that his amendment authorizing the ECA to pay ocean freight charges to India for relief parcels is still in the bill, although it has been amended to make it clear that the provision also applies to the supplies of the American Red Cross.

I hope that we will act quickly on this conference report so that the people of India may know that the people of the United States are willing to give them a helping hand in time of need.

I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have listened with interest to the distinguished Senator from Iowa as he has presented the conference report to the Senate. I realize that it is very difficult to accomplish all of one's objectives in any conference between two bodies such as the Senate and the House. I have served on too many conference committees to question the reports of conference committees. However, I wish to make a few suggestions.

I desire to point out to Senators that by this bill we are contributing to the confused foreign policy which has been wrought by the administration's State Department. I have favored the movement to provide wheat for India. I believe that it is a humane project. I believe that any project to relieve human suffering caused by famine conditions certainly deserves the attention and consideration of this great country.

Over the years America has been very generous—generous almost to a fault, I think. We have poured out billions of dollars to many countries since World War II. Today, some of those countries are our enemies. Some of them have failed to keep the first points of the arrangements which were made. I regret their actions, but we must face realities. In my opinion, the only way to judge the future is by the events of the past.

I am aware of and I support the necessity of providing relief for human suffering. The people who starve in India this summer will know little of the political events which have contributed to their plight.

I wish to point out to the Senators that the provisions of this bill do not have the color of a quid pro quo agreement with India. This is an outright loan, for the purpose of supplying food grain to India. When we pass this bill we automatically take the position of backing India in a trade war with Pakistan. We profess to be friendly with the people of Pakistan. However, it will be most difficult for the people of that country to understand our action. Our diplomacy has failed—if any real effort was made to acquire and cement friendly relations between this nation and the Moslem world.

Had we enacted an exchange provision with India, I do not see how any country in the world could have complained. I think the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has perhaps put in as simple words as possible what the bill means. It means a direct loan. It means a hope that somehow, something will be done to provide an exchange of vital commodities between these two nations.

Let there be no misunderstanding about this issue. America is engaged in a struggle for her existence. It is a struggle to provide leadership for the free world. If leadership does not come from America, it will come from no

other country. When any other nation on the face of the globe gets into trouble, it can turn to some bigger or stronger nation in the free world. But when the United States gets into difficulty, there is no larger or stronger nation in the free world to which we can turn. We are the core of resistance. We are the final wall of freedom; and from our bastions must come the leadership to carry the free world to peace.

So, in spite of the fact that we have a great humane interest in the suffering of people in other nations, as Americans we are certainly being practical and realistic, and looking to our own security and ability to provide leadership in a troubled world, when such Senators as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and others join in my effort to arrive at some practical arrangement under which we can obtain vital materials which are so desperately needed to prepare the defenses of our country.

The time may come when the dreams of the Senator from Iowa will not materialize. He stated that he wanted to be able to dream. I hope he can continue to dream. I, too, want to dream. But the Senator from New Hampshire realizes that a dream is not always practical. A dream is an illusion. It is unreal. Therefore, while we may have our illusions and our unreality, and our dreams, we must finally get down to bedrock, to something practical. The practical consideration is that we must have jet engines. We must have jet engines to deliver the atom bomb. We must have the vital materials which will prepare us so that we can maintain our core of strength in the world.

The bill as amended by the Senate and sent to conference would have provided some of the necessary materials to help make this country strong. I regret very much that the Senate conferees were unable to arrive at an agreement with the House conferees which would have retained in the bill the provisions to which I have referred, which were fair provisions, provisions which I think would have been complied with by any country which was trying to be cooperative.

I sincerely hope that the dreams of the Senator from Iowa will come true. I sincerely hope that they may materialize. I hope that our State Department, in working out the executive agreement, will be a little more practical than it has been in the past; that it will provide a little more positive leadership than it has shown in the past, and that it will approach the problem on a little more realistic basis. This is my dream so that not only will our great country render a service to hungry people in other lands, but also they will work out a practical arrangement whereby we may get some help in return for our effort. Our principal project after all, is building an America strong enough to be able not only to defend ourselves but also to give to other nations the leadership which they must have from us and which they cannot get anywhere else in the free world.

I hope we will solve our difficulties by peaceful methods. However, if the time ever comes when our country is in a fight for its very life, when bombs start dropping on our cities, when civilians are

killed; then if we do not have the materials at hand with which to go forth and fight to defend our country, I will not have it said that the Senator from New Hampshire did not stand up on the floor of the Senate while there was yet time to call attention to the facts and make a fight to have such arrangements incorporated in the so-called India wheat bill.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. I am sorry that I did not hear all of the debate in connection with the pending conference report. Can the Senator from New Hampshire enlighten me as to why the conference committee could not devise a plan by which America could get the monazite sands from India?

Mr. BRIDGES. I could not tell the able Senator from Idaho, because, as he well knows, I was not a member of the conference committee. Therefore he would have to address his question to one of the members of the conference committee, presumably the chairman of the committee.

I had hoped the committee would retain the provisions which the Senator from New Hampshire proposed, in which he was supported by other Senators, and on which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made an outstanding speech. The provision included the assignment of manganese and monazite sands, which are two very vital materials in our effort to build up our defenses. As it is, we are now left with no definite arrangement. All that we have now is the hope that some arrangement will be worked out. I still hope, too, but I shall have to await results.

Mr. WELKER. In other words, it is an Indian gift, or a one way deal, in which we do the transferring and India does nothing in return?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; although that is what it may result in. It is said as I understand from the report, that the details are to be worked out. Instead of having the details spelled out, so that we would be assured of what we would be getting, we are in effect providing a blank check, and I have never believed in signing a blank check.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Ellender	Johnston, S. C.
Bennett	Ferguson	Kerr
Benton	Frear	Kilgore
Brewster	Fulbright	Knowland
Bridges	George	Langer
Butler, Md.	Gillette	Lehman
Butler, Nebr.	Green	Long
Byrd	Hayden	Malone
Cain	Hendrickson	McCarran
Capehart	Hennings	McCarthy
Chavez	Hickenlooper	McClellan
Clements	Hill	McFarland
Connally	Hoey	McKellar
Cordon	Holland	McMahon
Dirksen	Hunt	Monroney
Duff	Ives	Moody
Dworshak	Jenner	Morse
Eastland	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Ecton	Johnson, Tex.	Neely

Nixon	Schoeppel	Thye
O'Connor	Smathers	Underwood
O'Mahoney	Smith, Maine	Watkins
Pastore	Smith, N. J.	Welker
Robertson	Smith, N. C.	Wherry
Russell	Sparkman	Williams
Saitonstall	Stennis	Young

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

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise again to urge the adoption of my amendment to the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan.

Those of us who support my amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan do not ask for increases in the appropriations, but we are fighting against reductions. I wish to point out that in the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee, the appropriations have already been substantially reduced below the budget estimates.

Mr. President, research is the backbone of medical progress. Gains which may seem to be small may result in the saving of many thousands of lives. Important developments in the field of research may change history. The splendid work done by the Public Health Service and by our Health Institutes is recognized the world over.

At the recent conference on health, held at Geneva, which I attended in company with my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from California [Mr.

Nixon], I heard nothing but praise and admiration expressed for the work done by the Public Health Service of our country. The value of research work is now recognized throughout the entire world. I think that if the junior Senator from California were on the floor of the Senate at this time, he would bear me out when I state that even the poorest countries are bending every effort to improve their health and sanitary conditions.

Mr. President, when I was governor of my State, during the depression years commencing in 1932, I was able through economy and careful administration to convert a deficit into a large surplus which happily I was able to leave to my successor. At that time I was called a penny pincher, and I suppose I was. I had to be a penny pincher in order to balance the State budget during those extremely difficult years. However, Mr. President, let me say that with all my preoccupation with the subject of economy, there were two activities on which I refused to economize: first, the health of our people; and, second, the education of our people. Health and education are fundamental in any democracy.

Let me point out—and I say this with the fullest degree of conviction—that any country which disregards its obligation to protect the health of its people and to educate its people adequately, inevitably will retrogress. I shall continue to fight for adequate health protection and education so long as I live.

Of course, Mr. President, I favor economy; my entire record in public life proves this to be so. However, the health of our people is a concern of Government which we cannot disregard, and it is a particularly important concern of Government at this time because it is a vital part of our defense effort.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I shall strongly support the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, because I believe that it will protect the funds which go to the chemists, the biologists, and the researchers who have done so much to protect and improve the health of our Nation and the health of the world. Is that not the case?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is quite true.

Mr. MONRONEY. The appropriation items affected by the amendment do not involve bureaucrats or a vast overhead of bureaucracy or bookkeeping or accounting; but, as I understand the Senator's amendment, it would exempt the appropriations for this very basic medical research from the 10 percent reduction.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; it would exempt the appropriation for research work and for these services from the 10 percent reduction. I am very glad the Senator from Oklahoma has brought up this point, because I wish to present to the Senate some figures which will show what a very small part the expenditures for administration play in these appropriations. It is a very minor part.

Mr. MONRONEY. If a reduction is made, almost all of it will have to be made in the funds for direct medical research, such as the research which developed the typhus vaccine, which today is saving the lives of probably hundreds of thousands of Americans in Korea. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I can say that more than 90 percent of the funds affected by the amendment will be used for the purposes of research in medicine, sanitation, and public health, and those funds will be paid to those who are actually carrying on that work.

Mr. MONRONEY. And they are the ones who have discovered the vaccine for rabbit fever and the vaccines which are used to combat all the plagues, such as malaria, which have reduced the economic status of so many countries. These research workers will develop new drugs to be used to combat those diseases. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, and they are of benefit to the entire Nation.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I am delighted that the Senator from New York has offered his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. Nevertheless, long before the Senator from Michigan submitted his amendment, the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and the full Appropriations Committee tried to do exactly what the Senator from New York is now trying to do.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, we have heard a great deal of discussion on the floor of the Senate about the excess number of chauffeurs and bureaucrats and administrators. I am very glad indeed that the Senator from Oklahoma asked the questions he did ask, because they give me an opportunity to present these matters more fully. It has been made to appear that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, if adopted, would serve to eliminate the excess number of chauffeurs and bureaucrats and administrators, as alleged, without in any way affecting the actual services for the protection of the health and welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say that I appreciate what the Senator from New York is trying to do, and I think it should be done. I simply object to having the amendment of the Senator from Michigan considered in any way at all. However, if it must be adopted, I would prefer to have it adopted as it would be modified by the adoption of the amendment which the Senator from New York has offered to it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from New Mexico that I have no doubt that other Senators will speak on other phases of Government activities which may be affected by adoption of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, but I am confining my remarks at this time to the services

which are administered by the Public Health Service and by the various Institutes of Health and allied services.

I wish to read certain figures, Mr. President, to refute the claims which have been made here about the great number of administrators who are used in this work, and the relatively small number of people who are used for the actual conduct of the health activities. In the control of venereal diseases, a total of 720 people are employed. The administrative forces comprise but 36.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that his amendment does not even exempt those engaged in combating venereal diseases?

Mr. LEHMAN. My amendment was supposed to cover—

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator would look at the budget, he would find that control of venereal disease is not under any of the items mentioned in his amendment. Venereal diseases are not mentioned among those which the Senator seeks to exempt.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not quite get the point made by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The point is that the Senator's amendment does not cover any question regarding the personnel engaged in health services with respect to venereal diseases.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well, but I want to read these figures. I desire to show how small a number of people is used in the administration of these health activities. Possibly I shall amend my amendment to include the item mentioned by the Senator from Michigan.

I desire to read the list, if I may: Control of tuberculosis, total number employed, 535, used in administration, 60. In assistance to States, general, total number employed, 483, number used for administration, 31; in the control of communicable diseases, total employed, 1,302, used in administration, 137; in engineering sanitation and industrial hygiene, which covers water-pollution control, radiological health, food, milk, and other sanitation activities, sanitation of interstate land, water and air carriers, industrial hygiene, total employed, 649, employed in administration, 37; diseases and sanitary investigation and control, in Alaska, total employed, 75, employed in administration, 9; in grants for hospital construction, total employed, 195, employed in administration, 22.

In hospitals and medical care—and I am reading these figures even though I believe the Senator from Michigan has already said that the employees engaged in this work are not covered by his amendment—

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Nonetheless, I wish to read the figures, in order to show the small percentage of persons used in administration as compared to the great number, even though it may still be inadequate, employed in health activities. The total number employed is 7,627 and

of that number only 124 are used in administration.

In foreign quarantine service, total employed, 603; used in administrative services, 33. In direct operations and research, National Institutes of Health, total employed, 1,567; employed in the administrative branch, 168.

In the National Cancer Institute there is a total of 678 employed, with only 22 used in administration. The others are in field positions, employed in basic and clinical research in cancer, as biochemists, biologists, biophysicists, chemists, cytologists, geneticists, and medical officers. These persons render technical assistance to the States in matters directly connected with research and investigation.

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

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

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator again state the number of administrative personnel in the National Cancer Institute?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am sorry, I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator again state his understanding of the number of administrative personnel in the National Cancer Institute? That was the last one the Senator mentioned, was it not?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes. I have the figures, which have been given to me, showing a total of 678, of which number 22 are in administration.

Mr. CORDON. I am reading from the Budget appendix, and I call the Senator's attention to the figures listed. In grade 7, which is an administrative grade, with salaries running from \$3,800 to \$4,500, there are 47; in grade 6, with a salary height of \$4,200, there are 13; in grade 5, top salary \$3,850, there are 120; grade 4, top salary \$3,355, there are 67; in grade 3, top salary \$3,130, there are 81; in grade 2, top salary \$2,930, there are 38; and in grade 1, the lowest, top salary \$2,680, there are 19. Of necessity, those must all be administrative personnel.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I am quoting from the volume of justification issued by the Budget Bureau, on page 72A, which shows that there are 22 positions listed under the heading of administration.

Mr. CORDON. Will the Senator permit me to say that this is the President's budget? The figures I quoted are from the official document.

Mr. LEHMAN. This also is an official document, I may say.

Mr. CORDON. Then I hope the President will get together with himself and give us some figures upon which both of us may rely.

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may inquire, how many positions has the Senator from Oregon enumerated?

Mr. CORDON. I shall determine the number, and let the Senator know in a moment.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, will my colleague yield for a question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield gladly to my colleague.

Mr. IVES. I should like to ask my colleague whether he has any knowledge

of the amount of money involved in the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I think I can give the Senator the figure.

Mr. IVES. It has not been brought out, as yet, to my knowledge; at least, I have not heard it, and I think it is important.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am including all the services, with the exception of hospitals and medical care. I am including all the services, even though the Senator from Michigan has drawn my attention to the fact, or has made the statement, that some of these services are not covered by my amendment. But, including all of those—because I think they all should be covered by my amendment—the saving would be \$1,807,000; that is all.

Mr. IVES. That is, the saving on all the services?

Mr. LEHMAN. On all the services, with the exception of hospitals and medical care.

Mr. IVES. My understanding was that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan would save only around \$2,000,000, itself.

Mr. FERGUSON. About \$11,000,000.

Mr. IVES. How do the figures of the Senator from Michigan check with the figures of my colleague, the Senator from New York, in the matter of the amounts involved in his amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. The difficulty with the amendment of the Senator from New York is that he includes a number of things which are not included in the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from New York includes hospital and medical care. The Senator from Michigan does not at all cover hospital and medical care; and that may be a big item.

Mr. LEHMAN. No, if the Senator will pardon me, I have not included hospitals and medical care.

Mr. FERGUSON. I submit that the Senator has included them on line 4 of his amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. That is true as to my amendment, but the Senator from Michigan has said that under his amendment they would not be affected.

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I still do not understand exactly how much, under the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, is to be affected by my colleague's amendment. Was it \$1,600,000, with all the services included?

Mr. LEHMAN. That is correct.

Mr. IVES. But, with the services immediately involved in the amendment, does the Senator have any idea what the amount would be? That is important.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like first to answer the question propounded by my colleague. In my amendment it would be less than \$1,000,000.

Mr. IVES. Considerably less than 10 percent of the total saving involved by the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very considerably less. But I may say to my colleague that I believe all these services should be included in an amendment similar to mine.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. As I understand the amendment offered by the Senator from New York, the full effect of it would be to exempt the various health items which would be affected by the Ferguson amendment. As to these items, the Ferguson amendment proposes to make a saving of \$230,027 in the item affecting the National Institutes of Health. In the National Cancer Institute item, I believe the Ferguson amendment would provide a saving of \$141,829. In the item relating to the mental health activities, I believe the Ferguson amendment would make a saving of \$62,026. In the National Heart Institute item there would be a reduction or a saving of \$77,018. As to dental health, there would be a cut of \$52,692. I believe I am correct in these figures.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think the Senator is substantially correct.

Mr. IVES. What is the total?

Mr. THYE. I have not totaled the figures. I have given the individual items.

As a member of the subcommittee, I sat through the hearings and listened to all the testimony. We listened to representatives of national associations and to testimony sent in by governors of States. The Governor of the State of Minnesota sent a statement on the mental health item. It is the desire of every one of us to economize, we have heard much talk about meat-tax action and pruning by the use of surgical instruments, and I should like to apply those means, but I am a little fearful that we might cut into the very heart muscle of someone who had been trained for years in research and who might find some way of saving the life of a person afflicted with a heart ailment or with cancer.

I am personally familiar with thousands of cases in mental institutions, because, as Governor of Minnesota for 4 years, I had the responsibility for those institutions. I know that there are men and women aimlessly wandering about, or in a condition requiring strait-jackets, because, if they were not so confined, they would tear their own flesh or that of other inmates. In view of all that, knowing the progress which has been made in research in mental health, knowing the splendid work of research in heart diseases and in cancer, for the life of me I personally cannot see any economy in reducing appropriations for health measures, such as that for the Cancer Institute, by \$141,829; mental health, by \$62,026; National Heart Institute, by \$77,018; and dental health, by \$52,692.

I should like to apply economy wherever it is possible; I would help to swing even a broadax, if necessary, but when it is sought to cut down on fundamental items involving the cure of mental cases confined to institutions, when we know that through research a great deal has been accomplished in that field during recent years, and when we know of the great research which is carried on by those engaged in caring for mental cases which arose in World War II, and how they have helped immeasurably in re-

search development, I feel that I am perfectly justified in supporting the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York, because I think it means economy rather than expenditure.

So, Mr. President, I say to my colleagues that while I think the Ferguson amendment, in general, is most commendable, and I shall support it in reference to all items except those relating to health research and health benefits, I shall, as to those items, support the amendment offered by the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his very helpful remarks. I wish to point out that it is not a question of possibly discharging persons who might do good work. There is a certainty that if the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan should prevail with reference to the health services of the National Cancer Institute, between 35 and 40 persons would have to be discharged. If only a very slight gain were made this year or next year in cancer research, or in the studying of heart diseases or mental diseases, probably many thousands of lives would be saved, and certainly the very small expense that is entailed would be merited and justified a hundred times over.

I yield to the Senator from Arizona, if he desires to ask a question.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the Senator from New Mexico was endeavoring to ask me a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Much as I like what the Senator from New York has said, I do not want him to think that all of a sudden he is trying to save the situation, because the committee tried to save it.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. In a minute.

Mr. LEHMAN. I think I have the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from New York has no more interest in the bill than has the Senator from New Mexico. I attended all the hearings. I did not come here at the last minute to say something for public health. I worked and suffered the agony of the damned.

The Senator may proceed, and I shall speak in my own time.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. If I may first answer the Senator from New Mexico, I shall be glad to yield.

I think I have said 50 times on the floor of the Senate that I have the deepest appreciation of the humanitarian instincts and the splendid work of the Senator from New Mexico. I know how hard he has worked on this bill. I also know how sincerely I have supported him thus far. I claim no credit for greater interest in this work than that of any other Senator. I know we are all interested in saving lives. I do not know what the Senator from New Mexico means by this attack on me. We are working on the same side of the street. We are trying to help people. I thought I was supporting the Senator from New Mexico. When I believe the Senator from New Mexico to

be right I shall support him, and I hope he will support me.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. I wish to commend the Senator from New Mexico for his fight for the bill. I also wish to commend the Senator from New York. Trouble always ensues from proposals to make percentagewise cuts. In making them we do not know what we are doing. It is being very well demonstrated on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that when percentagewise cuts are proposed to be made, in many cases items which should be cut are not cut and those which should not be cut are cut.

What the Senator from New York is trying to do is to save the health of the country. The main reasons for making cuts is that we need money for the defense of the country, and that effort entails a vast cost.

Mr. President, if there are items in the bill which involve the health of the people which the Senator from New York has not included in his amendment, I hope he will include them. I can think of nothing that will help the defense of the United States in greater measure than the protection of the health of our people, making them healthy and strong. I hope the Senate will never come to the point where it will vote against proper appropriations which involve the health and the welfare of the people of the country.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. Pardon me a moment. Only a small amount of money is involved. We really do not know what we are doing when we make percentagewise cuts that affect items involving health.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, after which I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am the chairman of the subcommittee. We would not have had any trouble whatsoever with the Lehman amendment or any other amendments, so far as the question of taking care of public health is concerned, if it had not been for the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. That amendment was offered. Then the Senator from New York offered an amendment to the Ferguson amendment, in an endeavor to try to protect the situation. But up to that particular time, the subject of public health was being cared for by the committee?

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes.

Mr. McFARLAND. I grant that what the Senator from New Mexico says is true. But inasmuch as the Ferguson amendment has been offered, and since it affects the health and welfare of the people of the country, let us do the best we can.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. That is why I say I am against it. That is why I want to vote it down. However, I do not believe it is fair to say that the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations is now being saved by the amendment of the Senator from New York. The committee itself first endeavored to save the situation. We do not want the Ferguson amendment or any other amendment.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The Senator from New Mexico misunderstood me.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. But I also know the English language.

Mr. McFARLAND. I do not think anyone is accusing the Senator from New Mexico of not having the interest of the health of the people of the country at heart. I know he worked hard in his committee on this measure. Had it not been for the offering of crippling amendments, particularly the one by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, the amendment of the Senator from New York would not have been necessary. We all concede that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The only thing we can do now is to defeat the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator now yield to me?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am very much astonished that nearly every speech in the Senate on the pending bill has started with the rather naive prelude, "I am for economy," and then come all the exceptions. We can take the remarks made by the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from New York, and apply them to nearly every research item in the Agricultural appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, to every one of the 12 supply bills as they come along. We can fill those bills with emotionalism, and then what happens to economy?

We can come to but one conclusion. There is a real doubt in my mind, and a real doubt in the minds of the people of the country, whether the Senate wants any economy as a matter of fact. I doubt very much that Members of the Senate do.

Mr. President, I am thoroughly disappointed. Instead of glorifying the subcommittee, I want to say that I am thoroughly disappointed in the action of the subcommittee in not following up on public assistance. That subject is passed off with one paragraph. The report says there is dissatisfaction with relief administration, and the subject is left there.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me continue. Yet there is a delegation from Indiana now in the Social Security Agency trying to cope with this matter, trying to secure a requirement that the names of the recipients be made public, or be made open to public inspection. There is nothing to that effect in the report, nothing in the hearings, nothing in the

amendments to the Social Security Act that have lifted these assistance payment from \$400,000,000 in 1946 to \$1,300,000,000 in 1952.

I am not going to glorify the subcommittee when they have failed in that respect. That is where the subcommittee could have done good work. So I do not want to hear anything about so-called economy.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly not. When the Senator does not want to listen, he does not have to remain and listen.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois remain in the Chamber a moment?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; I want him to remain also.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yielded to the Senator from Illinois for a question, not to make a campaign speech.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not going to make a campaign speech. But the Senator from Illinois raised the question of who sincerely believe in economy. I want to repeat what I said, and I am going to say it again later in my remarks, that I am for economy heart and soul, but I do not believe it to be economy to risk the lives and the health of the people of the country when a small amount of money will further our efforts to protect them. That is not economy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Now will the Senator yield to me?

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

Mr. LEHMAN. That is an entirely backward step in the social life and the thinking of this enlightened Nation. That is not economy, no matter what the Senator from Illinois may say.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is true that the Senator from Illinois used to be a Member of the House. It is also correct that the Senator from New Mexico used to be a Member of the House. But when the Senator from Illinois says there is no reason for glorifying the subcommittee, I call his attention to the fact that the ranking Republican member of the subcommittee is the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]; that another member of the subcommittee is the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]; that another member of the subcommittee is the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], as is also the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. That subcommittee cut the appropriations contained in the House bill \$112,000,000, which is unusual, because generally the Senate committee restores cuts made by the House, or increases the amount provided by the House. Since in this instance we cut \$112,000,000 from the House items, I cannot go along with my good friend from Illinois and agree with him that we did not do our duty. We may have been mistaken as to certain conclusions we reached.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me for an observation at that point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I could hardly put it in the form of a question and respond to the observation made by the Senator from New Mexico, but I will be very brief and endeavor to put it in the form of a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am not through.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Very well.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I understand that the remarks of the Senator from Illinois in connection with saving money will be printed in the home newspapers in Illinois, in the Decatur, Ill., newspaper, and in other newspapers. But the Senator from New Mexico, as chairman of the subcommittee, certainly tried to save money. The subcommittee tried to save money. I think perhaps our only mistake is that we did. If we had approved all the Budget items just as they were, instead of trying to act in good faith with the Senate, we possibly would have thought differently. But the report of the subcommittee was unanimous. The ranking Republican member of that subcommittee, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] is not a wastrel. Neither is the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE]. The report of the full committee was unanimous. After we have saved \$112,000,000, it is not fair to be accused of not doing our duty.

As I have previously stated, the three men to whom I have referred do not need to be on the payroll. We can save money in our offices. We do not have to have Mr. Johnson on the payroll. We can save money. But is that the way the Government should function? Or should necessary expenditures be met? I am not referring to waste. I am not referring to unnecessary payrolls. But we should carry on the functions of government. Should not the Senate carry on, even if we must employ office stenographers?

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to my good friend that seven times in seven fiscal years we have made reductions in the appropriations for old-age assistance, and seven times in 7 years the agency in charge of the administration of that activity has come back for a deficiency appropriation. That has happened every year since 1944. The cut which is proposed here is not an economy unless we can come to the end of the fiscal year and find that the cut has been made to stick.

I know what the hearings show. I have been boning up at night on the hearings. I understand that there are demands for new benefits, for permanent disability benefits, and for other things. Those demands will probably result in a deficiency appropriation, so where is the economy?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does the Senator deny that we cut \$150,000,000 from the old-age assistance item?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the reduction stick?

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator will help us make it stick this time, it will be easier to make it stick next year.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It never has stuck before.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Whether it sticks or not, the committee did save \$150,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What the Senator means is that the committee temporarily cut it out. The agency will be back in the fall saying, "Here is a new estimate of our obligations."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly so. I do not know what the committee will do eventually. I do not know what the next Congress will do. However, as far as this committee is concerned, there is \$150,000,000 less for old-age assistance. What else can we do?

Next year there will be another session of Congress. I cannot tie the hands of that session of Congress. However, so far as this committee is concerned, I assure the Senator from Illinois that there is \$150,000,000 less for old-age assistance. What will be done next year I do not know.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When we come to the end of the fiscal year, the question is, in terms of the budget, How much money have we saved? Unless we can go along with the Ferguson amendment and accomplish something in the way of a saving which will stick until June 30, 1952, there will be no real economy.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I have listened to the very eloquent remarks of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], during the course of which he mentioned by name. The remarks were to the effect that we were all talking about economy and that that was about as far as we would go.

The Senator from Illinois was possibly not present in the Chamber when I stated that I would support the Ferguson amendment with respect to all the items except the five items relating to research. Those items are as follows:

First, the National Institutes of Health.

Second, the National Cancer Institute.

Third, the mental-health activities.

Fourth, the National Heart Institute.

Fifth, dental-health activities.

Mr. President, I was present during the committee hearings, and I listened to the testimony which was given by representatives of the various national organizations which are engaged in health research. If we were to make a reduction in the funds for such activities, I do not believe that it would be an economy. I think it would be a short-sighted attempt at economy.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, that I will support the Ferguson amendment in all its reductions throughout the entire bill, with the exception of the five research activities to which I have referred. The only reason I do not support the Ferguson amendment in that respect is that I do not believe it would be an economy.

I am very happy to say to the junior Senator from Illinois that I am just as economy-minded as he is. However, after having sat through all the hearings, I fail to see the economy in making a reduction with respect to these five items. Therefore, I shall support the amendment which proposes to exempt

those items from the so-called Ferguson amendment.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. IVES. I merely wish to comment on the very pertinent remark of our distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I hope he will not leave the Chamber.

I yield to no other Member of this body in my efforts to achieve economy and in my record of supporting and voting for measures calling for economy. The other day I had occasion to figure out the total amount of authorizations against which I had voted in the past fiscal year. I discovered that they amounted to more than \$10,000,000,000. I yield to no one on the question of economy. If my distinguished colleague from Illinois will watch my voting in this session of Congress, he will find that in nearly every instance I shall be voting for the economy motion, and for all the amendments which are aimed at economy.

The point I wish to raise is this: I have added up the figures presented this afternoon by our distinguished colleague from Minnesota. They come to approximately \$573,000 in savings under the Ferguson amendment as it applies to the particular items which are covered by the Lehman amendment modifying the Ferguson amendment. If the figures given me by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are correct, when he states that approximately \$11,700,000,000 in savings are involved in his amendment, only 5 percent of such total saving is involved in the Lehman amendment.

Mr. President, for years some of us have been struggling to get an appropriation adequate to take care of the particular items which are covered by the amendment offered by my colleague from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Year after year an effort has been made to get enough. I am satisfied from what I know that we have not enough yet, the economy situation being what it is. We are faced with conditions over which we have no control.

The position taken by the committee in this respect, when it comes to these particular items, is probably sound. I would not endeavor to upset what the committee has done by trying to increase the appropriations for these items. However, I disagree most heartily with the proposal made by my distinguished colleague from Michigan. I think it is altogether out of order so far as these particular activities are concerned. I hope that in the name of economy, as well as in the name of humanity, the amendment offered by my colleague from New York will be sustained by the Senate. If the Senator from Michigan were present, I would ask him if he would be willing to accept that amendment. It would in no way destroy what he is trying to do. Ninety-five percent of the saving which he is endeavoring to make, assuming that his amendment were adopted, would still be realized if the Lehman amendment were also adopted.

I urge the Senate to vote for the amendment of my colleague.

Mr. AIKEN and Mr. DIRKSEN addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield first to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have listened to a rather lengthy discourse on the pending appropriation bill, particularly the section which deals with the health of our people and the welfare of our children and their mothers. It seems to me that we are attempting to place a cash value on children and mothers. I should like to know from some of our dollar-and-cent experts, of whom we seem to have several on the floor, what they believe to be the cash value of a 5-year-old child. Does a 5-year-old child have any cash value? What, if anything, is it worth to restore a crippled person, who is a care upon his family or a burden on his community, to a position where he may become self-supporting and self-respecting once more? What is the cash value of a healthy mother, as compared with a sickly mother? Are we to determine all these questions in terms of dollars and cents, and decide that the fewer the cents the better off the country will be?

Mr. President, a ship is being built down at Newport News. It will soon be launched. It is an \$80,000,000 ocean liner, which will be used in the North Atlantic service. It will be turned over to one of our shipping lines for \$28,000,000. In other words, we are making them a present of \$50,000,000. That amount of money is 50 percent more than we plan to appropriate for maternal and child welfare work in this country. We are spending billions of dollars in helping corporations expand their industrial plants, at the expense of our taxpayers. We hear little objection here on the floor to such expenditures. Are the lives of our children and the health of our mothers worth anything at all? To hear the talk this afternoon one might assume that probably we ought to drown them all and get them out of the way. Then they would not cost us anything at all. Are we to deal with the problem in that way? No; I will not vote for the Ferguson amendment. I will not vote for the Lehman amendment either. I will not vote for the Lehman amendment because it omits maternal, child, and rehabilitation services, which are just as important to the people affected as are similar services to those who are affected by heart trouble and other diseases. I am not in favor of scrimping or saving money at the expense of the lives of our children. I think our children are worth much more than all the millions of Detroit or Chicago put together.

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

Mr. AIKEN. I am opposed to anything of the nature of the Ferguson amendment. The Senate has shown that it has the ability to deal with items one by one. We adopted an amendment the other day which was offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. It

provided for a cut in appropriations for the solicitor's office of the Department of Labor. I voted in favor of the Senator's amendment. The Senator has many more amendments to offer. I shall vote for some of them. We have shown our ability to deal with items one by one. We should not resort to a dangerous across-the-board cut. We have shown our ability. We should now have the courage and determination to deal with the problem in the proper way. We should not put a dollars-and-cents value on the life of a child, an expectant mother, or a sick person. For heaven's sake, let us get away from that attitude in attacking the problems which we have before us.

Mr. President, I do not see how a Senator can stand on the floor and talk about saving a hundred dollars or a thousand dollars at the expense of someone's life. In other words, we are being asked to let the cripple stay crippled. Last year it cost approximately \$490 to put about 50,000 of them in a position where they could help themselves, instead of remaining helpless. I do not know what we can have in mind when we talk about saving a few dollars at the expense of lives and letting children be born of mothers who are physically not in a condition to take care of them. What are we thinking of?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the Senator from Vermont that he knows me well enough to be quite certain that I agree with everything he has said today. He has expressed my sentiments probably far better than I could express them.

Mr. AIKEN. We are not trying to increase the personnel or the appropriation for maternal or child welfare and vocational rehabilitation. Why should we undertake to cut back beyond what we have done in past years. We are not asking for an increase.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from Vermont has stated that he would not vote for my amendment. The reason he gave was that the amendment did not include grants for maternal and child-welfare services. I may point out that my amendment refers only to the Public Health Service. As he knows, grants for maternal care and child welfare come under other categories.

Mr. AIKEN. But a cut is involved there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Ferguson amendment would make a cut.

Mr. AIKEN. There is already a 5-percent cut in the personnel appropriation, and under the Ferguson amendment there would be an additional cut of 5 percent. Therefore the appropriation would be cut back to a point where it would be 10 percent less than was appropriated during previous years.

Mr. LEHMAN. I agree entirely with the Senator from Vermont that the cut proposed in the Ferguson amendment would apply to other items in which I and the Senator from Vermont are interested.

Mr. AIKEN. It would cut everything.

Mr. LEHMAN. However, Mr. President, I do not think it is a good reason for the Senator's not voting for my

amendment, because my amendment, after all, is an amendment to the Ferguson amendment. He could still vote against the Ferguson amendment. I hope he will vote against it. In the event that the Ferguson amendment is not defeated and my amendment is adopted, we will be at least that much better off.

Mr. AIKEN. I may say to the Senator from New York that I am voting against his amendment because it does not include provisions in relation to maternal care, child welfare, and vocational rehabilitation. If the Senator's amendment should carry with my vote, he then could vote for the Ferguson amendment. If his amendment were rejected, I believe he would vote against the Ferguson amendment. We should take the items one by one. We should have the courage to do it. We should vote for them one by one.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator from Vermont what he would suggest with reference to my amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. I would include vocational rehabilitation and maternal and child welfare services so far as personnel was concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. I hesitated to do it, because I thought my amendment was clean cut and showed the ridiculous character of the move for false economy. I did not want to complicate the situation. I think I was wise in not doing so, because I can still vote against items as they are brought up.

Mr. AIKEN. That would not be done. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the suffering of a 5-year-old homeless child is not of as much concern to us as a person who has a bad heart.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly.

Mr. AIKEN. Is not a cripple, who is a burden upon his community, but who wants to become self-supporting once more, as much our concern as any other person who is suffering from a disease? I think they all ought to be included.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. From the bottom of my heart I thank the Senator from Vermont for his remarks. I know he belongs to the other side of the aisle, but he is true blue. He is an American. He represents what I understand to be the concept of our ideals, and a concept of what is American. I pay tribute to the Senator from Vermont.

I think we owe more of a sacred duty to the mentally ill. How can they protect themselves? The Senator testified before the committee that more than 800,000 of them are in mental institutions. We are not talking about those whose families can care for them, but we are speaking only of those who are in public institutions. Do we owe them a duty? Should we give them some consideration? Of course, we know that those who have heart disease can speak for themselves and can make their own complaints to Senators. However, that is not true of the poor unfortunates who suffer from mental illness. So I am glad that there are Members of the Senate and there are people elsewhere in the

United States who do pay attention to these matters.

After all, Mr. President, a person who is suffering from tuberculosis can complain about his situation, and so can a person who is suffering from heart disease or a person who is suffering from cancer; but what about those who are suffering from mental illness? We owe them a duty, for that reason.

So I am very glad that the Senator from Vermont spoke as he did, and I am very glad that the Senator from New York has submitted his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

So far as health is concerned, I hope we realize that, in contrast, millions and billions of dollars are appropriated and spent for destruction, to kill people. I hope that we who serve in this body will not be so niggardly that we do not pay a little attention to the health of our people.

The Congress votes millions and millions of dollars in appropriations to be used to eradicate diseases of horses and cows and poultry, but then it is proposed that a 10-percent reduction be made in the appropriation items for the health of our people and in the appropriations to be used to find cures for heart disease, cancer, and other serious diseases, some of which may kill some of the present Members of the Senate, and certainly they will kill many other persons.

I really am disgusted that the Senate would seriously entertain a proposal to reduce these appropriations. After all, our Government spends more money in taking care of cows than it does in taking care of babies. I think the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New York are correct on this point.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield for a question. I decline to yield for speeches until my remarks are concluded.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Very well, I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to commend the humanitarianism of the Senator from New York, but I should also like to ask him a question. Is it true, as he said, that we are spending millions of dollars to help millionaires expand their war plants, or are we giving them certificates of necessity to spend their own money?

Mr. LEHMAN. That question has nothing to do with the pending question, of course.

Mr. ROBERTSON. So much misinformation has been given out and so much distress has been generated thereby, that I think the Senator from New York fell into error in using that point as an argument in favor of his amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. LEHMAN. No; I do not think I did. However, I should like to reply to what the Senator from Virginia has said.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I hope the Senator from New York will do so.

Mr. LEHMAN. Under the certificates of necessity, grants may be made to com-

panies which allegedly are expanding in order to increase their defense production potential. Under the law, such companies are allowed to charge for the complete depreciation of those plants within 5 years.

It has been demonstrated—and members of the Banking and Currency Committee have made this statement at meetings of the committee and also on the floor of the Senate—that \$2,500,000,000 of certificates of necessity were given to 20 large companies, and that many of those companies are being given an exaggerated allowance for depreciation, which will completely cover the cost of those plants within 5 or 6 years, whereas the life of the plants may be 40 or 50 or 60 years—thus gaining a great deal through the generosity of the Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON. There is misinformation before us, as well as elsewhere, Mr. President. The average of the certificates of necessity is about 60 percent; and on the basis of 60 percent, a manufacturer who expands his plant on the basis of present defense spending is going to lose money if peace comes next year and thus ends the defense activities. Such a manufacturer is gambling that we are going to spend \$40,000,000,000 or \$50,000,000,000 a year for 5 years. He puts his own money into that gamble, and we obtain the production we need now, through the expenditure of his money, instead of by embarking on a socialized plan of government and then wiping out the entire investment after the war is over.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia knows very well that a war plant which is erected either with or without the help of the Government has a normal life of 40, 50, or 60 years or more; and a manufacturer who can depreciate such a plant in full in 5 or 6 years will certainly profit through the generosity of the Government.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Does the Senator from New York recall that in 1933, when the total capacity of our steel companies was approximately 70,000,000 tons, they were operating at 50 percent of capacity? Now they are producing at the rate of 110,000,000 tons a year. Does the Senator think anyone can be certain that 110,000,000 tons of steel can be sold each year for the next 5 years or 50 years, as the Senator has indicated? Certainly they are taking a gamble.

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes; I think they can.

Mr. President, I wish to resume my remarks. I have already referred to the number of persons who are employed at various health and research institutes and the number of them who are engaged in administrative work. I wish to continue my statement along those lines.

In mental health activities, a total of 250 persons are employed, with an administrative staff of 36.

The National Heart Institute has a total staff of 367 employees, and only 12 of them are administrative employees.

The dental health activities have a total of 222 employees, and only 7 of them are on the administrative staff.

Mr. President, when it comes to the question of saving money by reducing appropriations for public works which are demonstrated to be nonessential, I will go as far as will any other Member of the Senate. However, Mr. President, in my opinion public health and research are essential activities in furthering the safety and welfare of our people and of our Nation. If we are not convinced that by means of research and public health services we can save lives, and can advance the health of our people, we should not make any appropriations for those purposes. However, we are convinced that appropriations for those purposes will result in the saving of lives and in improving the health of our people, because history has demonstrated the value of these activities.

In New York State we have splendid research facilities. We have there one of the best research laboratories in the United States. New York has long been very active in the fight against pneumonia, particularly through the development of serums. Our State has made large appropriations in that connection. I am sorry that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] is not now on the floor, for I wish to state that I am very grateful to him for the help he gave to me when I was Governor of New York and when he was the leader of the majority in the New York State Assembly. He gave me a very great deal of assistance in securing the necessary appropriations for carrying on this work.

The research work done in New York and the various areas which are developed, manufactured, and provided to the doctors and hospitals in New York are of tremendous service to the people of New York, and constitute a great protection to their health and safety. But, Mr. President, let me say that I am quite as much interested in saving the lives of those in the poorest of our States as I am in saving the lives of the people in my own State of New York; and we know that many of the States have inadequate facilities, and, in some cases, no facilities whatever, for research.

The Senator from Vermont asked what was the price of a child's life. It was a moving and pertinent and timely question. Let me say that if we saw a chance to save thousands or even hundreds of the lives of our fighting men or our other citizens or protect them against the hazards of accident, catastrophe, or illness, we should consider that no expenditure within our means was too large. But it is now proposed that we cut down on medical and public-health expenditures, fields in which we have demonstrated that what we are doing is of direct benefit, not only to thousands, but to literally millions of our people. The saving at best is relatively small, less than \$1,000,000 for the various services which are covered by my amendment and less than \$2,000,000 if we were to include all the services connected with public-health activities. That saving is relatively small compared with our total expenditures. The suffering and loss of life because of that cut may be large beyond calculation.

I feel so strongly about this question that it is hard to translate my feelings into words. It is claimed that the United States is an enlightened country, and I know that it is. I am glad to say we have done more in this country to raise the standards of medicine, public health, and sanitation than has been done in any other country in the world; and in doing that, we have helped the whole world. We have not been selfish. We have not reserved our advances, our discoveries, or the development of our sciences merely for the use of our own people. We have been glad to share them with other people. But we have a very long way to go. We have found neither the cause nor the cure of many of the most deadly diseases known to mankind. We have conquered smallpox, yellow fever, typhoid fever, the plague, and typhus, but we have not conquered heart disease, mental disease, cancer, poliomyelitis, or the many other deadly diseases with which human beings are beset.

I said Friday on the floor of the Senate that 1 out of every 20 people in this country either has suffered, is suffering, or will suffer from some phase of mental disease. I think the sufferers from mental disease are among the most unfortunate in the world, quite as unfortunate as those who die more quickly from cancer or heart disease, because, as has been said, they cannot help themselves, they need the help of others.

We are making progress in research and in the treatment of mental disease. New York State today is spending more than \$150,000,000 in the care and cure of the insane, in State institutions and probably two or three times that sum is spent in private institutions and by families.

We are making progress, though slowly, it is true, in the study of heart disease, of cancer, and of other diseases with which we are coping. Let us not call a halt to it. Let us not retreat. Let us not tell the world that the study of the diseases of chickens and cattle and pigs is more important to this country than the study, under proper research conditions, of the deadly disease which beset mankind. We are going to get at the secret of their prevention if possible, and, in those cases where prevention is impossible, the secret of cure or at least of amelioration. We are not going to do this by chance. Teamwork on the part of hospitals, private institutions, our colleges and universities and laboratories, working in cooperation with the Federal Government and with State governments, will be required. If we maintain that teamwork, and if Government does its utmost, not sparingly, not grudgingly, but with deep conviction that we shall be able to make progress, we will win the battle.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, today I find myself in opposition to both the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the amendment of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] to the Ferguson amendment. With other members of the Appropriations Committee, I had the opportunity to go rather carefully into the several

items which make up the bill which is now before the Senate. The committee had in mind, both when examining the justifications for the several items in subcommittee, and in the markup by the subcommittee, as well as in the final action of the whole committee, the necessities with respect to dollars which face the Nation. The committee made certain severe reductions in many of the items of the bill. When I say severe, I mean severe, so far as the committee within its limited time, could determine the facts.

I desire to be perfectly frank in discussing the pending bill. I have said before, and I now reiterate, that it is humanly impossible for the several subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee to make the careful, comprehensive investigation into the executive departments of the Government which alone would permit the committee to do a fully advised job on appropriations. The staff of the committee are devoted and competent in their work, though insufficient numerically, and if the committee, with its staff, cannot probe deeply and comprehensively enough into the several justifications fully to understand how much money is absolutely essential to carry on the activities of Government, and what requests may be properly denied, how much less able are the Members of the Senate, with all deference to them and to their ability to do that work? That does not mean, Mr. President, that the Senate should not at the appropriate time act, if it desires to act. I believe, however, that it does mean that the action of the subcommittee, followed by that of the full Committee on Appropriations, should at least carry some weight on the floor of the Senate when appropriation bills are presented. Otherwise, perhaps we had better get rid of the committee and legislate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the committee, in examining the bill in full session, felt that there had been one particular in which Congress had failed to do its full duty in reporting appropriation bills in the past. That was in attempting to indicate in reports what portion of appropriated funds should be used for the employment of personnel and what should be used for other purposes. Such a report can never be more than advisory. There is no legal obligation upon the departments to follow it. Substantially all items of appropriation carrying funds for personal services have combined in the items not only payments for personnel but also the amounts necessary to meet estimated expenses of the particular agency or division of the agency in question. Such an item usually appears under the heading "Salaries and expenses." In many other items the two factors of salaries and expenses are combined with various other proposed expenditures, sometimes including construction, sometimes funds for the farming out of efforts to other agencies, sometimes funds for grants.

It is most difficult to understand the final disposition to be made of appropriated funds. Understanding cannot be had in that field without a most careful study, first, of the President's budget

itself, a volume of more than 1,000 pages of statistical data, and then, Mr. President, there are presented before the committee for each agency for which an appropriation is asked, and for each activity within that agency, tables of justification of the several amounts requested. Broken down, we may find, at last, personnel; we may find expenditures itemized; we may find reimbursable items, contractual service items, and so on, all in detail.

Representatives of the several agencies appear before the subcommittees, and, after having made their own original presentations, are examined by members of the committee. The hearings are available to the full committee. Special compilations, termed "side slips," are prepared by the staff of the committee. In this instance, the side slips comprise some 220 pages. So the committee does have some idea, at least, of what is before it. It has some basis for its decision. It has before it last year's appropriation for the several items, the appropriation for the year before, and so on.

Reverting now to my first proposition, Mr. President, the necessity for some control over appropriated funds with respect to personal services, the committee this year adopted a motion which the Senator from Oregon happened to present and which was fully discussed by the committee, for statutory control over funds appropriated with respect to the application of such funds to the payment for personal services. In my opinion, the principle adopted is a long step forward in sound appropriative practice. For the first time in the history of appropriations, so far as I am aware, and definitely for the first time since I have been a member of the committee, the committee has recommended a statutory ceiling on the amount of appropriated money which may be used for the purposes of paying for personal services.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. The 5-percent provision, as it would relate to personal services, was really a substitute for the Jensen amendment, was it not?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct. It was so treated by the committee.

Mr. THYE. And the committee, after much study, and after having given consideration to the explanation by the General Comptroller's Office relating to the Jensen amendment and the impossibility of making the Jensen amendment administratively workable, gave the Cordon amendment consideration. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THYE. The 5-percent provision, as it relates to personal services, was adopted as a means of controlling and reducing personnel expenditures in the various Federal agencies as a substitute for what was known as the Jensen rider in the House appropriations bill.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct as to one of the two major purposes of the amendment.

I have said, Mr. President, that the amendment serves as a statutory limit

upon the expenditure of appropriated funds for personal services. The amendment provided—I say "provided" because at least in one instance it is no longer effective in detail—for a ceiling on all expenditures of appropriated funds for personal services of 95 percent of the amount estimated for that purpose in the President's budget. That means that in no instance can more than 95 percent of the budgeted item for personal services be expended for that purpose in the fiscal year. Heretofore any portion of any appropriation which included personal services might be used for personal services unless some portion was statutorily earmarked and thus excluded. Generally the money provided for the two items, salaries and expenses, might be used for salaries to the extent that the head of the department in his judgment decided. That, the Congress had failed, in my opinion, to exercise its full authority and responsibility in that particular field.

Mr. President, the amendment appears not as a single amendment in the bill, but throughout the bill wherever there are appropriations which include personal services. It applies to every item in the bill for personal services except the items for hospitals and direct medical care. With respect to those items there is no ceiling fixed by the bill. They were excepted by unanimous vote, I believe, of the committee.

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

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Do I understand correctly that the items in the bill which the amendment of the Senator from New York would eliminate from the Ferguson amendment, were eliminated by the amendment of the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CORDON. Not all of them. Foreign quarantine was not eliminated by my amendment; the Heart Institute, the Cancer Institute, and the like, were not eliminated, except as within those categories there were items for hospitals and direct medical aid.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, where they apply to direct personal service in hospitals and in providing direct medical aid. That is the distinguishing difference between what the amendment of the Senator from New York would do to the Ferguson amendment, and the amendment adopted by the committee, which was sponsored by the able Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon if it is not a fact that the Ferguson amendment, so far as its purpose is concerned, and its full force and effect, is identical with the Cordon amendment except that it makes an additional 5-percent reduction in the ceiling?

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding of the legal effect of the Ferguson amendment. The Ferguson amendment presents this question, and I think only this question: Should the

action of the committee in fixing a ceiling of 95 percent of the budget figures for personal services be changed to make the ceiling 90 percent?

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

Mr. CORDON. I shall yield to the Senator from Vermont in a moment. Under the Ferguson amendment hospitals and direct medical care would be excepted, because they were excepted by the committee. The legal effect of the Ferguson amendment, therefore, is simply to double the 5 percent which was the amount of the reduction under the so-called Cordon amendment, which is the committee amendment.

I now yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Is it not a fact that the Cordon amendment, the 5-percent amendment, was not exactly an across-the-board cut? Did not the subcommittee increase some appropriations before applying the 5 percent? I have in mind particularly the appropriation for the Children's Bureau, for which I believe the House allowed \$1,450,000 for personal services, and I believe the Senate committee increased that somewhat before applying the 5 percent, evidently on the theory that the amount that was left was the amount needed, which happens to be the amount the Bureau had last year, and, I believe, the year before, and for some time before that. In other words, evidently the committee thought this particular Bureau was entitled to \$1,500,000. So in that respect it was not exactly an across-the-board cut, certainly not an across-the-board cut as the bill came from the House.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Vermont is slightly confused with respect to the legal effect involved.

Mr. AIKEN. I concede that.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to do what I can to clarify the situation.

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

Mr. AIKEN. May I say for the Record that I did not have the bill or any material in my hand when I discussed the matter.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator made himself perfectly clear. I had expected to advert to that particular matter because, I may say to the Senator from Vermont, initially the amendatory provision did not operate as a reduction in an appropriation. It operated as a ceiling on expenditures and as a ceiling on expenditures it does operate on every item in the bill—on every item. In those instances where the action of the Appropriations Committee was a recommendation of the budget request in an amount, the total sum of which was greater than 95 percent of the budget request for personnel, there was a reduction. If the committee had made a reduction greater than the 5 percent of the personnel budget item, then there was no dollar reduction in the bill, but the limitation would still be there.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I find on examining the bill itself that the committee increased

the appropriation from \$1,450,000 to \$1,500,000 before applying the amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Irrespective of that amendment, that does not change the Budget figure, and the Senator's amendment relates to the Budget, and not to what either the House or the Senate placed in the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Exactly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to ask the Senator one more question so that the point may be made clear. As I understand, if the Ferguson amendment is adopted it will carry with it the identical exemption as the amendment which was sponsored by the able Senator from Oregon, which the committee adopted. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. My understanding is that that would be the case. The amendment does not purport to change the language, and the limitation appears as a language change in each appropriative item for personal services.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If that is the correct interpretation of the Ferguson amendment and the effect it will have, then the issue, and the only issue actually before the Senate in voting for or against the Ferguson amendment is whether in the judgment of each individual Senator we can safely reduce the amount to be expended for personal services another 5 percent; making it 10 percent instead of 5 percent, as now provided by the bill, under the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Is that not correct?

Mr. CORDON. I am entirely in agreement with the Senator from Arkansas. He has stated the legal effect of the proposed amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So, what we are talking about is the difference between 5 and 10 percent. We are all agreed on a cut. I presume the 5-percent cut has been adopted in the bill, by acceptance of the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So the only issue with respect to the amendment is whether we will extend that cut to 10 percent.

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to ask one further question. If the bill goes to conference with the Ferguson amendment adopted, without the amendment of the able Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], providing exemptions for certain functions, the conferees may include in the conference report one or more of the items in which the Senator from New York is interested. So there would be an opportunity for further study in conference. There would be opportunity to include any of the other agencies which the conferees might wish to include, and which are covered by the amendment of the able Senator from New York. I think I am correct in that statement. I ask the able Senator if that is not a correct statement. If not, I should like to be corrected. I should like to have the situation clarified.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the bill as it now stands carries a specific dollar ceiling on personal services for each item. That being so, each of the ceiling provisions will be in conference. The legal effect will be in conference. The amount will be in conference. The conferees might, of course, either delete all of a particular item, change the language, or change the figure. So the conferees would have complete control of all the items in the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the Ferguson amendment.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wanted to get the situation clear in my mind. I intend to support the Ferguson amendment. I believe that the time has arrived to make reductions. We all talk economy, but when an effort is made on the floor of the Senate to do something about it, we say, "I believe in economy, but—"

I shall vote for the Ferguson amendment, just as I voted for the 10-percent cut in committee. But the point I wish to make is that there are some services which none of us want to curtail. We do not want to retard or hamper them. I am unwilling to make a cut which would do so.

I am not so certain but that a number of cuts could be made without any actual curtailment of service. In this period of crisis, when we are drafting the young men of the Nation and sending them to foreign battlefields to fight and die, there is not an employee of the Government, not a Member of Congress, who ought not to be willing to work a little harder and a little longer, and make a little sacrifice toward the contribution which is now necessary by effectuating some economy throughout the various agencies when American boys are making such great sacrifices.

I am going to vote for economy. I am going to vote to cut appropriations not only in this bill, but in the legislative bill. I think I could work an hour longer a day, or 2 hours longer a day, if necessary. I think the staff in my office could do so. If we are unwilling to do that for the sake of the country, for the purpose of effectuating some economies, then we are not willing to make contributions comparable to those which we are calling upon the young manhood of America to make in defense of freedom.

I believe that appropriations can be cut. I believe that as a matter of moral right we ought to cut them. We ought to demand of those who work for the Government a small measure of sacrifice in this period of crisis.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me say to my friend from Arkansas—and I say it from the bottom of my heart—that he has just said something which ought to be said again and again throughout the country, something which should be said and reiterated time and time again by the Executive head of this Nation to the people of the country. I join the Senator from Arkansas. I am willing to go as far as my judgment will permit me to go in making reductions.

With what information I have at this time—and I have endeavored to inform myself as best I could on this particular bill—I am of the considered opinion that it would be dangerous to cut this appropriation in the personnel field more than the committee has cut it. I can understand that other members of the committee may take a different view. I can only present my views and, so far as I can, the reasons for such views.

Mr. President, we have before us a \$2,000,000,000 bill, with about \$117,000,000 of it for personal services. Before the bill came to the committee the Bureau of the Budget had scanned it. I am not one of those who believe that the Bureau of the Budget is wholly an agency of extravagance. I have worked with the Bureau of the Budget in the years I have been in the Senate. I am personally acquainted with many of its personnel. I know that that agency strives to send to the Congress as sound a series of estimates as it can, not only with reference to personnel, but with reference to other items.

It is easy to stand on the floor of the Senate and, in sweeping generalities, say that all the employees in the executive departments are lazy louts and wastrels, or that all the supervisory group seek only selfish interest, and to pad payrolls. We can make such statements, Mr. President, but we are a bit reckless when we do so. They cannot be borne out by the facts.

Certainly in any organization so vast and stupendous as is the American Government, employing personnel at an annual cost of more than \$4,000,000,000 a year, exclusive of the national defense, there must be room to reduce personnel. The committee has sought, in connection with this first bill, to approach the reduction with a statutory limitation reducing the estimate of the Bureau of the Budget by 5 percent across the board, exempting only hospitals and direct medical aid.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether a representation which has been made to me is correct, namely, that a 5-percent cut or a 10-percent cut would actually amount to more than that in cash, by reason of the fact that the personnel removed would be entitled to receive pay which they had earned for their accumulated leave, so that the total amount of money actually taken out would be not only 5 percent, but perhaps an additional amount beyond that.

Mr. CORDON. If I correctly understand the Senator—

Mr. HAYDEN. I am referring to terminal leave payments which personnel involuntarily removed are entitled to receive in cash.

Mr. CORDON. I think I fully understand the Senator. If I do, I am in agreement with him. Under the law as the Congress has put it on the books, employees of the Federal Government may accumulate unused annual leave. If they are detached from the Government

they are entitled to be paid at the regular rates for all of the period of accumulated leave which they have earned.

We have had various estimates from time to time before the committee with respect to the total amount of such accumulated leave. Although I am not certain, my memory is that it averages close to the limitation of 60 days per person. That means that if we apply a 5-percent limitation on the estimates for personal services as they appear in the budget, as a result of the necessity of paying for 60 days, or one-sixth of a year, of salary to each of the individuals who are detached, we actually increase the separation by considerably more than 5 percent, because we would make a reduction in money, not in numbers of personnel. If we attempt to make a reduction in numbers of personnel we are in a field of guesswork. We may take 10 percent of the personnel in the lowest brackets and hardly affect the budget. However, when we make a reduction in money—and that is the only way to cut down on personnel, if that is what we want to do—we do not appropriate the money. In that way the department must cut its suit out of the cloth we provide. With the 95 percent provided it must pay, first, those who are separated. If sufficient money is not available to pay for accumulated leave that must be taken into consideration when the personnel factor is applied to the money which is made available.

(At this point Mr. CORDON yielded to Mr. HUNT, who made a statement on the so-called Ferguson amendment. By unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT's remarks were ordered to be printed at the conclusion of Mr. CORDON's speech.)

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. A few minutes ago the Senator from Oregon made several observations in regard to the work which has been done by the committee and in regard to the work done by the Bureau of the Budget. I agree with the Senator as to that. I myself know of several men in the Bureau of the Budget who are very well qualified for the work they are doing, and who are doing a good job in attempting to bring to both branches of the Congress a budget which they feel is justified.

I was not present in the committee at the time when the Senator from Oregon proposed his 5-percent-reduction amendment. It was presented at the meeting of the full committee, after I had to leave, just before the committee voted to report the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, let me say that I am fully aware of the responsible position the Senator from Nebraska has on the floor of the Senate, and of the fact that frequently he is required to be in the Senate Chamber at a time when he would prefer to sit with his own subcommittee or with the full committee; but it simply cannot be helped.

Mr. WHERRY. I thank the Senator. I highly respect him. He said he was presenting his own views, and he said he

felt that to make an additional cut of 10 percent in the appropriations would be dangerous at this time.

I should like to have the Senator from Oregon show—as he no doubt intends to do—the justification for making a 5-percent cut in the appropriations, and also why he believes it would be dangerous to make a further cut. In other words, I should like to have him present the arguments in favor of making a 5-percent cut and in opposition to making a 10-percent cut.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether he would have any objection to a unanimous-consent agreement limiting the time for debate both on the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan and, subsequently, on the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. I should think we could conclude action on one of these amendments today, and then, tomorrow, conclude action on the other one. I certainly hope that will be done. The independent offices appropriation bill will be ready for consideration by the Senate tomorrow evening.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Certainly I have no objection to concluding action on the pending bill by means of any agreement which is satisfactory to the Senate.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. In response to the suggestion just made, let me say that so far as I am concerned, there is no objection to having an agreement reached in regard to limitation of debate at any time the Senate desires. However, before that is done, I feel that both the amendment of the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, and the amendment of the Senator from Michigan itself should be voted on, because they involve the entire basis for the cuts in appropriations which may be proposed by any other amendments; and when we conclude action on the so-called Ferguson amendment, we shall then be in a position to take up similar amendments.

Therefore, I hope no limitation will be placed on debate until we have completed action on the so-called Lehman amendment and the so-called Ferguson amendment. Then I am satisfied it will be perfectly agreeable to Senators on this side of the aisle to have the Senate limit debate in any way that is desired.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, I wish to have the so-called Ferguson amendment and also the so-called Lehman amendment voted on by the Senate without undue delay, but I do not wish those amendments to be voted on until the Senator from Oregon, who heard the testimony and who participated in the attempt in the committee to make a proper recommendation to the Senate, has an opportunity to present his views in regard to the amendments. He is the

one who recommended to the committee the 5-percent cut in the appropriations, and I think he should be allowed to inform the Senate why he favors such a provision.

We are not complaining about the attempt of the Senator from Michigan to have a 10-percent cut made—or even a 15-percent or a 20-percent cut made; but we are trying to convince the Senate that the sound course for it to follow, in making the proper kind of savings, is to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Oregon. Therefore, we wish the Senate to have the benefit of hearing the Senator from Oregon present his views and arguments, and then vote.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like now to give as direct an answer as I can to the suggestion of the minority floor leader. Let me say first that I cannot indicate with respect to any item in the bill specifically where a 5-percent cut can be safely made and a 10-percent cut cannot be made. My judgment is based to a very great extent upon the fact that 5 percent is 1 in 20, and 10 percent is 1 in 10. Among other things, the committee had before it the itemized list of the personnel, including the activities in which the several persons were expected to be engaged, and including the number of additional personnel, if any, requested in the proposed estimates, and I believe that when a careful scrutiny has been made by the Bureau of the Budget, and another careful scrutiny made by the committee, and all that information is taken into consideration, and we eliminate 1 to 20 of the persons employed in the civil departments of the Government, we shall have gone about as far as we ought to go, unless we are willing to give up our present system of appropriation by subjects and return to an itemized appropriation. If we return to that system, we shall have an appropriation bill consisting of perhaps 300 pages in the place of one consisting of 50 or 60 pages. We shall then have absolute control of the personnel, the expenses, and so forth, under an itemized list. In that way we could do a far better job than we do when we make single appropriations covering a great number of objects.

One might ask the same question which has been asked with respect to the difference between a 5-percent cut and a 50-percent cut. The difference again is, of course, 1 in 20 as against 1 in 2, and it is a matter of judgment for the Members of the Senate, most of whom have not had access to the detailed data, and it is a matter of judgment for the members of the committee, all of whom have had access to the data, although many have not had the opportunity to make the study which should be made.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I am not sure that the Senator has even attempted to figure it out nor am I sure that it can be done; but I should like to ask, if it were possible to translate into dollars and cents

the saving which is proposed in the Jensen amendment, as the committee finally modified it, what would the saving be, if it could be made—and I am not sure that it could be—as compared, let us say, to a cut of 5 percent?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, our study indicated that we were in a field of guess, after we had obtained all the information we could get. I do not assume to speak for the entire membership of the committee, though I heard some of the members discuss the matter, but the view of some of us was that the best that could be hoped for under the Jensen amendment was substantially a 5-percent reduction throughout the personnel level.

If I may revert for a moment to the Jensen amendment, the testimony before the committee was that separations throughout the Government service run from approximately 18 percent in certain agencies to as high as 36 percent in others. Those separations, of course, would begin immediately after the fiscal year, and would end with the close of the fiscal year. If we assume a steady rate of separations distributed throughout the year the average separation rate for the year would be these percentages divided in half, and we could then have a reasonable idea of the number of man-years, or average, to be gained if others could not be employed to take the place of those who were separated from the service. I mean that, with respect to the agencies in which the separation is around 18 percent, the average in man-years would be 9 percent, and that, with respect to those in which the separation is around 36 percent, it would be 18 percent.

However, we must have in mind, when we consider that matter, that the Jensen amendment as contained in the House bill, and the modified Jensen amendment which the committee considered, differed with respect to a specific provision for a ceiling which would be permitted in each agency before the amendment could become operative.

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

Mr. CORDON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Why would it not be much simpler, I may ask the distinguished Senator, merely to adopt the budget which the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] recommended, cutting it \$7,000,000,000 or \$8,000,000,000, instead of arguing about a little 5-percent cut on \$117,000,000? Would it not be better? A moment ago, the Senator from Oregon suggested that we might take up 300 different agencies or items. I ask again, why not take the Byrd budget, debate it, argue it, and settle it once for all in one debate?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall be glad to endeavor to answer the Senator. In my opinion, there is much to be said for that approach. I am one of those who last year supported the one-package appropriation bill. I still believe that it is the soundest approach to appropriations which the Congress will ever evolve, because it is the only procedure by which the Congress can maintain control of the total appropria-

tion until the last minute, when the bill is passed. Had we been able this year to carry that into effect, we could have done this year what we did last year, when we added section 1214 to the bill, and, in that section, cut the total appropriation by \$550,000,000; which sum was impounded and was not used, because not appropriated. In addition to that, there was \$30,000,000 more which was impounded, and I do not recall that there have been any great outcries because any essential activity was hurt. We cannot do that now. We are going to have our whole apple brought to us in some 12 or 13 segments. We must operate on each of the segments as it comes. I should prefer the other approach. I think it is the soundest approach. I think it is the one way whereby the entire Senate, despite the fact that many Senators never have the opportunity to work on the Appropriation Committee, can still use sound judgment in its final action. It can in that way look at the total necessities, the total expected income, and determine what relationship one should bear to the other, and, in one short section of such a bill, it can execute its judgment. That is the way it should be done. It is not being done in that way, and we must do the best we can with what we have.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did the Comptroller General endorse the Cordon amendment?

Mr. CORDON. The Comptroller General made no appearance and advised the committee not at all. Representatives of the Comptroller General's office were before the committee. Those who appeared before the committee joined with the Bureau of the Budget in the statement that the most logical method of making reductions in this or in any other appropriation bill would be the method of writing the reduced specific figures throughout the bill.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that neither the representatives of the Comptroller General's Office nor of the Budget Bureau made any recommendations? We asked them what the approach should be. Is not that correct? It was committee action; it was not the action of the Budget Bureau or of the Comptroller General.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not want to dispute with the able chairman of the subcommittee. I am perfectly clear in my mind that representatives of both agencies were responsible for the statement to the committee that the soundest approach was the approach of specific figures.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; but did not the committee ask them for that information?

Mr. CORDON. Oh, yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was not voluntary on their part.

Mr. CORDON. They were brought before the committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Because the committee wanted to arrive at some method of approach. Is not that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the questions we are asking the Senator are bringing out all the issues and the facts involved.

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to answer every question I can answer. I do not want to delay the Senate, because I think that what the Senator from Oregon has to offer is not of too much value.

Mr. WHERRY. If I did not think it was of value, I would not be asking questions; but I know the Senator from Oregon is one of our most industrious colleagues, and I appreciate his judgment.

Mr. CORDON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WHERRY. I desire to associate myself with his very pertinent remarks just made about the one-package appropriation bill, or the so-called Butler-Byrd bill, or however it may be identified. I think it was the proper way to legislate, and I am sure the Senator from Oregon knows, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, I was in favor of it. I think that method of appropriation should be reinstated. It would be a great boon in helping the members of the committee and getting before the whole Senate in one package the total appropriations.

I should like to ask the Senator one question. What is the difference between the amount of saving which might be effected by the so-called Jensen amendment and the saving which might be brought about by the committee's modification of it? How much difference would there be if we could translate it into dollars? The provision will be in conference, and that is why I am asking the question. So long as it will be in conference as the Jensen amendment, I am wondering what the difference in saving might be between the Senate provision and the House provision, no matter what happens here in the final determination of the question.

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

Mr. CORDON. In a moment.

Mr. President, there was no estimate before the committee from anyone as to the savings which would be effected by the Jensen amendment as it appears in the House version of the bill. It is wholly a matter of speculation. When one approaches consideration of the effect of an amendment, one is compelled to be wholly practical and to realize that if there is to be an average of 18 percent separation in a given agency—that is, if 18 percent of the total personnel at sometime during the year is to be separated under the conditions set forth in the Jensen amendment—the head of any agency, where that kind of a separation would result in a chaotic condition in the handling of the work of the agency, would, at the beginning of the year, do everything he could do so to arrange his whole personnel pattern as to: First, keep as many of his personnel on the payroll as he could, and second,

reemploy those individuals who are the most necessary in his particular employment pattern.

In the consideration of the effect of that kind of provision it must be remembered that it is not a matter of law; it is a matter of good common horse sense. We may assume, I think, that the Government agencies in general are not extravagantly overstaffed. They have not been culled as fully, perhaps, as they should be, and we know there are places where we could make reductions. We know that the average employee of the Federal Government and the average employee in industry, like the average employee of the United States Senate, is trying to do a good job and is a faithful servant endeavoring, to the best of his ability, to do the work he is called upon to do. But, Mr. President, when we consider the practical aspects of the situation, we are bound to come to the conclusion that if the supervisory head of any agency is faced with the application of an amendment along the lines of the Jensen amendment, and realizes that he can never know throughout the year when there will be a sharp change in his personnel because of resignation, death, or because of any of the reasons indicated in the amendment, he will do everything he can to keep on the job those who are now employed under him. To do that he will be willing to take less than able, faithful service from them. Only in that way can he protect his agency and its integrity in carrying out its assigned duty.

We must bear that in mind, because when we consider 18 percent of man-years out in a given year, we realize that many agencies could not function, and they would strive to do everything they could to change the percentage of separation. We do not know what that change will be. We do know that the percentage is bound to be less than it has been.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of propounding a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CORDON. I shall be happy to yield, if, by so doing, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may yield for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, beginning tomorrow at 12 o'clock, the time for debate upon the Ferguson amendment be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally between the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and that the time for debate upon any amendment to the Ferguson amendment be limited to 30 minutes, to be divided equally between the proponent of the amendment and the Senator from New Mexico if he is against the amendment, and, if not, between the proponent of the amendment and the distinguished minority leader; and that all amendments must be germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. I object.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, the agreement does not relate to a vote. As I understood the request, it relates only to limitation of debate.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. And the limitation applies first to the so-called Ferguson amendment, on which it is proposed that a limitation of an hour be placed, with 30 minutes to the side.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. Which I understand is agreeable to the Senator from Michigan. Then as to other amendments to the Ferguson amendment debate would be limited to 30 minutes on each amendment. It is not proposed to place a limitation on any other amendment to the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. WHERRY. I wonder if the distinguished Senator from North Dakota will reconsider. The request applies only to the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am willing to yield the 30 minutes controlled by me to the other side.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me for another question?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. My question does not relate to the unanimous-consent request. I appreciate that the Senator from Oregon is rendering a real service in bringing out all the facts and in trying to show what the end result might be under either the original Jensen amendment which is in the House language of the bill with which we will have to deal in conference, or the modified form, the proposed 5-percent cut. I wish the Senator would venture an opinion. I have heard various suggestions made, translated into dollars, with respect to what the original so-called Jensen amendment would produce, and what the modified form would produce. Will the Senator from Oregon furnish us with a guess as to what, in his judgment, the Jensen amendment would save? I realize, of course, that it is all a guess. A guess only can be made as to what the modified form of amendment would do. But when the bill goes to conference the conferees will be obliged to deal with the matter of dollars and cents. Would the Senator care to express himself percentage-wise? If he does not wish to do so, very well. But I believe it to be highly important to find what would be the saving as translated into dollars, if possible, under the so-called Jensen amendment as it came to the Senate, even though it be only a guess, and also what would result from a 5-percent cut.

Mr. CORDON. I wish I could hazard even speculation with respect to the Jensen amendment, but I cannot do so.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

Mr. CORDON. I do not think anyone can do so. One could take the records of separations in years past of the several agencies and cut them in two, to allow for the fiscal effect of the known separation rate spread over 12 months, then take average salaries with that weighted average, and finally arrive at a rough figure of what would have happened in

some other year. When we arrived at that figure we would still be faced with the fact that it was not worth a continental in considering the same amendment applied prospectively because we would not have the same result, inasmuch as the amendment in itself would be a factor in determining future separation rates.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Cordon amendment goes into effect, the savings under the bill will be \$2,318,190.

Mr. CORDON. That would be the savings over and above the recommendations of the committee at the time the amendment was finally adopted.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. That figure is shown in the report. What I am trying is, if possible, to get an approximate figure of savings that would be produced by the Jensen amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would result in employment of 1 person for every 4 vacancies, but what that would mean in savings in dollars and cents, I could not tell the Senator. Under the Cordon amendment there would be a saving of \$2,318,190 a year.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a few minutes more. I desire now to direct my remarks to the amendment offered to the Ferguson amendment, by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. I fully realize the views which have been expressed by the Senator from New York as being sincere and coming from his heart. I realize that the only thought in his mind, and in the minds of other Senators who agree with him with respect to this matter, is that of maintaining the integrity of the humanitarian efforts which are now being made in the name of the Government to promote health and to protect life. I find myself, however, in disagreement, not with the views or the desires of the Senator, but only with respect to the effect of the Ferguson amendment, if adopted.

Let me say that I do not believe the Ferguson amendment should be adopted and applied to any provisions in the bill. I am of the opinion that if the Senate should adopt it, however, its adoption would not more seriously affect the several activities mentioned in the Senator's amendment than it will seriously affect the other activities denominated in the bill.

I call attention to certain figures taken from the budget in support of that statement. For the National Institute of Health the bill contains an item of \$15,800,000. Personal service accounts for \$4,800,532 of that amount; grants account for \$9,650,000 of it. Then there is an item for other expenses. The Ferguson amendment would not attach to the grants of \$9,650,000, but only to the personal services item.

With respect to dental health we have a somewhat different picture, in that of the total estimate of \$1,750,000 personal services would represent \$1,053,848.

The total estimate for the Heart Institute is \$10,150,000, of which personal services account for only \$1,540,351, with grants representing \$7,591,000. The difference represents other expenses.

In the case of mental health activities, the total estimate is \$10,800,000, of which personal services represent only \$1,240,515, and grants \$8,182,000.

For the Cancer Institute the total estimate is \$15,122,000, of which personal services represent only \$2,836,590, with grants representing \$10,315,000.

In the case of foreign quarantine, where the whole operation almost is in personal services, the total estimate is \$3,000,000, with personal services representing \$2,639,430.

Mr. President, it is, of course, easy to make an argument in favor of each of these items in the bill, and certainly no one can deny the high purpose of the Congress in enacting the legislation providing for them, nor deny the necessity for work in the several fields. But, in all seriousness, I call the attention of my colleagues on the floor to what I believe is a demonstrable fact. The advances made in the medical sciences have resulted not from the expenditures of Federal dollars, but from the work done by a great number of devoted members of society working entirely on their own—working in the hospitals, in the clinics, in the great laboratories of the pharmaceutical groups, in the universities, and in the medical schools. That is where all the advance occurred until the last decade. We except only the work—and it has been a good work—done by the Public Health Service. But prior to that time that work was solely in the nature of instruction to local agencies in the several States. We have come from an average life expectancy of 35 years in the earliest years of the country to 70 at present. I think we can give credit to the men of medicine and surgery who were working in their private practice to accomplish the job which has been done.

It is altogether proper that the Government should come into the picture to some extent, because our tax system has guaranteed that there will not again be created in this country the great personal fortunes from which endowments were made in the past, which permitted much of this work to be done. Unless funds are now provided through taxation, we shall not continue to have support for these activities. We shall not continue to have the type of endowment which we have had in the past.

In the last analysis we shall not seriously injure these programs—if we injure them at all—by the kind of reduction which is here proposed, beyond the injury which would come from dislocation in connection with any of the other activities covered by the bill. I am of the opinion that when we make a 5-percent reduction we make all that we should make, until we can reach the problem item by item.

One further point, and I am through. In the one-package bill last year we had

section 1214, which was a rescission of \$550,000,000. That rescission was made effective by the Bureau of the Budget as a result of the knowledge which that Bureau had, from its inspection and study, of all the departments of government through past years. We can make such a reduction in this bill if it is the will of the Congress to do it. I present that problem to my colleagues so that they may study it.

In that connection, I should like to place in the Record the following figures:

In the civilian employment of the Federal Government we have for 1952 an estimated total payroll of \$4,232,727,846. That is exclusive of the Department of Defense.

For travel for 1952 the total of \$151,599,312.

For transportation of things, \$555,893,085.

For communication services, \$36,895,738.

For rents and utilities services, \$118,423,916.

For printing and reproduction, \$59,837,795.

For other contractual services, \$809,146,855.

For services performed by other agencies, \$132,387,712.

For supplies and materials, \$565,523,263.

For equipment, \$308,929,742.

For lands and structures, \$1,036,493,894.

For grants, subsidies, and contributions, \$3,431,746,126.

For pensions, annuities, and insurance losses, \$3,862,666,255.

For refunds, awards, and indemnities, \$17,575,156.

For interest, \$5,897,757,683.

For taxes and assessments, \$1,339,793,

For investments in lands, \$1,099,159,180.

There is an unvouchered amount of \$20,045,000.

There is a sum not distributed by budget class of \$72,796,273.

There is a total of direct obligations, exclusive of national defense, of \$22,477,944,623.

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

Mr. CORDON. One moment, and I shall be happy to yield.

With a total of \$22,000,000,000, certainly we can find places to wield the economy ax. If we can do it, then we must start here. In connection with each bill as it comes up we must do that which, when we finish the last bill, will represent what we could have done much more easily and logically had we been able to operate on a single figure of appropriation.

I now yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator mind reading the item for rents again?

Mr. CORDON. For rents and utility services, \$188,423,916.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator ever considered the question of compelling

the Federal Government and the regional agencies to locate their central offices somewhere near the center of the particular region? For example, take the Office of Price Stabilization. The regional office was located at Minneapolis. The result is that in some cases a man from Montana must travel 1,200 miles or more to go to the regional office. In Minneapolis the rents are very high. They could be cut in two by locating the office in South Dakota or North Dakota, somewhere near the center. Two or three more regional offices are being established in that area. One is an office under the Department of Labor. It seems to me that the committee, or whoever is in charge of this matter, ought to call in whoever is responsible and try to have the regional offices located somewhere near the center of the area. It seems to me that such a plan would save a considerable sum.

Mr. CORDON. I appreciate the suggestion. I think that somewhere along the road the committee could well set a rental pattern for the United States and have shown on it the divisional headquarters of all the agencies, so that we could get the picture of where the principal offices are located and the areas which they serve.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think we could go further. I am not so much worried about the old departments, such as the Department of Labor and the Department of Agriculture. It is the new agencies which establish the pattern. They get employees from the other departments. Such employees probably were class 8 employees. All of a sudden they become class 14 employees. It is the new agencies which cost the Government money. I refer to OPS and similar agencies. They pay more money to the average employee. They take employees from the Department of Labor and from other old departments of the Government. They are taking them right now by the thousands. I think we should watch that sort of thing. We need not worry about the old departments. We do not let them get by with anything. The new agencies are the ones who are actually getting the money.

Mr. CORDON. In conclusion, Mr. President, I suggest to my colleagues who are interested in some sort of logical approach to the problem that a study be made of the committee's report on the bill. In that way it is possible to determine the action which was taken last year by the President's Bureau of the Budget in applying to each of the agencies what the Bureau of the Budget felt was the respective proper share of the \$550,000,000 rescission. I refer to the tables beginning at page 19 of the report. The tables are headed "Comparative statement of appropriations for 1951, amounts as reduced under section 1214," and so forth.

I wish to say to my colleagues that overnight I shall give some attention to the tables. I believe that the proper approach to the bill would be to take the amendments which the committee has

offered and make a rescission along the lines of section 1214 of last year's general appropriation bill in the amount that the Senate feels the reduction should be made, and then leave it to the Bureau of the Budget to apply the reduction so that there will be used in that application all the accumulated knowledge of the one agency in the Government of the United States which has the necessary information to make that kind of application wisely.

During the delivery of Mr. CORDON'S speech.

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

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to speak for a few more minutes. I understand that the Senator from Wyoming must catch a train. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to him for a brief period of time.

Mr. HUNT. I ask for only 4 minutes.

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator. I do so with the understanding that I do not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]. I assure him that I shall keep within my 5-minute limitation. First of all, I wish to send to the desk an amendment to the Lehman amendment. I ask that the clerk read the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I am interested in the parliamentary situation. Is it not a fact that an amendment offered to the Lehman amendment would be an amendment in the third degree? If so, I believe it would be out of order.

Mr. HUNT. If it is out of order, I shall withdraw it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it is out of order.

Mr. HUNT. Then I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. WHERRY. Of course, the Senator understands that I am not objecting to his amendment. I merely stated my understanding of the parliamentary situation. I am quite certain that he can propose his amendment in another way.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I believe that by the votes which were cast on last Friday it was indicated that the majority of the Senate are in total agreement with the necessity for greater economy in the Federal Government, especially at this particular time. I think we are obligated to cut every single program which is not needed. I believe we must join together to reduce any Federal activity which benefits only a few of the people, and to wipe out completely any Federal activity which would permit an increase of employment in the Federal Government. Let us cut and cut drastically programs which have gone beyond the intent of Congress, and those which can be deferred until a time when the problems confronting us are far less urgent than those which now command our attention. I wish to say

to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that I think he has more or less broken with a custom and rule of the Senate, in that he has cut \$112,000,000 from the House recommendation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. HUNT. It is something in the nature of an entirely new procedure, as I understand.

Mr. CHAVEZ. As a general rule the Senate restores or raises appropriations acted on by the House. In this instance we have cut \$112,000,000.

Mr. HUNT. And the committee has cut \$215,000,000 from the budgetary requests. I wish to congratulate the Senator from New Mexico and the committee for having done a splendid job.

Mr. President, I believe that in cutting various appropriations we must take great pains that we do not inadvertently destroy programs which are of great value to the Nation, whether it is at war or at peace. We must be sure that when we strike at nonproductive bureaucrats, we do not inadvertently drive from Government public servants whose contributions to the health of all our people and that of our armed services far outweighs the cost of their services. A flat percentage cut in all funds to pay employees in a large department of the Federal Government is a blind and unreasoning way to go about the matter. It would harm essential services as much as it would reduce non-essential services.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that it would drive out of Government the efficient and essential employee more quickly than the inefficient and nonessential employee.

For example, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Michigan would cut off men at the National Institute of Dental Research whose work has been under constant observation by the American Dental Association, and which has won the continued approval of that knowledgeable and highly tax-conscious organization. It would cut off some of the men who helped find out that a few cents' worth of fluoride placed in city water supplies would halt tooth decay by 60 percent. Tooth decay has forced our Armed Forces to reject tens of thousands of potential servicemen during the two World Wars and the present Korean incident.

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

Mr. HUNT. I would prefer not to yield at this time. I am racing against time in an attempt to catch a train. Therefore, I decline to yield at this time.

Furthermore, the amendment would cut off some of the already all-too-few physicians at the National Institutes of Health, who also happen to be the scientists who inspect and thus insure the safety and effectiveness of the vaccines which protect our children against diphtheria and smallpox, and our soldiers overseas against typhus and yellow fever. Those vaccines now are the purest and the most potent in the entire world. It is absolutely necessary that they be kept so. I may say, Mr. President, that deaths in Korea from infectious and

contagious diseases today are practically nil. It is due to the magnificent work of the research men down through the years.

The amendment would drive away from their test tubes many scientists and technicians at the National Cancer and Heart Institutes who are trying to find means of preventing or curing those two great killers, cancer and heart disease. The highly skilled, dedicated men of mental disease, of cerebral palsy, of arthritis, and blindness, are unfortunately also included among the bureaucrats which the amendment seeks to purge.

These are the types of men and women who have been serving our Nation and humanity in the laboratories of the Public Health Service—men and women who, if we adopted the Ferguson amendment in its present form, would be told that their work is no longer needed, that the Congress does not approve what they are doing.

Mr. President, I know that is not the intent of Congress. I know that when we move to cut down the size of the army of Federal employees we want to do so selectively and with intelligence and on the basis of knowing just what each platoon in that army is engaged in doing. By all means let us make cuts in the swivel-chair commandos, but let us not make cuts in the platoons which are out in front on the firing line—the men and women who have dedicated themselves to the continuous war on death and disease, the men and women who could command far greater salaries and could live far less dangerously if they had not chosen to put public service ahead of private gain. Let us tell the men and women who are doing the research, and the planning and the testing at the National Institutes of Health that we will give them the opportunity to continue in their careers of self-sacrifice. We can and we should do so by voting in support of the amendment offered by the Senator from New York to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. President, I wonder whether all Members of the Senate realize that when our Nation was founded, 161 years ago, the average life expectancy was 35 years, whereas today it is 70 years. Incidentally, let me say that many of the present Members of the Senate are now enjoying that added life expectancy, due to the work which the scientists and research workers have done in years gone by.

Just at the turn of the century the average workingman was absent from his job 21 days a year because of illness, whereas today the average workingman loses only 8 days a year because of illness.

Only 15 or 20 years ago in my own State I often visited local hospitals and saw men who suffered from spotted fever, a disease caused by the bite of wood ticks. The Public Health Service established at Hamilton, Mont., a laboratory for the sole purpose of developing a vaccine for tick fever. That was done. Whereas in Wyoming 15, 20, 25 or more years ago, there were hundreds of deaths from spotted fever, today there are no deaths from that disease, a result which has

been accomplished because of the work done by the scientists who have engaged in research on spotted fever.

Mr. President, I am most hopeful that the Senate will not adopt blindly the proposed meat-ax approach, by which it is proposed to cut off the heads, so to speak, of the scientific and research workers in our Government establishment.

I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair). Without objection, the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming will be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Oregon.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH, 1951

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably, from the Committee on Appropriations, House Joint Resolution 267, making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes; and I request its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me say that the joint resolution calls for an additional appropriation of \$150,000 for expenses of inquiries and investigations of the Senate. The balance remaining in the appropriation for this purpose is inadequate to meet the payrolls which are due on June 15, 1951, and during the remainder of the fiscal year. So passage of the joint resolution at this time is necessary, in order that the employees may be paid.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Is this an appropriation for the contingent fund of the Senate?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. Is the purpose of the appropriation to replenish that fund to the extent of the money which is needed under authorizations we have already made?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas, if the Senator will yield for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A little while ago the Senator from Arkansas said this is a time for sacrifice. I wish to inquire whether the joint resolution comes in that category, in the opinion of the Senator.

Mr. McCLELLAN. All these bills come in that category—both this measure and the other measures referred to come under the category referred to by the Senator from North Dakota.

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

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall not object to the request, but I wonder whether we should make a 10-percent reduction in the appropriations carried in this measure.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; for it applies to the present fiscal year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 267) making an additional appropriation for the legislative branch for the fiscal year 1951, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, during the debate earlier today many statements and comments were made from which the inference might be drawn that Congress has not been sympathetic to an orderly expansion of our public health service program. I was aware of the extensive expansion over the past decade, and I requested the staff of the Committee on Appropriations to prepare an accurate summary showing appropriations for the public health service annually since 1941.

It is probably interesting and significant to note that in the fiscal year 1941 the total appropriation for the public health service was \$33,379,340, whereas the estimate for this year is \$362,693,000, with the bill as recommended by the Committee on Appropriations providing for approximately \$359,000,000. That means that since 1941 there has been more than a ten-fold increase, or approximately from \$33,000,000 to \$362,000,000.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to invite the Senator's attention to the fact that in the pending bill the amount recommended by the subcommittee is a 32½-percent increase over 1951 expenditures.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I thank the Senator for his contribution. The average number of employees of the Public Health Service in 1941 was 10,877, whereas the estimated personnel of the Public Health Service for the fiscal year 1952 is 16,103.

Mr. President, I have cited the figures primarily to show that Congress has not lacked sympathy for and that there has been an orderly expansion of the entire program. No one should stand on the floor of the Senate and charge that Congress has been niggardly in the consideration of appropriations for the Public Health Service.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks the summary to which I have referred.

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

Public Health Service

Year	Appropriation	Average employees
1941.....	\$33,379,340	10,877
1942.....	42,476,939	13,026
1943.....	58,037,245	17,465
1944.....	114,232,980	17,555
1945.....	126,925,073	16,098
1946.....	124,368,311	16,699
1947.....	104,096,446	16,727
1948.....	131,283,100	17,109
1949.....	168,521,000	16,952
1950.....	201,062,500	16,388
1951.....	274,794,280	16,049
1952, estimate.....	362,693,000	16,103

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to speak on the bill if there is to be any limitation of time tomorrow.

Mr. WHERRY. No; there is no limitation of time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I made some observations this afternoon in which I expressed myself rather candidly and frankly about the work of the subcommittee. I stand by what I have said.

I wish to get at the subject in an indirect way. Tomorrow morning the Committee on Banking and Currency will consider and possibly start marking up the Defense Production Act, on which the committee has been taking testimony for approximately 30 days. We will again hear all about the changes. We will again hear all the old hokum about price control. We will again hear what we have heard for many days gone by. We will hear all the old arguments. For all practical purposes, OPA will be back again. I am reminded of the old song:

OPA is back again, the skies above are black again.

Black markets are back again, OPA is here again.

We will have very much of the same thing. In listening to the testimony, I have been puzzling over it, and I have come to the conclusion that there is some virtue in the old formula that high prices are the result of volume of money times the velocity of turn-over of money, divided by the availability of goods. That seems to be the standard formula by which orthodox economists give us the clue to price control.

Let us take these factors in order to understand the bill. First of all, let us take the velocity factor. The Federal Reserve Board at long last is moving in with its credit controls and is trying to cut down the money velocity and turn-over. I have said on occasions that it is rather strange that the Federal Reserve Board waited so long. The act went on the books in September of last year. Evidently there was no interest in doing anything about it until after election day. Then things got under way, and prices began to go up. Now for the first time we begin to see the teeth of the Federal Reserve Board's regulations

in the form of regulation W and regulation X, and the regulations are having some effect.

We have had before us persons interested in the radio and television business. Senators can believe it or not, but there are now 600,000 television sets in storage because it is impossible to move them. That shows that the Federal Reserve regulations are finally beginning to work. That is one factor in the price formula.

The next factor is supply. If only we could hike up the amount of consumer goods. It seems that we always go in for the usual emotional binge and always get the cart before the horse. We impose restrictions which retard the development of a supply of consumer goods rather than making it easy.

My good friend, the Senator from Nebraska, is an expert in the field of beef. The other day I saw in a Washington newspaper an article stating that the packers were staging a sit-down strike. I looked at the market price in Chicago. On the 5th of June, 27,000 cattle reached the Chicago market—50 percent of what would reach it in normal times. My friend, the Senator from Nebraska, knows that quite well. Today there is a quota on the packers and a shortage of supply, and prices went up \$1 or \$1.50 per hundred. The packers could not buy cattle at that price, because they are operating on a ceiling, and they could not jeopardize their investment. So the cattle moved down the highways, and little slaughtering establishments were set up behind barns and elsewhere; but the problem is not solved at all.

If we can do something about supply, that will ease the control problem.

If we can do something about the velocity of credit that will ease the problem.

Another factor is money and the volume of money.

While we in the Congress talk about price controls, we vote to pour money into the economic bloodstream in tremendous amounts. We have before us a budget calling for the appropriation of \$71,500,000,000, and supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills which have been passed call for further appropriations of more than \$1,500,000,000, and I anticipate that other deficiency and other supplemental appropriation bills will come before us and will be enacted, with the result that in the fiscal year 1952 we may have an \$80,000,000,000 budget, rather than a \$71,500,000,000 budget. The demands for the appropriations will come from a variety of sources.

The approach to this matter seems to be by way of the ECA, subsidies, public hearings, and increases in the expenditures provided in the appropriation bills. I think we can prove it, because this year when the House passed the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, it contained items calling for the appropriation of \$88,000,000 more than was appropriated in the 1951 bill; and when the House finished acting on that bill, the amount carried in it was \$11,000,000,000 under the budget, but \$6,000,000,000 over the 1951 appropriations for the same agencies.

Further to prove the point which has been made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, let me say that I was defeated in my effort to head off Senate bill 445. There were a good many mistaken estimates in regard to what that bill would cost; but when I concluded my references to the testimony, I showed from the records made in the Appropriations Committee, at its own hearings which were taken last year, that Senate bill 445 would not cost \$21,000,000, as my friend, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], estimated it would cost, but would cost \$240,000,000, with \$80,000,000 coming from the Federal Treasury and \$160,000,000 coming from State and local sources.

A few days ago the Senate passed the central Arizona project bill, authorizing the expenditure of \$788,000,000. However, when the construction of that project is begun, if prices go up, I have an idea the project will cost nearer \$1,000,000,000 than \$788,000,000.

The other day when the Senate had before it the dispersal bill, authorizing the appropriation of \$107,000,000 for that purpose, I helped fight that bill. I know that the authors of the bill were not particularly happy about what I said then; but what I said with gusto and enthusiasm and conviction was that if there is a real danger to our country the danger lies more nearly on the inside than on the outside.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think the Senator from Illinois has a point with reference to other agencies of the Government, but I wish to have him appreciate the fact that our subcommittee did try to make a cut in these appropriations.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure the Senator's subcommittee did; I have no doubt about it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Possibly we did not make enough cuts. However, let me ask whether the Senator has ever seen a Senate Appropriations Committee report an appropriation bill making reductions of \$112,000,000 in the appropriation items carried in the bill as it was passed by the House? Has the Senator from Illinois ever seen that done before?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, I wish to say with modesty to my friend the Senator from New Mexico that when I was a Member of the House of Representatives we had a standing canon that "the House took it out, but the Senate put it back in."

Mr. CHAVEZ. However, in this instance our subcommittee voted to make smaller appropriations than the ones the House had voted for.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is good.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is the point I am trying to make to the Senate, namely, that in the subcommittee we tried to do what we thought was proper; we tried to make what we thought were proper cuts, and still provide sufficient money for the efficient operation of the functions of the Government appropriated for by the pending bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. President, there was the dispersal bill; there was the central Arizona project bill; and there is on the calendar Senate bill 337, providing subsidies for students and for universities. It is wonderful, it is desirable; but in heaven's name, when we confront such a condition as now exists, we must think in terms of the welfare of the entire country, for one thing; and, in the second place, we must decide whether we do a service to the country by taking more dollars from the pockets of the taxpayers when it cannot be shown that we make a better disposition of those dollars when we syphon them into the Government pool.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator from Illinois to refer to Senate bill 337, and I understood him to refer to it as a bill making grants to students and universities. I assume the Senator realizes that those grants would not be made to liberal-arts universities.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand that.

Mr. LEHMAN. The grants would be made to medical schools, for the training of doctors, nurses, and others who are safeguarding the health of the people of our country, both those in the military forces and those in civil life.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, I wish to say to my friend the Senator from New York that I understand that fully; and many youngsters in my home county are belaboring me about that bill and are asking, "When is the Senate going to pass the bill?" so that they will be helped and so that the schools they attend will be helped. It is wonderful. However, I wish to say that when I was a student there was no such help.

Let us not forget that all these funds must come from the Federal Treasury. The pressure to provide more funds is constantly upon the Government. I apprehend that as time passes there will be other bills calling for additional appropriations from the Federal Treasury, and all of them will be outside the budget. So the question is, Where are we to stop increasing appropriations, and when are we to start making cuts?

That was the reason for my observation this afternoon that, frankly, I do not believe the Senate wants to economize, and I am beginning to doubt whether the House wants to economize. Those who really favor making cuts in the appropriations are in favor of only one thing, and that is the thing which has been emblazoned so long by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who says, "I have only one measuring rod, and that is the good of my country."

So, Mr. President, desirable though the various projects may be, we must think of the whole country and of the impact of these appropriations on the budget. If we put all requests for additional appropriations through the wringer, we shall not be worrying about the making of exceptions and about how much we shall appropriate for the control of venereal disease, for instance, and we shall not be concerned then about what we

shall do about this item or that item, because what will count will be the effect on the good of the whole country, and then all of us will be scampering in the same direction.

Today we have an astronomical budget. In 1950 I spoke before many people, saying to them, "If you expect me to go to Washington and get you money out of the Federal till, you are badly mistaken. I do not propose to do it. I propose to see the good of the whole country benefited, and the knife will go deeply into all requests for further spending."

Mr. President, that brings up the question, What about the so-called meat-ax technique? I was intrigued by the observations of my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in regard to using the scalpel. It is great business if we can use the scalpel to good effect.

I used to say that we must use a meat ax. There is today a Member of the Senate who once was a member of the President's Cabinet. I remember when I voted to use the meat-ax technique on the appropriations for the Government department he then headed, when I was chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee in the House of Representatives. We voted to take \$131,000,000 out of the appropriations for that department, although later the Senate voted to restore \$80,000,000 of the amount. Yet I remember when that gentleman came to my office and said, "We can work under that reduction."

So, Mr. President, when we are confronted with a budgetary danger of this sort, I think it is our responsibility to reduce the budget, balance the appropriations with the income, and say that is reasonable. Otherwise the inflationary spiral will become infinitely worse.

I return now to the formula, high prices are the result of volume of money, times the velocity or turn-over of money, divided by the availability of goods. If it is possible to hike up production, good. If it is possible to curtail credit and to curtail velocity, good. But there comes a third factor, the volume of money, and that is where the Congress comes in, because it has exclusive power over the purse, and if it is not controlled here, it is not going to be controlled anywhere. That is why it is necessary to use a scrutinizing eye upon every appropriation bill which comes from the committee. I do not quarrel with the good work which is done. I simply say that, as an individual Member of the Senate, I am dissatisfied, that is all, because, if what is now presented is the only showing we can make, then I doubt very much that we are going to make a proportionately better showing on the other bills which will be coming from the committee. Then what happens to our hopes, our dreams that we can save \$4,000,000,000, \$5,000,000,000, or \$7,000,000,000?

So let us now take a little look at the pending bill. The appropriation contained in the pending bill for Labor-Security is \$2,437,000,000. The budget estimates were \$2,744,000,000. That is roughly a budget estimate for Labor-Security of \$300,000,000 in excess of the appropriation for last year. On that

basis of that, one is almost warranted in saying that the President does not want the appropriation cut, and that the Budget Bureau does not want it cut, judging from the estimates they have sent to the Congress.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield with pleasure to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator not kindly tell the Senate that, of the billions of dollars he is talking about, most of the amounts are grants to the States, including the Senator's State, my State, and every other State?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, yes; I shall come to that. I want to be entirely fair. First, let us consider the House action. For a certain item the House allowed \$90,000,000, of which \$50,000,000 was for old-age assistance. That is correct; is it not? At this point I want to say that I think my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was correct when he said that the saving indicated by the committee was only a forthright saving, because, as I read Miss Goodwin's testimony before the Senate subcommittee, there are going to be additional requests for permanent-disability grants, for dependent children, for other dependents, and for old-age assistance. Are we going to have the same procedure we have had before? If my figures are correct, every year since 1944 the item has been cut, and every year since 1944 the agencies have come back for a deficiency. Now, is that correct, or is it not? If it is correct; that is all there is to it.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course, neither a committee nor the Senate itself can tell what a department is going to do, but, as a matter of fact, so far as the committee is concerned, and so far as the particular bill which we are discussing is concerned, we said "We will cut it down so much." Is not that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, but what I want to emphasize this afternoon—

Mr. CHAVEZ. The thing the Senator is emphasizing might be, "Come and ask us for more money." Of course, we do not know that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. An economy is not an economy, in the accepted sense of the word, until the books are closed for the fiscal year, a line is drawn, and we can say, "We did it." If the amount is completely restored within the fiscal year, we simply are not accomplishing anything.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That might be true, in the case of a supplemental bill, but so far this bill is concerned, the Senator will agree with us that we cut it, will he not?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Certainly, and I do not quarrel about it. I merely want to find out about it, that is all.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What we shall do in the future, I, of course, do not know. I hope the Senator is incorrect, and that the agencies will not come back for more money.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee took approximately \$103,000,000 out of the public assistance appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The committee then took approximately \$50,000,000 out of the Railroad Retirement Board item.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. DIRKSEN. So that the committee shows decreases amounting to somewhat over \$153,000,000. The committee then shows about \$41,000,000 in increases. So the committee shows a net decrease of about \$112,000,000. But there is one item which in my judgment was a bookkeeping transaction, namely, the railroad retirement pension account. The other one, unless all signs fail, as they did not fail in the past 7 years, will be put back. So it leaves us in this situation, and this is the point I emphasize: Where is there shown any substantial economy that will stick? That is the important consideration.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well. In this particular bill the appropriation is \$112,000,000 less than the House figure. What else could we do?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I like a cut which, unlike an old soldier, does not simply fade away before the end of the fiscal year.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to my friend from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The apparent saving in the retirement fund, indicated in the report, is not really a saving at all, is it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; in my judgment, it is not.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not correct that the amount of money used here may be such that we shall have to place in the bill next year all the dollars which we took out this year?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. And is not the same true in regard to the reduction of \$100,000,000 for public assistance, and so forth?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I agree.

Mr. FERGUSON. So that, in effect, it is true, is it not, that we are not thereby saving a real dollar of the taxpayers' money?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that we have, in fact, added \$41,000,000 to the House figure?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No, no. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Last year the Department came to Congress with a supplemental budget estimate of \$40,000,000, which they received. They came forward with a \$120,000,000 supplemental bill, and we cut it down by \$40,000,000. This year they have unobligated balances of \$100,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; but the Senator must remember that the record shows that Miss Goodwin also said to the Senator's committee that for permanent disability they expected that for 1952 the demands would be 142 percent of the demands for 1951.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They may want that much and the Senator would apparently

like to have Miss Goodwin decide the matter for the committee. The committee did not so decide. The committee has its bill before the Senate now. Of course, Miss Goodwin may submit a request, and if the Senators think her request should be granted, that is a different thing. But the committee has not done so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; but the Senator must be sure that the record is straight. The appropriation is governed by a statute, with a formula, and the committee would be helpless in denying a deficiency in the event the Department came forward and said, "The State spent the money in the first instance; these are matchable funds; and here is the bill."

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct, I think, as a formula; but I do not think it is going to be so.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It has to be done.

Mr. CHAVEZ. All I ask the Senator from Illinois to do is to trust the Senate Appropriations Committee, and to believe that the members of that committee are as sincere in their desire to save money as is any Senator, regardless of who makes the request, whether it is Miss Goodwin or someone else. As the Senator stated a little while ago, the House might make a cut in the hope that the Senate would restore it. In this particular case, we not only did not restore it, but we cut it \$112,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I know.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It is completely different from the state of mind that is sometimes alleged to govern Senate behavior.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I had hoped that the Senator's subcommittee would take account of the problems now involved in old-age assistance. Mr. Ewing is trying to deny to the State of Indiana \$20,000,000 because the legislature, in February, passed a statute requiring that a list of the names of the recipients of old-age benefits be open to public inspection. It is one way to prevent abuses. A joint committee of the Legislature of Tennessee made an investigation and submitted an astonishing report. In the State of Florida, I understand, the same thing has happened. That is a subject on which there should have been some testimony, and in that field the Senator's committee could have done some worthwhile work.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator has mentioned Indiana and Tennessee. It was the testimony in reference to Tennessee and Indiana which made it possible for the committee to recommend the cuts. Notwithstanding the fact that the chairman of the committee was from Tennessee, and notwithstanding certain generally economical people from Indiana, it was the situations in Indiana and Tennessee which justified the committee in making the cuts; and we made them.

Mr. DIRKSEN. All I know is that in the report it is stated in crystal-clear print that the amount is over the 1951 budget for the Department of Labor, and over the 1951 budget for the Federal Security Agency, although we are wrestling with an acute problem which is pressing on the country and which imperils and jeopardizes vital security at home, so that we cannot overlook a single opportunity to make a cut.

If we follow the argument made here this afternoon, I could make the same argument as to every bill that comes before the Senate. When the agricultural bill is under consideration and an effort is made to reduce the appropriation for animal husbandry or for the eradication of cattle disease and insect pests, I can say, "You are jeopardizing the very food supply and the well-being of the country." That argument can be made as to any appropriation bill that comes before the Senate.

So, Mr. President, I come to this conclusion, that somehow, somewhere, sometime there must be those identified with the branch of the Government which has power over the purse, who will simply say, "We will walk down the middle of the road," because, when the President said to the public, "Prepare to accept some reductions in the standard of living," which is another way of saying, "You have got to go in for austerity," I think it is right for the people, through their elected representatives in the Congress, to say, "Look, Mr. Government, you must accept some austerity, too." So let us cut back the appropriations. That is why I am for the Ferguson amendment, and I would go even further than it goes.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We want to be fair in the debate. The Senator from Illinois has stated that the committee has been neglectful. But a look at page 2 of the report of the committee will disclose that the appropriation for the Department of Labor, which is included in this bill, is \$7,369,759 less than for last year, and for the Federal Security Agency the appropriation is \$25,420,215 less than for last year. What more can be expected of us? After all, Federal Security has to carry on. I wish the Senator from Illinois would read the statements.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have been through the big green book.

Mr. CHAVEZ. This is the way the hearing started:

The committee, as the Secretary will understand, is confronted this year with a somewhat different problem in its consideration of budget estimates. There is the necessity to provide adequately for the defense of our country, for which we have a tentative estimate in excess of \$60,000,000,000. There is before the Congress a recommendation from the President proposing a substantial increase in taxes.

We said, "If you do not cut, we shall cut. Tell the committee where you can cut." They did not cut, and we did.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I wish to conclude, because I do not want to keep the Senate in session any longer, but I desire to stop on this note, that recently I saw a statement made by my good friend Lindsay Warren, a former Member of the House, who is now the Comptroller General. He made the observation that he took 7,000 persons out of the General Accounting Office. An administrator in Government said, "I would not go through the experience you went through for anything in this world."

I thought it was rather revealing that there is great reluctance to use the ax in these agencies. There is only one thing we can do, and that is to use it here, and, by pressure, compel economies.

There was a top-echelon man in my office this morning who said to me, "We are over-staffed in my agency by 25 percent, but I can say nothing about it."

Mr. CHAVEZ. I agree completely with the Senator from Illinois. I think personnel can be cut to the extent of 10 percent and still do a better job for the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am glad to hear that, because it means that my friend from New Mexico is going to support the Ferguson amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I am not.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It provides for only a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We listened to the hearings and considered the stern realities. From the political angle there is no particular reason why I should agree with the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Cordon), but he is sincere and he is a fine citizen. He tries to work out the proper way of handling appropriations. The Senator from Oregon, after working assiduously, would have liked to cut 10, 15, or 20 percent, and so would I. But after the hearings we came to the conclusion that the proper, the decent, the common-sense procedure, if we were not to interfere with the operation of Government, was to cut 5 percent. That is why I am supporting the Cordon amendment. We would cut 20 or 50 percent, but that would not be the proper course to pursue, if we take our duties seriously. I sincerely think that a cut of 5 percent is the best we can do on this bill. We might be able to cut the State Department 20 percent or possibly 40 percent, and I may go along with the Senator along that line. But in considering the appropriations for health, education, Federal Security, and the Children's Bureau, I do not believe it is wise to cut by more than 5 percent.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I respond to that by saying that when we take the "my" out of "economy," we are on pretty good ground, and then we can courageously use the ax. That does not mean being reckless. But it takes something more than a scalpel to whittle the expenditures of the Government back to safe proportions. If we have the temerity to say to the people, "Next year we are going to ask you for \$7,500,000,000 in taxes," we should, with equal grace, say, "We are going to give you \$7,500,000,000 reduction to balance the taxes."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator agree with me that while we should cut and try to conserve the taxpayers' dollars, due consideration should be given to individual items? I believe, that we should not reduce the appropriations for public health in the bill, but should make the cut in the ECA item. I think we could take some out of the North Atlantic Pact appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The sentiment was expressed today by Members of this great deliberative body, "I am for economy, but." I think Shakespeare once said, "But me no buts."

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois has indicated that the President made a statement some months ago about economy in government, but so far, I am sure the Senator from Illinois will agree the President has not come before the Congress and asked that any particular item be cut from the budget.

On Saturday, June 9, he wrote a letter, from which I wish to read certain paragraphs:

The Federal Government, as the largest single employer in the country, should set the example in accomplishing this objective.

He was talking about cutting down manpower.

Therefore, I expect the head of each executive department and agency to take all necessary actions to conserve manpower and generally to bring about maximum effectiveness and economy in the utilization of personnel.

This manpower conservation program should be given top priority through the executive branch.

All we are trying to do here is to help the President.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Help him give it top priority.

Mr. FERGUSON. Give it top priority, and take it out even before he sends it here and actually asks for it. I am surprised that he did not write to Congress and ask Congress to do what he asked Mr. Lawton, his Director of the Budget, to do. Then he could have had worthwhile action on the budget. Does not the Senator from Illinois agree?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes, indeed, I agree.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I also agree with my friends the Senators from Michigan and Illinois. The only point I am trying to make is that in cutting we should cut at the proper place where no great harm will be done. Let us not, having in mind the common weal and the interest of public welfare, cut where a cut would be detrimental to the welfare of the country.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Where would the Senator from New Mexico suggest that a cut be made? Will he name the place?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. Cut anywhere except where it involves the public health of the American people. Cut anywhere else.

Mr. LANGER. Will the distinguished Senator from New Mexico name the departments and the agencies where we should cut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think cuts can be made in any department. But I think it would be against the interests of public welfare to cut any appropriation that affects the health of the American people.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Do I correctly understand that my amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] on behalf of himself and other Senators, remains the pending question?

Mr. McFARLAND. It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from New York to the so-called Ferguson amendment is the pending question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

RELEASE BY SENATOR FERGUSON OF PROPOSAL FOR CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION OF THE CHINA LOBBY

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement released to the press yesterday by me, commending the President for his offer of full cooperation in a congressional investigation of what has been termed by the newspaper as the China lobby. This commendation is recorded on the assumption that the President's offer embraces an investigation of all elements which have sought to influence United States policy on China, including the pro-Communists as well as the pro-Nationalists.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR FERGUSON

Those of us who have experienced the obstructionism of the executive branch in the past can only commend the President for his announced desire that Government agencies "cooperate to the fullest extent possible" in any congressional investigation of the "Chinese lobby" in the United States.

This commendation holds good, however, only to the extent that the President intends cooperation in an investigation of all elements that have sought to influence the course of this country's far-eastern policy. Those elements include not only those which have supported the Chinese Nationalist regime of Chiang Kai-shek but those which have supported the Chinese Communists.

There can be no doubt of the wisdom of an inquiry into all the factors and factions behind our far-eastern policy. That was precisely an objective of Republicans when they urged the so-called MacArthur hearings, which are now in progress.

Certainly the supporters of the Chinese Nationalists should be examined on the motives and the merits of their operations in this country. Likewise there should be full inquiry into the motives and organized operations of those who urged abandonment of United States support of the Nationalists; the proposition that the Chinese Communists were mere agrarian reformers devoid of Soviet domination; recognition of the Chinese Communist regime by the United States; seating of the Chinese Communists in the United Nations; and other related policies sympathetic to or designed to bring about Communist domination in China and nearby areas.

Some of these factors the joint Foreign Relations-Armed Services Committee of the Senate has sought to explore as collateral issues. Obviously they go beyond the already burdened scope of that committee, and that is what gives significance to the President's wishes as relayed by Secretary Acheson, that cooperation be extended "any committee or committees of the Congress which wish to go into this matter for the purpose of informing them what is known, for the purpose of help-

ing any investigation, for the purpose of assisting them to come to a conclusion as to whether or not they wish to have one."

Starting points for such an investigation, insofar as it would relate to the pro-Communist factors in the lobby which has sought to influence our China policy, are the Amerasia case and its unexposed ramifications, and the well known but hitherto disclosed activities of the Sorge spy ring maintained in Asia by the Soviets and its lobbying activities in the United States designed to put the Communists in control of China. As a matter of fact the subversive activities subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee has already launched preliminary activity in similar directions, and I know that subcommittee will welcome most enthusiastically this offer of assistance from the executive branch.

We should assume the good faith of the President in making his offer of Executive cooperation "to the fullest possible extent," and we should feel free to assume that the offer embraces an inquiry into both anti-Communist and pro-Communist phases of lobbying on China policy. This is highly commendable, because it reveals again the high regard which President Truman held for the function of congressional investigations while he was a Member of the Senate, and for a reversal of the attitude toward them which he has displayed in more recent years as President.

Such a reversal will go far to overcome the effects of his stubborn obstructionism in refusing to make security information on Government employees available to committees such as that which investigated the Government loyalty program and the case of William Remington, which kicked back so explosively when Remington was later convicted as a Communist, and his characterization of congressional investigations into the Remington and Alger Hiss cases as "red herings."

If the President's pledge is one of full cooperation to investigate both the supporters of the Chinese Nationalists and the Chinese Communists it is a praiseworthy reversal of his past attitudes and a great step forward in the national interest.

Should it develop that it applies only to an investigation of anti-Communists, however, the offer is a snare and a delusion as it will appear to be only an effort to cover confusion and error within his own administration, whose policies have been opposed to the Chinese Nationalists.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of North Carolina in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Peter I. Bukowski, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator, Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert I. Millonzi, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask that that nomination go over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Very well; I am willing that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of Mr. Bukowski.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified.

That concludes the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 12, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 11 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Harold R. Medina, of New York, to be United States circuit judge, second circuit, vice Hon. Learned Hand, retired.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Edward Jordan Dimock, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. George Murray Hulbert, deceased.

Frieda B. Hennock, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Alfred C. Coxe, retired.

Thomas F. Murphy, of New York, to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York, vice Hon. Harold R. Medina, elevated.

PROMOTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502 and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and sections 303 and 306 of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948. Those officers whose names are preceded by the symbol (X) are subject to physical examination required by law. All others have been examined and found physically qualified for promotion.

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from October 19, 1950

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Shankle, Willard Mayes, 4161A.
Hook, Fred G., Jr., 4162A.
Kunkel, John Howard, Jr., 4163A.
Hunziker, Richard Overton, 4164A.
Burbridge, Leo Michael, 4165A.
Oliver, Frank Everett, 4166A.
Clarke, Leo George, Jr., 4167A.
Knox, Jonathan Horace, 4169A.
Hedlund, Earl Clifford, 4170A.
Read, Jackson Yulee, 4171A.
Eaton, Robert Reynolds, 4172A.
Beezley, Wilbur Barrett, 4173A.

Montgomery, Robert Pearson, 4174A.
White, John Milton, Jr., 4175A.
Halberstadt, Harry Julius, 4177A.
Christy, Harrison Randolph, Jr., 4178A.
McBride, William Peter, 4179A.
Bourne, Evan Francis, Jr., 4180A.
Bowman, Julian Holt, 4181A.
Blachly, Ross Lindley, 4182A.
Baker, Basil Lee, 4183A.
Hargett, William Marion, 4184A.
Bell, John Howard, 4185A.
Allen, Harry Berkley, 4186A.
Quayle, John William, 4187A.
Wittrock, Howard Henry, 4188A.
Jones, Osce Vernon, 4189A.
Morton, Charles William, 4190A.
Grove, Philip Pike, 4191A.
Nichols, John Donaldson, Jr., 4192A.
Graves, John Calvin, 4193A.
Warren, Benjamin Calvert, 4194A.
Vetort, Francis John, 4195A.
Black, Vance Eugene, 4197A.
Keating, Robert Edward, 4200A.
Beaudry, Emil George, 4201A.
Faver, Dudley Ervin, 4202A.
Scott, Edward Walcot, Jr., 4203A.
Fandel, William Herbert, 4204A.
Hydron, Clarence August, 4206A.
Eaton, Dudley Paul, 4207A.
Cormier, Lionel Joseph, 4208A.
Mitchell, Richard Randolph, 4209A.
Ferguson, Harvey Eugene, 4210A.
Cloe, Keith DeLyle, 4211A.
Haesler, John Dietrich Walter, 4212A.
Sisk, Eugene Bounds, Jr., 4213A.
Norwood, James Maurice, 4214A.
Bounds, R. G., Jr., 4215A.
Stewart, James Clifton, 4216A.
Scruggs, Harold Woodrow, 4217A.
Carmichael, Walter Pendleton, Jr., 4218A.
Gerzin, Walter John, 4219A.
Newton, Preston Carnall, 4220A.
Herblin, William Leonard, 4221A.
Kemble, William Hudson, Jr., 4223A.
Salisbury, Arthur George, 4224A.
Kuntz, Bernard Romyne, 4225A.
Haney, Otto Reed, 4226A.
Moore, Wilson, 4227A.
Kesling, Earl William, 4228A.
Foley, Jesse Rush, Jr., 4229A.
Irish, Lynn Thornton, 4231A.
Macdonald, Henry Gordon, 4232A.
Schofield, Martin Benjamin, Jr., 4233A.
Clark, Glen William, 4234A.
Calderbank, John Jacob Birrell, 4236A.
Torresson, Thomas Samuel, Jr., 4237A.
Moir, Charles Louis, 4238A.
Silvey, Owen Watson, 4239A.
Chambers, Walter Earle, 4240A.
Herndon, Robert Elmore, Jr., 4241A.
Rector, Edward Franklin, 4242A.
Gilman, Mark Hulings, 4243A.
Hawel, Leo, Jr., 4244A.
Caple, Charles Edgar, Jr., 4245A.
Compton, Joe W., Jr., 4246A.
Ferguson, Matthew Henry Taylor, 4247A.
Byrnes, George Goodrich, Jr., 4248A.
Dervage, Minar Murry, 4249A.
Morris, William Wallace, Jr., 4250A.
Cumbaa, Noel Thomas, 4251A.
Berg, Gordon Howard, 4252A.
Bronson, Fred Ford, 4253A.
Livingston, John Waters, 4254A.
Fjelstad, Kenneth Silas, 4255A.
Taute, August Franklin, 4256A.
Calhoun, Robert Thomas, 4257A.
Lackey, Archer Evans, 4259A.
Ross, George Lee, 4262A.
Bigelow, Edgar Daugherty, 4263A.
Chapman, John Ward, 4264A.
Terry, Henry Warren, 3d, 4266A.
Jennings, Payne, Jr., 4267A.
Wys, Robert Andrew, 4268A.
West, Alden Edgar, 4269A.
Campbell, William Haddock, 4270A.
Pfingst, William Kingsley, 4271A.
Olson, Arvid Eldon, Jr., 4273A.
McKenna, Charles Francis, 3d, 4274A.
Lawson, Robert Morris, 4276A.
Ficke, Robert Hamilton, 4277A.
Stewart, John Elkin, 4278A.

McKee, Seth Jefferson, 4279A.
Gallagher, Raymond Keith, 4280A.
Orris, William Lester, 4281A.
Teschner, Charles George, 4282A.
Preston, Benjamin Sidney, Jr., 4283A.
Cutcher, Solomon, 4284A.
Lawton, Thomas Oregon, Jr., 4285A.
Moon, Robert Sell, 4286A.
Tope, William Arthur, 4287A.
Kundrat, Andrew, 4289A.
Wertenbaker, George Leftwich, 4290A.
Villars, Paul Emile, 4291A.
Chatterton, David Henry, 4292A.
Overstreet, Charles Sylvester, Jr., 4293A.
Mestier, Louis Jean Batiste, Jr., 4294A.
Ingelido, Michael Joseph, 4295A.
Goodwin, George Robert, 4296A.
Twilley, John Fougereousse, 4297A.
Avery, Delwin Barton, 4298A.
McKelvey, William Robert, 4299A.
Loesch, Lawrence Frederic, 4300A.
Hornsby, Thomas William, 4301A.
Beumeler, Wayne Marcellus, 4302A.
Bexfield, Frank William, 4303A.
Kittel, Robert Stewart, 4304A.
Birdsall, Charles Dale, 4305A.
Tschepl, Arthur Leopold, 4306A.
Henggeler, Francis Joseph, 4307A.
Daniel, David Edwin, 4308A.
Saltsman, Ralph Henry, Jr., 4309A.
Bertram, William Ellert, 4310A.
Lambert, Jean Koke, 4311A.
Cox, Andrew Lacock, 4312A.
Leocha, Adolph John, 4314A.
Garrett, Kenneth Lee, 4315A.
Skinner, Gregory Jackson, 4316A.
Conroy, Thomas Charles, 4317A.
Brawner, Daniel Campbell, 4318A.
Garner, Robert Frank, Jr., 4319A.
Bjornson, Wallace Erwin, 4320A.
Wardell, Michael Edward, 4321A.
McWilliams, Martin Cadenhead, 4322A.
Winterbottom, James McIndoe, 4323A.
Byerts, William Edward, Jr., 4324A.
Jones, George Lamar, 4325A.
McKenzie, James Beecher, 4326A.
Carroll, William Brooks, 4327A.
Penington, John Raymond, 4328A.
Glover, Walter Parrish, Jr., 4329A.
Alston, Jack Holt, 4330A.
Worley, Earl Wilson, 4331A.
Hall, Byron Eugene, 4332A.
Scper, Ray Edgar, 4333A.
VanMulleum, Louis David, 4336A.
Herbes, Edward Anthony, 4338A.
Lackey, John Herbert, Jr., 4339A.
Chitty, Charles Dean, Jr., 4340A.
Ray, Clyde Asa, 4341A.
Moore, Malcolm Arnot, 4342A.
Close, Winton Ralph, 4343A.
Matthews, Stanley Eldred, 4344A.
Waesche, Harry Lee, 4345A.
Williford, James Hobson, 4346A.
Wright, Donald McLarty, 4348A.
Brandon, Hubert Arthur, 4349A.
Thornquest, Frank Purvis, 4352A.
Osborne, Thomas Fleet, 4353A.
Ljunggren, Ernest Nils, 4354A.
Bounds, Fred Howard, 4355A.
Tash, Earl Raymond, 4357A.
Ottinger, William Wolfe, 4358A.
Lavelle, John Daniel, 4359A.
Marr, Jack Franklin, 4360A.
Graham, Donald William, 4361A.
Burge, Edward Longfellow, 4362A.
Brooks, Allison Cochran, 4363A.
Taylor, Henry Sidney, 4364A.
O'Brien, Frank Leo, Jr., 4365A.
Mooney, Joseph Francis, 4366A.
Cunningham, Jack Edward, 4367A.
Glasser, Otto John, 4368A.
Cowart, William Slater, Jr., 4369A.
Hoy, William Astor, Jr., 4370A.
Walker, Peter Saville, 4371A.
Manning, George Max, 4372A.
Puckett, Robert Stephens, 4373A.
Gordon, Donald Millard, 4374A.
Sullivan, Robert Bernard, 4375A.
Berg, Russell Allen, 4376A.
Hamner, A. H., Jr., 4377A.
Daigle, Lewellyn Clifford, 4378A.

Stefen, Le Roy Len, 4379A.
 Roberts, John Alva, 4380A.
 Whiteman, Harold Jennings, 4381A.
 Barrow, Leonard James, Jr., 4382A.
 Barnett, James Alex, 4383A.
 Stuart, Robert Hartwell, 4384A.
 Lingard, Aldro Immanuel, 4385A.
 Riddle, Samuel Stuart, Jr., 4386A.
 Rossoff, Isidor, 4388A.
 Rawlins, Phillip C., 4390A.
 McCalla, John Herman, 4391A.
 Brown, Paul Douglas, 4392A.
 Hawthorne, Harry James, 4393A.
 Anderson, Wesley Alleyn, 4394A.
 Williamson, Walter Henry, 4395A.
 Brown, Merle Clinton, 4396A.
 Benedict, Maurice Samuel, 4397A.
 Sullivan, Joseph Lewis, 4398A.
 Walker, George Alexander, 4618A.
 Schneider, George Elmer, 4400A.
 Evers, John Clay, 4401A.
 Brannock, Joseph Franklin, 4402A.
 Griffin, Louis Gray, 4403A.
 Brownfield, Albert Warren, 4404A.
 Carlson, Thorgny Cedric, Jr., 4405A.
 Tedder, Irby Velle, 4406A.
 Cox, Robert Bruce, 4407A.
 Armstrong, Ben Kay, Jr., 4408A.
 Leslie, George Adalord, 4409A.
 Waddleton, Thomas Renan, 4410A.
 Sharp, John Ferrin, 4411A.
 Briggs, Loran Dale, 4412A.
 Cole, James Lawrence, 4413A.
 Thyng, Harrison Reed, 4414A.
 Lucas, Walter Yeates, 4415A.
 Marts, Kenneth Elliot, 4416A.
 Stoddard, Edward Forrest, 4417A.
 Carlisle, Richard Thurman, 4418A.
 Coss, Walter Leroy, 4419A.
 Gehrig, Raymond Miller, 4420A.
 Selman, James Clarke, 4421A.
 Carey, Edwin Forrest, Jr., 4422A.
 Jones, Wilson Tolman, 4424A.
 Brown, George Evans, 4425A.
 Wallace, John Braxton, 4426A.
 Kirtley, Robert Eberle, 4428A.
 Adams, Alan Frederick, 4429A.
 Grossmith, Louis Bertram, Jr., 4430A.
 Moseley, Cuthbert Livingston, Jr., 4431A.
 Thornton, Robert Lee, 4432A.
 Jones, William Woodruff, 4433A.
 Baxter, Reuben Augustus, 4434A.
 Wheeler, Clermont Edward, 4435A.
 Lyster, David King, Jr., 4436A.
 Berry, Maurice Antony, 4437A.
 Brady, Francis Thomas, 4438A.
 Hornby, David Alonzo, 4439A.
 Wanderer, Ralph Matthew, Jr., 4440A.
 Hoover, Travis, 4441A.
 Foster, Byron Winton, 4442A.
 Lassiter, Olbert Ferring, 4445A.
 Fay, Fergus Cruse, 4446A.
 Robinson, James Cregg, Jr., 4448A.
 Craft, Winfred Owens, 4449A.
 Schilling, David Carl, 4450A.
 Mulholland, Mitchell Joseph Bernard, 4451A.
 Turner, John Landon, 4452A.
 Kelsay, Clyde Bruce, 4453A.
 Prentiss, Vernon, 4454A.
 Kelly, Earle Wellington, 4455A.
 Bagby, Francis Kay, 4456A.
 Stubbs, Claude Maxwell, 4457A.
 Shapiro, Leonard, 4458A.
 Greiner, Paul Earl, 4460A.
 Fish, Robert William, 4461A.
 Ault, Richard Leroy, 4462A.
 Thacker, Robert El, 4463A.
 Berry, Austin Luther, 4464A.
 Barr, Bernice Stone, 4465A.
 Hundt, George Raymond, 4466A.
 Daugherty, Jean Hamilton, 4467A.
 Zubko, Boris Michael, 4468A.
 Nicholas, Judson Dye, Jr., 4470A.
 Finan, Bernard Joseph, Jr., 4471A.
 Johnson, Wilton Wayne, 4472A.
 Yarchin, Samuel, 4473A.
 Lemmon, James Coskrey, 4474A.
 Wynn, Edward Henry, 4475A.
 Baker, Warren Sears, Jr., 4476A.
 Bell, John Francis, 4477A.

Richardson, Lester Elwood, 4479A.
 Yudkin, Richard Allen, 4480A.
 Curnutt, James LeeRoy, 4481A.
 Lewis, James Thomas, 4482A.
 Sutton, George Ellsworth, 4483A.
 Laughlin, Joseph Lyle, 4484A.
 Moore, Lynn Ross, 4485A.
 Heath, Norval Kemp, 4486A.
 Page, Roger William, 4487A.
 Chalek, William Dmitri, 4488A.
 Taylor, Charles Edward, 4489A.
 Parsons, Charles Erwin, Jr., 4490A.
 Brown, Preston, 4491A.
 Witham, Bertram High, Jr., 4492A.
 Livesay, Earl James, 4494A.
 Lelsy, Roland Henry, 4495A.
 Meyer, John Charles, 4496A.
 Blatta, Phillip James, 4497A.
 Taylor, Peter Rutherford, 4498A.
 Strother, James French, 4499A.
 Smith, Charles Henry, 4500A.
 Bynum, Richard Edward, Jr., 4501A.
 Todd, William Edward, 4502A.
 Sturges, William Raymond, Jr., 4503A.
 Van Hoozer, Alfred Vance, 4504A.
 Howe, Everett Bo, 4505A.
 Armstrong, Lorraine Farquhar, Jr., 4506A.
 Cello, Gove Clarke, Jr., 4507A.
 Williams, Howard Wilson, 4508A.
 Keller, Charles Richard, Jr., 4509A.
 Meng, William Jones, 4510A.
 Gough, Jamie, 4511A.
 Junkermann, Howard Calvin, 4512A.
 Cloyd, Virgil Mark, 4513A.
 Jones, William Anderson, 4514A.
 Schuck, Francis Joseph, 4515A.
 Shingler, Herbert Ives, Jr., 4516A.
 Kemp, James Dudley, 4517A.
 Ogas, Bernard Vivian, 4518A.
 Franklin, Charles Francis, 4519A.
 Wood, Wilson Roe, 4520A.
 DeLacey, William Howard, 4521A.
 Paxson, Charles Barger, 4522A.
 Hinton, Bruce Houston, 4523A.
 Thomas, Gordon Frank, 4524A.
 Fearch, Lowell Dean, 4525A.
 Darby, George Clifton, Jr., 4526A.
 Abernathy, Louis Madison, 4527A.
 Taylor, Powell Harrison, 4528A.
 Smotherman, Robert Ellis, 4529A.
 Simpson, Charles Cass, Jr., 4530A.
 Stiles, Joseph Ehrhart, 4531A.
 Abbott, Nathan Merrill, 4532A.
 Stewart, Robert Wood, 4533A.
 Hale, Samuel, 4534A.
 Goodman, Gilbert Ernest, 3904A.
 Campbell, Roland Arthur, 4535A.
 McDaniel, Hervey Allison, Jr., 4536A.
 Davis, Joseph, Jr., 4537A.
 Cloud, Howard Haines, Jr., 4538A.
 Taylor, Willis Johnson, 4539A.
 Hopkins, David Linton, 4540A.
 Linder, Kenneth Albert, 4541A.
 White, Joseph Dent, 4542A.
 Marvel, George Bertram, Jr., 4544A.
 Engelman, Frederick Charles, 4545A.
 Netcher, Thomas George, 4546A.
 Sponable, Edson Jay, Jr., 4549A.
 Erb, Gilbert Elmer, 4551A.
 Evans, Edwin Carlos, 4552A.
 Jackson, Clarence John, 4553A.
 Skinner, Oramel Horace, Jr., 4554A.
 Polking, Warren Anthony, 4555A.
 Prim, Kent James, 4557A.
 Teborek, Raymond George, 4558A.
 Hubler, George Oliver, 4559A.
 Duncan, Glenn Emile, 4560A.
 Eichl, Henry Herbert, 4561A.
 Hernlund, Richard Thomas, 4562A.
 Herron, Thomas Jackson, 4564A.
 Bishop, Edwin, Jr., 4566A.
 Allen, Charles Gilpin, 4567A.
 Larson, Robert Hillman, 4568A.
 Lambert, Blake Wallace, 4569A.
 Parsons, Freeman Archie, 4570A.
 Steele, Kenneth Slusser, 4571A.
 McDaniel, Samuel Ray, Jr., 4572A.
 Taylor, William Banks, 4573A.
 Mallory, Robert Frank, 4574A.
 Sorensen, Blair M., 4575A.
 Witt, Theodore John, 4576A.

Prasse, Frederick Teseler, 4577A.
 Ross, William Emmett, 4579A.
 Swan, Arthur Bernhardt, Jr., 4580A.
 Neslen, Alfred Jack, 4443A.
 Hollingsworth, George Herbert, 4581A.
 Alford, David Gaston, 4582A.
 Laybourn, John Eugene, 4583A.
 Ambrose, Elmer Elsworth, 4584A.
 Flanagan, James Lee, 4585A.
 Moore, Harold Elwood, 4586A.
 Hill, Frank Ackerman, 4587A.
 Mears, James Frank, 4588A.
 Spivey, Paulett, 4589A.
 Robb, Harry Wilson, 4590A.
 Norton, Malcolm Eugene, 4592A.
 Riha, Amos Frank, 4593A.
 Maull, Harold Vincent, 4594A.
 Werner, Wesley, 4595A.
 Pruitt, Harold Angus, 4596A.
 Farrell, Robert Howe, 4597A.
 Carleton, Bert Maurice, 4598A.
 Wooley, Preston Bruce, 4599A.
 Sampson, Raymond Donovan, 4600A.
 Mosher, Rowland Orson, 4601A.
 Dysinger, Leonard Stark, 4602A.
 Thacker, John Marshall, 4603A.
 Luschen, Frank Leslie, 4604A.
 Patterson, Ralph Raymond, 4605A.
 Davis, Emmett Smith, 4606A.
 Cleven, Gale Winston, 4607A.
 O'Keefe, Timothy Francis, 4608A.
 Neeley, Richard Cox, 4609A.
 Carey, John Bernard, Jr., 4610A.
 Bowe, Hugh Helby, Jr., 4611A.
 Shoop, Richard Raymond, 4612A.
 Griffin, Richard Varney, 4613A.
 Saad, John Ispiridon, 4614A.
 Chaffin, Andrew Arrol, 4615A.
 Butler, Edward George, 4617A.
 Evans, Harry Lee, Jr., 4619A.
 Weitzenfeld, Richard William, 4620A.
 Haley, Albert Lawrence, 4621A.
 Goerder, Robert Louis, 4622A.
 Etchemendy, John Michael, 4623A.
 Shy, William Malcolm, 4624A.
 Irish, James Robert, 4625A.
 McAllister, Gerald Bennion, 4626A.
 MacDonald, Daniel Venn, 4627A.
 Edris, Gordon Lavern, 4629A.
 Messenger, Lester Charles, 4630A.
 Dacey, Timothy John, Jr., 4631A.
 Whidden, Jack Davis, 4632A.
 Dempster, Kenneth Crawford, 4633A.
 Wikstrom, Floyd Edward, 4634A.
 Bailey, Bryson Robert, 4635A.
 Albright, Clay, 4637A.
 Olson, Clifford Butrix, 4638A.
 Wahlstrom, Norman Oliver, 4639A.
 Kruzel, Joseph John, 4640A.
 Perna, Anthony Joseph, 4641A.
 Burke, Archie Maurice, 4642A.
 Krieger, Andrew Edward, Jr., 4643A.
 Duganne, John Andrew, 4644A.
 Hayes, Jack William, Jr., 4645A.
 Schinz, Albert William, 4646A.
 Lanford, Horace Whaley, Jr., 4648A.
 Clark, Jack Cameron, 4649A.
 Allard, Charles Arthur, 4650A.
 Tavasti, Roy Emil, 4651A.
 Hardy, John Kay, 4652A.
 Bodenhamer, Ross Emsley, 4653A.
 McDonald, Everett Arthur, 4654A.
 Richardson, Harold William, 4655A.
 Kenny, Thomas Francis, Jr., 4656A.
 Bonin, Dwight Edward, 4658A.
 Shaefer, Robert Rowland, 4660A.
 Hearn, John Vernon, Jr., 4661A.
 Aldridge, George Thompson, 4662A.
 Porter, Howard Joseph, 4663A.
 Loudon, Edward Kimball, 4664A.
 Robinson, James Dallas Caswell, 4666A.
 Garland, Ben Allen, 4668A.
 Head, Charles William, Jr., 4669A.
 Hatch, Horace Eldredge, 4670A.
 Wright, Lewis James, 4671A.
 Hayes, Thomas Lloyd, Jr., 4672A.
 Weldon, Thomas Franklin, 4673A.
 Baker, Leonidas, 4674A.
 Brady, Henry Grady, Jr., 4675A.
 Crist, George Harvey, 4676A.
 Galbreath, Samuel Cairnes, 4677A.
 Hoey, Charles Joseph, 4678A.

Killian, Carl Louis, 4679A.
 McCafferty, George O'Day, 4680A.
 Elliott, Frank Bower, 4681A.
 Walker, Leland Arthur, Jr., 4682A.
 Lee, Jay Smith, 4683A.
 Rice, Arthur T., 4684A.
 Shoup, Harry Wesley, 4685A.
 Stafford, Robert Farrell, 4687A.
 Good, Donald Edward, 4688A.
 Brown, Howard Eugene, 4689A.
 Mason, Vincent Elmore, 4690A.
 Timlin, Francis Eugene, 4691A.
 Grable, Francis Lorenz, 4692A.
 Sault, William Edwin, 4693A.
 Von Arb, George William, Jr., 4694A.
 May, Richard Henry, 4695A.
 Bergamyer, Roland Wilson, 4696A.
 Zambon, Louis Basil, 4698A.
 Hopkins, James Iredell, 4699A.
 Hall, Robert Turnbull, Jr., 4700A.
 Glenn, Gale Spencer, 4701A.
 Smith, Herman Fount, 4702A.
 Martin, Clarence Allan, Jr., 4703A.
 Mangan, James Harrison, 4704A.
 Tesch, William Arthur, 4705A.
 Frizen, John Edward, 4706A.
 Moore, Charles Edwin, 4707A.
 Hatfield, Douglas Hampton, 4708A.
 Salvatore, Alexander Ralph, 4709A.
 Lundquist, Gustav Edward, 4710A.
 Walker, William George, Jr., 4711A.
 Brandon, William Harold, 4712A.
 David, Robert George, 4713A.
 Crumly, Harold Jesse, 4714A.
 Mandt, William Frederick, 3d, 4715A.
 Bauley, James Edward, 4716A.
 Sidwell, Lowell Gene, 4717A.
 Rush, Arthur Clement, 4718A.
 Catton, Jack Joseph, 4719A.
 Hawkins, Gabe Coke, 4720A.
 Butman, Paul Milton, 4721A.
 Rumsey, Herman, 4723A.
 Jurkens, Edward Albert, 4724A.
 Mason, Reginald Hoyt, 4725A.

To be majors with rank from December 14, 1950

Stephens, Allen Wright, 7309A.
 Kuntz, Chester Harlan, 7310A.
 Wells, John Pender, 7311A.
 Yancey, Gordon Allen, Jr., 7312A.
 Gault, Charles Edward, 7313A.
 Fleming, George Thomas, 7314A.
 LaBarre, Louis Jay, 7315A.
 Titus, Harold Jack, 7316A.
 Perry, Lucius Alvin, Jr., 7317A.
 Roache, Clarence Edward, Jr., 7318A.
 Hughes, Robert Bernard, 7319A.
 Bergmann, Charles Herman, Jr., 7320A.
 Hereford, Joseph Pierce, 7321A.
 Martin, Rawley White, 7322A.
 Beaty, Sherman Randolph, 7323A.
 Worthman, Paul Emil, 7324A.
 Campbell, Paul Welpheley, 7325A.
 Cobb, Phillip Gray, 7326A.
 Brown, Elwin Olliff, 7327A.
 Partridge, Lewis Joy, 7328A.
 Locher, James Reno, Jr., 7329A.
 Jordan, Wallace Robert, 7330A.
 Grierson, Walter Hayden, 7331A.
 Towne, Raymond Lester, 7332A.
 Andrews, George Edward, 7333A.
 Sommers, Norval Isom, Jr., 7335A.
 Jackson, Loren Elwood, 7336A.
 Hartley, Alice Hoyt, 21269W.
 Hyder, Ralph Charles, 7337A.
 Baker, Roger Norman, 7338A.
 Chadwick, Roscoe Lewis, 7339A.
 Angier, Frank Edward, 7340A.
 Wagner, Harry Alden, 7343A.
 Feeley, John MacGregor, Jr., 7344A.
 Gleed, Edward Creston, 7345A.
 Jella, Leonard L., 7346A.
 Stutzman, Robert Gordon, 7347A.
 Griffiths, Vincent Edward, Sr., 7348A.
 Schrack, Fred Richard, 7349A.
 Hergert, Thomas Malcolm, 7350A.
 Roberts, David Langston, 7351A.
 Alton, Carol Wilson, Jr., 7352A.
 Lazenby, James Elmer, 7354A.
 Mulloney, Daniel Clifford, 7356A.
 Cherota, Frederick William, 7357A.

Washburn, Walter Raleigh, Jr., 7358A.
 Svoboda, Milton Joseph, 7359A.
 Ruckman, Thomas Mayfield, 7360A.
 Lucia, Raymond William, 7361A.
 Brown, Raymond Sedgwick, 7362A.
 Davis, Thomas Julian, 7363A.
 Morris, Wesley Donald, 7364A.
 Nugent, Paul Raymond, 7365A.
 Abrams, James Simeon, 7366A.
 Heck, Frederick Brockway, 7367A.
 Ham, Stephen Paddock, 7368A.
 Dell, John William, 7369A.
 Shields, Benjamin Bayard, 7371A.
 X Rice, Carl Everett, 7372A.
 Gillespie, Calvin Eugene, 7373A.
 X Bonebrake, Robert Raymond, 7374A.
 Harshbarger, Elmer Thomas, 7375A.
 Blitch, Harry Anthony, 7376A.
 Mehalko, George Thomas, 7377A.
 Sedr, William Walter, 19569A.
 Streeton, Jack Wesley, 7378A.
 Daughton, Glenn B., 7379A.
 Wetzel, Albert John, 7380A.
 Calhoun, Philip Clare, 7381A.
 Blasingame, Benjamin Paul, 7382A.
 Stebelton, Samuel Frederick, 7383A.
 Fishburn, Thomas William, 7384A.
 Jones, Russell Park, 7385A.
 Legg, Oliver Morton, 7386A.
 Williams, William Allen, 7388A.
 McKee, James Thomas, 7389A.
 Steere, Samuel Adams, Jr., 7390A.
 Karsokas, Benjamin Anthony, 7391A.
 Hayes, William Donn, Jr., 7392A.
 Jones, Thomas Quaitie, Jr., 7394A.
 Desper, Dale David, 7396A.
 Koehne, George Henry, Jr., 7397A.
 Cullum, Felder Wilson, 7398A.
 Finney, William Leland, 7399A.
 Allen, Franklin Staples, Jr., 7400A.
 Johnson, Leland Warren, 7401A.
 Wright, Ellis William, Jr., 7403A.
 Fitzgerald, John Edward, Jr., 7404A.
 Biddlecome, Bruce Dutton, 7405A.
 Farley, Orville Boyd, 7406A.
 Rowe, Everett Calvin, 7407A.
 Wilcox, Frank Hurst, Jr., 7408A.
 Lane, James Russell, 7409A.
 Ricks, Carlyle, 7410A.
 Eakes, Raymond Timothy, 7412A.
 Cool, Paul Edward, 7413A.
 Baldwin, Robert Percy, 7415A.
 Wilcox, Roland MacGowan, 7416A.
 Jaynes, Roy Arnold, 7417A.
 Stambaugh, Claude Kendall, 7419A.
 Talmage, Henry Gardner, 7420A.
 Powers, John Francis, Jr., 7421A.
 Irby, John Jackson, 7422A.
 Roberts, Frederick Charles, Jr., 7423A.
 Ferran, Charles Gordon, 7425A.
 Crary, Gerald Demarest, Jr., 7426A.
 Dedrickson, Lorin Ross, 7427A.
 Swanke, Edwin Alden, 7428A.
 Suddeth, David Andrew, 7429A.
 Jamison, Donald Calvin, 7430A.
 Conrad, John Hill, 7432A.
 Packard, Peter L. M., 7434A.
 Hinton, Joe Kinney, 7435A.
 Rohr, Louis William, 7436A.
 Howenstine, Kenneth K., 7437A.
 Fletcher, Arthur Amos, Jr., 7438A.
 Munsey, Charles Wayne, 7439A.
 Pavlick, Charles Raleigh, 7440A.
 Gillespie, John Paul, 7441A.
 Sullivan, Edward Donald S., 7442A.
 Saunders, Robert Scott, 18062A.
 Stewart, George Benjamin, 7443A.
 Olney, Richard Bartlett, 7444A.
 Tyler, Robert Andrew, 7445A.
 Herring, Wilber Gunton, 7446A.
 Velde, Robert Lee, 7447A.
 Curtis, Gilbert Lewis, 7448A.
 Eddy, Ernest Chauncey, 7449A.
 Baumgardner, Bruce Kennedy, 7451A.
 Foley, Robert Langdon, 7452A.
 Sawyer, Charles Willard, 7453A.
 Dames, William Herman, 7454A.
 Moley, Charles Anthony, 7455A.
 Miles, Frederick Earl, 7456A.
 Eck, Anthony Ignatious, 7457A.
 Wyman, Frank Melvin, Jr., 7458A.

Berge, Ralph Irving, 7459A.
 Snipes, Gilmer Lee, 7461A.
 Hadley, John Carl, 7462A.
 Call, George William, 7463A.
 Nelson, Raymond Edward, 7464A.
 Hubbard, Edwin William, 7465A.
 Spielan, Richard, 7466A.
 Vanden Heuvel, George Renzo, 7469A.
 Roesch, John Edward, 7470A.
 Olsson, John Shepherd, 7471A.
 Crane, Vincent Mercer, 7472A.
 Denson, Harvey Thomas, 7475A.
 Lillard, James Warren, Jr., 7476A.
 Hale, Richard Eugene, 7477A.
 Smith, Leslie Albert, 7478A.
 Persinger, Thomas Earl, 7479A.
 Edne, James Sidney, 7480A.
 Murphy, James Herbert, 7481A.
 Goddard, Lowell Wesley, 7482A.
 Leahy, Edward David, 7483A.
 Dern, Arthur William, 7485A.
 Paige, Ronald Albert, 7486A.
 Payne, James Osborn, 7488A.
 Hudson, Roland Lee, 7489A.
 Hovik, Clifford Selmer, 7490A.
 Woody, Robert Elwood, 7491A.
 Fitch, Charles Root, 7492A.
 Wray, Robert Alexander, Jr., 7493A.
 Brown, Harvey Neal, 7495A.
 X Hall, James Newton, 7497A.
 Beery, Harold Floyd, 7498A.
 Powers, Robert Bruce, 7499A.
 Boswell, Irving Ward, 7500A.
 Gonzalez, Horace Roger, 7501A.
 Richens, Kent J., 7502A.
 West, Howard Barnell, 7503A.
 Smith, Raymond Miller, 7504A.
 X Bullock, Joe Ragland, 7505A.
 Bailey, James Edmund, Jr., 7506A.
 Koser, Jack Donald, 7508A.
 Thomas, Frank Leslie, 7509A.
 Goss, Ralph Russell, 7510A.
 Wilmot, Allan Eustis, 7511A.
 Sipes, Richard R., 7512A.
 Fellows, Walter Scott, Jr., 7513A.
 Booth, Robert Edwin, 7514A.
 Wells, George Louis, 7516A.
 Karlin, Francis Joseph, 7517A.
 Whitman, Edward Bostwick, Jr., 7518A.
 Cogswell, James Stines, 7519A.
 Swann, Franklin Wilburn, 7520A.
 Clary, Lawson, Jr., 7521A.
 Hansen, Robert Murdock, 7522A.
 Augustine, John Anthony, 3d, 7523A.
 Ellis, Robert Giles, 7524A.
 Swofford, John Forrest, 7526A.
 Holmes, Capers Andrews, Jr., 7527A.
 Lippard, John Albert, 7529A.
 Stanton, Carroll Lane, 7530A.
 Moon, Leo Claire, 7531A.
 Kendrick, James Bain, 7532A.
 Foley, Thomas Francis, 7533A.
 Alken, Albert Shelton, 7535A.
 McCoy, Paul Leslie, 7538A.
 Sisler, Orland Odell, 7539A.
 Smiley, Bert Nelson, 7540A.
 Griffin, Loyd Dean, 7541A.
 Hoffman, Theodore Caldwell, 7542A.
 Beam, James Carroll, 7544A.
 Rowe, William Matthew, 7546A.
 Jarman, James Theodore, 7547A.
 Uglow, Ray Daniel, Jr., 7548A.
 Grass, William Ellis, 7549A.
 Walker, Joe, 7550A.
 Hillyer, Roy Noyes, Jr., 7552A.
 Gay, Alex Henry, Jr., 7553A.
 O'Donnell, John Curran, 7554A.
 Martin, John Landrum, Jr., 7556A.
 Curtis, Robert David, 7557A.
 Whitlow, Floyd Bruner, Jr., 7558A.
 Moore, William Harold, 7559A.
 Patch, Horace Wendell, 7560A.
 Dunken, Allen Grambling, 7561A.
 Duncan, Roy Roscoe, 7563A.
 Bailey, Don Warren, 7564A.
 Berry, Frederick Dee, Jr., 7565A.
 Terzian, Roger Hornsby, 7567A.
 Hays, Norman Pershing, 7568A.
 Humphries, Donald Harrison, 7569A.
 Ruettgers, John Joseph, 7570A.
 McLaughlin, William Carr, 7572A.

Milledge, Henry Lee, 7573A.
 Berg, Walter Warden, 7574A.
 Martin, James Timmons, 7575A.
 Poncik, Victor Jerome, 7576A.
 Victor, Henry Grant, 7577A.
 Ludwig, George Henry, 7579A.
 McFarland, Hugh, 7580A.
 White, Thomas David, 7581A.
 Cannon, John Hinkle, Jr., 7582A.
 Seward, Wayne Jack, 7583A.
 Robb, Stewart Wilsey, 7584A.
 Betts, Russell Wood, Jr., 7585A.
 Blass, Daniel Luther, 7586A.
 Rasmussen, Philip Martin, 7587A.
 Christie, Charles Phillip, 7588A.
 Elvin, Malcolm Peter, 7589A.
 Ledford, Otto Clarence, 7590A.
 Wagnon, Manford Kinney, 7591A.
 Stinson, Lloyd Harold, 7592A.
 Thompson, Kenneth Dean, 7593A.
 Lancaster, James William, 7594A.
 Andrews, Robert Louis, 7595A.
 Hinchee, Robert Lee, 7596A.
 Ehlinger, Joseph Thomas, 7597A.
 Schneider, Albert Henry, 7598A.
 Cotton, Jesse Francis, Jr., 7599A.
 Beckelman, Jack Dwain, 7600A.
 Cooke, Guy, Jr., 7601A.
 Jindrich, Leonard Joseph, 7602A.
 Cook, Thomas Roland, Jr., 7603A.
 Jones, Felix Henley, Jr., 7604A.
 Dula, Mason Aurelius, 7605A.
 Wientjes, Gerard Francis, 7606A.
 Wooten, Clyde Curtis, 7607A.
 Legg, Paul Ashton, 7608A.
 Whitley, Charles George, 7609A.
 Otten, Leonard John, Jr., 7610A.
 Engle, Robert Thomas, 7611A.
 Jones, Lyle Merritt, 7612A.
 Rhodes, Hugh Egbert, 7613A.
 Blair, Alan Howard, 7614A.
 Davis, William Osborne, 7615A.
 Remillard, David Harold, 7616A.
 Mays, Ivan Kenneth, 7617A.
 Classen, Thomas John, 7618A.
 Martin, Wallace Stelle, Jr., 7619A.
 Terhune, Claude Mitchell, 7620A.
 Armstrong, George Harmon, Jr., 7621A.
 Dease, George Carl, 7622A.
 Sampson, Victor, Jr., 7623A.
 Smith, Carroll C., 7624A.
 Barnum, Robert Alexander, 7625A.
 Feist, Robert Douglas, 7626A.
 Robinson, Donald Allister, Jr., 7627A.
 Balkum, Earl Thomas, 7628A.
 Welch, James Edward, 7629A.
 Boardman, Robert Laurence, 7630A.
 Best, Jack Raymond, 7631A.
 Campbell, Chester McDonald, 7632A.
 Hoffmann, Carl David, 7633A.
 Hutton, Leonard Jackson, 7634A.
 Crandell, John Abner, Jr., 7635A.
 Russell, Roy Davis, 7636A.
 Toole, Richard Allen, 7637A.
 Ford, Louis William, 7638A.
 Van De Car, Howard Thomas, 7639A.
 Farwell, Robert Harvey, 7640A.
 Catington, James Douglas, 7641A.
 Ivey, William Glenn, 7643A.
 Cape, Rolf Douglas, 7644A.
 Fishburne, Paul Lee, 7645A.
 Burcky, Max Calvin, 7646A.
 Thompson, Harry Melvin, 7648A.
 Shackelford, Walter Scott, Jr., 7649A.
 Lemme, William Philip, 7650A.
 White, Joe Ross, 7651A.
 Peaslee, Jesse Clair, 7652A.
 Vall, Hugh Beugler, 7654A.
 Bledsoe, Joseph Vernon, 7655A.
 Watts, George Joseph, 7656A.
 Robinson, William Cyrus, 7657A.
 Kolander, Conrad Carl, Jr., 7658A.
 Otto, Robert Cushman, 7659A.
 Bachmann, Frederick Clemens, 7660A.
 Graham, John Kessler, 7661A.
 Hosman, Richard Sutton, 7662A.
 Kincannon, Francis Chase, 7663A.
 Jordan, Samuel Peele, 7664A.
 Lyon, Arthur Benjamin, Jr., 7665A.
 Welch, Rupert Carlton, 7666A.
 Fryer, Milton, 7668A.
 Marshall, Tom Lee, 7669A.
 Langford, Robert Irving, 7670A.
 Clarke, Clarence J., 7671A.
 Swanson, Ralph William, 7672A.
 Turnbull, John Frederick, 7673A.
 Mansell, Morris Enoch, Jr., 7674A.
 Marshall, Prevost, 7675A.
 Jones, William Orville, 7676A.
 Harmon, David Noah, 7677A.
 Holmes, Francis Sieg, 7678A.
 Cryer, James Magill, Jr., 7679A.
 Shaver, Dale Anderson, 7680A.
 Hankin, Abraham Louis, 7681A.
 Tilley, George Franklin, Jr., 7682A.
 Brown, Mark Josiah, Jr., 7683A.
 Oder, Frederic Carl Emil, 7684A.
 Murray, James Lore, 7685A.
 Dunn, Raymond Bennett, 7686A.
 Deans, Edwin Gray, 7690A.
 Carpenter, Hervey Benjamin, 7691A.
 Williams, Augustus Forney, Jr., 7692A.
 Reynolds, Andrew Jackson, 7693A.
 Duncan, Charles Henry, 7695A.
 Tomlinson, Franklin Eugene, 7696A.
 Howie, Loren Donald, 7699A.
 Adams, Ben Millard, 7701A.
 Marks, Mortimer David, 7702A.
 Elgenmann, John Christian, 7703A.
 Porter, Clarence Woodrow, 7704A.
 Riley, Earl Vaughan, 7706A.
 Harriger, Robert Lee, 7707A.
 Lewis, Charles Daniel, 7708A.
 Cavanagh, John Timothy, 7709A.
 Wine, Chester Bolton, 7710A.
 Munsey, Ned Gaines, 7711A.
 Davis, Dale D., 7713A.
 Olson, Royce Glenmore, 7714A.
 McConnell, William Scott, Jr., 7715A.
 Wood, Griffin Howard, 7716A.
 Thorne, Walter Edward, 7717A.
 Gilmore, Byron Harold, 7718A.
 Shaw, Charles Howard, 7719A.
 Bicknell, June E. Jr., 7720A.
 Deck, H. A., 7721A.
 Sather, Harley, 7722A.
 Teberg, Daniel Ernest, 7723A.
 Mead, Henry Lowell, 7724A.
 Service, Robert Hubbard, 7725A.
 Bailey, John Robert, 7726A.
 Carhart, Thomas Merritt, 7727A.
 Vaught, Robert Harry, 7728A.
 Hammer, Elmer Heath, Jr., 7729A.
 Prouty, Leroy Fletcher, Jr., 7730A.
 Minor, Marion Edward, Jr., 7731A.
 Huffman, Roy Edward, 7732A.
 Williams, George Vincent, 7733A.
 Brantley, Joseph Ray, 7734A.
 Whitney, William James, 7735A.
 Stulb, Joseph George, Jr., 7736A.
 Brundrett, Warner Morris, 7737A.
 Paschall, Benjamin Franklin, 3d, 7738A.
 Edwards, Allen, 7739A.
 Gwynn, Philip Simms, 7740A.
 Merten, Donald Herman, 7741A.
 Ricks, Thomas Jesse, Jr., 7742A.
 Williams, Jack Wilford, 7743A.
 Cole, Frederick John, 7744A.
 Wilkinson, Richard Gaddis, 7745A.
 Bratcher, Douglas Howard, 7746A.
 Moody, David Bloom, 7747A.
 McCarthy, Eugene John, 7748A.
 Simpson, Robert Tennent, 4th, 7749A.
 Kronauer, Clifford John, Jr., 7750A.
 Phillips, Robert Ernest, 7751A.
 Wheeler, Joe Dell, 7754A.
 Shahan, Michael Ellsworth, 7756A.
 Zweifel, Everett E., 7758A.
 Gattis, Robert Houston, 7759A.
 Stealy, Edward James, 7760A.
 Graham, Gordon Marion, 7761A.
 Abbotts, Lloyd Ferdinand, 7762A.
 McClellan, Howard William, 7763A.
 Cooper, Talmage DeWitt, Jr., 7764A.
 Turner, John Mac, 7765A.
 Busby, Douglas Ray, 7767A.
 Hurt, Wilbur Wellington, 7768A.
 Eberts, Major David, 7769A.
 Sapp, James Franklin, 7770A.
 Mehaffey, Nathan Gene, 7771A.
 Fowler, Thomas R., 7772A.
 Salzarulo, Robert Louis, 7773A.
 Harbour, David Frank, 7775A.
 Nelander, Frederick James, 7776A.
 Todd, Robert Francis, 7777A.
 Colson, William Benton, 7778A.
 Cox, Lucien Kozak, 7779A.
 Wilde, Linn Erlon, Jr., 7780A.
 Redman, Russell Lee, 7781A.
 Langdale, Robert Hammel, 7782A.
 Powers, Kenneth Henry, 7783A.
 Kelley, Wendell James, 7784A.
 Lewis, Glen, Jr., 7785A.
 Nelson, Conrad Nathaniel, 7786A.
 Ponder, Paul Holloway, Jr., 7787A.
 McClellan, John Barclay, 7788A.
 Burnstedt, Lloyd Ellis, 7789A.
 Land, William Mordecai, Jr., 7790A.
 Wegenhoft, Victor Charles, 7791A.
 Nance, Nicholas Haywood, 7792A.
 Broome, William Bohler, Jr., 7793A.
 Klechel, Walter, Jr., 7794A.
 Wellborn, Jeffery O'Neal, 7795A.
 Newton, George Lucius, Jr., 7796A.
 Van Patten, Isaac Toll, 3d, 7797A.
 Romstad, Rolf Norman, 7798A.
 Scarbrough, Ben Allen, 7799A.
 Hood, John Robinson, Jr., 7800A.
 Jacobsen, Otto Fredrick, 7801A.
 Price, William Gray, 3d, 7802A.
 Ledbetter, Henry Franklin, Jr., 7804A.
 Nichols, Edward McIntyre, Jr., 7805A.
 Bryant, Perry Killian, 7806A.
 Nielsen, Melvin Jesse, 7808A.
 Spaw, Douglas Wilson, 7809A.
 Hutchinson, Leonard Hugh, 7810A.
 Dodge, John Alfred, 7811A.
 Ferguson, Clay Van Dalsem, 7813A.
 Witters, Arthur George, 7814A.
 Williams, Walter Phippen, 7815A.
 White, Jack Clement, 7816A.
 Murphy, Maurice Edward, 7817A.
 Oppy, Paul Francis, 7818A.
 Waslenko, Michael, Jr., 7819A.
 Lunceford, Sigmon Austin, 7820A.
 Brocklehurst, Robert Lewis, 7821A.
 Baron, Oakley Walter, 7822A.
 Ingram, James Woodrow, 7823A.
 O'Neil, George Keith, 7824A.
 Bausser, William Jerome, 7825A.
 Findley, Harry Wilson, 7826A.
 Derr, Howard Stanley, 7827A.
 Curtis, Ferd John, 7828A.
 Gaff, John Wilson, Jr., 7829A.
 Bjoring, Robert George, 7831A.
 Diltz, Theo Roy, 7832A.
 Wright, Frank Edward, 7833A.
 Peck, Douglas Montgomery, 7834A.
 Walker, Ralph Lee, 7836A.
 Ralston, Wilson, 7838A.
 Berkow, Joseph Jeffrey, 7839A.
 Hagin, William Van, 7840A.
 Underwood, Herbert Arthur, 7841A.
 Buckey, George Rufus, 7842A.
 Abel, George LeRoy, 7845A.
 Lennox, Weston Monroe, 7846A.
 Atkinson, William Joseph, 7847A.
 Slocumb, Clyde Buchanan, Jr., 7848A.
 Martin, Gene Ivan, 7849A.
 Robinson, John Sidney, 7850A.
 Keefe, Thomas William, Jr., 7851A.
 Van Pelt, James Hilligoss, 7852A.
 Davidson, William Herman, 7853A.
 Rhees, Gilbert Neal, 7855A.
 Hodges, Kenneth Sherrill, 7856A.
 Walsh, Howard Benjamin, 7857A.
 Siler, Fred LeRay, 7858A.
 Gilmore, James David, 7859A.
 Couser, Walter John, Jr., 7860A.
 Miller, William Clinton, 7861A.
 Kyer, Fred Earl, 7862A.
 Stone, Albert Wilson, 7863A.
 Nesmith, Joseph Frederick, 7864A.
 Kinney, George Warren, 7865A.
 DeMal, Nicholas, Jr., 7866A.
 Farnell, Leland Borden, Jr., 7867A.
 Hook, Leo, 7868A.
 McGinn, John Leon, 7869A.
 Shelton, Orville William, 7870A.
 Fisher, Carl Byrd, 7871A.
 Brown, Harold Rowe, 7872A.
 Crabtree, Frank Ray, 7875A.
 Knepper, Frank Bernard, Jr., 7876A.

Hannah, Raymond Clifford, 7877A.
 Player, George Carlton, Jr., 7878A.
 Scepansky, Joe Thomas, 7879A.
 Erlenbusch, William Christian, 7880A.
 Hill, John Michiel, 7881A.
 Hawkins, Harry Lowell, 7883A.
 Furchner, Fred Thomas, 7884A.
 Morgan, Roy, 7887A.
 Conrad, Chester Melvin, 7888A.
 Metcalfe, Lee Edward, 7889A.
 Hotte, Eugene Theodore, 7890A.
 Smith, Raleigh Delmer, 7891A.
 Bird, Charles H., 7892A.
 McKinnis, Burdette Jones, 7893A.
 Rasor, Frank James Pierce, 7894A.
 Willey, Carl Raymond, 7895A.
 Dawson, Peter Paul, 7896A.
 Grubaugh, Boyd Lee, 7897A.
 Dressler, Gordon Albert, 7898A.
 McCord, Robert Ralph, 7899A.
 Lollar, Clarence LaVerne, 7900A.
 Price, Jack Clayton, 7901A.
 Schultz, Leonard Corwin, 7902A.
 Smith, B. J., 7903A.
 Woodring, Dugan V., 7904A.
 Keppler, Charles Nelson, 7905A.
 Neffinger, George Gail, 7906A.
 Kelley, Gordon Milford, 7907A.
 Ferguson, Robert Irving, 7908A.
 Thompson, John Arthur, 7909A.
 Malone, Frank Cletis, 7910A.
 Hall, Robert William, 7911A.
 Haning, William Frees, Jr., 7912A.
 Highley, John Norgrove, 7913A.
 Carmody, Richard John, 7914A.
 Luehring, Veri Dean, 7915A.
 O'Hara, Richard Kiernan, 7916A.
 Hensch, Ralph Vale, 7917A.
 Welch, George Coleman, 7918A.
 Quinn, Robert Francis, 7919A.
 Cristadoro, Maurice Anthony, Jr., 7920A.
 Freund, Albert Joseph, 7921A.
 Sandman, George King, 7922A.
 Tyler, Morgan Seymour, Jr., 7923A.
 Bodine, Francis Stephen, 7924A.
 Sams, Walter Birt, 7925A.
 Summerfield, Leslie Francis, 7926A.
 Streete, Alec Beaver, 7927A.
 Beale, William Henry, Jr., 7928A.
 Milch, Lawrence Jacques, 7929A.
 Would, William Jeffrey, 7930A.
 Royalty, William Saufley, Jr., 7931A.
 Snow, David Joseph, 7932A.
 Watkins, Loy Edwin, 7933A.
 Welch, Darrell Gail, 7934A.
 Snyder, Vincent Lucian, 7935A.
 Larrabee, Vance Henry, 7936A.
 Cappelletti, Francis Ronald, 7937A.
 Pearsall, David Williams, 7938A.
 Kenworthy, Charles Clifford, Jr., 7939A.
 Houston, William Marshall, 7940A.
 Dech, Robert Wagner, 7941A.
 Anzelon, George Joseph, 7942A.
 Sharp, William Eugene, 7943A.
 Kelley, Keith Patrick, 7944A.
 Sianis, Pete Chris, 7945A.
 Carney, Arthur William, 7946A.
 McKean, Harold Louis, 7947A.
 Fuchs, Marlon Jullion, 7949A.
 Williams, Lawrence Dale, 7950A.
 Bell, Charles Austin, 7952A.
 Parris, Howard Lindsey, 7953A.
 Teizrow, Thomas Eugene, 7954A.
 Tyler, John Thomas, 7955A.
 Briggs, Arthur Flem, 2d, 7956A.
 Hall, Mark Beardsley, 7957A.
 Elwell, Robert Lowell, 7958A.
 Cavender, John Proctor Knott, 7960A.
 Trail, Charles Darwin, 7961A.
 Fuller, Herbert Kaufman, 7962A.
 Anderson, Truman Foster, 7963A.
 Remakius, John Phil, Jr., 7964A.
 Kirby, Robert Leslie, 7965A.
 Tisdale, Paul Arthur, 7967A.
 Horne, John Edwin, 7968A.
 Turner, Lewis Mack, 7969A.
 Kent, Herbert William, 7970A.
 Shirley, Fred Allen, 7971A.
 Foster, William Wallace, Jr., 7972A.

Moore, Jack Edwin, 7973A.
 Johnson, Frank Edward, 7974A.
 Walrath, Richard Drake, 7975A.
 Producers, John David, 7976A.
 Conner, Hal Cheney, 7977A.
 Jolissaint, John Mire, 7807A.
 Toler, Richard Grant, 7978A.
 Claytor, Roy Frank, 7979A.
 Bryson, William Curtis, 7980A.
 Rydstrom, Jean Frederic, 7982A.
 Avery, Lyndall John, 7984A.
 Harrison, Morgan Randolph, 7985A.
 Geer, Virgil Clyde, 7986A.
 Westbrook, Jasper Alton, 7987A.
 Sherman, Lenard, 7988A.
 Wilder, Harlan Cree, 7989A.
 McNeeley, Harold Lee, 7990A.
 Spencer, Gordon Abbott, 7991A.
 Jensen, Ralph Albert, 7992A.
 Smith, Cecil Burnett, 7993A.
 Stitt, Austin Walter, Jr., 7994A.
 Nelson, Marshall Edwin, 7996A.
 Smith, John Robert, 7999A.
 Newman, Ralph Anderson, 8001A.
 Cook, Emery Alan, 8004A.
 Fitter, Philip Augustine, 8005A.
 Schuknecht, Lowell Albert, 8006A.
 Fain, Robert Snead, 8007A.
 Meyer, Charles Robert, 8008A.
 Deegan, Leo Francis, 8009A.
 Evans, Calvin Edmond, 8010A.
 Reardon, John Charles, 8011A.
 Bloom, Edmund Stanley, 8012A.
 Walker, George Theodore, 8013A.
 Christman, Harry William, Jr., 8014A.
 Frisbee, John Lee, 8015A.
 Smith, Alan Bronson, Jr., 8016A.
 Sowers, Gordon Thomas, 8017A.
 Thompson, Francis Newton, 8018A.
 Tauscher, Robert Edward, 8019A.
 Freeman, David Lloyd, 8020A.
 Ferguson, John Jacob, 8021A.
 Shivers, Julius Dewitt, Jr., 8022A.
 Dregne, Irwin Hendrick, 8023A.
 Franz, Fred John, 8024A.
 Krause, Lester Livingstone, Jr., 8025A.
 Bland, John William, 8026A.
 Burke, Sylvester Vernon, 8028A.
 Snyder, Edgar Ernest, Jr., 8029A.
 Webb, Allen Stern, 8030A.
 Farrar, John Wynn, 8031A.
 Blair, Samuel Vernon, 8032A.
 Peterson, Harry Graham, 8033A.
 Howell, Winfred Dennis, 8034A.
 Anderson, Delynn Edward, 8035A.
 Geary, Leo Paul, 8037A.
 McClure, John Crile, 8038A.
 Carter, Roger Mills, Jr., 8039A.
 Sherwood, Joseph Huling, Jr., 8040A.
 Ryan, John Leonard, 8041A.
 Fuhrmeister, Ralph Stream, Jr., 8042A.
 McComb, William John, 8043A.
 Kendall, Paul Cross, 8044A.
 Jenkins, Everett Kelley, Jr., 8045A.
 Williams, James Madison, 8046A.
 Strickler, Marshall Handy, 8047A.
 Moffitt, Franklyn Elwood, 8048A.
 Tilley, Thomas Marshall, 8049A.
 Lathan, Allan Adale, 8050A.
 Bird, Clement William, 8051A.
 Small, Arthur, 8052A.
 Reed, Henry Clay, 8053A.
 Sullivan, Woodruff Turner, Jr., 8054A.
 Radetsky, Harold Arnold, 8055A.
 Blum, Edward Francis, 8056A.
 Omohundro, Thomas Tipton, 8057A.
 Hagreen, Robert John, 8058A.
 Harris, William Bruce, 8059A.
 Kelly, Converse Beach, 8060A.
 Riva, Daniel Francis, 8061A.
 Rathbun, Edward Lyon, 8062A.
 Derr, Herbert Odell, 8063A.
 Uhrich, George Adam, 8064A.
 Jones, David Reese, 8065A.
 Roth, John Y. Crawford, 8066A.
 Tainsh, Alexander Simpson, 8068A.
 Parsons, James Wellington, 8069A.
 Robertson, Eddie Joseph, Jr., 8070A.
 Brooking, George Robert, 8071A.

Sauer, Robert Raymond, 8072A.
 Douglas, Paul Page, Jr., 8073A.
 Slocum, Paul James, 8074A.
 Ritchie, William Dee, 8076A.
 Roddy, Edward Francis, 8077A.
 Ivey, William Holder, 8078A.
 Durbeck, Arthur George, 8079A.
 Mitchell, Mack Ashton, 8080A.
 Renwick, Donald Dean, 8081A.
 Morse, Donald MacMillan, 8082A.
 Klein, Raymond Paul, 8084A.
 Walsh, Martin Raymond, Jr., 8085A.
 Amann, John Robert, 8086A.
 Quillen, Monroe Carl, 8087A.
 Willetts, David Leonard, 8088A.
 Ramsey, Glyn Wilburn, 8089A.
 Calhoun, William Rodwell, Jr., 8090A.
 Carey, John Audubon, 8091A.
 Short, William Walter, Jr., 8092A.
 Cole, George Peyton, 8093A.
 Elliott, William Wayne, 8094A.
 Ellington, Edward Hamlet, 8095A.
 Marks, Leonard Peter, 8096A.
 Dunham, William Douglas, 8097A.
 Cook, Walter Vaughn, 8098A.
 Little, James Walter, 8099A.
 Killen, Leo William, 8100A.
 Ryden, Donald Anderson, 8101A.
 Phillips, Herbert Leslie, 8102A.
 Stellenwerf, William Atkinson, 8104A.
 Johnson, Charles William, 8105A.
 Holcombe, Richard Eugene, 8106A.
 Cruikshank, Arthur Waur, Jr., 8107A.
 McClatchy, Howard Lee, 8109A.
 Hawkins, William Brevard, Jr., 8110A.
 Price, Robert Franklin, 8111A.
 Oglesby, Sam Russell, Jr., 8112A.
 Sylvester, Joseph James, 8113A.
 Whittaker, Roy Eugene, 8115A.
 Stansbury, Jay Wayne, 8116A.
 Roby, Albert Wilson, Jr., 8117A.
 Napier, John Gilbert, 8118A.
 Gregory, James Madison, Jr., 8119A.
 Ferguson, Robert Munro, 8120A.
 Moser, Alfred Leslie, 8121A.
 Jose, Elmer Howard, Jr., 8122A.
 Halloran, Robert Patrick, 8036A.
 Wright, Theodore Roger, Jr., 8123A.
 Yundt, Robert Wellings, 8124A.
 Nye, Robert Millard, 8125A.
 Williams, Charles Carter, 8126A.
 Aenckbacher, Arthur Eugene, 8127A.
 Brown, William Francis, 8128A.
 Robinson, Edgar Abram, 8129A.
 Fahey, James Martin, 8131A.
 Thorne, James Howard, 8132A.
 Carlton, Robert Nichols, 8133A.
 Carpenter, David Erwin, 8134A.
 Rahn, Gilbert Frank, 8135A.
 Hetzel, Robert Lewis, 8136A.
 Gardiner, Paul Eugene, 8137A.
 Anderson, Leonard Ward, 8138A.
 Foley, Robert Patrick, 8139A.
 Moore, William Paul, 8140A.
 Hutchison, Jacob Anderson, 8141A.
 Conklin, Howard Elmer, 8142A.
 Wilson, James Arthur, 8143A.
 Teubner, Harold Charles, 8145A.
 Wallace, Eugene Dye, 8146A.
 Neece, Richard Davis, Jr., 8147A.
 Joyal, Philip Eugene, 8149A.
 Tarvin, Russell Wayne, 8150A.
 Shook, Harold Graham, 8151A.
 Cranfill, Niven Kendall, 8152A.
 Gham, Elmer Floyd, 8153A.
 Booker, Brooks William, Jr., 8155A.
 Rogers, Robert Conant, 8156A.
 Bones, James Clinton, 8157A.
 Maher, William LeRoy, 8158A.
 Robertson, Raynor Easterling, 8160A.
 Gandy, Hilliard Leon, 8161A.
 Lewis, Richard Calvin, 8162A.
 Dilly, Vincent Sylvester, 8163A.
 Fulcher, Stanley Albert, 8164A.
 Neal, Philip Andrew, 8165A.
 Jefferson, Harold Dakan, 8166A.
 Crosland, Roy Truett, 8167A.
 Ard, Roswell William, 8168A.
 Beahan, Kermit King, 8169A.
 Lewis, William Charles, 8170A.

Martin, Fred Arnett, 8171A.
 McAbee, William Howard, 8172A.
 Messman, Howard Arthur, 8173A.
 Conway, Victor Cornelius, 8174A.
 Lee, Carl Cris, 8175A.
 Lanford, William Archibald, 8176A.
 Oliver, Ralph Lorimer, 8177A.
 Friley, Kenneth Owen, 8178A.
 Larson, Harold Jacobson, 8180A.
 Casey, William Joseph, 8181A.
 Cook, James Rawdon, 8182A.
 Sharon, Cora Edra, 21271W.
 Parsons, Irvin Millard, 8182A.
 Hodge, Dexter Lawrence, 8185A.
 Jernigan, William LeRoy, 8186A.
 Weltzin, Richard Fredrick, 8187A.
 Huntley, William Henry, Jr., 8188A.
 Stell, Glenn Aswell, 8189A.
 Pickett, Lawrence Jackson, 8190A.
 Greene, James Barrow, 8192A.
 Dale, James Roy, Jr., 8193A.
 Zeigler, Jack Spiers, 8194A.
 Hey, Winston Snowden, 8195A.
 Jolly, David Chester, 8196A.
 Dieffenderfer, James Clark, 8197A.
 Parsons, Samuel Polk, 8198A.
 Des Portes, John Augustus, 8199A.
 Coleman, Kenneth Donald, 8200A.
 Estes, Chandler Bayard, 8202A.
 Brown, Harold Lovelace, 8203A.
 Merrill, Charles Thomas, 8204A.
 Glaser, Leonard Tulare, 8205A.
 Knox, George Levi, 8206A.
 Jackson, Howard Edward, 8207A.
 Dillon, Stephen Patrick, 8209A.
 Hester, Thomas Jefferson, 8210A.
 Hardin, Ernest Charles, Jr., 8211A.
 Oglesby, Stuart Roscoe, 3d, 8212A.
 Pickford, Jack Cedric, 8213A.
 Greathouse, Harry Smith, 8214A.
 Davis, Glendon Valley, 8215A.
 Weeks, James Lew, 8216A.
 Butler, Earl Howard, 8217A.
 Herrick, Harold James, 8218A.
 Myers, Henry Vernon, 8219A.
 Meeker, Everett Roscoe, 8220A.
 Howell, Henry Randolph, Jr., 8221A.
 Long, Joseph Edward, 8222A.
 Byers, Edward Franklin, 8223A.
 Luepke, Cornell John, 8224A.
 Theisen, Emmett John, 8225A.
 Gilbert, Raymond Arthur, 8226A.
 Miller, Eugene Francis, 8227A.
 Taylor, Richard Winn, 8228A.
 Loughry, Robert Johnson, 8229A.
 Yon, Pershing Lockey, 8230A.
 Howes, Francis Bradford, Jr., 8231A.
 Schaal, William Richard, 8232A.
 Selden, Littleton Cole, 8233A.
 Thompson, Dan Fox, 8234A.
 Hoermann, Francis James, 8235A.
 Brodie, George Fontaine, Jr., 8236A.
 Taylor, Robert Harold, 8237A.
 Kaufman, Alfred, 8238A.
 Black, William Morrison, 8239A.
 Wobbe, Roger Lawrence, 8240A.
 Steakley, Ralph Douglas, 8241A.
 Fears, James William, 8242A.
 Whitmire, James Martin, Jr., 8243A.
 Smith, Edward Donald, 8244A.
 Svore, Ferdinand Luther, 8246A.
 Wray, Cletus, 8248A.
 Cox, Elizabeth Narcissus, 21272W.
 Kurz, Albert Adam, 8249A.
 Hatch, Lewis Marvin, 8251A.
 Alois, Frank James, 8252A.
 Boles, Homer Clem, 8253A.
 Roberts, Sam Alfred, 8254A.
 Nixon, Robert Lee, 8255A.
 Nestor, Vergil Nick, 8256A.
 Neil, Charles Verne, 8258A.
 Smith, Elmer Frank, 8259A.
 Tyler, Joe Milton, 8260A.
 Larrick, Percie James, 8261A.
 Rogers, Herbert Joseph, 8262A.
 Hunter, Floyd Williams, Jr., 8263A.
 Williams, De Jack, 8264A.
 Wiehrdt, Leonard Irving, 8265A.

MacKay, Neill Camp, 8266A.
 Aubrey, Carl Lee, 8267A.
 Peck, Fred Ross, Jr., 8268A.
 McRaven, Claude Coy, 8269A.
 Wilkerson, William Frank, 8270A.
 Relfe, Robert Wylie, 8271A.
 Nielsen, Leonard Emery, 8272A.
 Hamilton, Joseph Coursin, Jr., 8273A.
 Bridges, Dewey Rodgers, 8274A.
 Johnson, Paul Esrom, Jr., 8275A.
 Beall, J. Mac, 8276A.
 Papania, Ralph, Jr., 8277A.
 Sorte, Martin Eugene, 8278A.
 Ewing, Donald Walker, 8279A.
 Payne, Carl Goolshee, 8280A.
 Newland, Martin Kenneth, 8281A.
 Martin, Lloyd, Jr., 8282A.
 Winkler, John Moon, 8283A.
 Twichell, Wallace Bruce, Jr., 8284A.
 Mansfield, Richard Miner, 8285A.
 Tanberg, Lawrence Frederick, 8286A.
 Edwards, Wilbur Hugh, 8289A.
 Smith, Derwood Keith, 8290A.
 Whitehorn, Kenneth Walker, 8291A.
 Westfall, William Bryan, 8292A.
 Andrae, Andreas Arthur, 8293A.
 Sanders, Harry Glenn, 8294A.
 Ducote, Marc Marmaderle, Jr., 8295A.
 Silliman, Clifford Roger, 8296A.
 Rankin, Warner Frank, Jr., 8297A.
 Childress, Raymond Keith, 8298A.
 Burns, Harold William, 8299A.
 Parker, Julian Wilsey, 8300A.
 Fischer, Henry Arthur, Jr., 8301A.
 Yarbrough, Walter Rudell, 8302A.
 Benner, John George, 8303A.
 Morris, Robert Carlock, Jr., 8304A.
 Coutts, Richard Lee, 8305A.
 Robertson, Philip Owen, 8306A.
 Frazier, Edwin Becton, 8307A.
 Cook, Leo Winford, 8308A.
 Payne, Carl Wilson, 8309A.
 McGuire, Troy B., 8310A.
 Johnston, George Henry, 8311A.
 Daunt, John Joseph, Jr., 8312A.
 Smith, Robert Emmett, 8313A.
 Uhle, Richard Bauer, 8314A.
 Baker, Royal Newman, 8315A.
 Sabin, Flavel Provine, 8316A.
 Tucker, Norman Percy, 8317A.
 Fields, Melvin Edwin, 8318A.
 Brundage, Theodore Thompson, 8320A.
 Blatt, Seymour, 8321A.
 Cryer, Elmer Harold, 8323A.
 Jack, Chester Arthur, 8324A.
 Cook, Richard Henry, 8325A.
 Roberts, Ben H., 8326A.
 Jobanek, Wilbur Lewis, 8327A.
 Kyzer, David Arthur, 8328A.
 Thornton, Clark Olmsted, 8329A.
 Schlupp, John Alexander, 8330A.
 Perry, Bruce Lee, 8331A.
 Key, William David, 8332A.
 Guyton, John Alexander, 8333A.
 Watson, Oscar Lafayette, 8334A.
 Taylor, Fitz Gerald, 8335A.
 Cheney, James Spiers, 8336A.
 Shapton, Leslie Douglas, 8337A.
 Jackson, Edgar Ray, Jr., 18106A.
 Schratz, Robert Kress, 8338A.
 Mixson, Marion Clarke, 8339A.
 Hill, Landon Prescott, 8340A.
 Joyce, Thomas Byron, 8341A.
 Lucas, Henry Edward, 8342A.
 Brown, Winfield Henry, 8343A.
 Helser, Sherwood Watkins, 8344A.
 Foy, John Patrick, 8345A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 11 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Peter I. Bukowski, of Illinois, to be Deputy Administrator of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 11, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have entered upon a new week with problems and responsibilities which challenge the best that is in us and which demand the consecration of our noblest manhood and womanhood.

We pray that in these times of tremendous economic and social upheavals and of tense and discordant international relationships, our moral and spiritual ideals may remain unshaken for if these foundations are destroyed, what can the righteous do?

Grant that the social order, which we are seeking to establish upon this earth, may have in it the spirit of reverence and devotion to Thee, of justice and good will toward all mankind, and of mutual trust and helpfulness.

Inspire us with an increasing concern and compassion for all who are in need. May we sense the high privilege of fellowship with Thee and with one another in the glorious enterprise of ministering to the welfare and happiness of men and nations everywhere.

In Christ's name we offer our prayer.
 Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 7, 1951, 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 joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 51. Joint resolution providing for United States participation in the celebration at Philadelphia, Pa., of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 51-23.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MASON asked and was given permission to address the House for 30 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and include an address given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].