

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RODINO: Committee of Conference. H. R. 1424. A bill for the relief of T. L. Morrow (Rept. No. 583). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 1087. A bill to amend title 18, section 3618, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, to empower the courts to remit or mitigate forfeitures; with amendment (Rept. No. 584). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3095. A bill to authorize payment of salaries and expenses of officials of the Klamath Tribe; with amendment (Rept. No. 585). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 4473. (A bill to provide revenue, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 586). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 4496. A bill making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4497. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to provide for more effective consultation with interests affected by its administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POLK:

H. R. 4498. A bill to permit the Ohio Society of Washington to erect a shelter house in East Potomac Park, in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 4499. A bill to provide that certain women officers of the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps shall have the rank of brigadier general and that certain women officers of the Navy shall have the rank of rear admiral; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 4500. A bill granting an increase in pension to certain widows and remarried widows of Civil War veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, urging enactment of legislation granting aid to Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By THE SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to assembly joint resolution No. 38, relating to the reopening of Birmingham General Hospital; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to senate resolution No. 310, being opposed to social-security taxes on maids and domestic help, and requesting the Senators and Representatives elected from Texas to use their utmost influence in opposition to said project; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN:

H. R. 4501. A bill for the relief of Maria Teresa Ortega Perez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4502. A bill for the relief of Santos Sanabria Alvarez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORAND:

H. R. 4503. A bill for the relief of Suzanne Marie Schatz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 4504. A bill for the relief of Dr. Philip Bloemsma and Mrs. Joy Roelink Bloemsma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4505. A bill for the relief of Tien Koo Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H. R. 4506. A bill for the relief of Marcel Duvivier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4507. A bill for the relief of John J. Braund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H. R. 4508. A bill for the relief of Dr. Abraham Richard Best; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

322. Mr. HESELTON presented a resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact certain legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 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:

Almighty and everlasting God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed: As the torch of a new day lights afresh the path of duty, we bow before Thee in humility and hope. As Thou hast bound together the free peoples of the earth, with all their differing traditions and cultures in a costly struggle to preserve their threatened liberties, hold them together, we beseech Thee, in a stern resolve which can never be broken by any sinister force bent on enslaving the earth.

Hasten, we pray, through us the day of an ampler life for all, when every man shall dwell in safety among his neighbors, free from gnawing want, free from torturing fears, free to speak his thoughts and free to choose his altar of worship. Above all other acclaim or reward in these searching days we crave the assurance of Thy approving voice: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they

shall be called the children of God." We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 18, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1025) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The message notified the Senate that the House having had under consideration the joint resolution of the Senate (S. J. Res. 70) to suspend the application of certain Federal laws with respect to an attorney employed by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, had rejected the same.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 157. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

H. R. 302. An act to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 1183. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official registers of their respective services;

H. R. 1733. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2321. An act to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs;

H. R. 2995. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder;

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C., sec. 353);

H. R. 3861. An act to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farm-house loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950;

H. R. 4000. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insur-

ance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods;

H. R. 4024. An act to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4200. An act to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the quartermaster experimental fuel station, Pike County, Mo.;

H. R. 4338. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.; and

H. R. 4393. An act to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, or ordered to be placed on the Calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 157. An act to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation;

H. R. 2321. An act to protect consumers and others against misbranding, false advertising, and false invoicing of fur products and furs; and

H. R. 4200. An act to make certain revisions in titles I through IV of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947, as amended, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

H. R. 3861. An act to extend to June 30, 1953, the authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct home and farmhouse loans under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 302. An act to redefine the eligibility requirements for appointment of pharmacists in the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration; and

H. R. 3932. An act to provide vocational rehabilitation training for veterans with compensable service-connected disabilities who served on or after June 27, 1950; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H. R. 1183. An act to authorize the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense, to cause to be published official Registers of their respective services;

H. R. 4024. An act to authorize certain easements, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4260. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to transfer to the Department of the Interior the quartermaster experimental fuel station, Pike County, Mo., to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 1733. An act to authorize the establishment of the City of Refuge National Historical Park, in the Territory of Hawaii, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 3100. An act to repeal the act of August 7, 1939 (53 Stat. 1243; 48 U. S. C. sec. 353); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 2995. An act to amend the joint resolution of August 8, 1946, as amended, with respect to appropriations authorized for the conduct of investigations and studies thereunder; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4000. An act to amend subsection 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to authorize renewals of level premium term insurance for successive 5-year periods; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4338. An act to extend the time for completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Delaware River near Wilmington, Del.; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 4393. An act to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. LEHMAN, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ABSENCE OF SENATOR WHERRY TO ATTEND THE ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent today. As a member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, the Senator from Nebraska is delivering an address this noon in Philadelphia.

He is addressing a meeting there to inaugurate plans for celebration of the Fourth of July. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the city of Philadelphia, and the President's Commission of which Chief Justice Vinson is Chairman, are cooperating in plans for the celebration.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

THE VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 47)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$225,000, for the General Services Administration, fiscal year 1952 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations; and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH (S. Doc. No. 48)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of \$150,000 for the legislative branch, fiscal year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations; and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS

A letter from the Acting Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Librarian of Congress, together with a complete set of quarterly journal of current acquisitions, the supplements to the annual report, for the year ended June 30, 1950 (with accompanying documents); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF ROCHESTER (N. Y.) BAR ASSOCIATION

MR. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Rochester (N. Y.) Bar Association, endorsing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

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

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States resolutions known as House Joint Resolution 3 and Senate Joint Resolution 27 which are designed to implement the obligation of the United States as set forth in the 1941 St. Lawrence agreement between the United States and Canada, calling for a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway and power project; and

Whereas the said project will directly benefit local and national commerce and private enterprise by improving transportation, creating additional electric power, and conserving natural resources; and

Whereas the economic feasibility of such a project has been established by many non-partisan studies which have resulted in recommendations for the completion of said project by Presidents Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt [sic], and Truman and by the New York Governors, Smith, Roosevelt [sic], Lehman, and Dewey; and

Whereas such project will be a further step forward in the harmonious relations between the United States and Canada; and

Whereas such project will strengthen the military defenses of the United States: It is hereby

Resolved by the Rochester Bar Association, That said resolutions should be approved by the Congress of the United States.

Abram N. Jones, Chairman; Sol M. Lino-witz, Vice Chairman; Leon H. Sturman (in favor of power project only); James D. Andrews; Ray F. Fowler; John Branch; Bernard M. Pogal; Harry D. Goldman; William L. Clay; S. William Rosenberg; John Lomenzo.

PRICE CONTROL OF BEEF—MEMORIAL

MR. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution in the nature of a memorial which is being circulated in Stanton County, Nebr., remonstrating against the meat-control orders, and particularly the proposed rollbacks. I am afraid many city residents do not realize how seriously this order will affect their supply of beef in the future. Those who live in the farming country, townspeople as well as farmers, understand what is being done to meat production by these unwise and hasty orders. I am told that townspeople are signing memorials like this just the same as cattle feeders. I am presenting it now even before all the signatures are collected because we will

shortly be taking up the extension of these controls, and it is absolutely vital that Congress realize the seriousness of this problem.

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

STANTON COUNTY LIVESTOCK FEEDERS ASSOCIATION, STANTON, NEBR., JUNE 1951—MEMORIAL TO UNITED STATES SENATOR HUGH S. BUTLER

Whereas OPS through its infamous, discriminatory, and un-American order to roll back the price of beef cattle 18 percent or to pre-Korea levels has so drastically reduced the available supply of beef that the Government is planning to buy foreign beef for the armed services. This plan calls for supplying inferior quality foreign beef to our boys in uniform while saving the limited supply of high quality corn-fed beef for our civilians. We the undersigned believe that the boys at the front well deserve first priority on this country's supply of choice corn-fed beef. The civilians here at home are still free to strive for the elimination of OPS regulations that have increased the price of meat on the one hand and sabotaged the source of supply on the other; and

Whereas beef is much higher to the American housewife under OPS ceiling prices; and

Whereas with the continuation of OPS meat rationing will soon be inevitable; and

Whereas the control of pork production is next on OPS schedule; and

Whereas thousands of OPS-ers (snoop troops) have been employed at public expense to prey on the industry; and

Whereas wide-scale black market operations including such practices as illegal slaughtering, tie-in sales, up grading, and devious ways of cutting beef, are now well under way; and

Whereas, many World War II veterans just getting started in the cattle business are either being wiped out or thrown for serious financial loss. This, of course, applies to countless others who own cattle in every neighborhood, county, and State in the United States. The roll-back order does not allow cost of production as proven by hundreds of feed-lot records from all over the Corn Belt. A large share of the investment in feed-lot cattle is covered by borrowed money. When a livestock feeder buys feeder cattle at the prevailing market price, and the price is rolled back 18 percent, it means the loss of all profit and part or all of the equity that the owner has in his cattle. This condition covers a large percent of the cattle on feed in the country at the present time. This is why cattlemen who bought cattle in good faith on the free open market before the roll-back are so concerned and anxious to have the roll-back canceled; and

Whereas, 80,000,000 cattle in the United States, at the close of the 18 percent roll-back period, will have been depreciated approximately \$50 per head or \$4,000,000,000. This affects nearly every one of our millions of farmers and ranchers, because cattle are owned and beef is produced on nearly every farm and ranch in the country. Even dairy or farm milk cows sold for beef will be depreciated nearly \$100 per head; and

Whereas beef cattle and related industries are in a state of paralysis. Large numbers of packing-house laborers have been laid off. Feed lots are rapidly becoming empty. For the past several weeks, during the roll-back scare period, cattle feeders have greatly reduced the buying of replacement cattle to fill their feed lots and have sold large numbers of unfinished cattle with a resulting large loss in beef tonnage. The sale of feeder cattle in the big ranch areas of the western half of the United States has practically stopped. At Wisner, Nebr., one of the largest cattle feeders in the United States has

stopped buying cattle for his feed lots because he says cattle fed under OPS regulations would only result in serious financial loss. Before OPS this feeder produced 500 top quality corn-fed cattle per week, or 300 tons live weight; 15,600 tons per year. Thus, one of our Nation's important food producing defense plants is being closed due to OPS. Many livestock trucking companies report a drastic reduction in the business of hauling feeder cattle, feed, and supplies to feed lots and finished corn-fed cattle to market; and

Whereas there is much more at stake in the roll back order than the price of cattle and meat. If the roll back is allowed to stand it will mean permanent government domination of the industry and the end of a free agriculture in the United States; and

Whereas OPS officials administering the meat program are strictly inexperienced in this industry and are totally unqualified for their positions. Neither will they heed the sincere counsel of leading men of long experience in the industry; and

Whereas an 87 percent of last year slaughter quota on beef cattle will force cattle into the black market require that packers slaughter at least 13 percent less cattle than a year ago. Under this plan the owner of a shipment of cattle on a given market might be forced to take his cattle back home if all the buyers had filled their quotas toward the end of an accounting period; and

Whereas grain farmers look to the livestock farmer and feeder for a market for their corn, other feed grains, and hay. With an OPS forced shortage of livestock feeding, great surpluses of these commodities are certain to accumulate; and

Whereas OPS has so ruthlessly destroyed confidence in the livestock feeding industry that many feeders have lost all desire to continue their operations until such controls are eliminated; and

Whereas Mr. DiSalle has threatened to roll all farm prices back as far as the law will allow. This would mean another 20 percent roll back in the price of cattle since cattle will still be 125 percent of parity at the completion of the present 18 percent roll back. Parity is a horse and buggy formula based on the period 1909 to 1914 and has very little to do with present day conditions. Much higher quality corn fed beef is produced today under considerably higher relative production costs. For instance, in the 1909 to 1914 period poorer quality cattle were carried for much longer periods on cheap pasture; much of which was free public domain. Today highly bred corn-fed cattle are marketed as baby beefes, yearlings, and 2-year olds. In the previous period cattle were marketed mainly as 2-, 3-, and 4-year olds; many as grass finished beef; and

Whereas every division of the meat industry, including livestock feeders, farmers, processors, and retailers stand ready and willing to supply the American consumer and the armed services with an ample and ever increasing supply of meat at reasonable prices as determined by consumer demand, if left unhampered by OPS controls; be it

Resolved, That we, the undersigned farmers, livestock feeders, and other interested parties of Stanton County, Nebr., most urgently request you, Senator HUGH BUTLER, to do everything possible to prevent the renewal of any legislation affecting the livestock industry when the National Production Act expires June 30.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

H. R. 3605. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law 134, approved July 6, 1945, as amended, to grant annual and sick leave privileges to certain indefinite substitute

employees in the postal service; without amendment (Rept. No. 443); and

H. R. 4393. A bill to extend for 2 years the period during which free postage for members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Korea and other specified areas shall be in effect; without amendment (Rept. No. 444).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1696. A bill to amend Public Law 587 of the Eighty-first Congress (approved June 30, 1950) to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders; and

S. 1697. A bill for the relief of Sister Maria Gasparetz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1698. A bill to provide for the education, medical attention, relief of distress, and social welfare of Indians in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1699. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to authorize the Federal Power Commission to prescribe safety requirements for natural-gas companies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference three bills, the first of which deals with the transportation of fireworks in interstate and foreign commerce for use in violation of State laws; the second deals with the suspension of certain rates of duty on steel, and the third deals with the imposition of penalties under the Federal Narcotics Act, with special emphasis on the imposition of the death penalty on persons who purvey narcotics to minors.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1700. A bill to prohibit the transportation of fireworks in interstate and foreign commerce for use in violation of State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1701. A bill to suspend certain rates of duty on steel; and

S. 1702. A bill to amend the penalty provisions applicable to persons convicted of violating certain narcotic laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 1703. A bill to exempt certain wholesale marketers of petroleum from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. CONNALLY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 1704. A bill to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to provide for a codification of regulations of agencies and departments of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN WHOLESALE MARKETERS OF PETROLEUM FROM PROVISIONS OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to exempt certain wholesale marketers of petroleum from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1703) to exempt certain wholesale marketers of petroleum from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, introduced by Mr. CONNALLY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a semicolon and the following: "or (16) any employee of an employer engaged in the business of dealing in petroleum products as a commission merchant, factor, consignee, wholesaler, or distributor, if at least 50 percent of such employer's annual dollar volume of sales in the course of such business is made to retail service stations or local agricultural consumers, or to both, and at least 85 percent of such employer's annual dollar volume of sales in the course of such business is made within the State in which his principal place of business is located."

The statement by Mr. CONNALLY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CONNALLY

Last week I called the attention of the Senate to the activities of the Wage-Hour Division of the Department of Labor in attempting to apply the Fair Labor Standards Act, commonly known as the Wage-Hour Act, to wholesale petroleum marketers.

I pointed out that, by any reasonable test, these marketers are not engaged in interstate commerce and therefore do not come under the Wage-Hour law. Most of their operations are in a single county and within a radius of 30 miles and therefore cannot be in interstate commerce. But the Wage-Hour Administrator is nevertheless attempting to bring them under the law, notwithstanding the plain intent of Congress to the contrary.

In order to make the meaning of the law perfectly clear, I am today introducing a bill to amend section 13 (a) of the Fair Labor Standards Act. This is the section dealing with employees specifically exempt from the minimum wages and maximum hours provisions of the law. My bill would add employees of certain wholesale petroleum marketers to this list.

PRINTING OF REPORT ENTITLED "MAN-POWER UTILIZATION AT MILITARY INDOCTRINATION CENTERS" (S. DOC. NO. 46)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Preparedness Subcommittee, Committee on Armed Services, entitled Twenty-sixth Report, "Manpower Utilization at Military Indoctrination Centers," be printed as a Senate document.

This report was based upon a thorough investigation by the subcommittee of manpower practices at 16 military indoctrination centers. We believe it has already resulted in some constructive steps and that additional steps will be taken to remedy an unfortunate situation. I am sure the Senators will be interested in reading this report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF SUGAR ACT OF 1948—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYEL], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. ECTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be added as co-sponsors of the bill (S. 1694) to amend and extend the Sugar Act of 1948, and for other purposes, introduced on behalf of myself and several other Senators on June 18, 1951.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Louisiana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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. KILGORE:

Address on the achievements of the supply services, delivered by him before the European Theater Operation, Quartermaster Association, New York City, June 9, 1951.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the Baltic freedom rally in Carnegie Hall, New York, June 16, 1951, and address by Edward M. O'Connor on the subject The Tragedy of the Baltic States, on the same occasion.

Editorial entitled "Mucking," published in the Washington Post of June 19, 1951, relating to charges made by Senator McCARTHY.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address entitled "This Year of Decision," delivered by Samuel F. Pryor, vice president and assistant to the president of Pan-American World Airways, on June 13, 1951, in Milwaukee, Wis.

By Mr. NIXON:

Memorial Day address entitled "Over Silent Graves," delivered by Bishop Timothy Manning at Sawtelle Veterans Hospital.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Statement regarding the effect of controls, by Charles J. MacGowan, international president of the International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers and Helpers, A. F. of L.

Article entitled "Bulletin No. 84. How the 48 States Would Share the Cost of the President's \$8,500,000,000 Foreign-Aid Program," appearing in Federal Spending Facts, published by the Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

By Mr. KEM:

Article entitled "Query on Kansas City Vote Theft Stirs Applause at Optimist Lunch," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of June 16, 1951.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

Article entitled "Roll-Backs Won't Produce More Beef," published in the Nebraska Farmer of June 2, 1951.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Essay entitled "Freedom's Open Door," written by Richard Samuel Sterns, of Skowhegan, Maine, second award winner in State competition sponsored by Women's Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

Address delivered by Senator WHERRY in Philadelphia, Pa., on June 19, 1951, as a member of the President's Commission for the Celebration of the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Address entitled "Danger Signs in Our Domestic Economy," delivered by him at the annual banquet of the national convention of the American Plant Food Council, at the Homestead, Hot Springs, Va., June 16, 1951.

Address entitled "The Duties of a Citizen," delivered by George E. Stringfellow, vice president, Thomas A. Edison Co., Inc., before the Kiwanis Club at Elizabeth, N. J., on June 7, 1951.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Statement on the Fulbright resolution to establish a Commission on Ethics in the Federal Government, made by Senator BENTON before a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on June 19, 1951.

By Mr. BENTON:

Letter from Rev. Charles Brainard Hart regarding Peace Sunday, and a statement of Christian interpretation of international relations by the International Relations Committee of the Connecticut Council of Churches.

Letter regarding oppression in Communist-controlled Hungary, from Laszlo Boros, of Connecticut, publisher and editor of the newspaper the American Hungarian.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

An address delivered by Mr. George L. P. Weaver, Special Assistant to the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board at the commencement exercises of Livingstone College, Salisbury, N. C.

WASTEFUL PROCUREMENT PRACTICES OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, as we debate the cost of government, and as we labor in this Chamber to eliminate unnecessary expenditures, it is discouraging to realize that our Department of Defense has not yet been able to solve its simplest procurement problem, the problem of buying an insignificant item without using all the cumbersome and expensive machinery it employs in purchasing materials the cost of which runs into the millions of dollars. I have in my hand a letter from a paint manufacturer in Chicago telling me that he received a request to bid on four pints of paint, a request in triplicate mailed from Washington, as it must have been mailed to hundreds of other paint manufacturers. The irony of the situation is emphasized by the fact that this order, which if he had chosen to bid, would have represented a purchase of approximately \$2, contained this statement: "No partial payments will be made on resulting order."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

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

JEWELL PAINT & VARNISH CO.,
Chicago, May 31, 1951.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have before me a bid form—Request for Proposal and Contractor's Proposal—that is in no respect unique, but illustrates so well a type of wasteful and unreasonable purchasing practice extant among some agencies of the Government that I feel impelled to call it to your attention.

The form is a request for a bid from the Chief, AFSA Procurement Office, Armed Forces Security Agency, Washington, dated May 4, 1951. How many firms received this request I have no way of knowing, but the fact that it was sent to us in Chicago would imply that the list must have been fairly long. Proposals are to be submitted in triplicate by May 18, 1951—4:30 p. m., delivery f. o. b. Arlington, Va.

Now all the above is perfectly normal, and the procedure is similar to that regularly employed by procurement officers in obtaining bids for a tremendous variety and quantity of commodities, including paints. But in this case the quantity on which bids are requested is four pints of "Wrinkle Varnish, black, air-drying for machines." No special specifications or requirements, just a regular black wrinkle finish that is a product of a long list of manufacturers. Only the fact that it is to be the air-drying variety, rather than baking, makes it anything but a regular stock item. Its value, if we had entered a bid—which we did not—would be about \$2.25 total, plus parcel post or express charges.

What the cost of making such a purchase is I can't estimate, but the preparation of bid forms in quadruplicate for each prospective bidder and their distribution by mail must in itself run to a sizable figure. Add to that the opening and tabulation, final preparation of vouchers and forms, and the value of the merchandise itself must be a very small fraction indeed of the cost of purchasing it.

If this were an isolated case it would be rather comic, and a statement on the reverse side of the form that "No partial payments will be made on resulting order" adds to its ludicrous aspect. But as an example of painfully wasteful practice that is unnecessary it isn't so funny. One of the nearby Navy installations takes care of such small items by making cash purchases from the nearest source, just as you or I would buy a package of razor blades from the handiest drugstore, which makes a lot more sense.

Yours very truly,

ROBERT O. CLARK,
President.

INDEPENDENT OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS,
1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3880) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], lettered "R."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. 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	George	McKellar
Anderson	Green	McMahon
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Benton	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Moody
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Conor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Cain	Ives	Pastore
Capehart	Jenner	Robertson
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppe
Clements	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Langer	Sparkman
Douglas	Lehman	Taft
Duff	Lodge	Thye
Eastland	Long	Watkins
Ecton	Magnuson	Welker
Ellender	Maybank	Wiley
Ferguson	McCarran	Williams
Flanders	McCarthy	Young
Frrear	McClellan	
Fulbright	McFarland	

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] 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 now being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into, 15 minutes are allowed to each side, to be controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my amendment would amend the bill at page 2, line 17, by striking out the figure "\$1,883,615", and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "\$1,585,553." It would represent a reduction of approximately \$300,000.

The reason for taking the latter figure is that it represents the exact amount which was allowed to the President during the past fiscal year. Frankly, I seriously question the advisability of allowing even this much for salaries and expenses of the White House Office, but surely there can be no argument whatever made for the increase which is recommended.

The argument has been advanced that the President might need more money this year than he did last year, but that is still no reason why the amount proposed by my amendment should not be adopted and the reduction made, since it is a matter of record that last year the President had more money than he could use properly. Since he has the usual New Deal bureaucratic aversion to returning any unused funds to the Federal Treasury we found that out of these funds he assigned a Government car, chauffeur, and other personnel to conveying his sister on an unofficial tour of the country.

Last Thursday night President Truman, when speaking to the country, made an eloquent appeal to the American people for their cooperation in reducing their own individual expenditures to the barest minimum as their contribution to the fight against inflation.

Surely the President of the United States would not want Congress to make an exception of his own personal expense allowance and thereby place him in the category of those selfish people whom he so bitterly denounced as individuals who were always willing to call on the other fellow for sacrifices but always end their appeals with the statement, "Cut the other fellow's but don't cut mine."

It is in an effort to place the President's expense account in line with all other appropriation cuts and also in line with his own statements that I am offering this amendment and urging that it be adopted.

This amendment has no reference to the special \$50,000 tax exemption allowance which is enjoyed by the President, which question will be taken up when the tax bill arrives from the House.

This amendment refers only to his miscellaneous expense allowance.

In reviewing the past years, we find that the following amounts were allowed to Mr. Truman's predecessor in the White House:

1944	\$302,190
1945	339,131
1946	312,583

We find the following figures after Mr. Truman took office:

1947	\$283,660
1948	952,500
1949	969,612
1950	1,375,140
1951	1,585,553

Now we are being asked to appropriate \$1,883,615. Remember, there is no accounting required for these vast expenditures.

Mr. President, I believe the time has come when we must call a halt to such

lavish expenses. There is no reason why the President should require such a large sum of money for entertainment expenses. It is nearly five times as much money as was spent on the same item by President Truman's predecessor. Frankly, I feel that we should go much further than my amendment proposes to go. Certainly, making this mild reduction I propose is the very least we should consider and would be taking a step in the right direction. We should at least put the figure back where it was last year, when, as I said before, apparently the President had more money than he could properly spend, otherwise he would not have assigned a Government car and chauffeur to take his sister on an unofficial tour of the country.

I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Delaware yield the floor?

MR. WILLIAMS. I yield the floor.

MR. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Arizona. First, I should like to make a brief statement. I believe the committee was in full accord on the item. The House had made no reduction. Speaking as chairman of the subcommittee, let me say that I could not agree to take the amendment to conference; I would have to oppose it.

In the meantime, if the Senator from Arizona will bear with me, I should like to say that when the Senator from Arizona completes his 4-minute statement, I wish to have the clerk read a letter which came to me from the Atomic Energy Commission. I believe the letter is of great consequence. Yesterday I showed it to the Senator from Michigan, but I should like to have the letter read into the RECORD. I think there will be time to have that done, unless some other Senator wishes to have me yield time to him.

Mr. President, let me inquire how much time I have remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 14 minutes remaining.

MR. MAYBANK. Then I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Arizona, if he desires to have that much time; and at the completion of his remarks I shall ask that the clerk read the letter to which I have referred.

MR. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist on this amendment. During the time I have been in the Senate, no attempt has ever been made in any way to change the amount requested by the President as the appropriation for an item such as this one. For the Congress to interfere with the appropriations for the President's office would be just the same as for the President to interfere with appropriations for the Congress or to veto them. It is simply one of the things which are not done.

I have made inquiry; and during the short time I have had since the Senator offered his amendment, I have not been able to find any precedent for the action the Senator suggests. I have not been able to find any case in which the

Congress has cut down the appropriation items for use by the President in connection with conducting his office.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Delaware will not insist on his amendment. It is not in keeping with the precedents of the Congress, and I am sure that no good would come by our taking such action as is proposed by the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has requested unanimous consent that a letter to which he has referred be read at the desk. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY

COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., June 15, 1951.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,

Chairman, Subcommittee on Independent Offices, Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952, as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee, on June 13, 1951, contains the following provision under the appropriation language for the Atomic Energy Commission:

"Provided further, That no part of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for any new construction project until after the Commission shall have notified the architects and engineers involved that the plans for such projects should be purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements."

We believe this provision may adversely affect the scheduled completion of the present large construction program of the Commission. The purpose of this letter is to request that such language be eliminated from the bill.

The Commission, as part of its method of doing business has had as one of its goals the objective apparently sought by this language. In addition to the continuing surveillance of the construction program to assure that facilities are entirely utilitarian in design and do not contain unnecessary refinements, the General Manager recently reemphasized existing instructions to the field offices to assure that these objectives are being accomplished. A copy of his memorandum to all managers of operations is attached. Moreover, we are considering the employment of a well-known architect engineer, with considerable experience in this field, to survey the work being performed by our architect engineers to determine what, if any, further measures could be taken, including possible standardization of design for certain types of buildings, to accomplish this objective.

Our concern with the proposed language is not with its basic purpose but with the effect it may well have on our contractors and, consequently, on our ability to get our construction jobs done. The language, literally applied, places a restriction on the availability of our appropriations. It is our understanding that this restriction would be removed in any case where the Commission gave the proposed notification to the architects and engineers involved. However, the language will, we anticipate, raise immediately in the minds of our contractors numerous questions as to whether they will be reimbursed under the terms of their contracts with the Commission. Because of the indefiniteness of the standards "purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements," and other interpretive difficulties, construction and architect-engineer contractors may well be reluctant to assume the risks of doing business with the Commission. The following are illustrations of the difficulties we an-

ticipate if the quoted language is included in our appropriation act:

1. The required notification of an architect-engineer firm could reasonably be interpreted both by the firm and by the construction contractor as making compliance with the notice a condition of reimbursement. The question of what constitutes "purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements" is one on which men of experience and sound judgment could well differ. Contractors may be concerned that the architect-engineer's best judgment could later be questioned not only by the Commission but by other agencies of the Government and that, therefore, funds would not be available to reimburse either the construction contractor or the architect-engineer for the costs of the construction project. The risk thereby imposed would probably make more difficult obtaining the services of qualified firms.

2. Many of our contracts with firms of architect-engineers are subcontracts made by our principal operating contractors, such as du Pont and General Electric. We are concerned that they would also interpret the quoted language as making reimbursement to them conditioned on their architect-engineer complying with the rider. We anticipate that they would be reluctant to proceed expeditiously with the work with the assumption of this risk.

3. The specifications for many of our facilities are provided in the first instance by the responsible operating contractor to meet operating requirements. It is often necessary to include what might be considered elaborate safeguards to protect against unusual hazards associated with the project. An architect-engineer firm may well differ with the judgment of the operating contractor and the Commission as to whether certain of these features are purely utilitarian. We could not be in the position of substituting the judgment of the architect-engineer for the judgment of the operating contractor and of the Commission. The design might well be unduly delayed while agreement with the architect-engineer is being sought.

4. To complete our construction program on schedule it is necessary to start construction and procurement on some of the most important projects in the early stages of design. Contractors may believe that it is necessary to delay construction and procurement until the design is completed and a final determination made as to whether it is purely utilitarian and without unnecessary refinements.

5. Contractors may also be concerned as to the possible retroactive application of this language. Design of a number of our urgently required facilities is nearing completion. Since the architect-engineers will not have received notification in the proposed formal statutory words, a possible interpretation of language might lead to insistence upon a complete review of all construction plans before proceeding further with construction work. This could result in an extensive delay in completion of the project and considerably increased cost, since in many cases construction will already have been started.

We are in agreement with the objectives proposed to be attained through this language. We believe that this can best continue to be done administratively by the Commission without adversely affecting the construction schedules presently established. If such an objective becomes a matter of law, we believe that it may interpose many obstructions to the speedy accomplishment of the Commission's construction program.

We would appreciate an opportunity to discuss this matter with you and members of your committee. Copies of this letter are

being sent to the chairman, Independent Offices Subcommittee, House Appropriations Committee, and to the Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, for their information.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON DEAN,
Chairman.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina also wish to have the clerk read the paper which is attached to the letter?

MR. MAYBANK. No, Mr. President; I do not think that is necessary. However, I should like to have it printed in the RECORD.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the attachment to the letter will be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The attachment to the foregoing letter is as follows:

APRIL 10, 1951.

ALL MANAGERS OF OPERATIONS,

M. W. BOYER,

General Manager, Washington:

ECONOMY OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

It is appropriate at this time to reiterate the policy of the Commission concerning the design and construction of facilities required for the program. A determined effort must be made to assure that facilities are designed and constructed with that forthright simplicity that will effect the maximum of economies in money and critical materials, while fully satisfying the functional adequacy for which intended, and with due regard for vulnerability criteria developed for individual installations.

Bulletin GM-127—"Building Codes and Other Building Criteria" established the basic building codes to be considered as minimum requirements for the appropriate classes of structures and at the same time stated that the policies of the Commission require that economy, safety, and uniform good practice be followed in the design and construction of work built for the Commission's use.

Under date of December 19, 1950, I sent to all managers of operations a memorandum concerning the conservation of critical materials, which called attention to the fact that the President was directing the executive agencies "to conduct a detailed review of Government programs, for the purpose of modifying them wherever practicable to lessen the demand upon services, commodities, raw materials, manpower, and facilities. The Government, as well as the public, must exercise great restraint in the use of those goods and services which are needed for our increased defense efforts." This memorandum further stated that it is the responsibility of managers of operations to screen all design to assure that no critical materials are used where it is practicable to use noncritical substitutes.

Steps have been taken to initiate a conservation coordinating committee, comprising representatives of major Government agencies, under the auspices of the Defense Production Administration to ensure that savings of manpower, materials, and industrial services, as well as dollars are attained to the greatest extent possible through simplification, standardization, substitution, and conservation. In a period such as exists today, with the unprecedented industrial expansion which the Nation is undergoing, even economies of dollars are far outweighed by economies of critical materials.

Bulletin GM-128 "Supervision of Construction and Related Activities" set forth the responsibility of the operations offices and the Washington office in ensuring that such economies are met. It is the responsibility of the operations offices to screen all preliminary proposals, designs, and specifica-

tions to insure that both economy and functional adequacy are obtained. There is also set forth, under paragraph 4c of the bulletin, the requirement for submitting preliminary proposals in duplicate on proposed projects to the Washington office for review as to general functional adequacy, practicability, and feasibility of basic design for construction of proposed facilities. In most cases, such submissions have not been timely and the purpose of the submission therefore has been largely nullified. I would like to call your attention at this time to the necessity for timely and informative submissions and your responsibility for doing same.

I want you to forward copies of this memorandum to the principal operating contractors and architect-engineers engaged at your installations to reaffirm our policy concerning economy of design in effecting functional and utilitarian facilities.

In the near future I plan to visit all offices of operations and will discuss this subject with you and key personnel of your principal contractors.

MR. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me about 1 minute?

MR. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to yield. Mr. President, how many minutes do I have remaining?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has 5 minutes remaining.

MR. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee as much of the 5 minutes as he may desire.

MR. MCKELLAR. I shall need but a moment. Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona has stated the case very frankly and fully. In support of what he has said, let me say to the Senator from Delaware, whom I admire very much, that so far as I recall, this is the first time in my long service in the Senate the Congress has ever been asked to interfere with the Executive's appropriations. The appropriations for the Executive Office have been agreed to in all cases without any objection, just as the President does not interfere with the legislative appropriations which we make. I do not think he should, and I do not think we should interfere with the Executive appropriations. I hope the Senator will not insist upon the amendment, because, while I am very much in favor of economies, as the Senator knows, and as I have demonstrated time and again, I do not believe we ought to change this appropriation for the President of the United States.

MR. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. MCKELLAR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

MR. CASE. The junior Senator from South Dakota would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether he does not recall the instance, a few years ago, when the Chief Executive sought to change the White House structure and to convert it more or less into a modern office building, at which time there was considerable discussion about it. At that time I think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was opposed to the change. He may recall that the House of Representatives adopted an amendment to an appropriation bill which reappropriated the funds from which it had been proposed to pay for the remodeling of the White House,

and directed that those funds should be used for other purposes connected with the White House; which, in principle, expressed the opinion of Congress with regard to the expenditure of funds in connection with the White House.

MR. MCKELLAR. I may say to the Senator that I recall it very distinctly; but it was a different item entirely. I was utterly opposed to changing the White House or to building a new one. I so stated on many occasions.

MR. CASE. I may say to the distinguished Senator, it was an opposition which I shared.

MR. MCKELLAR. I thank the Senator. I think we are going to have a wonderful White House, when the improvements now under way are completed, which will probably be by November 1. I wish to say in regard to the particular appropriation referred to by the Senator from South Dakota that it was, of course, an entirely different thing. It was for the building of a new White House or the reconstruction of the present one. It was not an appropriation of money to be used for the personal expenses of the President in connection with his office. As I have said, so far as I know—and I have been here for quite a while, and there are those in my State who think I have been here too long—this is the first time that a question has ever been raised as to appropriations for the President's personal expenses. The Senator from South Dakota has served a long time in the House of Representatives and in the Senate. We have had two wars lately, and even during those wars nothing was said about appropriations in this category, and they were always passed. I hope the Senate will allow this one to be passed also.

MR. CASE. The reason the Senator from South Dakota raised the question—

MR. MAYBANK. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina has 1 minute remaining.

MR. MAYBANK. I yield that 1 minute to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in voting on this amendment I shall follow the committee action. I shall do so, cause I believe that the personal expenditures of the President should not be questioned, any more than we question the expenditures of the House of Representatives, or any more than the House of Representatives questions the expenditure of the Senate.

I should like to point out, however, that the President apparently intends to add 35 persons to his staff. In a period such as this, every effort should be made to effect economies. I think we should bear this in mind, and I hope the President will not find it necessary to expend the entire appropriation. From his 1950 appropriation the President had remaining, after all expenditures, \$115,426. In 1951 he had \$150,000 remaining, though he spent \$45,020 of the 1950

amount which was carried over. In 1952 he estimates that he will have remaining \$170,615, but that he will carry over from prior years \$100,000. I hope the President will not find it necessary to add so many new employees to his staff and that he will not require all the money the bill provides. I, personally, shall not vote to cut it down, because the personal expenditures of the President have never been questioned by the Congress, I believe, in our history.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I may say that I hope the President will not appoint the additional employees to whom reference has been made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Delaware has some time left.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to say first that I, too, have examined the record and I agree with what the Senator from Arizona has said regarding precedents. To my knowledge, this is without precedent. Perhaps that accounts for today's excessive expenditures. I might add that there is no precedent within the past 18 years of the Administration having made any sincere effort to cut the appropriations of any of the departments. But that is all the more reason my amendment should be adopted. It is high time that the Congress established a precedent by calling not only upon the heads of the executive departments but also upon the President to cut out their extravagance and to begin rendering some account to the American people of the moneys spent.

Perhaps the expense accounts of the Presidents who preceded the present incumbent of the White House were not questioned, but I point out that, for the years 1944, 1945, and 1946, which were the war years, at no time, even at the peak of the war, did President Roosevelt spend more than \$350,000 in this same classification. Last year the cost was almost five times that much, and we are being asked now for another \$300,000 increase.

If we are to continue this trend through the years and not call a halt sometime, where is it going to stop? I certainly shall insist on this amendment. I think it is time we established a precedent. So far as the argument is concerned that there has been no check placed upon the Senate and the House of Representatives, I may say that we should put a check on ourselves. The time has come when we must check them all. The President of the United States has himself said that those who would exempt their own budgets and be excused from cuts are selfish. Surely no Senator on this floor wants to put the President of the United States into the classification of the selfish individuals whom he so bitterly denounced.

I ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Bricker	Ives	Monroney
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Case	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Ferguson	Lehman	Saltonstall
Frear	Maybank	Welker
George	McFarland	Williams
Hill	McKellar	
Holland	McMahon	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The Secretary will call the names of the absent Senators.

The names of the absent Senators were called, and Mr. BENTON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BYRD, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. LODGE, Mr. THYE and Mr. YOUNG answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. MCFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant-at-Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant-at-Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. HOEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. WILEY, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. DUFF, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KEM, and Mr. AIKEN entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. ECTON, Mr. FLANDERS, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. No business has been transacted since the roll call for a quorum just completed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood that, but I wanted to make it clear.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered. The Chair assumes that that may be regarded as business. Does the Senator insist on his point?

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Flor-

ida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS] is unavoidably detained on official business, and if present would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] 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.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay," and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] who is absent because of illness is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a Member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business. If present and voting the Senator from California [Mr. Nixon] would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New

Hampshire would vote "yea" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Ecton	Millikin
Bennett	Ferguson	Mundt
Brewster	Flanders	Robertson
Bricker	Frear	Schoeppel
Bridges	Hendrickson	Smith, Maine
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Thye
Byrd	Jenner	Watkins
Cain	Kem	Welker
Carlson	Knowland	Williams
Case	Lodge	Young
Cordon	McCarran	
Duff	McClellan	

NAYS—36

Anderson	Hoey	McFarland
Benton	Holland	McKellar
Chavez	Humphrey	McMahon
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Monroney
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Moody
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Eastland	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Langer	Pastore
George	Lehman	Russell
Green	Long	Saltonstall
Hayden	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Hill	Maybank	Sparkman

NOT VOTING—23

Capehart	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Malone	Stennis
Dworshak	Martin	Taft
Fulbright	McCarthy	Tobey
Gillette	Morse	Underwood
Hennings	Murray	Wherry
Hunt	Nixon	Wiley
Kefauver	O'Conor	

So, Mr. WILLIAMS' amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which is substantially the same as the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], except that it would reduce the amount from \$1,883,615 to \$1,685,553. It would increase the amount appropriated last year by \$100,000, but would diminish the amount provided in the bill by approximately \$200,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "\$1,883,615" and in lieu thereof insert "\$1,685,553."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is not in order. It is an amendment to the amendment which has just been agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-15-51-C." It is offered to the committee amendment on page 9, in line 18.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an announcement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the majority leader for that purpose.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement. Hereafter during the consideration of an appropriation bill I shall object to any committee meeting during the session of the Senate, except the Appropriations Committee. I will state further that I believe the Committee on Appropriations

should not meet during the consideration of appropriation bills. That committee, above all other committees, should not meet, because its members should be present on the floor of the Senate to help conduct the business of the Senate.

In spite of a limitation on debate of 30 minutes, we have spent an hour and a half considering one amendment. Hereafter I shall object to any unanimous-consent requests to permit committees to meet during the consideration of appropriation bills.

Mr. President, several Senators have asked me when we shall be able to get away from Washington. I will tell them that we will not get away for a long time, unless we can make more progress than we are now making on appropriation bills. Senators must be in attendance on the floor and they must be more attentive to their duties on the floor if we are to make any progress.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, did the majority leader except the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. MFARLAND. I believe that the members of the Appropriations Committee should want to be on the floor. That committee, above all other committees, should not meet during the consideration of appropriation bills.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree completely and for that reason I believe the majority leader should not except the Appropriations Committee. No committees should be permitted to meet during the sessions of the Senate when appropriation bills are being considered, and least of all the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations considering appropriations for the Department of the Interior is meeting this afternoon. Did I understand the majority leader to insist that the members of that subcommittee remain on the floor?

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator by saying that all Senators ought to be on the floor. However, the members of the subcommittee to which the Senator from New Mexico refers have already secured unanimous consent to meet this afternoon. I still say that if the members of any committee should be on the floor it is the members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Of course I should like to comply with the request of the Senator from Arizona. It so happens that the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is conducting the meeting of the subcommittee this afternoon. I wish to comply with the will of the Senate. If our committee is not going to be exempted, well and good; but we would like to know whether we can meet.

Mr. MFARLAND. The Senator's committee already has received unanimous consent to meet during the session of the Senate today. It is up to the Senator's committee to determine whether it will meet.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield, to permit me to propound a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I am glad to yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before there was any knowledge of the action to be taken by the Senate with reference to the meeting of committees while the Senate is in session, a meeting had been called for 2:30 this afternoon by the Foreign Relations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, meeting jointly. Hereafter, when appropriation bills are under consideration in the Senate Chamber, I shall not seek to obtain consent for meetings of the two committees during the afternoon, but at least I should like to have an opportunity for the committees to meet jointly this afternoon in order that we may apprise the witnesses of the action taken, so that at least we shall be able to proceed in an orderly way.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that for this afternoon the two committees, meeting jointly, may sit at 2:30 p. m.

The PRESIDING OFFICE (Mr. HOLLAND in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? Hearing none, consent is given.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate that for this afternoon the committees to which the Senator from Georgia refers have made arrangements to meet and witnesses have been called. That was the reason for making this exception, and I think it was proper, instead of having the witnesses appear but not be able to testify.

However, I join the majority leader, as I know the Senator from Georgia, a distinguished member of the committee, does, in saying that appropriation bills are very important and worthy of full attendance on the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that hereafter we would not undertake to have the two committees meet during the afternoon when appropriation bills are under consideration in the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand that, and I will ask that all Senators on this side of the aisle be in attendance in the Senate Chamber, because each of these appropriation items is very important. Although I realize that all Senators feel that they have outside duties or missions of importance, yet I doubt that any of their outside missions are more important than their duties on the floor of the Senate, particularly when debate is limited and votes are being taken every few minutes on various items in appropriation bills.

I see in the Chamber the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR]. I would say he has spent every minute of his time on the floor of the Senate during the time when the appropriation bills have been under consideration.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. In view of the fact that certain of the committees are going to meet this afternoon, I would suggest that after we vote on the pending amendment, which has been proposed by the Senator from Michigan, we take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. I shall not make that motion at this time; but certainly nothing will be accomplished this afternoon with only a few Senators in attendance. Under such circumstances, the situation in the Senate chamber will be similar to the situation here yesterday afternoon or last Friday afternoon. Until we can have many Senators present at the sessions on the floor, we are merely wasting our time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I know how the chairman of the subcommittee feels, and I join him in reiterating that these are very important matters and should have full attendance on the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate having the Senator from Michigan join me in regard to this matter. Both of us serve on the committee, and we appreciate the seriousness of the situation. There are a large number of amendments which must be considered by the Senate in connection with this bill, and certainly Senators should be present. However, not many Senators will be present this afternoon.

Therefore, when we conclude action on the pending amendment I shall make a motion that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow. If the motion is not carried, of course we shall proceed this afternoon.

Mr. FERGUSON. At the moment we have an increased attendance, and I should like to proceed with the amendment I have offered to the committee amendment.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. As I count the Senators who are now in attendance, it seems to me that not as many as one-fifth of the Members of the Senate are in the Chamber at this time. Am I mistaken?

Mr. FERGUSON. Certainly considerably less than half the Members of the Senate are present, but a 50-percent attendance would be large.

Mr. MAYBANK. I count only 15 Senators present at this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Even that is a large number, compared to other recent sessions.

Mr. MAYBANK. However, when we are considering such important matters, it seems to me that at least a quorum should be present. I shall not ask for a quorum, of course; but I make these remarks because earlier today, during the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], only five Senators were present.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the amendment I am asking to have considered at this time is offered by me, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], to the committee amendment on page 9,

in line 18, and would strike out the figure appearing at that point and would insert "\$17,500,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 9, in line 18, it is proposed to strike out "\$18,050,000" and insert "\$17,500,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the appropriations for 1951 for the same function was \$16,511,913. In other words, if my amendment is adopted, we shall be increasing the appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Civil Service Commission by \$1,000,000, less only \$1,913.

The House of Representatives voted to appropriate \$17,000,000 for this item. The amount recommended by the Senate Appropriations Committee is \$18,050,000, and the amendment now proposed to the committee amendment would reduce that amount to \$17,500,000.

The Civil Service Commission requests an increase of 1,628 employees over the number it had last year, and that accounts primarily for the great increase in budget estimates.

The entire increase in funds requested is, in the words of Chairman Ramspeck at page 459 of the Senate hearings, "to process greater workloads resulting from rising Federal employment and from an anticipated increase in turn-over."

The House discounted the extent of the burden carried by the Commission in its placements, and allowed the Commission \$17,000,000, which was an increase of approximately \$500,000 over last year.

Two cuts were involved. The House committee recommended a reduction of about \$5,000,000, on the ground that turn-over estimates were inflated. The Commission had estimated turn-over rates for 1951 at about 1.4 percent per month, or 17 percent a year; but it anticipated a turn-over rate of 3 percent a month, or 36 percent a year in 1952. The House committee determined that turn-over rates were running at about 2.3 percent a month, which figure was confirmed in the Senate hearings by Chairman Ramspeck. Accordingly, the House committee projected that rate for the future and justified the reduction of \$5,000,000 which was made.

Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission admits there is a great turnover in personnel, principally because transfers seem to be allowed from one agency to another in the Government service, by means of which the employees thus making transfers are able to secure increases in their ratings and increases in their pay, whereas they would not be able to obtain such increases in ratings and in pay if they did not make the transfers.

On the floor of the House of Representatives, Representative TABER pointed out that placement activities of the Commission called for an increase of \$1,500,000, although the actual increase in number of placements was estimated at only 5,000. Accordingly, he was successful in reducing the appropriation on the floor by \$1,050,000, leaving an in-

crease of about \$500,000 for placement activities.

It is the amount of the floor cut in the House, \$1,050,000 which the committee amendment proposes to restore, and my amendment to that amendment proposes to allow only \$500,000 of that increase. Adoption of the amendment to the amendment would still leave the Commission with approximately \$1,000,000 more than it received in 1951.

I want to say a few words about the effect of carrying out the Senate's avowed intent to reduce budget estimates for personal services by 10 percent, which it expressed in its action on the Labor-Federal Security bill and in recommitting this independent offices bill after it was first reported with only a 5 percent cut. That action affects the activities of the Civil Service Commission in two ways.

First, it is going to cut down considerably the turnover in Government employment. Vacancies created by death or resignation are not going to be filled so readily. In fact, it is my contention that the 10-percent reduction in funds can be realized by failing to replace personnel in vacancies. This was the theory of the Jensen amendment, adopted in the House. The Senate has departed from that theory to impose a ceiling on expenditures for personal services. Any administrator can adopt the principle of the Jensen amendment as a means of staying within the ceiling the Senate has set.

Also, there will be fewer transfers from one agency to another. They run to at least 22,500 a year on the basis of the limited data furnished by the Commission, excluding those not reported and those who resign from Government service and later re-enter, perhaps after using up their terminal leave in one agency.

Mr. President, there appeared in the press this morning—and I mentioned this case on the floor a few weeks ago—an account of a man who was employed in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and who, while on terminal leave, sought employment with a company which was borrowing money from the RFC. From that company he received, I think, almost double the salary he had been receiving with RFC. He was still on the payroll of the Federal Government, by reason of having accumulated terminal leave.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, will Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Was the man referred to dismissed from the RFC, where he had been employed?

Mr. FERGUSON. No. I take it he had resigned voluntarily in order to take this private employment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. He should have resigned, and, if he did so, I commend him for it. But in the event he failed to resign, he ought to have been discharged.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree.

Mr. MCKELLAR. He should have resigned, because he did a dishonest thing.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. The man who has been referred to in the press within the past few days, apparently resigned, because he had an opportunity to get from the private company a salary twice that he had been receiving from the Government. I say it is no wonder that he resigned.

Mr. FERGUSON. But what the Senator from Michigan calls attention to is the fact that, while he was on terminal leave from the Federal Government, he was using his position and the office and telephone where he had been employed by the RFC, to carry on work for the private company.

Mr. CASE. I do not question that point at all.

Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield further to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is it not also true that the Civil Service Commission, in addition to not having as much of a load, by reason of reductions made in appropriations, in the House under the Jensen amendment and in the Senate under the Ferguson amendment, may get some allocations from National Defense appropriations for the purpose of processing National Defense employees?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, and many of those are not covered by the Civil Service Commission regulations.

Mr. CASE. Then certainly we ought to be able to save half the amount which the House thought it could save.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield me sufficient time that I may place the remainder of my statement in the RECORD, and may also read from the committee's report by way of answer to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the Senator will not ask me to yield too much time. How long will the Senator take?

Mr. FERGUSON. About half a minute.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of my prepared statement be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the remainder of Mr. FERGUSON's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Transfers will be fewer because Government personnel money will be a little tighter. All this adds up to a confirmation of the House committee's lower estimate of turnover, upon which the original cut in this appropriation was predicated.

Second, if the Senate's intent were to work out as a straight across-the-board cut of 10 percent budget estimates for personnel, we would have at least halted the trend of increased Government payrolls. I might add, however, that we would be doing no more than halt it. We would simply be holding payrolls to the 1951 level and disallowing

the increases planned for next year. Some may have thought the 10 percent reduction formula was going to do a great deal more, but unfortunately it does not. It just about allows us to stand still.

In any event the result would be to relieve the Civil Service Commission of the "greater workloads resulting from rising Federal employment" which Mr. Ramspeck used, along with increased turn-overs, as justification for the increase in funds he requested.

Information which he furnished the Senate committee shows how this works out. He reported Federal civilian employment within the continental United States on June 30 would be 2,350,000. He estimated that by June 30, 1952 it would be 2,600,000. If we apply a 10 percent cut to this 1952 figure, which roughly the Senate's actions would accomplish although our 10 percent cut has been in dollars and not in jobs, there would be taken 260,000 off the 1952 figure. That takes us back almost exactly to the current employment figure of 2,350,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should also like to read to the Senator from South Dakota from the committee report on the pending bill, this statement:

The committee also wishes to point out that 72 percent of the placements during the next fiscal year will be made by boards and committees of examiners paid for by the several agencies, whereas only 54 percent of such placements will be made by agency boards during the current fiscal year. This transfer of work to the agencies will permit additional savings in the commission's expenditures.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the subject of the RFC was brought into the argument by the Senator from Michigan, and he mentioned the case of an employee who had made an improper use of his terminal leave. No one knows better than the Senator from Michigan that I am, and always have been, opposed to employees accumulative terminal leave. The Senator knows that he and I, last year, when the subject of rent control was under consideration, voiced complaint about terminal leave. I understood that the purpose of the law was to require Federal employees to take their annual leave, not to accumulate it and make an improper use of it in getting a better job.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to answer that by saying I think that is exactly true. I think that particular agency pointed out to the subcommittee, of which we were both members, the fallacy of permitting a large amount of terminal leave to be accumulated by Federal employees.

Mr. MAYBANK. As the Senator from Michigan knows, in the latter part of the pending bill we propose an amendment to require Federal employees to take their leave at appropriate times.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Further replying to the Senator's statement, I merely wish to say that this particular item for the Civil Service Commission, as the Senator is aware, is \$4,950,000 below the Budget estimate. It is true that it is more than the House figure, but that is because the chairman and other members of the Commission appeared before us in connection with the loyalty

program, and wrote various letters and submitted various statements in connection with the enforcement of that program. In the Senate subcommittee, we increased the House figure by more than \$1,000,000. I refer to the House committee's figure. Therefore, what we have reported to the Senate is merely the figure of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for this agency, plus the full committee's report to the House. I hope, in the interest of good government, that this additional amount will not be taken from this agency of Government. As I have stated, it is already about \$3,900,000 below the President's budget.

There is no point in my reading the hearings and the records and the letter which was written by Mr. Ramspeck, or in reading the laws which were passed by the Congress.

I know the Senator from Michigan will agree with me on one thing, namely, that oftentimes Congress passes a law but makes no appropriations with which to pay those employed to enforce the law. They come before the committee and say that there is an authorization, or that because of the law with respect to loyalty proceedings, or something else, more money is required. It is incumbent on Congress, as I see it, to appropriate money with which to carry out the provisions of laws duly passed.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely want to say in reply that we have attempted to get estimates as to what prospective laws are going to cost the taxpayers before the bills are passed in the Senate and in the House.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from South Carolina has been assisted in that effort by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have joined hands with the Senator, and we have introduced a bill to meet that objective.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Michigan knows that, so far as terminal leave is concerned—and I am not boasting; I merely happened to be one of those who introduced the bill—we have been trying to do something about it for 2 years. We have in the pending bill an amendment, I think, which prohibits the accumulation of terminal leave, and which provides that leave must be used from year to year. Certain amendments are legislation on an appropriation bill, but there will be amendments proposed by other Senators for the purpose of furthering the legislation which the House committee has sent to the Senate regarding terminal and other leave.

Mr. President, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan will not be willing to accept my amendment "C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield time to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator from Illinois on my side, or on the other side?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am on the other side.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, whatever side the Senator is on, I yield 2 minutes to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wonder whether the Senator from Michigan would not be willing to accept my amendment "C," which appropriates \$17,000,000 instead of \$17,500,000, and hence would effect an additional saving of \$500,000, and would conform to the House figure. I know it is sometimes difficult for us to agree on precise amounts in the matter of the cuts which are to be made. On the last amendment upon which there was a yea-and-nay vote, I think the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] went a little further than I was willing to go. But I wondered whether we could not get together on the suggestion I have made, and save another \$500,000 in the Civil Service Commission. This may be going further than the Senator from Michigan wants to go, but I think that agency can take the cut. It would still allow nearly \$500,000 more than was allowed last year.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, when the Senator from Illinois refers to the House figure, he, of course, refers to the cut which was made on the House floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. He does not refer to the action of the Appropriations Committee of the House or of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House, which made a lengthy study of the matter, but he refers simply to some amendment which was thrown into the House hopper during the closing hours.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The House is a deliberative body.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; but not quite so deliberative as is the Senate.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not agree to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. The number of employees is being increased by reason of the situation in which we find ourselves. I should like to invite attention to one group of figures. I read from page 464 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations:

Senator SALTONSTALL. This increase, Mr. Ramspeck, in this particular function comes from increasing your number of employees from 704 to 1,805, and your record check and inquiry cases from 483,000 to 1,250,000.

In other words, the work of the Commission has increased threefold. That is why we should give at least enough money properly to do its work. The amount suggested is an estimate. I believe the estimate of the Senator from Illinois is too low and that the estimate of the Senator from Michigan is more in line with the facts. The committee took the figure which the House felt was right. If we are going to have loyalty checks, Mr. President, I believe we should make them worthwhile.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, insofar as the law is concerned, the amend-

ment of the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan is based on too low an estimate. I am not here defending the Civil Service Commission, but I am defending the laws passed by the Congress of the United States. Mr. Ramspeck was for many years a responsible Member of the House of Representatives. He stated that, because of developments, it is expected that June 30, 1951, will find the Commission with a balance of more than 650,000 cases on which it has been unable to make the loyalty check required by the laws of Congress.

I do not know whether the cost was discussed, but we are asked to appropriate money, and then when the item comes up for debate we are asked to undo the laws passed by Congress. So I am opposed to both amendments.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the information which Mr. Ramspeck furnished the Senate committee shows how the amendment would work out. He reported that on June 30 Federal civilian employment within the continental United States would be 2,350,000. He estimated that by June 30, 1952, it would be 2,600,000. If we apply a 10-percent cut to this 1952 figure, which roughly the Senate's actions would accomplish, although our 10 percent cut has been in dollars and not in jobs, we would take 260,000 off the 1952 figure. That takes us back almost exactly to the current employment figure of 2,350,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the reason why the 10-percent cut is not effective is that we had already cut the agencies so much.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we apply the 10-percent cut to budget estimates for personnel we shall go back to the current employment figure of 2,350,000. That would mean maintaining the status quo rather than cutting from the number they had last year. The budget figures propose a pyramid.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan knows that we have given the Civil Service Commission additional laws to administer. We have passed laws which have placed extra burdens upon the Commission. We pass laws and then do not want to appropriate money to carry out the laws passed by the Congress. That is my sole point. The Senator cannot differ with that statement.

Mr. FERGUSON. We are giving the Commission a million dollars more than last year, and the loyalty program has been in effect.

Mr. MAYBANK. But the loyalty program requires \$3,000,000.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senators from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR and Mr. MON-

RONEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

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 Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent by leave of the Senate, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 19, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Frear	Mundt
Bennett	Hendrickson	Nixon
Brewster	Hennings	Robertson
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hoey	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Holland	Schoeppel
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Cain	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. C.
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Sparkman
Case	Kem	Thye
Connally	Knowland	Watkins
Douglas	Langer	Welker
Duff	Long	Wiley
Eastland	McClellan	Williams
Ecton	McMahon	Young
Ferguson	Millikin	
Flanders	Moody	

NAYS—19

Anderson	Hayden	Maybank
Benton	Hill	McFarland
Chavez	Humphrey	McKellar
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Cordon	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
George	Lehman	
Green	Magnuson	

NOT VOTING—25

Capehart	Gillette	Malone
Dirksen	Hunt	Martin
Dworshak	Kefauver	McCarran
Ellender	Kerr	McCarthy
Fulbright	Lodge	Monroney

Morse	Smathers	Underwood
Murray	Stennis	Wherry
O'Connor	Taft	
Pastore	Tobey	

So the amendment to the committee amendment proposed by Mr. FERGUSON on behalf of himself and other Senators was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask to have my amendment lettered "O" considered at this time.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Illinois a question? I have an amendment which is a limitation on travel expense of the Civil Service Commission, which logically follows the one we have just acted upon. I believe the chairman may accept it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to withhold offering my amendment temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois temporarily withdraws his amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment lettered "D" for myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, line 21, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$600,000" and insert "\$575,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, last year's appropriation act contained a limitation on travel expense of \$438,013. With an increased appropriation of \$1,000,000 in the first supplemental appropriation bill, the limitation raised to \$466,000.

The budget estimates for 1952 carry an estimate for travel of \$499,058. Despite this estimate it was asked that the limitation for this item be raised to \$623,000. The House allowed \$520,000 and the Senate Committee has allowed \$600,000. We propose that the limitation be reduced to \$575,000, which is about \$75,000 more than was allotted by the Budget Bureau, and some \$25,000 under the Senate committee figure. It would be in line with the amendment previously adopted.

This limitation does not actually assure any saving. It is, however, a brake upon waste through excessive or unnecessary travel. If anything, we have been entirely too generous in the ceiling upon travel expense which we propose in this amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, what the Senator from New Hampshire has said is eminently correct, and I shall be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself

and other Senators to the committee amendment on page 10, line 21.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated. It is my amendment designated "6-18-51-O."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 65, line 17, after the word "leave", it is proposed to insert "of any civilian officer or employee in excess of 20 days per year or for annual leave."

On page 65, line 20, in the committee amendment, after the comma, it is proposed to insert "That after July 1, 1951, no civilian officer or employee shall be permitted to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days per year: *Provided further,*."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have been advised informally that this amendment is in order from the parliamentary standpoint, because section 601 of the bill before us is already legislation upon a general appropriation bill. Section 601 not only applies to the leave provision for Government agencies covered by this appropriation, but also to all Government corporations and agencies included in this or any other act. So section 601 is already general legislation. My amendment is therefore merely an amendment to language already in the House provision, and it is my understanding that therefore, from a parliamentary standpoint, it is in order.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator whether the effect of this amendment is the same as the effect of his amendment he offered a few days ago to the Labor-Federal security bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is the same, with the exception that, because of the fact that section 601 does not itself refer to sick leave, I have omitted from my amendment any reference to sick leave, and have confined it purely to annual leave. Otherwise, this amendment would not be germane. It has the same purpose as the amendment I offered last week, but it is even more technically iron-clad than was that amendment. It contains a prohibition that no one shall be permitted to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days a year, and provides that no money shall be paid out for leave in excess of that amount. So it affords a double protection.

Thus there are two important differences between this amendment and the one I offered to the Labor-Federal Security bill. First, this one affects all Government agencies rather than only those included in any particular appropriations bill. Second, the law is actually changed, so that fund limitations for the payment of annual leave are backed up by changes in the law itself.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. When the House bill came to the Senate, it contained the language in section 601, on page 65, lines 14 to 20. Mr. Campbell, president of the Association of Government Workers, wrote me quite a long letter, suggesting that the subcommittee amend this provision under one of two alternative plans, either plan 1 or plan 2.

We amended the House language under plan 2.

Mr. President, I ask that my remarks be charged to my time. I do not want to make a speech on the time of the Senator from Illinois. However, I wish to state the situation perfectly clearly for the RECORD.

I talked with the Senator from Illinois about the amendment at the time the Federal Security bill was before the Senate. That bill contained no legislation. This bill contains the provision "that the head of any such corporation or agency shall afford an opportunity for officers or employees to use the annual leave accumulated under the section prior to June 30, 1952."

It is my judgment, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, that this section, as it came from the House, is legislation. I would not undertake to instruct the Chair how to rule, or to suggest a ruling. I merely wish the RECORD to be clear, that in view of the fact that the provision is legislation as it came over from the House, and in view of the fact that the language was amended by the committee itself, the amendment is not subject to a point of order. I express only my own opinion. I would not presume to suggest to the Chair how he should rule.

When a similar amendment came up in connection with the Labor-Federal Security bill, as I remember, I spoke to the present occupant of the chair, and we looked at the language. When the amendment was before the appropriations subcommittee I took the liberty of saying at that time, as well as before the full committee, as the Senator from Michigan knows, that it was my opinion, after consulting with several Senators, that since the House provision itself was legislation, the amendment would not be subject to a point of order.

The Senator from Illinois has been talking with me about this subject over a considerable period of time. We have been discussing leave and other matters for about 2 years. So far as I was concerned, as chairman of the subcommittee, and speaking solely for myself, I stated that I would have no objection to accepting his amendment.

I appreciate the fact that it seeks to legislate in this bill contrary to the wishes of my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. The last time, when the amendment was carried by one vote, I voted with the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, because at that time I stated that I construed the amendment to be legislation on an appropriation bill. In view of the fact that I am charged with the responsibility for the bill as reported by the subcommittee, and in view of the fact that I am

in charge of the bill as reported from the full committee, I felt that I should call attention to the situation.

The House of Representatives wrote this language into the bill in no uncertain terms. While I will not stand here to defend it, I consider it to be my duty not to oppose the language which the House placed in the bill, as amended by the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and as agreed to by the full committee.

That is the point which I wished to make clear. I do not want to be charged with interfering with some other committee. For that reason I opposed the Senator from Illinois when he sought to amend the Labor-Federal Security bill. The distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] made an excellent speech on the subject.

This provision I consider to be legislation on an appropriation bill, but it was written into the bill by the House of Representatives. The subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations amended the language, and the full committee added a proviso, as I remember, under plan numbered 2.

I am not here to make a speech in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, but I will say to him that as a member of the subcommittee and of the full committee I cannot consistently and honorably object to his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that he accepts the amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina stated that he would be willing to accept it on behalf of himself, as chairman of the subcommittee. However, other Senators may wish to discuss the amendment. I merely wish to have the RECORD show what happened in the committee. I want the RECORD to show why I opposed the Senator's motion on the previous bill. I told him a week ago how I construed the language. I am merely stating my own position as chairman of the subcommittee. I will accept the amendment provided it is agreeable to the committee. I do not know what the committee desires to do. I do not know what my good friend from South Carolina, chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, intends to do. I supported him to the end on a previous occasion because I believed that at that time the Senator from Illinois was attempting to legislate on an appropriation bill, although the Chair did not so rule.

Mr. President, I ask that the time consumed by my remarks be charged to my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That arrangement will be made. The Chair advises the Senator from South Carolina that 7 minutes are now charged to his time on this amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It would reduce from 26 working days a year to 20 days the amount of annual leave provided for virtually all employees in the Government. As I have pointed out over and over again, the present provision of 26 working days, on the basis of a 5-day

week, comes to 5½ weeks for every Government employee, except for postal workers; and if this amendment carries, I will offer an amendment to the post-office bill to give them the same amount of leave. With the provision of 15 days for sick leave—which, because of a parliamentary situation, we could not touch by this amendment—3 weeks more are added. I am merely substituting for this 5½ weeks a 4 weeks' vacation, which, with a week end, will amount to a full month.

I believe that every Member of the Senate, and virtually everyone else in the country as a whole, is convinced that 5½ weeks' annual leave a year for every classified Government employee is excessive. They should not have had it in the past, and certainly, in view of the financial stringency in which the Government is placed at present, we should not allow it to continue any longer.

Fortunately, the section inserted by the House is of such a general nature that we can now proceed to legislate, not merely for the independent offices, but for all other Government agencies.

Mr. MAYBANK. It means the amendment, as the Senator says, is general in nature.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to state again that it is legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. LEHMAN, and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I should like to finish my statement on one more point. Then I shall be glad to yield. I see the bees closing in around me. I did not say hornets; I said bees.

I believe every Senator is convinced that this step must be taken at some time. The question is when the step should be taken. I submit that now is the time, when the need for economy is very great. My amendment would save \$200,000,000. That is not something to be ignored.

I know that my good friend the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], for whom I have great admiration, is very likely to say that the subject should be left to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, of which he is chairman. However, I should like to point out, in all sincerity and friendliness, that his committee has had the subject before it for more than a year, and no action has been taken. In a sense, Mr. President, we are helping the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because by fixing 20 days, or four full weeks, we are taking from the committee a great deal of pressure which would undoubtedly be brought to bear on it by every group of Government employees. If the committee does not like the provision, it is always within its power to provide for a more graduated scale based on length of service. The amendment is merely an attempt on the part of Congress to express its conviction that something should be done now. We can leave the working out of the details to the committee. If the committee believes that the leave period should be left at 26 days, it can restore the 26-day

provision, although I do not believe it is likely that the committee would take such action.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MOODY. Does the Senator from Illinois know of any private business in the United States which gives its employees a vacation of 5 weeks?

Mr. DOUGLAS. A negligible number. Less than one-half of 1 percent of all employees are granted such liberal vacations.

Mr. MOODY. I should like to commend the Senator from Illinois for the action he is taking. I believe this is the way it should be done. I am not in favor of a meat-axe cut. I believe economy should be effected in the manner now being suggested by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The adoption of the amendment would save \$200,000,000.

Mr. MOODY. Which is not a negligible sum of money.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan understands that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], who is in charge of the bill, is willing to take the amendment to conference. I wonder whether the Senator from Illinois would allow it to be taken to conference. The Senator from Michigan shares the views of the Senator from Illinois on the proposed cut in the number of days of leave, indeed, the Senator from Michigan had endeavored in committee to get an agreement as to what would be a reasonable amount of leave, both in connection with this bill and on the previous appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. CASE, and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the committee is willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference, it will be perfectly satisfactory to me. I shall not insist on a yea-and-nay vote at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Illinois that the Senate would have to vote on his amendment regardless of whether it is accepted by the chairman. The Chair will state that the time for debate on the amendment is controlled by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], respectively.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from New York is in favor of my amendment, I shall be glad to yield some time to him.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York wishes to ask a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. In debate on the floor of the Senate recently I have seen it very definitely demonstrated that if the pending amendment were agreed to, there would still exist liability on the part of the Government to pay for the extra 6 days provided by law, unless the appropriate statute were simultaneously repealed or amended.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend from New York that if he will look at lines 4 to 7 of my amendment and compare the language with line 20 of the bill he will see that the amendment is now in such form that no legal liability against the Government would accrue in the future. We have closed the door.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. CASE addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield further to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I would certainly question whether the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would not constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say to my good friend from New York that the House has already legislated in this bill. If I understand the parliamentary rules, amendments to such legislation if germane are therefore in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Although it is quite probable that the length of annual leave should be curtailed, I certainly do not believe this is the way to do it. The Senate has a committee which has charge of the consideration of matters affecting the employees of the Government. It would seem to me that instead of again resorting to a hit-and-miss method—and that is what we are doing virtually with every amendment that is being presented—we should proceed in an orderly way through the functions of a committee which is duly constituted by the Senate with definite powers in that regard. We have seen several instances on the floor of the Senate of amendments being adopted in a completely hit-and-miss manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my affection for the Senator from New York is so great that I am very glad to have yielded him time for him to make a speech against my amendment.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Before yielding I should like to say in reply to the Senator from New York that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service could work out the details. The adoption of my amendment would be merely a declaration by the Senate that we do not believe that on the average annual leave should exceed 20 days.

I now yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I again wish to say to the Senator from

New York that I think it is rather unfortunate when we attempt to legislate on the floor of the Senate, but this is not an attempt to legislate on the floor of the Senate. It is merely an attempt to amend legislation which was passed by the House of Representatives in the pending bill, which was sent to the subcommittee of which I am the chairman. I had previously voted against changing the present law, but not because I thought the amount of leave should not be reduced, or that the employees of certain agencies should not have more leave, such, for example, as the employees of the Post Office Department. The amendment is not legislation, except in the sense that it proposes to change what the House has legislated.

Mr. CASE and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is controlled by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] as proponent of the amendment, and by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from South Carolina has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall yield whatever time the junior Senator from South Carolina wishes to take, except that I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the senior Senator from South Carolina is yielding 6 minutes to his colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and 2 minutes thereafter to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is that satisfactory to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. CASE. That is satisfactory.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, we have a rule in the Senate which provides that the Senate cannot legislate on an appropriation bill. I believe every Senator agrees that it is a good rule. Let us see what we are doing here. I shall raise a point of order to the amendment of the Senate committee, on the ground that it represents legislation upon an appropriation bill. If such be the fact, then the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to that amendment is out of order at this time. Let me read the provision of the bill:

No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the Government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during the calendar year 1951 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1952.

Now let us consider the amendment voted by the Senate committee. Here is where we begin with legislation on an appropriation bill and here is where I raise the point of order. I read now the committee amendment:

Provided, That the head of any such corporation or agency shall afford an opportunity for officers or employees to use the annual leave accumulated under this section prior to June 30, 1952: *Provided further*—

Now comes the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment. It reads as follows:

That after July 1, 1951, no civilian officer or employee shall be permitted to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days per year: *Provided further*—

Mr. President, if that is not legislation on an appropriation bill, there cannot be legislation on an appropriation bill. When we take into consideration both the committee amendment and the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment, it is clear that they constitute legislation on an appropriation bill. Therefore, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. I make the point of order against both the committee amendment and the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment. Certainly they are legislation on an appropriation bill. I should like to have the Chair rule on the point of order before we proceed further.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it in order to make a point of order against a committee amendment which has been adopted, namely, the committee amendment on page 65 in lines 20 to 23?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that at the time when the committee amendments were adopted, it was agreed, and was so stated in the RECORD, that the committee amendments would be open to future amendment, just as if they had not been agreed to on that day.

Mr. FERGUSON. Let me inquire whether the right to offer amendments to the committee amendments which then were adopted would include the right to make points of order in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair believes that would be possible. The Chair would welcome expressions of opinion on that point by Members of the Senate.

However, it seems to the Chair, who has conferred with the Parliamentarian in regard to this matter, that the fact that the bill as passed by the House of Representatives contained the words, on page 65, in lines 15 and 16, "in this or any other act," makes this provision of the bill, as passed by the House, general legislation applicable not only to the agencies covered by this appropriation bill but to other agencies of the Government, likewise. That being the case, it is in order for the committee, in turn, to offer the amendment now appearing on page 65 in lines 20 to 23.

If that be true, the latter part of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would itself be in order as an amendment to a committee amendment which is offered to wording already contained in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives; and, as the Chair has already stated, the committee amendment also would be in order.

Before making a final ruling to that effect, the Chair will be glad to be ad-

vised by Members of the Senate, if they care to argue the matter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, would it be possible for me to obtain time in that connection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair rules that under the unanimous-consent agreement there may be as much as 30 minutes of debate on the point of order, with the time to be divided equally.

The Senator from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to confirm the interpretation given by the present occupant of the chair. As I indicated on the floor of the Senate a few days ago, when I first read section 601 of the bill, it was not apparent that it was legislation, but a second reading indicated clearly that the words "in this or any other act," as those words appear in lines 15 and 16 on page 65 of the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, are not only a limitation but are general legislation. Being general legislation which was included in the bill as passed by the House of Representatives, those words, in my opinion, then became a general provision of the bill, and therefore are subject to amendment in the Senate. The only question that remains is whether any Senate amendment to that general legislation is germane. Certainly the committee amendment appearing in lines 20 to 23 on page 65 is germane as an amendment to the general provisions of section 601.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems clear that the Chair is correct in ruling that the amendment is not subject to a point of order.

I inquired whether the adoption of that committee amendment, although subject to further amendment, would exclude the possibility of making a point of order. After the Chair's ruling that the adoption of the committee amendment at that time did not prevent in the future the making of a point of order, I still feel that the Chair is correct in his ruling that the words "in this or any other act," as those words were inserted in the bill by the House of Representatives, make this provision of the bill general legislation, and that therefore the committee amendment is in order, and that therefore the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment is also in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Michigan to raise the question of germaneness. The Chair has not ruled on that question at all. The Chair understands that if that question is raised, it will have to be submitted to the Senate itself for determination.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Presiding Officer about the allocation of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That depends on whether the Senator from South Carolina favors the point of order. If he favors the point of order, the time in opposition to the point of order will be controlled by the minority leader or by some Senator designated by him.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make it perfectly plain, so that there will be no misunderstanding, that I do not think

the amendment is subject to a point of order, although I may be mistaken.

Therefore, I desire to yield whatever time I have to the junior Senator from South Carolina. Inasmuch as the provision referred to is in the bill as it came from the House of Representatives, I believe the committee amendment is in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may yield control of his time on this matter to his colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me ask how much more time is available to the Senator from South Carolina, and how much time is available to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The entire 15 minutes in opposition to the point of order are available to the Senator from South Carolina.

The time remaining to the Senator from Michigan is 11 minutes, so the Chair is advised.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is not the Senator from South Carolina speaking in favor of the point of order, and the Senator from Michigan speaking in opposition to the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Chair's ruling is simply that the Senator from South Carolina has not begun to use his time, and that 4 minutes of the time available to those opposing the validity of the point of order have been consumed.

Mr. MAYBANK. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the time allowed to me under the unanimous-consent agreement to the junior Senator from South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CASE. Reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that the unanimous-consent request pertains to the question regarding the point of order, and does not affect the time previously allowed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from South Dakota that it is the understanding of the Chair, that the Senator from South Dakota will have the right to be recognized for 2 minutes upon the principal question, when the point of order shall have been disposed of.

Mr. MAYBANK. In justice to the Senator from South Dakota, I may say, before I yield the entire 15 minutes, that I shall be glad, as I feel certain my colleagues will, to yield additional time to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from South Carolina may proceed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in regard to the saving of money for the Federal Government under this appropriation bill, when we adopt the House provision, we save money to the extent of stopping the pay of employees for certain accumulated leave. We would not be saving it if we

were to cut the annual leave to 20 days this year, next year, and the following year. Next year the Congress, if it sees fit to do so, may appropriate whatever amount it cares to in regard to leave, as it could do in this appropriation bill; but in this bill the door has been closed as to accumulation of annual leave next year, or until June 30, 1952. The Congress will have until then to adjust the matter of leave. The question will then arise, how can the greatest saving be effected?

I have in my hand a table which is the basis of the work of the subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service at the present time, and adoption of the figures there given would result in greater saving than the saving which would be effected by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

I desire to read from the table certain figures. I notice that the saving under the Senator's amendment would be \$140,618,430, as against \$199,765,215, as shown by the table. It will be noticed that the figures appearing on the table represent a far greater saving—and it would be brought about in a systematic way and in an equitable way—than by merely making a cut across the board.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand, then, that the Senator from South Carolina is in favor of a graduated system of leave which will reduce the total amounts of leave from 26 days?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that, as a result of discussions, the committee seems to think that that would be the logical course, instead of applying the provision equally to an employee who has been working for, say, 30 years and one who has been working only a short time. The former may need more leave than would be needed by a man serving his first year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the Senator is in favor of reducing the total amount of leave, I take it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The total amount of leave should be reduced for those in the early years of their service.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Why does not the Senator from South Carolina accept this amendment, and then later in committee propose his refinements?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I assert to the Senator from Illinois that his amendment would not save a single dime in this appropriation bill. It is nothing but a flash, so far as saving money is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understood the Senator from South Carolina to say my amendment would save at least \$140,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The amendment which now lies on the desks of Senators would not save anything this year, not a cent. The truth of the matter is that employees who do not take leave are the ones who cost the Government money. In the case of those who take their leave, in most instances

their jobs are filled by people within the department, through a doubling-up process.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend bear with me, to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield gladly to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the total amount of leave were reduced from 26 days to 20, so that each man would work 6 days more than would otherwise be the case, does the Senator from South Carolina not feel that as a result fewer people would be employed to do the same amount of work, and would that not effect economies in the total size of the payroll?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My understanding is that a reduction is already being made. Let me call to the attention of the Senate one other matter which should be considered for a moment. First we make a 10-percent cut, and then we cut the employees leave. When both those things are done, the result is a two-way cut. That is exactly what we would be doing to the Government workers.

So far as Government workers are concerned, I am not here to say that each of them is working at his job every minute; neither is every employee in the office of the Senator from Illinois or in my office working every minute. But I think that, as a whole, Government workers give as good service, hour in and hour out, as do employees working for corporations in carrying on their activities. So I think we should adopt a provision which would result in the older employees being shown some consideration for their service. The truth of the matter is that as a usual thing the older a person becomes, the more he needs to take leave.

I do not care to consume the time of the Senate in connection with this appropriation bill, but I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that I believe the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which has been devoting many hours to the consideration of this particular question of leave, should be given consideration, rather than what is said by some Senators on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER rose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If there were a bill before a committee, whether it be the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Foreign Relations, or the Committee on Finance, each member of the committee would want the committee to decide what was best to be done under all the circumstances.

Let us remember that there are various kinds of leave, which the committee is studying at the present time, in an effort to determine what should be done. An amendment is now proposed to cut annual leave to 20 days, merely by an amendment to be acted upon on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I ask the distinguished Senator whether it is not true

that, if the question were before a committee, we would be confronted with a proposition which I shall cite purely as an example. We have before our committee a matter which concerns Alaska, where the weather is very cold, and where the situation is entirely different from that in Panama. Our committee found, for example, 3 years ago, that in one department 800 employees were doing absolutely nothing. They had been on the payroll a long time, and the criticism was made, "Here you have 800 employees who are doing absolutely nothing." We brought in the head of the Bureau of Mines, and we said, "How can you justify having on the payroll 800 employees who are doing nothing?" The answer was, "It is very simple. John L. Lewis may call a strike tomorrow. He is threatening from day to day, from week to week, and from month to month to call a strike. It is necessary that we have these stand-bys, so that, in case a strike is called, we shall have the people available to go in and do the job, overnight." He said, "For example, who is going to take charge of these mines if a strike occurs?" The members of the committee, including one of the Senators who today is arguing for the pending amendment, decided unanimously to extend the period of time of those 800 employees, by reason of the fact that it was winter, and it was desired to protect the American people from suffering in case a strike occurred at any time within the near future.

I ask my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, if the subcommittee and the committee itself have not spent weeks and weeks of time in working out this matter on an equitable basis, so that, as the Senator said a moment ago, those who have worked for a great many years would get more leave than those who have worked a shorter period.

I agree fully with what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said. The subject is pending before his committee, and hearings are being conducted. Therefore, I believe that the committee should not be discharged, as it were, and legislation passed on the floor without our going into the question very carefully. I compliment the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for battling not only for the rights of the committee, but for the rights of Federal employees so that they may receive a square deal.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his remarks. If we examine the appropriation bill, it will be found that some persons employed by the Federal Government receive bonuses or increased salaries because they reside in certain territories or areas, which brings out the fact that possibly those persons who live in a particular section will receive more leave than will others.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Will the Senator from South Carolina inform me whether it is

his opinion that the same problem which is before the Senate at this moment was discussed, argued, and acted upon in connection with a similar amendment last week?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. It was.

Mr. WELKER. Does the Senator remember the very learned and able address of the senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. GEORGE), when he told his colleagues that it was an attempt at general legislation on an appropriation bill and was, therefore, not in order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I recall the address, and the Senator from Georgia was correct.

Mr. WELKER. Is it not a further fact that in the event this amendment is adopted claim after claim will be presented to the Treasury of the United States to pay for the administration of the amendment, and that no good lawyer upon the floor of the Senate can tell the real legality of the amendment?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator is entirely correct. There is no Senator who will not agree that this amendment is legislation attached to an appropriation bill. The fact that it started in the House and the amendment is offered in the Senate makes no difference. It is still wrong legislation.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I was attending a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations this morning and could not be present at the meeting of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Did the committee report a bill on this subject?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The bill is before a subcommittee at the present time, which is now considering it. The Senate is asked to take it out of the hands of the subcommittee.

Mr. MCKELLAR. It seemed to me that the plan which the subcommittee had worked out was a very excellent plan.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Tennessee was present when we discussed the same question in the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I think that practically every member of the committee agreed that an excellent piece of work had been done and that the present head of the Civil Service Commission had made an excellent record on this subject. Yet, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois brings up the question of limiting the annual leave to 20 days and doing nothing with reference to sick leave. Why did he not make the number of days 19, or 21? How did he arrive at the provision for 20 days? That is the length of leave received by the Post Office Department employees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired. The Chair is ready to rule, unless there be further discussion.

After conferring with the Parliamentarian, the Chair rules that the inclusion of the words "in this or any other act," in section 601 of the pending bill as it

came from the House of Representatives, constitutes general legislation, and in view of that fact, amendments, whether they be committee amendments or amendments offered from the floor, which are germane or relevant to the subject matter, are in order.

The Chair rules, therefore, that the point of order is not well taken, and that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois is in order.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment, I think, is one as to which there is general agreement. I myself have a bill pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service which proposes during the national emergency to reduce the leave of employees from 26 to 15 days, the amount which postal employees have. So I am in favor of the objective. But there are two questions with respect to the language, concerning which I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Illinois. First, the effect of inserting the first amendment, starting in line 14, would be to make it read, "shall be available to pay for annual leave of any civilian officer or employee in excess of 20 days per year or for annual leave."

The question I raise is whether that would seek to confiscate leave in excess of 20 days. I fear that it would open the Government to claims of civil-service employees who have accrued leave in excess of 20 days, and that no appropriation would be available for the 6 days. It seems to me it should be made applicable to the existing fiscal year. I would suggest that instead of the words "per year" we use the words "for the fiscal year 1952."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, that is perfectly acceptable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is modified accordingly.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the second question related to the use of the words "permitted to earn" in line 6 of the suggested amendment. If "permitted to earn" means permitted to accrue, that is one meaning, but I think the intent of the Senator from Illinois is to go to the matter of entitlement. I think the present law entitles a civil-service employee to have annual leave of 26 days, except as to postal employees. I would suggest that instead of using the words "permitted to earn" the words be "entitled to earn."

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very happy to accept that modification also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Illinois is modified accordingly.

Mr. CASE. I thank the Senator from Illinois. The problem is a very difficult one.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator for his suggestions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. 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	George	McMahon
Anderson	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Benton	Hendrickson	Moody
Brewster	Hennings	McKellar
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Mahoney
Byrd	Humphrey	Pastore
Cain	Ives	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Saitonstall
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kem	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Taft
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Dworschak	Long	Watkins
Eastland	Magnuson	Weicker
Ecton	Maybank	Wiley
Ellender	McCarran	Williams
Ferguson	McCarthy	Young
Flanders	McClellan	
Frear	McFarland	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified. All time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been asked for. Is the demand sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 65, line 17, after "leave" insert the following "of any civilian officer or employee in excess of 20 days for the fiscal year 1952 or for annual leave."

On page 65, line 20, after the comma, insert the following: "That after July 1, 1951, no civilian officer or employee shall be entitled to earn annual leave at a rate in excess of 20 days per year: *Provided further.*"

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] 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.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is paired on this vote with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEYL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea", and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate, and, if present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a Member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEYL] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent because of illness, and if present, he would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 26, as follows:

YEAS—52

Bennett	Ferguson	Millikin
Benton	Flanders	Monroney
Brewster	Frear	Moody
Bricker	George	Mundt
Bridges	Green	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Robertson
Byrd	Hennings	Russell
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Saitonstall
Case	Hill	Smith, Maine
Clements	Hoey	Smith, N. J.
Connally	Holland	Smith, N. C.
Cordon	Jenner	Sparkman
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Douglas	Kem	Wiley
Dworschak	Long	Williams
Eastland	Maybank	Young
Ecton	McCarran	
Ellender	McClellan	
	McMahon	

NAYS—26

Aiken	Johnson, Tex.	McFarland
Anderson	Johnston, S. C.	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Kilgore	Neely
	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Cain	Langer	Thye
Carlson	Lehman	Watkins
Chavez	Magnuson	Weicker
Hayden	McCarran	
Humphrey	McCarthy	
Ives		

NOT VOTING—18

Duff	Lodge	Pastore
Fulbright	Malone	Smathers
Gillette	Martin	Stennis
Hunt	Morse	Tobey
Kefauver	Murray	Underwood
Kerr	O'Conor	Wherry

So the amendment offered by Mr. DOUGLAS, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). All time on the committee amendment has expired. Without objection, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

RENOVATION AND REPAIR OF WHITE HOUSE

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, preceding an amendment which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The communication was read by the Chief Clerk, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1951.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of the Congress a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1952 in the amount of \$225,000 for the General Services Administration.

The details of this proposed appropriation, the necessity therefor, and the reasons for its submission at this time are set forth in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with whose comments and observations thereon I concur.

Respectfully yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The message will be referred to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 25, it is proposed to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For an additional amount for "Renovation and modernization, Executive mansion," \$225,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, the Director of the Budget writes:

These funds are necessary to meet unforeseen expenses arising out of the advance in construction costs between April 1, 1949, when the original estimate of costs was prepared, and the time the various elements of the renovation and modernization project were actually committed for contract. The work to be performed with funds contained in this estimate has been reviewed and concurred in by the Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion.

If Senators will bear with me for a moment I should like to explain the amendment. The entire appropriation for the purpose of renovating the White House was in the amount of nearly \$6,000,000. Prices have gone up tremendously since the work was first undertaken. It seems to me that in the light of all circumstances the President and the Director of the Budget are making a very reasonable request. I have talked with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] who is in charge of the bill, and I have talked also with the majority leader and the minority leader. They have substantially endorsed the amendment. However, the Senator from Michigan has made a proposal, which I am perfectly willing to accept. He would like to reduce the amount by \$50,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. MCKELLAR. So as to reduce the amount requested to \$175,000. I believe it is a very reasonable request on his part. I, therefore, ask that the amendment be adopted, as modified. I believe we all realize that the work must be completed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I should like to make an explanation of the item.

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

Mr. MCKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not mind agreeing with the Senator from Michigan. However, it would seem to me to be rather inconsistent to have the Bureau of the Budget and the President write to Congress; to have us agree with them; to have the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] tell us that the amount requested is necessary in order to finish the renovation of the Executive Mansion—and we all agree that the work should be completed—and then to be asked to agree with the Senator from Michigan that we must cut the amount requested by \$50,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan would like to state the reason for the proposed cut.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would like to see the work completed. I would like to agree with my good friend from Tennessee. I believe he is correct. I believe the work should be finished. If \$225,000 is required that is the amount that should be appropriated. If \$200,000 is required, \$175,000 will not be sufficient.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to make an explanation on that point. I should like to explain why I propose to cut \$50,000 from the \$225,000. It is based on an examination of the details involved in the completion of the White House. In the items submitted there is included one which is in effect a contingency amount of eighty-nine-thousand-and-some-odd dollars. As a matter of fact there is another \$10,000 in reserve, or a total of about \$100,000. Something like \$89,000 of that contingency reserve would be replaced if the whole amount of \$225,000 which is requested were granted. Therefore if we were to reduce the amount by \$50,000 there would still be in the contingency fund approximately \$50,000, which would enable the Commission to take care of any small items that might arise. And if we deduct \$50,000 from the \$225,000 requested there remains \$175,000. The \$175,000 would cover every item of dollar expenditures required to complete the construction of the building. I feel as the Senator from Tennessee feels, that if we are going to spend \$5,600,000 to build the White House—

Mr. MCKELLAR. It is practically \$6,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. It is almost completed. There are such matters as the installation and adjustment of chandeliers and some venetian blinds still to be provided for, I believe. At any rate, I certainly believe that we should finish the work on the mansion for the President. However, that can be done even if the item of \$50,000 is taken out because it is only a contingent item. Does that explain the situation to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It explains it, but I am not satisfied with the explanation. I think we should appropriate the entire amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. I hope the Senator will not insist on replacing \$50,000 in the reserve for contingencies because even after we take \$50,000 away there will still be \$50,000 remaining for such unanticipated expenses.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Under the agreement there would be sufficient funds provided to pay for materials and work to finish the White House. The sum of \$89,000 is purely a contingent fund. It could be brought up in a deficiency bill at any time if the expense were actually incurred.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is the Senator from Tennessee satisfied that \$175,000 will be sufficient to complete the White House?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I think so, but I am not absolutely certain.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what I have in mind.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Estimates are the best we can get at this time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Inasmuch as estimates are being made and the present estimate is for \$225,000, why can we not appropriate \$225,000?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I should like to do so, but there is opposition.

Mr. FERGUSON. Under my proposed modification of the amendment sufficient funds would be provided to complete the building, except for the contingency fund, for which we would provide \$50,000.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I hope we can have a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee modify his amendment by deducting \$50,000, so as to make the amount read \$175,000?

Mr. MCKELLAR. The amount is to be reduced to \$175,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. The amount of \$225,000 is to be reduced by \$50,000, making it \$175,000.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I shall be happy—because it must be done—to accept the amendment.

I rise to ask how much time remains, because I have assured another Senator that he will be able to have 3 minutes of the time available to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to read to the Senate the language of the modified amendment of the Senator from Tennessee:

Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For an additional amount for "Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion," \$175,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. President, the Bureau of the Budget and the President both said that for this purpose \$225,000 would be needed. The amendment as originally submitted was prepared in accordance with their letters or requests.

However, as a result of the compromise reached with the Senator from Michigan, the amendment now has been modified so as to provide \$50,000 less, or \$175,000,

for renovation of the Executive Mansion. I wish to point out that both the Bureau of the Budget and the President requested the larger amount, namely, \$225,000. I simply wish to have the Senate know what it is doing when it acts on the modified amendment. When we act on the modified amendment, we are not acting on the request of the Bureau of the Budget or the request of the President, but we are acting on an amendment which was submitted on the floor of the Senate, by which the amount requested by the President and the Bureau of the Budget—namely, \$225,000—would be cut \$50,000, to \$175,000.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have not suggested the reduction. However, I wish to say that I understand that the request for this item is an additional request on which no hearing was held. When the chairman of the committee asked me whether I would agree to take the amendment to conference, I simply said I would agree to do so. I did not agree to do anything else.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] as modified.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from South Carolina has agreed to yield 3 minutes to me.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, Mr. President; I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I ask unanimous consent to report favorably 1,736 nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and, in order to avoid the printing of the nominations in the Executive Calendar, I wish to ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nominations be confirmed and the President be notified.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I object. We should not go into executive session at this time.

Mr. CAIN. My request is that the nominations be confirmed as in executive session. These are routine nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force; and they are unanimously reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no objection to having the nominations confirmed, but I do not think we should go into executive session at this time, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement. Certainly it will be proper to have the nominations brought up later in the day.

So, with all respect to the Senator from Washington, I think it would be a mistake for the Senate to act on the nominations at this time, but of course I would have no objection to having the nominations confirmed toward the end of today's session.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I thoroughly understand the position of the Senator from South Carolina, and I shall report the nominations toward the end of the session today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amend-

ment of the Senator from Tennessee, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to, as follows:

On page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion: For an additional amount for 'Renovation and modernization, Executive Mansion,' \$175,000, to remain available until expended."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I submit, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], an amendment to the committee amendment on page 24, in line 1; and I ask that the amendment to the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 24, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out "\$16,426,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this item relates to the General Services Administration expenses, general supply fund. It is the overhead item for operation of the general supply fund through which the General Services Administration makes purchases for use of the various Government agencies. Some time ago the Senate and the House decided—and it is now the law—that purchases for the various Government agencies should be made by the General Services Administration, rather than by the various agencies themselves. Therefore we now have before us this item.

There is no real basis for comparing present costs with past costs, for two reasons: First, in the past indirect costs were appropriated for under operating expenses of the General Services Administration, and direct costs were financed from surcharges paid to the General Services Administration by the purchasing agencies. Second, there has been a great increase in the volume of business to be done in 1952—an increase from approximately \$92,000,000 to approximately \$150,000,000.

The Budget request was for \$18,426,000. The House allowed \$15,000,000. That is the amount proposed to be allowed by this amendment to the committee amendment, although the Senate committee recommended, by its amendment, the amount of \$16,426,000. In other words, Mr. President, our amendment to the committee amendment proposes a reduction of \$1,426,000 in the appropriation.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amendment the Senator from Michigan now proposes is the same as an amendment which was offered on the floor of the House of Representatives, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. And the amount voted for this item by the Senate committee is the same as the amount which the House Appropriations Committee recommended, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is.

Mr. President, aside from storage facilities this item relates to the handling of stores sales which may amount to \$88,000,000 in volume. For handling expenses or overhead the bill in its present form would allow \$8,700,000, or a handling charge of 9.9 percent of those sales.

There are also direct deliveries of supplies amounting to \$61,600,000. The bill would allow 1.25 percent of the dollar volume of direct deliveries as a handling expense.

The total sales amount to \$149,600,000, and the bill as it is before us would allow \$9,500,000 to the General Services Administration as expenses in connection with the total sales—in other words, the business of making the purchases and distributions. That allowance for expenses amounts to 6.35 percent of the total sales.

Also included in the requests are funds for rent and space maintenance amounting to \$2,805,200, and for new warehousing facilities amounting to \$4,061,200. Both of those items could bear reduction and any reductions would make more money available for handling expenses. But even including them, we arrive at the real point of the reduction desired.

The proposed overhead cost for handling this program is 8.3 percent on store sales and 1.25 percent on direct deliveries, for an average of 5.41 percent, as compared with 6.35 percent which is in the bill.

Now let me emphasize again that those are pure handling costs, because rents, utilities, and the usual costs of doing business are taken care of otherwise. Here is a place where Government must prove its ability to do a businesslike job economically, and we propose by appropriating no more than the \$15,000,000 for this operation, that the agency should be required to cut down its handling costs.

Mr. President, this is a business which can be compared to ordinary business outside Government. It is not at all one of the intangibles, where we are enforcing regulations, or any such thing. This item simply involves the centralized purchase and handling of material and supplies for the various agencies of Government.

For the operation of this business we propose an allowance of 5.41 percent on the dollar volume handled. That is exclusive of the usual overhead costs chargeable to private business, and I am entirely confident that private business could and would operate on such an operating allowance. For that reason I think the Government agency doing this business should. I hope that the Senate will see fit to vote favorably upon this proposed cut, which is \$1,426,000 below the committee recommendation but in accordance with what the House allowed.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, the Senate committee adopted the House committee figure, after going into lengthy hearings with the General Services Administration, General Larson, and others.

I should like to call the following quotation to the attention of the Senate:

Although this is a new appropriation item for 1952, the functions, activities, workload,

unit costs, staffing and other elements which are utilized to formulate the estimate are not new. The fundamental difference between the operations to be financed in 1952 is the volume of business to be done and in nonrecurring preparatory work for taking care of the increased volume of business.

I might comment in that connection that there has been an increase of Government activities, under the Reorganization Act, with respect to buildings turned over to the General Services Administration during the past year.

I read from page 696 of the hearings on the pending bill:

The increase in volume of business is best expressed in terms of stores sales which show an increase from \$35,000,000 in 1951 to \$88,000,000 in 1952, or 151 percent. As compared to this 151-percent increase in sales, the cost of doing business on a comparable basis is increased only 77 percent.

In other words, the increase in cost was half of the business.

The budget for 1952 presented a balanced program for expanding the business under the general supply fund from \$35,000,000 in 1951 to \$88,000,000 in 1952. The reduction indicated by the House committee distributed between activities shown in the report would result in such an unbalanced program as to defeat, or at least defer until 1953, the purpose of the Congress in providing \$34,000,000 increase in the capital of the general supply fund to increase the inventory and to increase sales of common-use items to Government agencies.

Reference was made to a law similar to the laws of which I spoke previously, which the Congress passed under the Reorganization Act, setting this sales activity up. For the first time it is included this year in an appropriation bill. We finally reached the conclusion that we would go along with the original recommendation of the House committee, and not with what the Senator from Michigan has recommended, which is the same as the amount adopted by the House after the recommendation of the committee was cut on the House floor. With due deference to them, most of the Members of the House had not sat in committee when the hearings were conducted, and therefore were not familiar with what the House committee had done and the reasons for their action.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I hope that this amendment of the Senator from Michigan will not be adopted. I do not think it would result in economy. I believe it approaches the subject in the wrong way. The increased expenses of the General Services Administration are based on the Hoover Commission report. Under that report the sales to the various departments of the Government would be centralized in one department. The General Services Administration estimated the need for the fiscal year 1952 would amount to \$18,426,000 of which \$15,781,000 would be due to new legislation passed by Congress.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has referred to the so-called reorganization

acts. The provision under consideration gives effect to bills reported by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which became Public Laws 152 and 754, Eighty-first Congress. We are endeavoring to provide the appropriations required under laws passed by the Congress. I wanted the RECORD to show that. As the Senator has so ably said, it was one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. The General Services Administration requested \$18,426,000, of which \$15,700,000 was necessary because of the new legislation. The House committee cut the amount to \$16,426,000, and, on the floor of the House, it was cut to \$15,000,000. The amendment of the Senator from Michigan would reduce the appropriation to the figure to which it was cut in the House, whereas the Senate committee put it back to the House committee figure of \$16,426,000.

Why is this money needed? The store sales, plus the goods which are stored, amounted in 1950 to \$26,000,000; in 1951, to \$35,000,000; and in 1952 they are estimated at \$88,000,000. The direct delivery sales were \$51,000,000 in 1950, \$56,000,000 in 1951, and estimated to be \$61,000,000 in 1952.

The purpose of providing for store sales is to enable the agencies to buy in bulk and then to store in warehouses. The money proposed to be appropriated is needed to enable the agency to place in warehouses the goods bought in the so-called store sales. If the money is not allowed for the warehouses, then it is impossible to have the store sales; and if we make this further cut, which will be a total cut of more than \$3,000,000 in the amount estimated, the consequence will be that we shall simply be unable to carry out the purposes of the Hoover Commission, because of the impossibility of buying goods in advance, as a result of having no place in which to store them. That is my understanding of the reason for the appropriation.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has most ably elucidated the point about which I was going to ask him a question. I might add, however, that they are all put into one group, rather than being scattered helter-skelter. That is what the Hoover Commission and the Senate committee recommended. We have appropriated sufficient funds after we have cut \$3,000,000 from the original estimate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I might make one more statement. The floor amendment in the House of Representatives reduced the amount to \$15,000,000. Representative WILLIAMS, who argued the question, compared store sales with the percentage of costs, but he failed to take into account the fact that the expense of the store sales would gradually decline from 19 percent to 12 percent, providing there were a place in which to store the goods. Gradually the expense of carrying on the store sales will decline and we can get the original warehouse cost out of the way. That is what I understand to be the purpose of the appropriation.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I hope, therefore, Mr. President, that the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan will not be adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON of Texas in the chair). The Senator has 10 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the sponsors of this amendment realize what the Hoover Commission recommended. All the sponsors of the amendment are endeavoring to do is to ensure efficient and economical operation, which was what the Hoover Commission most certainly intended. We realize that it is claimed that the agencies will purchase \$150,000,000 worth of supplies instead of \$92,000,000 worth. That is, incidentally, one of the things wrong with the budget. We are supplying to various agencies \$150,000,000 instead of \$92,000,000. This amendment does not cut down those amounts, but as I understand, the Senate and the Appropriations Committee have been seeking to cut down the amount of the budget. To the extent they are successful that volume of purchasing supplies will be reduced and the need for overhead funds or handling charges reduced also.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to predict what the Senator from Michigan will say in his argument, but the Senator knows that the products which the Government buys have materially increased in price during the past year. That applies to typewriters and everything else the Government has to buy. It has to buy from private concerns.

Mr. FERGUSON. But I am contending that it does not cost any more to handle the purchase of a \$100 typewriter than a \$50 typewriter. That makes my argument that pyramiding costs of supplies should not make pyramiding costs of overhead. It should not take a correspondingly greater number of employees to do the work.

Mr. President, if there is any cut in the bill that is justified, it is the one in connection with purchasing. I hope we shall not go back to the conditions such as the Truman committee found during the Second World War, with warehouses full of saddles designed for use in the First World War, and full of parts of wagons intended for use in the War Between the States.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It was up to the Senate of the United States to turn down the Hoover reorganization recommendations if it did not agree with them. The general supply office and other agencies of Government have been scattered all over the country. Furthermore, some of the Government agencies never went to any central depot to buy goods. They bought wherever they chose.

Mr. FERGUSON. I know that and I supported the Hoover Commission recommendation. I am only saying that I want a businesslike administration of

Government agencies. It is that for which the Senator from Michigan voted when the GSA was set up, and he is now one of the sponsors of legislation to put into effect all the other Hoover Commission recommendations.

There should be a businesslike administration. The House, after due consideration, voted for \$15,000,000, and I think the Senate will be wise in cutting the amount to that figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield me time—

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. But first let me say that the House never had a record vote with reference to this appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the side-slip on page 47, it is stated that the amendment by Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi was agreed to.

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes, but there was no yea-and-nay vote. The amendment was just accepted by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. In effect, then, it was accepted by the House unanimously.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not question the Senator from Michigan, but I had understood that there was no yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the action taken was indicative of what the House wanted to do. The chairman of the subcommittee consented to the cut.

Mr. MAYBANK. I think it was thought it would be taken to conference, if I may say so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I shall not continue the discussion except to point out that the appropriations for 1950 and 1951 did not include rent for additional space in warehouses in order to make the contemplated sales possible. I understand the whole theory of authorizing store sales is to make it possible to be able to buy in sufficient bulk to supply the needs of more than one department at a time. If there is no place in which to store goods, that cannot be done.

I argue most sincerely that the idea of the Hoover Commission is to cut down the overhead expenses of Government, but we shall not bring about that result unless the Government agencies can buy goods as cheaply as possible, from such stores as Sears, Roebuck, Montgomery Ward, and other department stores which have storage space.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, there is included in the amount of \$15,000,000 the sum of \$4,061,800 for warehousing. We are not asking to have the warehousing appropriation cut down, although I have suggested that possibility if it is not absolutely essential storage space that is to be provided.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, we have already cut \$2,000,000 from that amount. It was requested by the Bureau of the Budget. Instead of \$4,000,000, it is \$2,000,000, and my argument applies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. [Putting the question.] The "ayes" seem to have it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	McKellar
Anderson	Green	McMahon
Bennett	Hayden	Millikin
Benton	Hendrickson	Monroney
Brewster	Hennings	Moody
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Nixon
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	O'Conor
Byrd	Humphrey	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Ives	Pastore
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Case	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoopel
Clements	Kem	Smith, Maine
Connally	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Langer	Taft
Douglas	Lehman	Thye
Duff	Long	Watkins
Dworschak	Magnuson	Weicker
Eastland	Maybank	Wiley
Ecton	McCarran	Williams
Ellender	McCarthy	Young
Ferguson	McClellan	
Frear	McFarland	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself and other Senators, in the committee amendment, on page 24, line 1, to strike out "\$16,426,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$15,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. On that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] 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 Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] is absent on official business as a Member of the President's Commission on the One Hundred Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who is absent because of illness. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is absent because of illness, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 27, as follows:

YEAS—49

Bennett	Frear	Moody
Brewster	George	Mundt
Bricker	Hendrickson	Nixon
Bridges	Hickenlooper	O'Conor
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Robertson
Butler, Nebr.	Holland	Schoopel
Byrd	Ives	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. C.
Case	Kem	Taft
Chavez	Knowland	Watkins
Clements	Langer	Weicker
Connally	Long	Wiley
Cordon	Magnuson	Williams
Dirksen	McCarran	Young
Douglas	McCarthy	
Duff	McClellan	
Dworschak	McFarland	
Eastland	McMahon	
Ecton	Millikin	

NAYS—27

Aiken	Hayden	McCarran
Anderson	Hennings	McFarland
Benton	Hill	McKellar
Chavez	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Kilgore	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Long	Pastore
Ellender	Magnuson	Saltonstall
Ferguson	Maybank	Thye

NOT VOTING—20

Cain	Kerr	Smathers
Flanders	Lodge	Sparkman
Fulbright	Malone	Stennis
Gillette	Martin	Tobey
Hunt	Morse	Underwood
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Wherry
Kefauver	Russell	

So the amendment offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators, to the committee amendment, was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the Senate has been making some reductions. Now I shall offer two small amendments in an effort to increase certain appropriations in the bill. I have been voting with economy-minded Senators almost straight down the line; but we have now reached an appropriation which I think, in the interest of the country and in the interest of the national defense, should be increased. I refer to the safety sections of the Interstate Commerce Commission appropriations.

The other day I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan, making an across-the-board percentage cut. It is difficult to justify an across-the-board cut when we reach certain items. I know it is said that we want to cut everything except the things in which we are directly interested. That does not happen to be the case

with respect to the amendments which I am offering today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests that the Senator offer his amendment. He has only 15 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Very well. The time can be charged to me.

The first amendment which I shall offer is to strike out the Senate committee amendment on page 30, line 1, thus restoring the item of \$706,600 as passed by the House. The item covers the inspection of locomotives.

Mr. President, I believe that railroad transportation is as much a part of national defense as is the purchase of a cannon, a tank, or any other kind of weapon used in warfare. Railroad transportation is an absolute necessity in carrying on any kind of national defense.

We know that trains have been speeded up. We know that the railroads have been called upon to exert every possible effort to improve the transportation of freight and passengers. We are dealing with a proposed increase of \$44,080. That is pretty small potatoes, measured by the amounts of appropriations which have been granted for national defense.

We are transporting soldiers across the country. We are transporting supplies for them. It does not seem to me that it is sensible to attempt to effect an economy in such an item as this.

I wonder how many Members of the Senate have ever seen a bad railroad wreck. I have had the misfortune to see three very serious railroad wrecks, in one of which a dozen or more passengers were burned to death. I have seen 20 or 30 derailments, in which freight was strewn across the right-of-way. There is nothing much worse than a railroad wreck.

I do not know whether restoring \$44,080 in this appropriation would save us from a wreck, or whether, if the amount were not restored, such action would cause a wreck. However, I am very sure that we are going to have wrecks. We are going to have very bad wrecks. Such wrecks will kill many GI's. They will destroy a great deal of property and many weapons of war. I have the feeling that if the Senate votes not to restore this appropriation, someone will be unkind enough to say that had the appropriation been restored the wreck would not have occurred. Perhaps it would not.

The number of inspectors has been cut to the very limit. Congress, in its wisdom, determined the number of engine inspectors for the country. It seems to me that we would be going against the judgment of Congress if we were to cut the appropriations and thus reduce the number of locomotive inspectors. I sincerely hope the committee will accept my amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that I regret that my good friend from Colorado voted for the 10-percent cut in personnel, which affected also the Interstate Commerce Commission. I believe his amendment should be agreed to, and I shall vote for it. I regret that he does not make the amount more than \$44,000. There is

nothing to be gained by cutting the appropriation for the Interstate Commerce Commission, as can be seen from the letter written to the committee by Commissioner J. Monroe Johnson, which I have had printed in the RECORD. My suggestion would be that the Senator raise his figure of \$44,000 to \$100,000, in the interest of economy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will permit me to say so, I am offering two amendments. One of them is for \$44,000, which would cover locomotive inspections. The other amendment is for the sum of \$67,000, which would cover the maintenance and inspection of automatic signals.

Mr. MAYBANK. The amount of money to be appropriated for the Interstate Commerce Commission should be what was originally reported to the Senate by the Appropriations Committee, including the restoration of the 10-percent cut which was voted. That would be the fair thing to do. It should be done to protect the railroads. It would be the fair thing to do to protect the transportation of our country. I hope the Senator will modify his amendment and that we will have a yea-and-nay vote on it. I am not in favor of taking half-way measures.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be happy to yield if I have some time remaining.

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not intend to take his time. People have come from all over the United States to testify before the subcommittee. I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota was present.

Mr. President, I ask that the time I have used be charged to my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement the Senator from South Carolina would not have any time in his control, because he is supporting the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; I am supporting the original appropriation as made by the Senate committee. I am supporting the entire amount.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending amendment is the Johnson amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I beg the Chair's pardon.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I shall be happy to yield, but first I yield to the Senator from Minnesota. I yield to him very briefly.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I know it is very unpopular to support an increase in an appropriation. However, those of us who heard the testimony and became familiar with all the facts involved know that with present demands upon our railroads, they must be kept in a condition to transport every ton of freight that is necessary to be transported.

Mr. President, I suggest that one wreck on our railroads would cost more in money than the amount of the appropriation involved. There would not only be an interference with transportation, but the lives of people would be endangered. A failure to provide adequate ap-

propriations would endanger not only the lives of the passengers on trains, but of the crews who operate the trains.

In these days, when we have such an increase in freight movements, I cannot see any economy in reducing an appropriation item and thereby curtail the required number of locomotive inspectors and of others engaged in safety work on our railroads.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the time for debate on the pending amendment is equally divided. The proponent of the amendment is entitled to 15 minutes, and a Senator opposing the amendment is entitled to 15 minutes.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am opposing it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, as I have already stated, I have two amendments. One of them is on page 29, line 18, to restore the figure \$983,000. The other amendment is on page 30, to restore the original amount of \$706,600. They are the amounts which the House voted. If I may, I should like to consolidate my amendments into one amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent the Senator may offer them together.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall be happy to yield if I have some time remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that although I am in favor of his amendments, both of them are limited by the amendment with respect to personal services, and I would suggest to the Senator from Colorado that the amounts in his amendments be increased proportionately.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Colorado will yield, I should like to say that what the Senator from Massachusetts has said suggests the only reason why I opposed the amendment. The proposal of the Senator from Colorado is to add money without providing a sufficient number of men to carry on the work. It was my thought that the 10 per cent cut, from which the Senate exempted some agencies, such as the Atomic Energy Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board, should also not apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission. I am in further agreement with the Senator's suggestion that the amount be raised to over \$100,000. I believe he should restore the cut that was made in the item for personal services.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to perfect my amendment. The first part of the amendment is on page 29, line 18, to restore the figure "\$983,000"; to strike out the figure "\$922,575"; and on line 19 to strike out "\$696,800", and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$743,000".

The second part is on page 30, line 1, to restore the figure "\$706,600" and strike out the figure "\$662,520"; and on line 2,

to strike out the figure "\$508,300" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "\$540,000."

The amendments would restore the appropriations as originally provided for the employment of personnel in almost exact proportion to the amounts which were provided by the Committee on Appropriations.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment, as modified.

THE CHIEF CLERK. The first part of the amendment is in the amendment of the committee on page 29, line 18, to strike out "\$922,577" and insert "\$983,000," and on line 19 to strike out "\$696,800" and insert "\$743,700."

The second part of the amendment is in the committee amendment on page 30, line 1, to strike out "\$662,520" and insert "\$706,600," and on line 2 to strike out "\$508,300" and insert "\$540,000."

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. FERGUSON. I inquire whether the amendment is in order. Is it not an amendment in the third degree?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is in the second degree. It is an amendment to a committee amendment, which has not been agreed to.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The time for debate is divided between the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

MR. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I yield my time to any Senator who desires to oppose the amendment. I have no intention to oppose the amendment as modified. The only reason why I opposed it originally, as I stated previously, was that the personal services provision should have been restored. That has been done. I am in favor of the amendment. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Michigan.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized for 12 minutes, or as much of the 12 minutes as he desires to take.

MR. FERGUSON. With respect to the Bureau of Railroad Safety, I have been trying to ascertain the number who would actually be employed in the inspection department of this particular agency. I believe there are 95 inspectors out of a personnel force of 131. However, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to what I understand to be the fact that there are seven vacancies in the Bureau at the present time, although funds were appropriated for those positions last year. Funds for them have naturally been requested again for 1952. We must also bear in mind that these percentage cuts are made against budget requests, rather than against the number on the payroll this year.

The Bureau gets credit automatically for those vacancies if they are not filled. The average salary in the Bureau is

\$5,894. That means that a credit of possibly \$40,000 will automatically be applied against the cut made in the budget estimates. At that point the Bureau will be left with the work force which now is on the job. Any further reductions would have to be absorbed in other ways, but particularly in administration.

Of course, Mr. President, we realize that when we propose cuts in the funds for the administration of a particular agency, representatives of the agency are always inclined to say to Congress that the result will be a reduction in some vital part of the work of the agency, rather than in the number of clerical positions or in the amount of overhead.

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

MR. FERGUSON. I yield.

MR. THYE. When we deal with work in the field of safety, I must say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that the question is not what one person may do when he makes inspections in the field, but the question is what he may be able to accomplish in the way of education among those who work in the shops—for instance, education of the section crews or the engineers or the brakemen or the conductors or the switchmen. The inspector must do educational work with them, in order to teach them how to assure safety in the operations of the railroad or in the operations of the division or the shop.

The great safety record made in the United States in its industrial plants, and elsewhere, has been achieved as a result of educational work, rather than work by the individual inspectors in the field.

If a reduction were made in the number of persons who engage in the safety work, there would be a decrease in the results achieved in the field in terms of reducing accidents and reducing the resultant losses.

So, as a colleague and as a fellow member of the Appropriations Committee, I say to the Senator that I regret exceedingly that I cannot agree with him. I understand that he is entirely sincere in attempting to bring about economy in Government, and of course his purpose is most laudable. Nevertheless, in this particular case I am afraid that if the personnel are reduced, there will be a decrease in the educational work in connection with the attempt to minimize the losses occurring on the railroads.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, we appreciate the sincerity of those who are pleading for a high standard of railway safety inspection. We do not wish to injure or curtail that inspection. However, it cannot be contended with correctness that this program is an educational one. These men make spot checks in the shops. The superintendents and others in the shops are the skilled men in the field, and they are the ones who do the real work. This item relates to inspections to see whether the work is done, rather than to an educational program.

I hope that those on the other side, who contend that we are in error, will appreciate, in turn, the sincerity of our efforts to reduce the staggering load of the Federal budget. I am sure the

amount of the reduction now proposed can be absorbed in the overhead and in the general operations, rather than by making a reduction in the number of inspectors.

Mr. President, we have previously had an example of this situation. Some time ago when we said we would make a reduction in the appropriations for the Customs Service, the officials of that Service said that if the cut were made, they would have to reduce the number of men engaged in the patrol work, which of course is the vital part of the Customs Service; and of course an argument based on that claim has a real appeal to the Members of Congress.

Similarly, in this case, the officials claim that the cut we propose will cause a reduction in the number of inspectors, rather than in the overhead. However, we believe that all of the proposed reduction can be absorbed in the overhead, without doing harm to a program which has unquestioned value.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Colorado will be rejected.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to a point of information.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. I should like to address this inquiry to the Senator from Michigan, who is the author of the 10-percent reduction amendment, which I supported: In the committee amendment on page 69, in lines 12 and 13, we find the following:

Railroad safety, \$37,725.
Locomotive inspection, \$28,240.

If those two lines are stricken, will not the amendment just agreed to become effective?

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, technically speaking, I am not certain of that. But I am of the opinion that what has been stated on the floor, together with the vote which has just been taken on the Senator's two amendments and his proposal to strike the two lines on page 69 would make very clear the intent of the Senate and any technical detail could be worked out in conference. I understood that the 5-percent cut originally contemplated in the committee would remain in effect because it would remain in the figure the Senator has stated in connection with this item.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

MR. FERGUSON. I am satisfied that would be accomplished.

MR. MAYBANK. That is correct, and I point out that line 11 should also be included.

MR. FERGUSON. That is correct. I was about to point that out. It is the title of these items.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. Then, Mr. President, I move that in the committee amendment on page 69, lines 11, 12, and 13 be stricken out.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

THE CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 69, it is proposed to strike out lines 11, 12, and 13, reading as follows:

Interstate Commerce Commission:
Railroad safety, \$37,725.
Locomotive inspection, \$28,240.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. JOHNSON OF COLORADO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert certain statements in the RECORD, in connection with the amendment dealing with locomotive inspection and railroad safety. I also want to thank the chairman of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, the very able Senator from South Carolina (Mr. MAYBANK), for his generous attitude with respect to the appropriations requested by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

My reason for wanting these statements made a part of the record is so that they may be available to the conference committee.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection the statements will be printed in the RECORD.

The statements are as follows:

STATEMENT COVERING APPROPRIATIONS, INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, BUREAUS OF MOTOR CARRIERS, TRANSPORT ECONOMICS, AND STATISTICS AND VALUATION

BUREAU OF MOTOR CARRIERS

The appropriation as proposed will make it necessary to substantially curtail enforcement of the law and regulations affecting motor carriers. It will result in complete discontinuance of highway safety work. These activities are already greatly undermanned; if discontinued or substantially curtailed, disorder in highway transportation and increased accidents may be expected. This might be disastrous in view of the greatly increased movement of explosives by highway at this time.

The reduction in the funds available for holding hearings and preparing decisions will further delay the determination of application and rate cases involving motor carriers. There is presently a backlog of 2,500 such cases, and more than 300 new cases are added each month. The proposed reduction will cause this backlog to increase. The present delays already cause justifiable complaint.

The proposed reduction will cause a reduction of 35 percent in the field staff, which is the source of information on which the Commission grants temporary authority to furnish emergency service. Handicapping the Commission in authorizing temporary service and causing delay in determining formal proceedings will prevent proper provision for necessary transportation, at a time when the need is greatest.

Field service

The field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission are the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To eliminate any substantial number of field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission would eliminate correspondingly the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To offset such reduction, the Defense Transport Administration would immediately have to supply itself with additional field services, which would in all probability cost the United States more money than the entire proposed cut to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The House appropriations would cut from the Interstate Commerce Commission's personnel, 232 employees.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORT ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

The Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics studies, compiles, and publishes statistics concerning railroads, motor carriers, water carriers, pipelines, freight forwarders, private car lines, express and sleeping-car companies. These statistics which cover financial, traffic, and other vital data are in universal use in the transportation world. They are essential to the Commission in its regulatory duties and responsibilities; its financial investigations and findings; are a part of the record in all the major rate and revenue cases; are of inestimable value to the carriers, shippers, and other Government agencies, and are used by committees of Congress. The work of this Bureau is of necessity never quite current. Its serious impairment, as indicated by the present status of the appropriations, would be a tremendous blow to the regulation of transportation and most difficult and expensive to bring back in its present relationships.

BUREAU OF VALUATION

The Bureau of Valuation of the Commission must keep reasonably current the inventories and costs of properties of railroads and pipelines subject to the Commission's jurisdiction. This is essential to the Commission in prescribing just and reasonable rates, determining the divisions of joint rates and fares, prescribing switching charges, setting up depreciation reserves, determining costs of services, and in passing on financial reorganizations, mergers, and consolidations. This information, vital to the Commission, is also most useful to other governmental agencies and regulatory bodies and to Members of Congress.

Recently under mandate from the Congress, work in bringing pipeline valuation up to date was resumed in the face of a decrease in the appropriation. Progress has been made at the expense of other functions. The present status of appropriations in Congress would stop the pipeline valuation and so cripple and hinder the other operations vital to the Commission that valuation would become so far in arrears that at some future time it would be most difficult and most expensive to bring it reasonably current.

The work of the Commission would be seriously hampered if the work of the Bureau of Valuation were to become any further in arrears than at present.

BUREAU OF MOTOR CARRIERS

The allocation of the 1951 appropriation to the Bureau of Motor Carriers was \$3,742,149. The allocation of the 1952 appropriation as it passed the House of Representatives is \$2,799,060, a reduction of \$943,089. The reduction applies almost entirely to the work of hearings, and to highway safety and enforcement work.

The reduction in the amount available for holding hearings and preparing reports is \$84,897. The Commission has pending on its dockets 3,800 motor carriers proceedings, many of them several years old. Because of an increase in the staff authorized 2 years ago, the backlog was being reduced. If the present appropriation is continued, it is estimated that this work can become current within 2 years. The present delay in reaching decisions is frequently so long that the Commission has been subjected to criticism. As the law requires that no person may begin to furnish interstate service as a motor carrier without obtaining approval of the Commission and also provides that the Commission can determine whether rates filed by such carriers are reasonable and may be collected, any delay in reaching a determination on such matters in effect denies justice to the public. Unless the present appro-

priation for this work is continued, there will be a constant increase in the backlog and of the time required to reach decisions.

The reduction in the work of highway safety and enforcement and the field staff, which work is intermingled, is \$867,365, from \$2,075,554 at present to a proposed \$1,208,189. The reduction was made for the purpose of eliminating the highway safety work of the Commission. This would have serious consequences to every person using the highways, and, in view of the great increase in transportation of explosives and inflammables during the present emergency, the increased danger will affect also those persons residing near highways. The Interstate Commerce Commission is the only agency having jurisdiction in respect of safety of operation of interstate motor vehicles and hours of service of their drivers, and its jurisdiction covers every bus and truck operating in interstate or foreign commerce.

This work consists of preparation of safety regulations and of safety programs for motor carriers, inspection of the records and practices of carriers, analysis of accident reports and suggestions to eliminate unsafe practices and conditions, obtaining evidence of violations of the law or regulations, to presentation of evidence of violations in Commission proceedings and in prosecutions in the Federal courts. It has been demonstrated that this work, to the extent that it can be performed with the staff available, can reduce the danger and deaths by 50 percent.

It has been suggested that the safety work of the Commission is a duplication of work performed by the States. That is not correct. The kind of work performed is entirely different, and applies to different vehicles. As long as the Federal Government has assumed jurisdiction over safety practices of interstate operations, State regulation cannot be effective as to such operations. No State can effectively regulate hours of service of drivers of vehicles crossing the State, nor the operating practice. Patrolling the highways alone will not provide proper protection. Control of the carrier, and holding it responsible for the operation of its vehicles in all States in which it operates has been shown to be the best way to reduce accidents by motor carriers. This can be done only by a Federal agency, and the cost is minute in comparison with the saving in lives and property.

The desirability of reducing nondefense spending at this time is recognized, but transportation is not a nondefense industry. Highway accidents involving motor carriers involve loss of essential transportation equipment, loss of essential manpower, and loss or delay in delivering materials essential to the defense effort. There is no question that the Armed Forces are justified in spending money to assure safe delivery of material shipped on army trucks. It is equally important that the much greater quantity of defense freight moved on civilian trucks, as well as the freight essential to the civilian economy, be transported safely. It would be false economy to destroy the effectiveness of the one Federal agency which is working to reduce this loss at this time merely because it is one of our regular agencies and not one set up temporarily for defense purposes.

Field service

The field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission are the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To eliminate any substantial number of field services of the Interstate Commerce Commission would eliminate correspondingly the field services of the Defense Transport Administration. To offset such reduction the Defense Transport Administration would immediately have to supply itself with additional field services, which would in all

probability cost the United States more money than the entire proposed cut to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

The House appropriations would cut from the Interstate Commerce Commission's personnel 232 employees.

BUREAU OF TRANSPORT ECONOMICS AND STATISTICS

The statistical and analytical work of the Commission's Bureau of Transport Economics and Statistics will be seriously crippled during the fiscal year 1951-52 if the funds for its maintenance are reduced by about one-third, as indicated by the action of the House of Representatives. In the Commission's 1950 annual report to the Congress attention was called to the importance of the examination and tabulation of the returns contained in the monthly, quarterly, and annual reports filed by the various agencies of transport subject to the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. From these data the Bureau prepares a series of periodic publications all of which are necessary tools in connection with the Commission's regulatory duties. It would be impossible properly to administer many of the important provisions of the act if the Commission is not kept currently informed as to the trend in the financial and operating statistics of the railroads, motor carriers, carriers by pipeline, freight forwarders, private-car lines, and express- and sleeping-car companies. In all of the recent major rate and revenue cases a large number of the Bureau's periodic publications, including its waybill studies and the basic reports of the carriers from which the data are compiled, were made a continuing part of the record. These data are also of fundamental importance to the carriers, shippers, Government agencies, State commissions, practitioners, and others in preparing exhibits and evidence in Commission proceedings.

Because of the enlargement of the Commission's jurisdiction by various legislative enactments, the workload of the Bureau has increased greatly in recent years (about 60 percent since 1940). In presenting the budget for the fiscal year 1952, the Commission recommended that the Bureau's force be increased from 151 to 228 employees to cope with the situation. Subsequently the Bureau of the Budget, in its recommendations, allowed only eight additional positions.

If the House cut in the appropriation is allowed, the number of employees of the Bureau will be reduced from 153 at present to about 100. This will, of course, result in the dismissal of a large number of competent employees who are thoroughly trained in the various phases of the Bureau's work. Such a severe cut in personnel will immediately result in the curtailment of some of the Bureau's important functions. The examination and compilation of the various periodic returns filed by the carriers under orders of the Commission will be greatly delayed. This will, of course, delay and no doubt prevent the issuance of important publications, many of which are being currently used as a continuing part of the record in major cases pending before the Commission.

The Bureau's trained staff of economists, statisticians, and accountants, which is engaged in the analysis of transportation problems and in assisting the Commission in connection with rate, financial, and other proceedings, will also have to be drastically reduced. The loss of men trained in the highly technical field of transportation research will be a severe blow to the Commission.

BUREAU OF VALUATION

The cut in the budget estimate for 1952 proposed for the Bureau of Valuation by the House is based on the understanding that the amount for the fiscal year 1952 will be one-third less than that available for the

fiscal year 1951. This will mean a reduction of \$155,566 from a total of \$480,905, leaving \$325,339 available for 1952, reducing the Bureau's present staff from 89 to about 59, and separating 30 experienced employees with an average service of 25 years in a highly technical field.

Without any lessening in duties and responsibilities, the appropriation for this Bureau has been steadily reduced over the last 13 fiscal years from \$640,000 in 1939 to \$504,398 in 1950 and to \$480,905 in 1951, with the resulting decreases in employment from 187 in 1939 to 89 in 1950 and to 86 in 1951. Notwithstanding a 25-percent reduction in the appropriation for the fiscal year 1950, additional pipeline work was resumed in late 1949 by direction of Congress. The basic pipeline program will not, however, be completed during the fiscal year 1951, and with the reduction proposed in the House bill completion will be difficult, if not impossible. Further, after completion of the basic pipeline program there will remain the responsibility of keeping inventories and cost records current.

The continual reduction in personnel, especially that from 122 in 1949 to 89 in 1950, has placed the Bureau in a position of inability to keep up with its current program, and backlogs are accumulating rapidly. If the cut presently proposed is put into effect the Bureau will no longer be able to develop to any degree of currency the information required by the statutes and needed by the Commission in the performance of its regulatory functions.

In connection with keeping inventories and cost records, certain field checking is absolutely essential to assure dependability of results. With the 1951 funds only 19 field men are on the rolls, as compared with a requirement of at least 34. Under the proposed cut the field force would be completely eliminated.

Presently, the Bureau is engaged in furnishing certain important information to various defense agencies. This has been possible because its files contain data peculiarly fitted to develop such material.

With the appropriation recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, an increase in force of seven employees was provided for which would have enabled the Bureau of Valuation to recruit some new blood and to lower the average age of the technical employees which is now about 59 years.

In summation, if the Bureau of Valuation is cut to the extent now proposed, the result of long years of work and large expenditures of money devoted to the accumulation of the only over-all record in existence of physical consist and costs of carrier property will necessarily become of little current value. If this work is allowed to lapse it will be extremely difficult and costly to resume it at some later date. Such resumption is inevitable.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], I offer the amendment identified as "6-18-51-Q."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 70, between lines 7 and 8, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

Sec. 604. No money appropriated by this act to any corporation or agency shall be available to pay the compensation of persons performing information functions or related supporting functions, if the amount expended by such corporation or agency during the

fiscal year 1952 to pay such compensation is in excess of 75 percent of the amount required to pay the compensation of all persons the budget estimates for personal services heretofore submitted to the Congress for the fiscal year 1952 contemplated would be employed by such corporation or agency during such fiscal year in the performance of information functions and related supporting functions. For the purposes of this section, the term "information functions" means functions usually performed by a person designated as an information specialist, information and editorial specialist, publications and information coordinator, press relations officer or counsel, or publicity expert, or designated by any similar title; and the term "related supporting functions" means functions performed by persons who assist persons performing information functions in the drafting, preparing, editing, typing, duplicating, or disseminating of public information publications or releases, radio or television scripts, magazine articles, and similar material.

On page 70, line 8, it is proposed to strike out "604" and in lieu thereof insert "605."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia is recognized.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if the Senator from Virginia will yield, I merely desired to call attention to a typographical error I noted when the amendment was being read by the clerk. In line 5 the word "forming" should be corrected to "performing." I imagine the Senator from Virginia would desire that that correction be made. It was for that reason that I rose while the amendment was being read by the clerk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia may make the modification.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the amendment be modified, in section 604, line 5, by striking out "forming" and inserting "performing."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be modified accordingly.

PUBLICITY EXPERTS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is to correct one of the greatest abuses in our governmental services. Since 1913, it has been illegal, by virtue of an act of Congress, for governmental agencies to employ any publicity experts unless appropriations are specifically made for that purpose. Notwithstanding that, Mr. President, every agency of the Government has publicity agents. It is true they are not called by that name, but they are scattered throughout the departments. I am presenting an amendment, which is the only way by which the question can be reached, which provides that for the purpose of information functions only 75 percent of the money recommended by the Bureau of the Budget shall be available for expenditure under this bill.

I call attention to a long fight which has been made for the purpose of trying to eliminate these publicity agents, whose employment, as I have said, has been illegal since 1913, when an act was placed on the statute books providing that no money appropriated by Congress should be used for the compensation of any publicity expert, unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT

The effect of the amendment would be, as I said, to limit expenditure of funds appropriated in this act for personal service to 75 percent of the amount requested by the President in his budget estimates to pay employees whose functions are those of publicity experts and their assistants, and those engaged in related supporting activities, such as typing, mimeographing, mailing, and so forth.

Any reduction in personal service funds resulting from this amendment could, of course, be applied to the requirements of the Cordon and Ferguson amendments.

NEWSPAPERMEN—PUBLISHERS—VAST GOVERNMENT

Mr. President, I am a newspaperman and a publisher. I have great sympathy for the problems of both. Nothing I shall say is intended to reflect upon either; and I am certain that if this amendment is intelligently and efficiently administered it will result in more news and less "bull" from the Federal publicity mill.

I am aware that no newspaper, no press association, no radio chain, and no newsreel publisher could possibly finance enough of a staff adequately to cover the vast domain of the Federal Government without the assistance of legitimate press services to be maintained within the Federal Establishment. But the fact remains that this necessity for services to the public press which results from big government is subject to abuse in the form of propaganda, political figures, and political programs such as the Brannan plan.

PROBLEM

Individual glorification of bureaucrats and political propaganda constitute the press service problem which this amendment seeks to curtail. It has been a problem for a long time. Since 1913, as I said, there has been a statute on the books providing that no money appropriated by Congress shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

I sum up the debate on the problem, which is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 50, part 11, pages 4805 and 4806, as follows:

No person should be employed as a press agent by a Government agency to extoll his boss or to advertise the work of the department, but we ought to have men in the various departments to make available facts about the work of these departments to the public.

The amendment which is proposed by myself and the Senators associated with me, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], allows a sufficient appropriation to make facts available about the work of the departments, but it will, I think, compel the dismissal of all those who are being employed as publicity experts, of whom

there are many thousands of them, and who are acting as such.

In 1937 the Brookings Institution, in a report for the Senate Select Committee To Investigate Executive Agencies of the Government, said:

Notwithstanding the fact that the employment of publicity experts is forbidden by the act of October 22, 1913 (38 Stat. L. 208, 212), unless funds are specifically appropriated for that purpose, publicity agents are nevertheless appointed under other designations, and one of the results has been an increasing flood of press releases produced by the process method.

Later, in 1947, the House committee headed by Representative Harness said:

It is a duty of representative government to keep the people fully and accurately informed. Administrative officials at policy making levels are and should be entirely free to express their views and discuss policy on any issue. But beyond the regular news channels no agency properly may go. The information services of the administrative agencies may not lawfully use public funds to promote new projects, to influence legislation—

They are doing that now—

or to mold public opinion for or against any legislative proposal. * * * The sole legal function of Federal information service is to issue factual, objective, and studiously unbiased information.

The Harness report continued:

Unfortunately, the law is being violated repeatedly by numerous administrative agencies. In hundreds of ways, some devious, some blatant, Federal officials and employees are ignoring or flouting section 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code, often for the deliberate purpose of fostering sentiment and support for administration policies and programs.

The issue is far broader than the merits of any particular piece of legislation. The record reveals clearly the manner in which Government lobbyists operate on the Federal payroll, how they are always at work to expand their fields of interest, to perpetuate themselves in office, and to impose their ideas and systems upon the American people by organized propaganda paid for entirely by the diversion of public funds from their true purposes to the secret purposes of top bureaucrats and planners.

Then came the Hoover Commission report. In its preparation, a task force on Government publicity and propaganda started out by saying:

Federal operations in publicity, public relations, and dissemination of Government intelligence cost the taxpayers approximately \$105,000,000 a year.

The Hoover Commission Task Force said further:

Every agency of the Government maintains its public relations staff. Every agency issues printed matter in great or small volume every year for public distribution. Printing costs on Government literature approach \$50,000,000 a year, and the mailing costs, computed at regular postage rates add \$40,000,000 a year.

Staff salaries in publicity functions were tabulated by the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1948 at \$13,000,000, but this figure does not include—

I am quoting from the report of the Hoover Commission Task Force—editorial and research expense in the preparation of Government intelligence. The Budget Bureau's itemization begins with

preparation of the press release, radio continuity or motion-picture scripts. The research and testing behind the press release are not charged to the publicity function, but rather to the routine administrative expenses of the department.

Then the Hoover Commission Task Force touched on that facet of the problem which makes it difficult to be reached by any sort of legislation. It said:

In many cases public-relations work is concealed entirely from routine accounting review, principally by the device of carrying publicity operatives on the roll as supervisors, administrative assistants, or technical experts.

They never call them "publicity experts"; they give them some other name.

For these reasons in the present state of the Federal budget and accounting procedures, a precise itemization of Government expenditures in this broad field is almost impossible.

For this reason the language of the pending amendment is directed to functions performed, no matter what the title may be, or at what station in Civil Service ranks and grades the employee may be.

In this bill, and in the Government, now it is still virtually impossible to determine how many people there are engaged in so-called information work in the Federal Government, but the Civil Service Commission admits to 4,199 who can be positively identified in these positions. A check of the appendix to the budget document reveals that of this number there are more than 100 such positions covered by the independent offices appropriation bill, and that the salaries run to nearly three-quarters of a million dollars. Undoubtedly there are others in high positions who cannot be identified in the detailed personnel tables, and still others engaged in clerical, mechanical, and transportation jobs connected with publicity which would more than double—probably treble—both the number of people involved and the personal-service costs.

But this is not all that is involved. We become involved also in the paper shortage, in the purchase of duplicating equipment, and especially in the cost of disseminating the material through the mail.

VOLUME AND MAIL COSTS

The Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures on April 19 started a sampling of material printed and otherwise duplicated by Government agencies for public dissemination. In 2 months, exclusive of the material printed by the Government Printing Office, Government publications, mimeographed and otherwise processed, have been received at the rate of a file case full a week, exclusive of envelopes and wrappings. That means single statements and all publicity sent out. By actual count in the mails of Saturday and Monday morning 2,226 separate pieces were received. All of this, of course, was delivered under the free penalty mail privileges. On page 741 of the budget document, the Post Office Department reveals that in fiscal year 1952 it expects to handle 1,780,100,000 pieces of penalty mail from Gov-

ernment departments and agencies in the executive branch. That is approximately a letter a month from the executive branch departments and agencies to every man, woman, and child in the country. This volume of penalty mail represents an increase of nearly a hundred million a day over the volume handled last year, which totaled less than a billion and a half pieces.

Examples of some of the material which is going through the mails is a pamphlet called *Filipino Women—Their Role in the Progress of Their Nation*, published by the Labor Department; *Raccoons of North and Middle America: North American Fauna No. 60*, published by the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior; and then there is the gem by the ECA entitled "ECA's Dilemma—Can Elephants and Water Buffalos Outwork Machinery?" This is a little article about 5-day weeks for elephants working in Burma. The ECA found that elephants do not like to work in the hot sun.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has the Executive Office issued any publication concerning the Byrds of Virginia?

Mr. BYRD. There has been some comment about that, I believe.

The ECA has found that elephants do not like to work in the hot sun, and that in March and April they should be sent to a rest camp, and also that they should be given about 2 weeks vacation again in October.

Mr. President, that is where some of our money is going.

It is no wonder that I and other Senators are receiving numerous complaints about the stuff which is being received by citizens all over the country, about the uselessness of the material which they are receiving through the mails, in the nature of Government publications from the executive departments of the Government.

I receive letters, and I assume other Senators receive similar letters, saying "For God's sake stop sending all this mail." It is thrown away because the recipients have no use for it; yet the mails are filled up with it.

A typical paragraph is quoted from a letter from Mr. H. W. Osgood of the Youngstown, Ohio, Modern Furniture Store. Mr. Osgood writes:

I enclose a copy of a publication, *The Agricultural Situation*, April 1951, which we received in the mail today. This publication has no value to us (in the furniture business).

Mr. Osgood further suggested that instead of unnecessarily oversized heavy envelopes the Government might use cheaper self-mailers. The Government gets the most expensive paper and envelopes it can obtain.

As I have said, this material which is now coming into our office does not include any publications disseminated by the Government Printing Office. In addition, publications disseminated by the Government Printing Office, printed in fine type, cover 78 pages of an attractive green-bound monthly catalog, and exclusive of the Military Establishment,

the appendix to the budget reveals that the Government's printing bill for fiscal year 1952 is estimated at \$41 million, and the Military Establishment will more than double this figure when the estimates are counted.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Am I correct in my interpretation of what the Senator has said, that the Senate having approved an amendment which inspired department heads to drive their own cars, the Senator from Virginia now proposes another amendment which will require Senators to write their own speeches?

Mr. BYRD. I hope that will be the effect of it. I do not know whether it would improve the quality of the speeches.

All my amendment would do, as I have said, is to limit expenditures for the purposes enumerated to 75 percent of the figure recommended by the Budget.

Actually, this amendment simply points up a field of Federal personnel costs where the requirements of the Cordon and Ferguson amendments may be absorbed in nonessential activities.

I have no fear about serious impairment of essential Federal functions resulting from this amendment in any agency headed by an efficient administrator.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we cut down personnel 10 percent, what the Senator's amendment would do, in substance, would be to cut the personnel used for this informative service by another 15 percent, would it not?

Mr. BYRD. That is correct. Much discretion is given to the bureaus of the Government. If the Ferguson amendment applies to them, the cut would be 25 percent. The total would not be in excess of 25 percent.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I take it that the Senator's amendment would not apply to legitimate informational work, such as that done by the Bureau of the Census, would it?

Mr. BYRD. No; it is not intended to do that. The publicity experts are not set forth separately in the budget. I feel that 75 percent will be entirely adequate for handling reports and other things which are important to the people.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has one more minute.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I have been working on this subject for a number of years. I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a table headed "Estimated expenditures for educational, informational, promotional, and publicity activities, executive branch of the Federal Government, fiscal year 1946, by departments and agencies." The total sum to be spent in 1946 for those purposes was \$74,829,467. This table is 6 years

old but I think it may be the latest and most complete indicator of the functions we are talking about. I had it in my files as a survey that I had once requested the Bureau of the Budget to make for me.

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

Estimated expenditures for educational, informational, promotional, and publicity activities, executive branch of the Federal Government, fiscal year 1946, by departments and agencies

	Total expenditures
Total, executive branch	\$74,829,467
Executive Office of the President	8,154,021
White House	6,103
Bureau of the Budget	165,700
Office for Emergency Management:	
Civilian Production Administration	172,000
Committee on Fair Employment Practice	3,370
Foreign Economic Administration	15,175
Alien Property Custodian	121,000
Office of Defense Transportation	207,000
Office of Inter-American Affairs	886,178
Office of Scientific Research and Development	6,800
Office of War Information	3,772,095
War Shipping Administration	157,000
Office of Price Administration	2,572,000
Petroleum Administration for War	69,600
Independent establishments	2,627,808
American Battle Monuments Commission	0
Civil Service Commission	204,000
Employees' Compensation Commission	9,000
Export-Import Bank of Washington	6,700
Federal Communications Commission	24,363
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	4,650
Federal Power Commission	75,266
Federal Trade Commission	27,417
Interstate Commerce Commission	43,000
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	171,000
National Archives	19,400
National Capital Housing Authority	500
National Capital Park and Planning Commission	0
National Labor Relations Board	21,400
National Mediation Board	8,063
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	292,000
Office of the Director	180,000
Office of Contract Settlement	22,000
Surplus Property Administration	90,000

¹ To date of liquidation.

² Liquidated in part during 1946 fiscal year.

Estimated expenditures for educational, informational, etc.—Continued

Independent establishments—Continued	Total expenditures
Railroad Retirement Board	\$17,300
Securities and Exchange Commission	91,000
Selective Service System	19,500
Smaller War Plants Corporation	279,100
Smithsonian Institution	134,000
National Gallery of Art	24,850
Tariff Commission	25,000
Tennessee Valley Authority	245,000
The Tax Court of the United States	30,728
United States Maritime Commission	199,000
Veterans' Administration	660,571
Federal Loan Agency	331,167
Federal Security Agency	2,043,988
Federal Works Agency	89,295
National Housing Agency	343,616
Department of Agriculture	9,295,700
Department of Commerce	2,003,212
Department of Interior	387,569
Department of Justice	199,000
Department of Labor	1,440,641
Navy Department	704,000
Post Office Department	11,960
Department of State	30,377,000
Treasury Department	11,104,800
War Department ³	5,715,690

³ Exclusive of pay and allowances of military personnel.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have another table printed in the RECORD, another table I have had in my files, showing the number of personnel engaged in public relations and publicity activities in the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1949, totaling approximately \$8,162,505.

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

Personnel engaged in public relations and publicity activities, Department of Defense, fiscal year 1949

Department	Military	Civilian	Total personnel	Total compensation
Departmental	273	255	528	\$1,806,584
OSD	0	10	10	46,517
Army	75	141	216	745,123
Navy	155	47	202	542,555
Air Force	43	57	100	472,389
Field	1,585	593	2,178	6,355,921
OSD	0	0	0	0
Army	566	344	910	2,259,838
Navy	315	43	358	1,556,083
Air Force	704	206	910	2,540,000
Total	1,858	848	2,706	8,162,505
OSD	0	10	10	46,517
Army	641	485	1,126	3,004,961
Navy	470	90	560	2,098,638
Air Force	747	263	1,010	3,012,389

NOTE: Compensation for Air Force enlisted personnel excludes subsistence and quarters allowances.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I may say that I agreed to give some time to the Senator from Michigan, and I ask unanimous consent that he be given 5 minutes additional time.

Mr. MAYBANK. I object.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill. Some abuses may have been disclosed, but there may also be some value to the publications mentioned. Sometimes Government agencies are criticized for not giving out sufficient information.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, may I be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MAYBANK. I hope the Senator from Virginia will permit me to say a word.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to discuss the point of order.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that, but the reason why I objected was because the Senator from Michigan asked me one or two questions, and I said I would discuss the questions with him in the time I had remaining.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That does not affect the Senator's time on the amendment.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wanted to invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that section 603 deals with the same subject, and was passed by the House.

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

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my judgment that section 603 should have remained in the bill.

Mr. BYRD. I am speaking to the point of order. The amendment is a limitation on expenditures. I again invite attention to section 603 of the bill. There is no contingency whatever involved in the amendment which the Senator from Virginia has offered. It is a limitation on expenditures, along the same lines as was the Ferguson amendment, which was declared to be in order by the Presiding Officer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under rule XVI, no limitation on an appropriation bill is permissible which depends for its validity upon a future contingency. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia provides that not more than 75 percent of the amount is to be made available for the information services, and that the departments involved must look into the question and determine, as the year goes along, whether the 75 percent has been reached or has been exceeded. It also involves the definition of informational services. The Chair is of the opinion that there is a contingency involved, and also a definition, and that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I respectfully invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that there is no contingency, and that the amendment is exactly along the same line as the Ferguson amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Ferguson amendment was a straight-out reduction.

Mr. BYRD. It was based upon budget estimates, just as is my amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, but it does not contain the terms which are contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, may I be heard prior to the final decision of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The bill contains legislation on the same point in section 603—

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I do not want to be misunderstood in this situation, because we went over it very thoroughly in the committee. The reason for section 603 being stricken out was that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and another Senator thought it might apply to farmers' bulletins which farmers requested. I am relying on my memory. However, I may be wrong.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, when the bill came from the House it contained this language:

No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

At the present time there is a statute on the books, section 54 of title V, United States Code, which provides as follows:

No money appropriated by any act shall be used for the compensation of any publicity expert unless specifically appropriated for that purpose.

That law was passed on October 22, 1913. It is chapter 32, paragraph 1, Thirty-eighth Statutes, page 212.

The Byrd amendment is merely a limitation on the amount of the budget estimate, so the specific 75 percent is already determined. No determination is necessary to be made in the carrying out of the provisions of the amendment. I hope the ruling of the Chair will be that this is not legislation, because it could be part and parcel of section 603, which provides the same kind of a limitation. Therefore I hope the point of order will not be upheld.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask the Chair a question, in the nature of a parliamentary inquiry? Would it not be possible for the Senator from Virginia to move to reconsider the committee amendment striking out section 603? If the committee amendment were rejected, and the House provision were restored, would not an amendment to the House language then be in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Section 603 is the language that came from the House. The Senate committee struck out that language, and the Senate committee amendment has been agreed to. The only way to proceed in that connection is to reconsider the vote by which the Senate committee amendment was adopted.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate committee amendment was adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. SALTONSTALL. I understood that all committee amendments which were adopted were adopted with the understanding that Senators would have the privilege of reopening them without moving to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were adopted.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct, but action would have to be taken by the Senate in order to do what the Senator suggests be done.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. SALTONSTALL. It was my understanding that it was specifically agreed that no reconsideration of the votes by which amendments were agreed would be necessary in order to take action on the amendments. While all the committee amendments were agreed to en bloc, they were agreed to with the understanding that they could be reopened or reconsidered merely by the action of Senators in offering amendments to the committee amendments.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Ordinarily the procedure is to move to reconsider the vote by which a committee amendment was adopted. However, under the unanimous-consent agreement with respect to committee amendments to the bill, it was agreed that if any Senator wished to offer an amendment to a committee amendment, which would ordinarily make it necessary to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to, all he would have to do would be to offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

MR. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think it requires any motion, in view of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into. A point of order is pending as to the language of the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

MR. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been requested to withdraw the point of order. I will say, however, that I am sincere in my belief that if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia should be adopted the result would be to cut out publicity which should be given. The Senator from Virginia thinks that certain things are being done which should not be done. On the other hand, others are criticizing the administration for not doing certain things. I do not think reconsideration of the vote by which the committee amendment striking out section 603 was agreed to will make any difference. There still will remain the question of a point of order. I feel that the questions involved should be considered by a legislative committee, which could give the time carefully to consider the effects of the various proposals. I am not opposing the principle the Senator from Virginia is trying to maintain, but I think the subject is one which should be brought before

the proper committee. If the Senator should introduce a bill dealing with the subject, I am sure it would receive careful consideration. I do not think this is the time to consider the question. The Senate has adopted certain rules, and we should live up to them.

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

MR. MCFARLAND. Yes.

MR. SALTONSTALL. I respectfully say that I believe the Senator from South Carolina will agree with me that the subcommittee cut out section 603 not so much because it opposed it, but because it did not think it was framed in proper language and form, and that we felt that the section should be stricken so that it might be further considered and rewritten in proper form.

MR. MAYBANK. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct. It is my recollection that fear was expressed by some members of the subcommittee that the action would seriously impair the publication and distribution of the Farmers' Bulletin. So the committee struck out section 603, with the idea that it would be taken to conference. Is that not the recollection of the Senator from Alabama?

MR. HILL. That is my recollection, Mr. President. It was feared that there might be interference with the publication and the distribution of the Farmers' Bulletin to the farmers of the country.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must pass on the point of order, and not on the merits. The Chair would say that he is not certain that if section 603 as adopted by the House, were restored, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia still would not be subject to the point of order that it is limitation based on a contingency, and also that it contains legislation in the form of definition of terms which are not now in the law and which would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Massachusetts will say very frankly that perhaps it is not a parliamentary inquiry. However, I should like to put the question: Cannot Section 603 as adopted by the House be restored by simply reconsidering the action by which the Senate committee amendment was agreed to? Or if the Senate feels that the House language is not in proper form, then it certainly can amend that language, can it not?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. By any germane amendment.

MR. SALTONSTALL. So if the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is germane it would be proper to attach it as an amendment to section 603. I ask that as a parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question of germaneness is not one of which the Chair, in connection with an appropriation bill, can pass, because the rule provides that that question should be submitted to the Senate. If the language of the House bill in section 603 should be restored, undoubtedly any

germane amendment to that section would then be in order. If the question were raised as to its germaneness it would have to be submitted to the Senate as a parliamentary question, on which the Senate would pass and not the Chair. But any germane amendment to the House language would be in order, although the Chair would not wish to say in advance than an amendment which constituted legislation or put a limitation on an appropriation contingent on some future event would be in order. The Chair is not passing on that now.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement. If the amendment of the Senator from Virginia should be ruled out on a point of order it seems to me that the whole purpose of the Senate committee in striking out section 603 in the hope of obtaining better language to cover the purposes of the section, would be destroyed, and the whole theory on which the committee acted would be frustrated.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair suggests to Senators that if section 603, which has been stricken out by action of the Senate, remains in that status, it will be before the conferees, and they will have the right to modify it in any way which is not beyond their power, as between the language of both Houses. If section 603 is restored and there is no amendment to it in the Senate, it will not be in conference. It will go into the bill as the House has written it.

MR. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. FERGUSON. Is not the question now before the Senate the restoration of section 603?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. No. The Chair thinks that the point of order is the question which is pending.

MR. FERGUSON. May the Senator from Virginia withdraw his amendment and ask for the restoration of section 603, and then offer his amendment to that section, and have the Senate pass upon the question of germaneness?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia may withdraw his amendment by unanimous consent, and then proceed to some other amendment.

MR. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, may I speak to the point of order?

MR. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the Senator withdrawing the amendment? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is withdrawn.

MR. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask reconsideration of the action taken by the Senate with respect to section 603, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement; and I ask that it be restored to the bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia asks that the vote by which the amendment striking out section 603 was adopted, be reconsidered, and that that language be restored for the further consideration of the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we had a unanimous-consent agreement that any of the committee amendments which were agreed to en bloc could be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into at the time the bill was taken up, any Senator has the right to ask that a committee amendment be reconsidered.

Mr. BYRD. There was an agreement that there would be no objection to the reconsideration of any of the committee amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely reserved the right to object.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not think that under the agreement an objection would avail anything. The Senator may reserve the right to object.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is all I ask. There is no need for the Senator from Virginia to be disturbed about what I have to say.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator said he objected.

Mr. MAYBANK. I said I reserved the right to object.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator going to object, or not?

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I believe that before we consider this question there should be a quorum call, so that Senators who objected in the subcommittee to section 603 being in the bill may have an opportunity to be present. I do not want to have the question considered in their absence.

Mr. BYRD. Every other Senator has had the privilege of having the action of the Senate with respect to committee amendments reconsidered. I do not take it with any special appreciation that the Senator from South Carolina is objecting to my request.

Mr. MAYBANK. I have not objected.

Mr. BYRD. Such requests have been acceded to in every other instance, in accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have not objected. I merely reserved the right to object. I have stated that before the action suggested is taken—and as chairman of the subcommittee, I feel that the Senator from Virginia should agree with me—the other members of the subcommittee should know what we intend to do with respect to section 603. I did not move to strike it out. As I stated, I had hoped that it would remain in the bill. But some Senator moved to strike it out. Frankly, I will say to the Senator from Virginia that I do not remember which Senator moved to strike it out; but I believe that members of the subcommittee should be present before action is taken.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I renew my request that the action whereby section 603 was stricken from the bill by the committee amendment be reconsidered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I hope the Senator will not insist upon a quorum call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is not subject to an objection.

Mr. McFARLAND. May I complete my statement, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. McFARLAND. It was understood that we might take this action. I merely wish to say that I do not believe, when we take out section 603, that any department should have the right to use publicity or propaganda to defeat or support legislation. However, that is not the point of order which I was making. I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is definitely new legislation, other than that contained in the House provision in section 603, and I shall make the point of order against the amendment just the same.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to section 603 being put back in the bill. I reserve the right to object until I can find out who made the motion to strike it out. I think I am entitled to that opportunity.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I renew my request.

Mr. MAYBANK. That question has nothing to do with the point of order.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? The Senate committee reduced the appropriation for personnel 10 percent, as shown by the new section 603 on page 69. If that section is stricken out that reduction will be stricken out.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I may say to the chairman of the full committee that there is no difference of opinion between the Senator from Virginia and myself about the section 603 which has been stricken out. However, I wish to show the proper courtesy to members of the subcommittee who objected to the section at the time. I suggest that they be present. That is all I have asked. I am certain that the Senator from Virginia would extend the same courtesy to a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services or the Committee on Finance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks he can clear up this situation.

Under the rules, when an amendment is offered and a point of order is made with respect to it, during the discussion of the point of order the sponsor of the amendment may withdraw the amendment without having unanimous consent. If the Chair had actually ruled on the point of order, the amendment could not be withdrawn. While the Chair has indicated how he might rule, he has not actually ruled on the point of order, and therefore the Senator from Virginia may withdraw the amendment if he wishes, without asking unanimous consent. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to do that?

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment which I have offered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia withdraws his amendment, and he moves that the Senate disagree to the amendment striking out section 603. That question is now before the Senate. [Putting the question.]

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I trust that we shall wait until members

of the subcommittee can return to the Chamber.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, this is the unanimous-consent agreement, as stated by the Presiding Officer on page 6817:

The PRESIDING OFFICER. An agreement was entered into Friday that the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations should be considered as agreed to en bloc, with the privilege reserved to any Senator to offer an amendment in the second degree without reconsideration.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I do not know what the Senator wants to do. Does he want to have a quorum call, or shall we stand here indefinitely until some Senator comes into the Chamber?

Mr. MAYBANK. No.

Mr. BYRD. I am not going to withdraw my request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia has made a motion, on which he has 15 minutes. The Senator from South Carolina may have 15 minutes in opposition to the motion. Does the Senator from Virginia wish to take time on his motion?

Mr. BYRD. I have no desire to take time on the motion now.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have no desire to take time on the motion, because I have been advised that the Senators who were interested at the time are not now interested. That is all I wanted to find out.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Virginia that the Senate disagree to the amendment striking out section 603.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Therefore the original language of the House in section 603 is restored.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I now offer the amendment which I have previously offered, as an amendment to section 603, beginning in line 17, after the word "Congress."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment has already been read, and therefore it will not be necessary to read it again.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia is new legislation, offered on an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hear the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I believe that the Chair has well stated the contingency which is involved. The Department must determine when 75 percent has been used, and there must be a definition as to what is propaganda, and so forth.

I think it is a dangerous field that we are getting into, when we try to insert in appropriation bills on the floor of the Senate definitions which change legislation. I do not care to argue the question at length. I think the Chair has better stated the rule than I could state it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will ask the Senator from Arizona to read section 603 so that we may have clearly in mind what it says.

Mr. MFARLAND. Does the Chair ask me to read it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. MFARLAND. Section 603. No part of any appropriation contained in this act, or of the funds available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this act, shall be used for publicity or propaganda purposes designed to support or defeat legislation pending before the Congress.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It seems to me that we are now getting ourselves into the position which the committee did not want us to get into. We have adopted the House language. Unless we accept an amendment like the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia or a similar amendment, the section will not be open to conference and to a change in language. In that case we would have language in the bill which we thought was not good language.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is the reason I reserved the right to object, because it was the desire of the subcommittee that the original language should not stay in the bill.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MFARLAND. We have not adopted the amendment. All that we have done was to repeal the action adopting the amendment. It is now before the Senate. The Senator from Virginia offers an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is mistaken. The Senator from Virginia moved that the committee amendment be disagreed to. The Senator's motion was agreed to. That action restored the language of the House bill.

Mr. MFARLAND. I consider the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to be far more dangerous than the original language. All of us agree on the principle involved. However, when it comes to the question of publicity to be used by departments, I do not know what might be involved. If we were considering a health bill, we would know what was involved.

We should not legislate on an appropriation bill. We should have the amendment go first to a committee and have the committee give careful consideration to it. We have committees established for that purpose. Let us use the committees.

Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. BYRD, Mr. THYE, and Mr. MOODY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to offer a suggestion. The Chair is confronted with an important point of order, which he does not wish to rule on without having sufficient advice on it. Inasmuch as other amendments are to be offered, and it does not appear as though we shall finish consideration of the pending bill today, the Chair would inquire if it would be agreeable to let the amendment go over temporarily until tomorrow so that the

Chair may look further into the question involved.

Mr. MFARLAND. It would be agreeable to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BYRD. It would be agreeable to the Senator from Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If it is agreeable, the Chair will look into the question before the Senate convenes tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am certain that the Senator from Virginia was confining his motion to the reconsideration of the original section 603.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. His motion had no reference to the new section 603, which was written in following the recommitment of the bill to the Committee on Appropriations; is that correct?

Mr. BYRD. I said page 67.

Mr. HOLLAND. May I ask the Senator from Virginia to state definitely that he does not refer to the new section, having to do with the reduction of appropriations for personnel?

Mr. BYRD. I think the RECORD is clear. I have already stated that I refer to section 603 on page 67. What I have said applies to the old section 603, not to the new section.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment temporarily goes over. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I raise a point of order with respect to the language in the bill at page 63, lines 6 to 13, on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is a committee amendment which has been agreed to.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does the Senator have reference to the Inland Waterways Corporation?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. We heard the testimony of the Secretary of Commerce on that point. As he is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the Senator from Colorado understands my position. I am glad he brought up the point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had a proposal before it authorizing \$18,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing barges. The bill was before the committee a long time. We gave it a great deal of consideration. It was not enacted by Congress. Now the bill contains an amendment which reads:

Provided further, That the Corporation may use its funds to purchase equipment on credit or otherwise, and in so doing may mortgage or pledge equipment as security for the payment of any obligations representing the balance of the purchase price, and for this purpose may enter into purchase money mortgages, conditional sales contracts, equipment trusts, or other similar methods of financing.

The proviso makes it possible for the operators of the Government Barge Line to pledge for loans, property of the United States. I believe it is a very improper proviso. However, my point of

order is based on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan agrees that it is general language and therefore it is legislation in an appropriation bill. Does it not attempt to do indirectly what the committee had before it? It would permit the Corporation to use Government money for the purchase of additional barges. It would allow them to mortgage Government property, which at the present time is owned by the Corporation, and use the money for the purchase of additional barges, or as they may see fit to use the money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The barges which the corporation owns belong to the United States of America.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. Therefore, they are trying to do indirectly what they have not been permitted to do directly by the committee.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. LONG. I should like to point out for the benefit of the Senator that it is my understanding that the attorneys who have examined the question have arrived at the opinion that the Federal Barge Line does have the right to borrow such money as may be necessary to make purchases of equipment out of funds it may have on hand from the mortgaging of equipment. However, out of an abundance of caution, so that there would be no doubt so far as banks making such loans were concerned, it was thought wise to clear up any doubt that might exist.

I would say to the Senator from Colorado that actually the purpose of the amendment is to make it possible to replace some worn-out equipment with a smaller amount of better equipment, which would reduce the loss of the barge line and probably would put the barge line into the black, instead of having it continue to operate in the red. It would involve only a small amount of funds. I believe I can give the Senator some figures I have available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In either case it is legislation and should come before our committee in the regular way.

Mr. LONG. I believe the Senator will find that actual legislation is not necessary, and for the most part the attorneys have advised me that it is not necessary. However, there is some doubt in this situation. Therefore, it probably would be wise to have the doubt cleared up.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If there is any doubt, it should be removed by means of legislation handled in the regular way by the committees which are authorized to handle legislation on this subject.

I repeat that at one time there was before the committee a bill calling for an authorization of an appropriation of \$18,000,000 for this purpose, but Congress did not pass the bill. The committee did not report the bill favorably, and Congress has never passed such a measure.

So I make the point of order that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair wishes to determine whether he has a proper understanding of the unusual unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into, by means of which all the committee amendments were adopted en bloc, with the reservation of the right for any Senator to offer an amendment to any committee amendment which thus was agreed to.

By analogy, but not by the specific terms of the agreement, the Chair would assume that if a Senator has a right, after a committee amendment is agreed to, to offer an amendment to it, he would have a right to make a point of order against it. Only on that basis could the Chair entertain the point of order at this time.

The Parliamentarian indicates that the Chair's opinion on that subject is what the Senate had in mind at the time when the agreement was entered into.

Therefore, the Chair can entertain the point of order against the amendment, although it has been agreed to.

The Chair would like to have the language of the bill to which the amendment is offered read.

MR. LONG. Mr. President, let me submit that in this section of the bill as it was passed by the House there is already general language dealing with this matter, namely, the Inland Waterways Corporation, and dealing with other matters. In view of the language included in that section by the House, which also is general legislation, I believe that an amendment such as that reported by the Senate committee is in order.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would like to have the language of this portion of the bill, as passed by the House, read in connection with the amendment.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I rise to a point of information.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

MR. JOHNSON of Colorado. What must I do in order to make my point of order in that case?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator does not have to do anything. The Chair is entertaining the point of order at this time, but the Chair would like to have the original language of the bill as passed by the House read, along with the amendment.

MR. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to point out—

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will suspend for a minute, please. The Chair, for his own information, would like to have the language of this section of the bill as passed by the House read. The clerk will please read it.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

INLAND WATERWAYS CORPORATION

Inland Waterways Corporation (administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Commerce): Not to exceed \$481,200 shall be available for administrative expenses, to be determined in the manner set forth until the title "General expenses"

in the Uniform System of Accounts for Carriers by Water of the Interstate Commerce Commission (effective January 1, 1947): *Provided*, That no funds shall be used to pay compensation of employees normally subject to the Classification Act of 1949 at rates in excess of rates fixed for similar services under the provisions of said act, nor to pay the compensation of vessel employees and such terminal and other employees as are not covered by said act, at rates in excess of rates prevailing in the river transportation industry in the area (including prevailing leave allowances for vessel employees, but the granting of such allowances shall not be construed as establishing a different leave system within the meaning of that term as used in section 3 of the Act of December 21, 1944 (5 U. S. C. 61d)).

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would now like to have the Senate committee amendment read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the Corporation may use its funds to purchase equipment on credit or otherwise, and in so doing may mortgage or pledge equipment as security for the payment of any obligations representing the balance of the purchase price, and for this purpose may enter into purchase money mortgages, conditional sales contracts, equipment trusts, or other similar methods of financing.

MR. LONG. Mr. President, let me point out that the language beginning on page 62, in line 25, dealing with the compensation of employees, including the words "and other employees as are not covered by said act," and I stress these words "at rates in excess of rates prevailing in the river transportation industry in the area" amounts to requiring the Corporation to determine what the rates are in private industry and to make the rates of the Corporation not in excess of the rates in private industry. Therefore that would be general legislation relating to the manner in which the Corporation could use its funds. The amendment proposed to that section of the bill is of the same type, namely, it relates to the manner in which the Corporation can use its funds.

Furthermore, the attorneys have advised the Corporation and have advised the committee that the Corporation already has a right to use its funds in that manner. This is merely a matter of clearing up any doubt as to the manner in which the funds may be used, although the Senate committee proposal is not so broad as the House proposal in regard to the way in which the use of the funds should be restricted.

Therefore, it seems to me that the Senate committee amendment is of the same nature as the language adopted by the House in this portion of the bill, both of them relating to the manner in which the funds may be used, and that therefore the committee amendment is in order.

MR. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to speak to the point of order.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

MR. SALTONSTALL. I wish to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that in the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, the following appears on page 161, in connection with

the testimony of Secretary of Commerce Sawyer in regard to these funds:

I propose to use the funds available as a down payment upon a substantial quantity of new equipment, to be financed on a short-term basis through equipment trusts or some similar method, if such financing can be arranged.

This is the important point:

The Attorney General has advised me that I have authority to purchase new equipment on this basis. However, in attempting to make arrangements for such purchases, questions have been raised by prospective financiers of the new equipment as to my authority, as to the validity of the Attorney General's decision.

NEED FOR CLARIFICATION OF LANGUAGE OF LAW

I believe it would be appropriate for this committee to clarify my authority to use the Corporation's funds in this manner.

Then there was colloquy between the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Secretary of Commerce, as follows:

SENATOR MAYBANK. You gentlemen know the question about legislation on appropriations during all of these Marshall-plan fights and the Chair's ruling. So if you could work up something that would be satisfactory, the committee would be glad to give consideration to it.

Secretary SAWYER. We will see that your committee gets that.

SENATOR MAYBANK. You can get it both ways and if we see a chance of doing it, we could do it.

Mr. President, I respectfully call attention to the fact that apparently the Attorney General has made a ruling that the Secretary of Commerce has the authority. If that is correct, the amendment would not be subject to a point of order. If the Secretary of Commerce has to get an opinion in addition, then the point of order would be well taken, because the amendment would be legislation on an appropriation bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I would argue in favor of the position of the committee, namely, that it is merely trying to clarify authority which the Secretary of Commerce already has.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair does not have before him at the moment the statute upon which the Attorney General may base his opinion, and the Chair cannot accept an opinion *ex officio* as having any binding force or validity upon a parliamentary point of order raised in connection with an amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The House language to which the amendment is offered deals only with the compensation of employees. The amendment deals with the power to purchase equipment. If the statute already provides that power, it is difficult to understand why the amendment is necessary, because it does not provide funds, but merely says the agency has the power to use for that purpose the funds already appropriated in this bill.

Unless there is something in the nature of a permanent statute, which does not appear on the surface of the bill, obviously the amendment would not be

in order to the bill, because in the bill there is nothing dealing with the purchase of equipment by the Inland Waterways Corporation or by any agency connected with it.

Therefore, the Chair feels constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I point out to the Chair that the question which the Chair is relying upon is the point of germaneness, which the Chair is deciding for himself, in saying that this amendment is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair does not base his decision upon that.

Mr. LONG. I should like to point out to the Chair that, if there is legislation on an appropriation bill, the Chair would rule that it was out of order, in that it is legislation. Here, however, we have a case in which there is already House legislation, which is being amended, and, therefore, the point that this is legislation on an appropriation bill would not apply, unless it should happen that the Senate determined that it was not germane; and it would be the duty of the Chair at that point to submit the question of germaneness to the Senate, as a body, rather than to rule on the point directly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not understand that the point made was based on the question of germaneness, and the Chair did not base his decision upon the question of germaneness, but based it on the fact that it constitutes legislation, giving the Inland Waterways Commission power to purchase equipment, which is nowhere provided for in the bill, and which, so far as the Chair knows without further investigation, is not provided for in the present law.

Mr. LONG. Am I to understand that the Chair's ruling is that the section being amended does not contain general legislation? Because if that section, which came from the House, contained general legislation, then the Senate has the right to amend that section by further general legislation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair does not understand the rule to be that, if the House writes into an appropriation bill a legislative provision on a particular subject, the Senate can then provide for the whole field, adding to it legislation of all sorts. The Chair does not understand that to be either the rule or the practice of the Senate, and especially since it constitutes new legislation, not definitely in the House bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I point out that the House wrote in general legislation, and it is my impression that the Senate may amend that legislation with amendments which are germane, and that the question of germaneness is a question to be decided by the Senate, rather than a question for the Chair to decide directly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair feels that his ruling is correct, on the basis of the amendment being new legislation; and the question of germaneness was not one of the questions upon which the Chair undertook to pass.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if we have disposed of the point of order, I desire to call up an amendment which is on the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, line 3, after the word "further", it is proposed to restore the language stricken by the committee, to and including line 24, as follows:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, (1) authorize during the fiscal year 1952 the commencement of construction of in excess of 5,000 dwelling units, or (2) after the date of approval of this act, enter into any agreement, contract, or other arrangement which will bind the Public Housing Administration with respect to loans, annual contributions, or authorizations for commencement of construction, for dwelling units aggregating in excess of 50,000 to be authorized for commencement of construction during any one fiscal year subsequent to the fiscal year 1952, unless a greater number of units is hereafter authorized by the Congress: *Provided further*, That the Public Housing Administration shall not, after the date of approval of this act, authorize the construction of any projects initiated before or after March 1, 1949, in any locality in which such projects have been or may hereafter be rejected by the governing body of the locality or by public vote, unless such projects have been subsequently approved by the same procedure through which such rejection was expressed.

And in line 25, to strike out the language to and including line 5, on page 28, as follows:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of the United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended, the Public Housing Administration shall not, with respect to projects initiated after March 1, 1949, authorize during the fiscal year 1952 the commencement of construction of in excess of 50,000 dwelling units.

And on page 28, line 7, to strike out the committee amendment, "\$11,400,000" and restore the numerals "\$5,000,000."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, if I may inquire, is it the Senator's desire to amend the provision regarding the Housing Administration, so that the provisions for the 5,000 units will be restored?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to congratulate the Senator. I am not for the amendment, but there have been many amendments proposed whose meaning I have never yet been able to understand exactly. But the Senator intends to cut the number from 50,000 to 5,000, directly. I am against the amendment. We had votes in the committee, as the Senator knows, upon two occasions, and in the subcommittee, to make it 50,000, which the House Appropriations Committee had made it, and to raise it from the House floor figure of 5,000.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Illinois is running.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to utilize a little of my own time in explaining this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the Senate will be patient for a moment, let me say that when the Eighty-first Congress passed the Act of July 15, 1949, it provided—

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. My time is running out.

Mr. MFARLAND. Will the Senator yield, upon the understanding that his time will not be running?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am agreeable, if it is not taken out of my time.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time shall not be charged to the Senator from Illinois.

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

Mr. MFARLAND. I wonder whether the Senator wants a vote on his amendment this evening. The hour is getting late, and some Senators have left thinking the Senate was about to recess. The Senator from Illinois was recognized when I was trying to get the floor for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to present this matter for the moment, at least, and then come to a resolution of the Senator's question a little later, if he does not mind.

Mr. MFARLAND. I thought perhaps the Senator would rather discuss the amendment tomorrow. I had intended to move a recess.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in the Eighty-first Congress, by the act of July 15, 1949, Congress authorized the construction of 810,000 public housing units, and those were to be divided up, with construction to begin on 135,000 units a year. So there is authority of Congress for 135,000 housing units a year for a period of 6 years. When the hearing was held by the House committee, witnesses indicated that, as of the first of March, they had under construction 34,356 units; that construction bids had been advertised for 47,514 units; and that loan and contributions contracts had been authorized for 116,592 units. So they were proceeding under the act of 1949, in due course.

Then out of a clear sky comes an Executive order; and what does that Executive order say? First of all, it limits the number of units for the last 6 months of 1950 to 30,000 units. The order further goes on to say that, for the 6 months' period beginning January 1, 1951, and for each 6 months' period thereafter, the limit should be 37,500 units. So, we have an Executive order which provides for 75,000 units a year, as against 135,000 a year, as authorized by Congress. In other words, the President cut the number down by 60,000 units a year.

There must have been some reason for that, and there was a reason. We have been dealing with this matter in the Senate for quite some time. The Federal Reserve Board indicated that in order to keep the inflationary pressure within manageable dimensions, the housing starts ought to be reduced from, roughly, 1,350,000 units in 1950 to 850,000 units in 1951; in other words, indicating that there should be a stoppage, by means of

credit regulations, of possibly 500,000 starts in 1951.

When this matter came before the House, the House committee limited the number to 50,000 units. An amendment was offered on the floor by Representative GOSSETT, of Texas, which cut it to 5,000, and his argument, which I think was a good one was that "If we are in war, and if on the one hand we have to watch our credit and watch our materials, then certainly on the other hand, we do not want to be authorizing the Government to undertake a life-sized housing program." In that amendment there was also a proviso that there should be no housing units constructed in an area or locality where there was public objection, unless it was done by a vote of the public body in that locality. That was the shape in which the matter came to the Senate. The bill provided for 5,000 starts, to take care of some botailed contracts, if there were any such. The Senate committee has restored the number to about 50,000.

I think we ought to readopt the House language, and I say that for a reason. All this construction is carried out under the 1949 act, which is a low-rent housing act. It is an act which calls for a subsidy. Mr. President, if you please, and yet, in the budget message, the President said he was going to use this authority for defense housing. He said:

To make sure that the full defense potentialities are realized, the Public Housing Administration, to the maximum extent feasible, will give preference to projects serving defense areas and will require local housing authorities to give military personnel and defense workers preference tenants.

That is precisely what the Federal Housing witnesses said when they came before the House committee. The quarrel I have is simply this, that we are to use the construction for defense housing—and it is a subsidy program—there will conceivably be persons living on one side of the street who work in a defense plant, and who pay their own rent without any help from the Government, and on the other side there will be persons working in the same plant, receiving the same pay, but receiving a gratuity or a subsidy under the program which is set forth in the President's budget message. That is indicated, of course, by testimony of housing officials.

I submit, Mr. President, that if the situation is as bad as we are told it is, and if the inflationary pressures are as bad as we are told they are, Congress has no business authorizing public housing units so long as it is possible for private enterprise to do the job. For that reason, I believe the House language should be restored, the administrative funds ought to be refined and reduced, and the Senate committee language ought to be deleted.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think one statement which the Senator made is incorrect. He said that the defense workers would be subsidized. I do not approve the policy of permitting public housing to be used for defense workers. They have to pay the economic rent. There is no subsidy

for a defense worker. So the suggestion of the Senator that one man is subsidized, and another man earning the same amount is not subsidized, is not correct. A man who is a defense worker must pay the economic rent. He sometimes pays three times as much as does the other man.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Conceivably, he could be a defense worker and still not pay the economic rent in his area. He would be eligible for the same subsidy as would anyone else. That is what happens under the basic language of the law. I think it is unfair. I agree with the Senator from Ohio that the kind of housing proposed should not be used for defense purposes. That is a further argument for cutting down from 50,000 units to 5,000 units, as indicated by the amendment which was adopted in the House.

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona is recognized.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am shocked at the proposal made by the junior Senator from Illinois. I think 50,000 housing units would be too small a number. I want to increase the number—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is not propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am seeking information from the Presiding Officer. I wish to increase the number of units from 50,000 to 60,000. I should like to be informed as to how that can be done.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have not yielded for an inquiry.

Mr. MFARLAND. I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, may I have a reply to my parliamentary inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks an amendment to the committee amendment would be in order. The amendment now offered by the Senator from Illinois is an amendment in the second degree. Therefore, the Senator from New York could not offer another amendment until the amendment of the Senator from Illinois had been disposed of; and it may depend on how it is disposed of whether he should offer it at all. He could not offer it as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LEHMAN. Would it be in order to restore the amount the Senator from Illinois now wishes to change to the original sum mentioned in the bill as reported by the Appropriations Committee?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands the House provided a certain number of units, 5,000. The Senate committee amended the figure to 50,000.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is this a motion to strike out and insert, or is it an attempt to defeat the committee amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The committee amendment struck out and inserted, and the Senator from Illinois is seeking to restore the House language, which would involve the defeat of the committee amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Was it a motion to strike out the committee amendment and insert?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the agreement, the committee amendments were all agreed to en bloc with the understanding that any Senator could move to amend a committee amendment even though it had been agreed to. The effect of the amendment would be to restore the 5,000 units provided in the House bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is it in order for the Senator from New York to strike out "50,000" and insert "60,000" and have it passed on before the Dirksen amendment is passed on?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is of the opinion that an amendment would be in order changing the committee amendment from 50,000 to another figure, and it should first be voted on.

The Chair has recognized the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MFARLAND. I will yield for another parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the reason why I am asking for a ruling on this parliamentary question is that I do not want to be deprived by some parliamentary procedure from offering such an amendment. Do I correctly understand that at this time I may offer an amendment to increase the number of units from 50,000 to 60,000?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Whenever the Senator is recognized for that purpose, he may do so. But he cannot do it under the situation in which the Senator from Arizona yielded to him.

Mr. MFARLAND. I will yield for that purpose.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of enabling me to offer an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator?

Mr. FERGUSON. Reserving the right to object, do I correctly understand that if this is accomplished the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be in order because it will be in the third degree?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The effect of the amendment of the Senator from New York, if and when he shall offer it, will be to amend the committee amendment which the Senator from Illinois is seeking to have defeated so as to restore the original House figure. It

would take priority in the vote of the Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator offer an amendment?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is my judgment that it would affect several pages and sections of the bill where money is provided for different purposes. I do not think that any amendment should be suggested in a hurry. I do not want to object to the Senator from New York attempting to accomplish his purpose, but it would take quite some time. I understood the Presiding Officer to say that the Senator could offer an amendment when he was recognized for that purpose.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, my reason for yielding was that the Senator from New York might have his amendment printed. I did not mean that the amendment would be discussed at this time. If the Senator will offer his amendment, it can be discussed tomorrow.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, as the Senator from South Carolina has pointed out, the amendment which I propose to offer would undoubtedly affect several pages of the bill. So I would prefer not to offer it at this time, but I do not want to be estopped from offering it in due course.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator can offer it at any time before the amendment of the Senator from Illinois has been disposed of.

REGISTRATION OF AMERICAN SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1704) to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. O'CONOR), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate, as I did last year and the year before, to the great number of foreign-flag-registry ships, not only American-owned ships, but ships of other countries as well. The Panamanian Merchant Marine today is the fourth largest in the world. It is exceeded only by that of the United States, Great Britain, and the Scandinavian countries.

Putting ships under Panamanian registry is a growing evil which involves tax evasion insofar as American corporations are concerned. It is a serious threat, of course, to our merchant marine, and we have no control over the situation. There are some serious legal

difficulties involved as to how we might put a stop to this practice, which may have to be worked out further.

The bill I am introducing now is the bill which the Senator from Maryland and I worked out last year, and which the committee unanimously passed. The bill was placed on the calendar.

Mr. President, in a recent trip I made to the Orient I found that much of the trade in Red China was being handled by ships flying the Panamanian flag. These ships never were in Panama. In 90 percent of the cases their crews do not even include a single Panamanian. The United Nations Economic Relations Pact, to which Panama is a signatory, provides for no control over the situation whatever.

The practice which our bill seeks to control however is one we should stop, and I hope we can stop it. I hope the bill may be the answer. It is the answer with respect to the ships over which the Maritime Board has control. The board has long ago, except in cases of rare emergency, followed the policy of not allowing the transfer of a ship to a foreign flag when we had some control over the ship, such as a mortgage, or where the line was a subsidized line. But the operators in question are independent operators. What they have done has caused a great deal of trouble, not only to all the other maritime nations of the world, but here at home.

Mr. President, surely the bill will take care of those ships over which we have control, but if it should not provide the way to stop the practice, I wish to attach to it, if I can, necessary amendments, in which the Senator from Maryland will join me, such as providing for a possible tax penalty on American capital or American corporations that expend their money for maritime building or maritime operations outside this country, and yet not fly the American flag.

Mr. President, the other day in Vermont, at a place called Island Pond, a Memorial Day address was delivered by the chairman of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, Mr. Crispe, which I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD, together with my remarks made when I introduced the bill last year.

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

EXTRACT FROM MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY
A. LUKE CRISPE, OF BRATTLEBORO, VT., CHAIR-
MAN, NATIONAL AMERICANISM COMMISSION
OF THE AMERICAN LEGION AT ISLAND POND,
VT., MAY 30, 1951

Fellow Americans, today we again observe Memorial Day and pay homage and respect to all those who have answered the final call in the service of their country. This year this observance takes on added significance; for Americans are again engaged in battle in defense of democracy and freedom.

I have discussed the general menace of communism. There is, however, a very important aspect of which the American people should immediately take notice. Some years ago, Panama enacted legislation permitting foreign shipowners irrespective of residence to register their vessels with that government, thereby assuming Panamanian na-

tionality. The mechanics of this law are very simple: A shipowner need only to apply at the nearest Panamanian consulate and pay a small fee. From then on, he is entitled to fly the flag of Panama.

When the United States passed the original Neutrality Act, United States ships were forbidden from entering war zones. Because of this prohibition, some United States citizens, owners of vessels, immediately applied for Panamanian registration and were then free from the restrictions of the Neutrality Act. This practice has now developed into a most definite and serious threat. After the war, because many shipowners could save money by registering as Panamanian, great numbers of vessels were registered by citizens of many countries. As a result we now have a huge fleet flying the flag of Panama, having access to the ports of this country and the rest of the world.

Nevertheless, if all of the vessels flying the Panamanian flag were American owned, the problem would be rather simple. However, we must bear in mind that the Panamanian merchant marine is now among the big ten in the world and that actually a great majority of the vessels flying the Panamanian flag are of European and Asiatic origin.

The practice of Panamanian registration developed about 20 years ago when a few countries couldn't get an American registration or certificate. From that time on it has developed into an international octopus with all sorts of tentacles. Shippers have used it to smuggle contraband goods, narcotics and opium. The Panamanian Government knows only that they have registered a ship, received a fee, and sent somebody some registration papers. The ships, of course, may operate anywhere, but a great majority of them never see the shores of Panama. The Panamanian Government doesn't know anything about the ship it registers, its traffic, officers, crew or business. On 90 percent of these vessels there isn't even one Panamanian citizen.

The tonnage of the Panamanian merchant marine runs into several million tons. About one-sixth of the total tonnage is Russian owned or owned by countries behind the iron curtain. The crews of these Russian-controlled vessels number Communists of all nationalities, yet they are allowed free access to the ports of the United States. It may not be far-fetched to say that the greatest threat of a Russian atomic explosion may be a Panamanian ship.

The crews of these ships are often interrogated by our port and police authorities, but invariably the pattern has been one of silence which typified the well indoctrinated "Commie." The fact that the ship may be owned by some European corporation is not always a test of its genuineness for there is evidence that many of the holding companies licensed by countries in continental Europe are controlled either by Russia or its satellites. These holding companies are as fraudulent as the ship's right to fly the flag of a Central American country.

Although we must recognize that we have no jurisdiction over the Government of Panama, nevertheless it is our responsibility to bring about a full disclosure of this menace. The question immediately arises as to how many of these ships are actually owned and controlled by Americans? How many are owned and controlled by Russia and her satellites? What cargoes do they transport? Is our Government fully cognizant of the Communist-manned ships? What so-called Americans are flying the Panamanian flag to betray our boys in Korea by trading with the enemy?

You and I cannot answer these questions, but our Government can conduct an investigation and give us the answers. There is now pending before the Congress a bill,

introduced by Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, which would prohibit American-owned ships from transferring their registration to Panama. The bill is in committee and is receiving thoughtful study. However, this Senate Committee not only has a great responsibility but a great opportunity to investigate all phases of this problem.

The work of the House Un-American Activities Committee, which I have mentioned in discussing communism with you today has been of tremendous service to our country. Then, too, we have had the recent so-called Kefauver investigation which has resulted in the conviction and imprisonment of various gangsters and phony politicians. These two committees have demonstrated that the investigative power of Congress can be of tremendous service to the Nation. Therefore, I feel that it is incumbent upon the Congress and the committee studying the Magnuson bill to immediately launch a full and complete investigation so that the questions which I have propounded may be answered. The American people are entitled to know whether some of these Panamanian-registered ships are Russian couriers engaged in espionage and ready for sabotage. We are entitled to know whether American-owned vessels flying the Panamanian flag are furnishing supplies and ammunition to the enemy. I am sure that once this knowledge is brought to the attention of the American people we can find a remedy to deal at least with those American citizens who betray our boys in Korea. Publicity alone would tend to discourage the American citizen from dealing directly or indirectly with the Red Chinese or other Communist, for our recent investigations have demonstrated the power of publicity and the American, owning ships flying the Panamanian flag and dealing with the enemy, knows the price that he will pay in the loss of commerce and business here at home.

The dangers of Russian-controlled Panamanian vessels can be dealt with by adequate security regulations.

REGISTRATION OF AMERICAN SHIPS UNDER FOREIGN FLAGS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduced for appropriate reference a bill. It is introduced on behalf of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to an evil which has arisen in the maritime industry of the world, namely, the registration of ships under Panamanian and other foreign registries, which operates to the detriment of the employment of our seamen. It also involves a tax evasion on the part of many American citizens who build ships here, or at other places throughout the world, and then register them under the Panamanian flag. It is an evil which we hope we shall be able to eradicate.

There is a most difficult legal question involved, but it surely is one which must be dealt with if we are to keep an adequate merchant marine flying the American flag. I call attention particularly to the fact that the language of the bill is not entirely perfect, because of legal questions involved. However, we hope to have immediate hearings on the bill. We are open to suggestions. Our real objective is to eradicate the evil referred to.

The bill (S. 3823) to amend section 9 of the Shipping Act, 1916, relating to transfer of vessels documented under the laws of the United States to foreign citizens and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SAVING IN THE PRICE OF TIN—ARTICLE BY CHARLES LUCEY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. MCFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LONG. During the past several days we have been working in an attempt to achieve greater economy in government. I notice that on some occasions we have spent hours in considering amendments which might save as much as \$3,000. Therefore it is gratifying to notice that there are several committees of the Senate which are saving the taxpayers of the Nation a great deal of money, without legislation ever coming to the floor.

I have particularly in mind the Preparedness Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Armed Services. Excellent work is being done in that committee by its members, particularly by the chairman, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON].

I hold in my hand an article in which it is explained how, largely because of the work of that preparedness subcommittee, the price of tin has been greatly reduced, and that the Government of the United States in its stockpiling program will save many millions of dollars, possibly hundreds of millions. I ask that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TIN CARTELS TAKE A LICKING—UNITED STATES GETS TOUGH AND SAVES MONEY

(By Charles Lucey)

Tough action by the United States is beginning to break the back of price-gouging foreign monopolies on strategic materials. The campaign is to save this country hundreds of millions of dollars.

Three months ago this Government, tired of being held up by British, Dutch, Belgian and Bolivian tin cartels, pulled out of the world market as a buyer and decided to make a fight of it.

In these 3 months tin prices have tumbled from nearly \$2 a pound to \$1.11. The foreign tin producers have panicked.

And the United States is telling them that if they want to sell tin they'd better get the price down even more.

Credit for this seems to go chiefly to Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of a Senate Preparedness Subcommittee which built a hot fire under the administration; RFC Chairman Stuart Symington and Donald C. Cook, the subcommittee's chief counsel.

WEARY TAXPAYER

On February 12 the subcommittee, in a detailed report on tin, said:

"The American taxpayer is weary of being gouged for the privilege of obtaining from some of its allies the raw materials with which he is expected to supply the food and armament needs of the non-Communist nations in the event of another all-out war. And this committee intends to do whatever it can to put an end to that gouging."

The ceiling price on tin in World War II had been only 52 cents a pound. In May 1950 the price was 76 cents. But the Korean war gave the tin producers a lever to shove prices up and they did—to about \$2 in February.

Tin was coming into the United States both as metal and in concentrates—the latter to be smelted at the Texas City, Tex., tin

smelter operated by the RFC. The RFC bought all the tin that came from overseas, and sold it as needed to United States industry.

RFC DROPS PRICE

After the Senate committee report, the RFC dropped its tin price from \$1.82 to \$1.57 and then to \$1.34. This meant the United States no longer was tied to the world-controlling Singapore tin price. The Singapore price followed downward at first but then, perhaps "feeling out" the United States, moved higher again.

At one point the RFC, paying more for tin than it was selling it for to United States industry, wavered and shoved its selling price upward—and promptly drew a severe rebuke from Senator JOHNSON. Then, on March 6, the United States decided it could stop buying tin for its stockpile without prejudicing national security, and this decision, plus the earlier pressure, at last got tin prices in Singapore and London rolling downward in earnest.

On April 12 the Singapore price was \$1.50, the RFC price was \$1.47. By May 31 both prices were \$1.39. On June 1 the RFC pulled its price to \$1.36, and Singapore went to \$1.32. Then RFC went down to \$1.29 and so did Singapore. RFC led down to \$1.23, and Singapore followed. Last Thursday the Singapore price went to \$1.18, and the RFC cut its price to the same level. Friday Singapore went to \$1.11, and so did the RFC. This was an 18-cent tumble in 4 days.

CANCELLATION THREAT

After the RFC stopped buying tin for the stockpile, the only tin coming into the United States was that which had been contracted for under long-term contract. These contracts carried a clause saying that if the tin price was above \$1.03 they could be canceled on June 30 of this year.

The Senate committee had recommended cancellation, and the Government decided now to do that. Nothing has been announced about it, but a notice of intent to cancel went out to Singapore. It could have reached there toward the end of last week—when prices really began to tumble.

All of this has caused much wringing of hands by the tin producers, and the State Department, always intent on keeping our overseas allies happy, has passed on their protests.

The United States, world's biggest tin user, chews up about 135,000,000 pounds a year. The price tumble since February, applied to that, represents more than \$100,000,000. And, although detailed figures can't be disclosed in relation to this country's tin stockpile, the saving could be several hundred millions there.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER OUTPUT—ARTICLE BY CHARLES LUCEY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I also have another article along the same line, relating to the savings in the stockpiling program of rubber, as well as the synthetic rubber program, in connection with which the same Senate Preparedness Subcommittee has also done very excellent work. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

NATURAL RUBBER PRICES DECLINE—STEPPED-UP SYNTHETIC RUBBER OUTPUT IS SAVING MILLIONS FOR UNCLE SAM

(By Charles Lucey)

Production of synthetic rubber is moving toward full capacity and is helping to drive down rubber prices so effectively as to rep-

resent hundreds of millions of dollars in savings for this country.

That's the word from the Senate Preparedness Committee headed by Senator LYNDON JOHNSON (Democrat, Texas), which criticized Government rubber policies a few months ago and is now preparing a new report on this strategic commodity.

The report may make at least two important recommendations: Get a tougher rubber conservation program and build more synthetic-rubber plants to decrease United States dependency on overseas rubber sources.

NOT QUITE AS GOOD

No synthetic rubber produced yet is as good for all purposes as natural rubber—for the biggest, heavy-duty truck tires, for example—and so this country must import and stockpile natural rubber. Ninety-five percent of it comes from the Far East. The United States lost this source during World War II, and it could happen again. Hence, the committee says, this country must have adequate natural-rubber stockpiles and increasing synthetic capacity.

After World War II the United States had a synthetic-rubber capacity of 830,000 tons a year. But synthetic plants were closed down to a point where output was only about 300,000 tons. Senate committee officials place some blame for this curtailment on the State Department. The Department, they say, favored British, Dutch, and other natural-rubber producers who wished to sell more rubber here.

At one time in the postwar period, the United States was making synthetic rubber at a profit for about 18 cents a pound, and the natural-rubber price dipped to 16-17 cents. But when the Korean war started, natural-rubber prices began to climb. By last September they had reached 50 cents a pound; by January the level reached about 70 cents, and at one point was headed toward 90 cents.

FAILED TO MAKE HAY

Yet, according to the Senate committee, when the natural-rubber price slid below 20 cents, the Government wasn't stockpiling. There were big United States rubber imports, but they were going mostly to the rubber industry. Later on, though, Government stockpiled at much higher prices.

Rubber can be bought now for about 49 cents a pound, or 26 cents under the February price, and the view of Donald C. Cook, Senate Preparedness Committee counsel, is that the United States action in building up synthetic output is largely responsible.

The United States uses about 500,000 tons of natural rubber a year. Applying the price decline of recent months to this would run to more than \$200,000,000. And Mr. Cook's view is that the price would have been much higher if the United States had not stepped up its synthetic production.

THAT'S NOT ALL

At the time the committee first protested, the Government actually had been considering disposing of a 30,000-tons-a-year capacity plant at Akron.

But the saving growing from forcing down natural-rubber prices isn't the whole saving. The substitution of greater quantities of synthetic rubber, made possible by the increased production program, means more savings. The Government is selling synthetic now at 24½ cents a pound. That's about half what natural rubber costs today. Savings could run to a pile of millions here again.

There seems to be continuing good news ahead on rubber prices for the consumer, if there's no bigger war. Future deliveries are being scheduled at 43 cents, 6 cents under current quotations.

The Senate committee said months ago it had found that "Government agencies responsible for our rubber supply and stockpile have been slow to adjust their thinking to and actions to the realities of the post-Korean world." The coming Senate report on rubber may give credit for progress made, but is fairly sure, too, to demand still more aggressive action to cushion possible loss of overseas rubber sources in future days.

THE 1952 BUDGET AND INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a breakdown of the \$71,250,000,000 budget that has been proposed for this year. There is a breakdown by States, showing the proportionate part each State will pay. At the same time there is shown how much was collected by the Internal Revenue Bureau for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1950.

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

State	Total internal revenue collections for fiscal year ended June 30, 1950 ¹	Proportionate part to be paid toward the \$71 1/4 billion budget
Alabama	\$233,208,454	\$427,500,000
Arizona	74,822,094	135,375,000
Arkansas	105,425,486	192,325,000
California	2,794,713,395	5,108,625,000
Colorado	272,505,614	498,750,000
Connecticut	592,874,470	1,083,000,000
Delaware	356,901,157	655,500,000
Florida	359,387,115	655,500,000
Georgia	392,518,088	719,625,000
Idaho	71,828,836	128,250,000
Illinois	3,396,892,658	6,213,000,000
Indiana	973,283,542	1,781,250,000
Iowa	345,223,492	634,125,000
Kansas	307,923,529	562,875,000
Kentucky	857,689,175	1,567,500,000
Louisiana	350,570,822	641,250,000
Maine	106,910,352	192,375,000
Maryland	1,128,476,407	2,066,250,000
Massachusetts	1,127,641,137	2,056,125,000
Michigan	2,747,570,685	5,023,125,000
Minnesota	629,726,416	1,154,250,000
Mississippi	88,306,655	163,875,000
Missouri	1,102,085,135	2,016,375,000
Montana	74,864,363	135,375,000
Nebraska	261,366,873	477,375,000
Nevada	35,446,339	64,125,000
New Hampshire	68,755,337	128,250,000
New Jersey	1,133,975,046	2,073,375,000
New Mexico	57,906,231	106,875,000
New York	7,215,466,535	13,195,500,000
North Carolina	1,131,446,603	2,066,250,000
North Dakota	52,054,181	92,625,000
Ohio	2,435,580,908	4,453,125,000
Oklahoma	413,470,362	755,250,000
Oregon	262,968,480	484,500,000
Pennsylvania	2,964,381,617	5,422,125,000
Rhode Island	183,795,663	334,875,000
South Carolina	175,019,823	320,625,000
South Dakota	56,717,659	106,875,000
Tennessee	316,035,571	577,125,000
Texas	1,290,622,384	2,358,375,000
Utah	84,012,613	156,750,000
Vermont	37,110,077	71,250,000
Virginia	744,061,228	1,360,875,000
Washington	444,759,395	812,250,000
West Virginia	203,917,245	370,500,000
Wisconsin	758,371,637	1,389,375,000
Wyoming	37,425,839	71,250,000
Alaska	17,393,930	28,500,000
Hawaii	81,400,813	149,625,000
Puerto Rico	2,320,274	7,125,000

¹ From report of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, Treasury Department, released Aug. 23, 1950.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1951—STATEMENT BY ERLE COCKE, JR.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I understand the President has signed the Universal Military Training and Service Act of 1951, the manpower bill, which

contains the universal military training and service provisions. I desire at this time to compliment the commander of the American Legion, Erle Cocke, Jr., for the splendid work he did in behalf of the bill. No one worked harder and more diligently to secure UMT legislation than did the commander of the American Legion. He worked for it because he felt it was necessary for the defense of our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by Commander Cocke dealing with the subject.

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

STATEMENT OF ERLE COCKE, JR., NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, COINCIDENT WITH THE SIGNING INTO LAW OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT OF 1951, JUNE 19, 1951

Universal military training was first advocated by the American Legion in 1919. The organization has fought for it without let-up ever since.

The 1919 resolution adopted at the Legion's first national convention, called for "a policy of universal military training (with) administration, removed from the complete control of any exclusively military caste." The American Legion stands for that policy today.

The measure signed into law today sets up a series of steps by which the Congress must decide finally whether the Nation is to have an operating UMT program. We believe a clear majority of Americans made up their minds long ago, and affirmatively. We intend to use every means at our disposal to convey that majority opinion to Congress.

While postponement of the final decision is regrettable and unnecessary, I am convinced that the additional study and detailed training curriculum to be initiated by the National Security Training Commission will serve to strengthen and solidify the public support UMT has enjoyed since the end of World War II.

The opposition has been whittled over the years by enlightened understanding of the need for a system of youth training under civilian control and within predictable costs. It remains centered today where it has always been—in a small but loud handful of pacifists and chronic critics who are for national security but against the measures that would make the Nation secure.

The American Legion had introduced into the Congress last January Senate bill 1. That bill provided for a program of UMT, to go into operation after the end of the present national emergency. The measure signed into law today was S. 1 as amended to strengthen the draft and set up the preliminaries of UMT.

Twenty-eight years elapsed before UMT legislation won approval of a committee of the Congress. Now, another 4 years later, the Senate and House have agreed to settle the issue once and for all in the reasonably near future.

The Universal Military Training and Service Act is an important victory—although a limited one—for realistic preparedness. The American people owe a great deal to the leaders of vision and courage, particularly Senator Richard Russell, Senator Lyndon Johnson, Senator Styles Bridges, Senator Harry Cain, Representative Carl Vinson, Representative Overton Brooks, Representative W. Sterling Cole, Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall, and the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Mrs. Anna Rosenberg, who fought this legislation through.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Fifteen postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Paul W. Brosman, of Louisiana, to be judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1956.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I should like to state briefly that we of Louisiana are very much honored by the appointment of Dr. Paul W. Brosman to the Court of Military Appeals. Dr. Brosman has a very eminent and distinguished record as dean of the Tulane Law School. He has been a distinguished citizen of Louisiana for many years. We believe that no finer jurist could have been appointed by the President.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George W. Latimer, of Utah, to be judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1961.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, Judge Latimer has rendered outstanding service to the Nation through 26 years of military service with the Utah National Guard and the Army of the United States. He has served the State of Utah well as a justice of the Utah State Supreme Court. He has the universal approval of the bench and bar of the State of Utah.

Judge Latimer practiced law in his home State for 15 years prior to entering active military service. While in the service he was awarded the Legion of Merit for service in combat in New Britain and the Philippines.

While Judge Latimer was recommended by Republicans and the Republicans are proud that he is a member of the party, he has received the support of members of both parties. The enlisted men and the men in the ranks of the Army of the United States will find in Justice Latimer a man who has risen through those ranks and who therefore is sympathetic to them and their problems.

Utahans are proud of Judge Latimer and are confident that he will fill with dignity, ability, and distinction the office to which he has been appointed.

I have a short memorandum giving the details of Judge Latimer's military, professional, and legal activities. I request that it be printed at the close of my remarks.

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

MILITARY SERVICE

Col. George W. Latimer has had approximately 26 years' military service with the Utah National Guard and the Army of the United States. He enrolled in the Reserve Officers Training Corps, University of Utah, and attended a basic camp at Camp Knox in 1920 and an advance course at Fort Lewis, Wash., in 1922. In 1924 he graduated as a second lieutenant of field artillery. The year after he accepted a commission in the National Guard, and has served that organization in all ranks from second lieutenant to colonel. In 1926 he was ordered to and graduated from the Battery Officers Course, Fort Sill, Okla. He was selected to attend the Ninth Corps Area Command and General Staff School in 1938 and 1939, but this course was discontinued. In 1940 he was selected to attend the first special course, Command and General Staff School, Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and upon his completion the school requested he be detailed there as instructor. He was inducted into the Federal service February 1941 as G-1 of the Fortieth Infantry Division. He subsequently was promoted to a full colonel, became chief of staff of this division, and served in that capacity while the division was in Hawaii, Guadalcanal, New Britain, and Luzon, Negros and Panay, Philippine Islands. During the years 1944-45 this division was engaged in combat in the areas above mentioned. Since being relieved from active duty late in 1945, Colonel Latimer was selected for duty with the General Staff in Washington, D. C., but was unable to accept the assignment because of his election to the supreme court, State of Utah. In 1948-49 he accepted two short tours of duty with the Army Field Forces, Fort Monroe, Va. He supervised the National Guard officers in the preparation of National Guard training programs and staff-training programs.

PROFESSIONAL AND LEGAL SERVICE

Justice Latimer graduated from the University of Utah Law School with an L. L. B. in 1924. He practiced law in Salt Lake City, Utah, from 1925 until 1940. In the latter year he discontinued his practice because of having been ordered into the military service. He returned to general practice in the State of Utah in the latter part of 1945, and remained in the practice until he was elected to the supreme court of the State of Utah in November 1946. He has served 4½ years of a 10-year term, and he is regarded by the people of the State of Utah as an eminent jurist and hard working public servant.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD several editorials from Utah newspapers, as well as a resolution passed unanimously, by the legislature of the State of Utah, congratulating Judge Latimer upon his appointment, and pointing out his many fine qualifications, as well as congratulating the President upon making such a wonderful choice.

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

[From the Deseret News, Salt Lake City, Utah, of May 24, 1951]

UTAH JURIST NAMED TO HIGH FEDERAL POST

Utah has again been honored by the choice of one of its eminent jurists for Federal appointment to a high appellate court. Justice George W. Latimer of the Supreme Court of Utah has been named by President Truman for a post on the new Federal Court of Military Appeals.

This is a newly constituted court, consisting of three civilian judges of adequate experience and specialized knowledge, set up under the new program of unification of the Armed Forces. Its duties are to review the findings of military courts, on proper appeal, and its rank is on a par with a United States Circuit Court of Appeals with civilian jurisdiction.

In accepting this post, Justice Latimer will join a list of illustrious Utahans who hold or have held high Federal appellate posts. Most noteworthy was the late Justice George Sutherland, British-born but Utah-raised, who was Senator from Utah and later for 16 years was a Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. Judge Harold M. Stephens is chief justice of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, and Judge Florence E. Allen, a member of the Sixth Court of Appeals which has jurisdiction in Ohio and adjacent States, was born and raised here in Salt Lake City.

Utah feels that it shares the honor of Justice Latimer's appointment, and wishes him the fullest measure of success in his new and responsible post.

[From the Salt Lake Telegram of May 24, 1951]

JUDICIAL HONOR

Utahans will be pleased over the nomination of George W. Latimer, Justice of the State supreme Court, by President Truman for the Republican post on a new Court of Military Appeals. Judge Latimer's name has been sent to the Senate for confirmation, and approval seems certain.

Justice Latimer has served on the Utah Supreme Court for more than 4 years. A native of this State and a graduate of the University of Utah Law School, he practiced law in this city from 1924 until he entered military service in 1940. Service in the ROTC at the university and in the Utah National Guard put him well up the ranks in the army and he came out of the war a full colonel, having served as chief of staff of an infantry division in the Pacific.

The Military Appeals Courts to which Judge Latimer and two Democrats have been nominated is a new tribunal of civilian jurists set up under the Armed Forces unification program to serve as a final court of appeals for serious military cases. Under normal circumstances judges will serve 15-year terms, although initial terms are staggered, that of Justice Latimer being for 10 years.

It is a position of real judicial and military importance to which George Latimer has been named. It is an honor to him and to this State. The Telegram congratulates him and wishes him well in the new position which we are sure will soon become definitely his as the result of senatorial confirmation.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune of May 24, 1951]

AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

Beginning June 1 a new system of military justice will go in effect for the Armed Forces designed to give servicemen accused of major

offenses fairer treatment and more of the legal protection they would have received in civilian life. The new system, latest step in the unification program, broadens court-marital procedure and in addition provides for appeals to a three-man court of civilian judges. Decisions of the appeals court will be final in all cases except those involving the death penalty, where the president will retain the last say.

President Truman has nominated Justice George W. Latimer of the Utah Supreme Court as a member of the new military tribunal. The choice is excellent. Since his graduation from the University of Utah Law School in 1924 Justice Latimer has been a respected member of the bar. In 1947 he became a member of the Utah Supreme Court, where his wide knowledge of the law and his judicial temperament have been much in evidence. He has long been interested in military affairs and for many years was a member of the national guard. During World War II he served with the Army in the Pacific, participated in three campaigns and was awarded the Legion of Merit. He left the service as a colonel, a rank he now holds in the national guard.

Justice Latimer's appointment is a signal honor for Utah. But, more than that, it is a great break for the Armed Services. He will bring to his new position (confirmation by the Senate should be a mere formality) a military background and a soldier's viewpoint, combined with marvelous judicial temperament and training in civilian law. These are qualities which will assure success to the new system of military justice.

Senate Joint Resolution 4

Joint resolution congratulating Justice George W. Latimer upon his appointment as a Justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals

Whereas the President of the United States of America has seen fit to appoint Justice George W. Latimer of the Supreme Court of the State of Utah to the office of Justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals; and

Whereas Justice Latimer has served with distinction and honor as a member of the bar and the bench of this State, and as an officer in the Army of the United States, and the National Guard of the State of Utah; and

Whereas the people of the State of Utah regret to lose the services of such an able jurist and humble, friendly soul, but rejoice in the great honor which has come to Justice Latimer and to the State of Utah: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah in session assembled, That Justice George W. Latimer be congratulated upon his appointment as Justice of the United States Court of Military Appeals; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Justice George W. Latimer and to the President of the United States and the Senate of the United States of America, and Utah delegation in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I take pleasure in associating myself with the senior Senator from Utah in his representation in behalf of Judge Latimer.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination of George W. Latimer of Utah is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert Emmett Quinn of Rhode Island, to be judge of the Court of Mili-

tary Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1966.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask that the nomination of Irving Florman, of New York to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bolivia, go over. I ask that that nomination be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over. Without objection, the other nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service will be confirmed en bloc.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

CONSIDERATION OF ROUTINE NOMINATIONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, from the Armed Services Committee, I report 1,736 nominations in the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In order to avoid printing these names in the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed and that the President be notified.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I think it would be well for the Senator to say what I know to be the fact, that the Committee on Armed Services unanimously reported all these nominations, and that some of them are of immediate necessity?

Mr. CAIN. To my knowledge every member of the committee voted in support of all the 1,700-odd nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in support of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, six of the officers nominated for promotion are with our Army in Korea. Brig. Gen. Joseph S. Bradley, nominated for appointment as a major general, is commanding the Twenty-fifth Infantry Division in Korea.

The five colonels, Champeny, Watson, Ennis, de Shazo, and Guthrie, nominated for appointment as brigadier generals, are all in Korea. These officers have won their promotions on the field of battle.

One of the officers, Gen. Arthur S. Champeny, is a combat veteran of World War I, World War II, and of the far eastern war I, in Korea. This officer is deserving of a particular word of attention and compliment. He has been decorated with the Distinguished Service

Cross in each of three wars, which cover a period of 33 years. I know of no other individual in the United States Army who has so often through so many years exposed himself in defense of and for the good of his Nation to the weapons and ruthlessness of his Nation's enemies. General Champeny has given of his blood, strength, courage and heart for the common welfare. The Senator from Washington, for himself and others, most humbly expresses his gratefulness to this fighting American.

General Champeny was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Nation's second highest combat award, for gallantry in action with the Eighty-ninth Division in World War I. During World War II, he commanded the Three Hundred and Fifty-first Infantry Regiment of the Eighty-eighth Division in Italy. While in command of his regiment he was awarded an oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, and the Bronze Star Medal for heroism in action, and was awarded the Purple Heart, with three oak leaf clusters, for wounds received during this period. General Champeny commanded the Twenty-fourth Infantry Regiment of the Twenty-fifth Division during the early days of the fighting in Korea. He was awarded the second oak leaf cluster to the Distinguished Service Cross for extraordinary heroism while in command of this regiment in Korea. He was wounded twice during this period. Other decorations awarded General Champeny are the Legion of Merit, with oak leaf cluster, and two oak leaf clusters to the Bronze Star Medal.

As Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway has said with such justification and faith—and it applies with equal force to General Champeny—"If it be life that waits, then I shall live forever, unconquered."

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 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION

James W. Wadsworth, of New York, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 3 years, expiring June 19, 1954.

Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid, United States Navy, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 4 years, expiring June 19, 1955.

Lt. Gen. Raymond S. McLain, United States Army, to be a member of the National Security Training Commission for a term of 5 years, expiring June 19, 1956.

The following-named persons to be members of the National Security Training Commission for terms of 2 years, expiring June 19, 1953:

William L. Clayton, of Texas.

Karl T. Compton, of Massachusetts.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 19 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

THE COURT OF MILITARY APPEALS

Paul W. Brosman, of Louisiana, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1956.

George W. Latimer, of Utah, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1961.

Robert Emmett Quinn, of Rhode Island, to be a judge of the Court of Military Appeals for the term expiring May 1, 1966.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Willard L. Beaulac, of Rhode Island, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Cuba.

John C. Wiley, of Indiana, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Panama.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

To be Foreign Service officers of class 1

Ware Adams George Lewis Jones, Jr.
John M. Allison Cecil B. Lyon
Charles F. Baldwin Paul O. Nyhus
Donald F. Bigelow Edward Page, Jr.
Sidney H. Browne Donald W. Smith
Charles R. Burrows William P. Snow
John Davies, Jr. Philip D. Sprouse
Owen L. Dawson Francis Bowden Stevens
Charles E. Dickerson, Jr. Tyler Thompson
Walter C. Dowling William C. Trimble
C. Burke Elbrick Walter N. Walmsley, Jr.
Walton C. Ferris Joe D. Walstrom
Andrew B. Foster Miss Frances E. Willis

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2

William K. Ailshire Bertel E. Kuniholm
Frederic P. Bartlett Rufus H. Lane, Jr.
Burton Y. Berry Patrick Mallon
Clarence E. Birgfeld Gordon H. Mattison
Ralph J. Blake Edward D. McLaughlin
Ralph A. Boernstein Robert B. Memminger
Niles W. Bond George A. Morgan
Elmer H. Bourgerie John H. Morgan
Aaron S. Brown Brewster H. Morris
Robert Y. Brown Robert Newbegin
Prescott Childs William C. Ockey
Claude Courand Cabot Coville Marselis C. Parsons, Jr.
Howard Elting, Jr. Jerome T. Gaspard
Eugene A. Gilmore, Jr. C. Montagu Pigott
Bernard Guifre Paul J. Reveye
Edmund A. Gullion Arthur R. Ringwalt
Theodore J. Hadraba Andreas G. Ronhovde
John J. Haggerty Albert W. Scott
John N. Hamlin Charles Nelson Spinks
Parker T. Hart Robert B. Streeter
James E. Henderson E. Paul Tenney
L. Randolph Higgs Charles W. Thayer
John A. Hopkins Sheldon Thomas
Morris N. Hughes Frederik van den Arend
Fred W. Jandrey Woodruff Wallner
Perry N. Jester Milton K. Wells
Howard P. Jones Clifton R. Wharton
Erwin P. Keeler William L. Kilcoin
William L. Kilcoin Evan M. Wilson

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3

William C. Affeld, Jr. John H. Burns
H. Gardner Ainsworth Frank P. Butler
Edward Anderson Donald B. Calder
Leonard Lee Bacon Jr. Turner C. Cameron, Jr.
N. Spencer Barnes Robert J. Cavanaugh
James D. Bell V. Lansing Collins, Jr.
Carl Breuer Harry Conover
Willard O. Brown Austin B. Cox

Robert C. Creel
Glion Curtis, Jr.
Philip M. Davenport
Joseph L. Dougherty
Perry Ellis
Robert B. Elwood
Frederick E. Farnsworth
Robert S. Folsom
Paul E. Geier
Lewis E. Gleek, Jr.
Richard E. Gnade
Bartley P. Gordon
Caspar D. Green
Robert Grinnell
Claude H. Hall, Jr.
Wesley C. Haraldson
Walter W. Hoffmann
John B. Holt
Richard S. Huestis
Hartwell Johnson
Sidney K. Lafoon
Frederick P. Latimer, Jr.
Raymond G. Leddy
F. Ridgway Lineaweaver
Walter J. Linthicum
Raymond E. Lisle

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4

Robert J. Dorr
David I. Ferber
Deane R. Hinton
Oscar C. Holder
Walter C. Isenberg, Jr.
Leslie W. Johnson
Weldon Litsey
Henry L. Pitts, Jr.

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4 and consuls

Robert W. Adams
Robert G. Bailey
Milton Barall
Taylor G. Belcher
Donald C. Bergus
Robert O. Blake
Thomas D. Bowie
John W. Bowling
Robert A. Brand
Howard Brandon
Gray Bream
Clarence T. Breaux
William L. Brewster
Lewis D. Brown
Miss Lora C. Bryning
Rolland H. Bushner
Wilbur P. Chase
Keld Christensen
Charles Philip Clock
A. John Cope, Jr.
Robert F. Corrigan
Roy T. Davis, Jr.
Alexander J. Davit
Juan de Zengotita
Dwight Dickinson
Donald P. Downs
Thomas J. Duffield, Jr.
L. Milner Dunn
William J. Ford
Martin F. Herz
William P. Hudson
Alfred le S. Jenkins
Joseph J. Jova
William C. Lakeland

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5

Theo C. Adams
Thomas W. Ainsworth
Willard Allan
Arthur B. Allen
James F. Amory
John C. Amott
Alfred L. Atherton, Jr.
John Campbell
Ausland
Philip Axelrod

Ernest de W. Mayer
David H. McKillop
John M. McSweeney
John Gordon Mein
Robert G. Miner
H. Gordon Minnigerode
Charles H. Owsley
Paul Paddock
J. Hall Paxton
Kennett F. Potter
Henry C. Ramsey
Halleck L. Rose
Edward J. Rowell
Roy Richard Rutherford
M. Robert Rutherford
William Langdon
Sands
Richard M. Service
Harold Sims
Henry T. Smith
Henry W. Spielman
Paul J. Sturm
Horace G. Torbert, Jr.
Murat W. Williams
David G. Wilson, Jr.
William Witman 2d

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4

Edward F. Rivinus, Jr.
Randolph Roberts
Robert Rossow, Jr.
Sheldon B. Vance
Edward L. Waggoner
Fred E. Waller
Meredith Weatherby
Charles H. Whitaker

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4 and consuls

Samuel Owen Lane
Armistead M. Lee
Scott Lyon
George Hubert
Maness
Oliver M. Marcy
David E. Mark
Edward N. McCully
Thomas W. McElhiney
Thomas D. McKiernan
Cleveland B. McKnight
Lee E. Metcalf
Joseph J. Montllor
Robert W. Moore
Andrew E. Olson
Clinton L. Olson
W. Paul O'Neill, Jr.
Alexander L. Peaslee
Norman K. Pratt
Lubert O. Sanderhoff
Rufus Z. Smith
Herbert D. Spivack
Wells Stabler
Charles G. Stefan
Gerald Stryker
John H. Stutesman, Jr.
John L. Topping
Temple Wanamaker
H. André Weismann
Jackson W. Wilson

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5

Robert A. Aylward
William M. Bates
Robert M. Berry
Slator C. Blackiston, Jr.
James J. Blake
Vincent R. Boening
Howard L. Boorman
William D. Brewer
Robert C. Brewster
William B. Buffum

Miss Patricia M. Byrne
Stuart B. Campbell, Jr.
William C. Canup
Frank E. Cash, Jr.
Ralph G. Clark
S. Wilson Clark
Stephen A. Comiskey
Thomas J. Corcoran
Henry L. Coster
Richard H. Courtenay
William D. Craig
David C. Cuthell
Philip M. Dale, Jr.
Nathaniel Davis
Robert D. Davis
Frank J. Devine
John B. Dexter
William B. Dunn
Samuel D. Eaton
Hermann F. Elts
Richard A. Ericson, Jr.
Richard T. Ewing
John M. Farrior
John W. Fisher
Wayne W. Fisher
Benjamin A. Fleck
Robert C. Foulon
A. Eugene Frank
James A. Garvey
John N. Gatch, Jr.
Scott George
Howard C. Goldsmith
Herbert Gordon
John G. Gossett
Philip C. Habib
Philip E. Haring
Gregory Henderson
Robert S. Henderson
Converse Hettinger
John H. Holdridge
Walter P. Houk
Paul R. Hughes
Vernon V. Hukee
Edward C. Ingraham, Jr.
Richard G. Johnson
Howard D. Jones
Ralph A. Jones
Harold G. Josif
Abbott Judd
Warren A. Kelsey
Jack T. Kilgore
Richard H. Lamb
James F. Leonard, Jr.
Edward T. Long
Matthew J. Looram, Jr.
Roye L. Lowry
John E. MacDonald
Robert J. MacQuaid
Frank E. Maestrone

To be consuls general of the United States of America

Heyward G. Hill
Paul W. Meyer
Edward D. McLaughlin
Robert E. Ward, Jr.

To be consuls of the United States of America

Robin E. Steussy
Walter E. Kneeland
Joseph H. Rogatnick
Arthur Doak Barnett
Philip J. Conley

To be vice consuls of the United States of America

Peter J. C. Adam
Wilson P. Dizard, Jr.

Robert W. Kerwin
Glenn Lee Smith

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Robert G. Caldwell
Herbert Cerwin
Bruce Buttles

Francis N. Magliozi
Philip W. Manhard
Eugene V. McAuliffe
Richard M. McCarthy
Glenn R. McCarty, Jr.
Stephen H. McClintic
James H. McFarland, Jr.
Joseph F. McFarland
Thomas J. Corcoran
John B. McGrath
Ralph J. McGuire
Paul M. Miller
Robert E. Moberly
James D. Moffett
Thomas H. Murfin
John L. Murphy
William Nesseihof, Jr.
Cleo A. Noel, Jr.
Richard B. Parker
John M. Perry
Chris G. Petrow
Robert M. Phillips
Paul O. Proehl
Ernest E. Ramsaur, Jr.
John B. Root
Robert W. Ross
James R. Ruchti
Samuel O. Ruff
John A. Sabini
Mrs. Corey B. Sanderson
Dwight E. Scarbrough
Robert Simpson
Michel F. Smith
Karl E. Somerlatte
C. Melvin Sonne, Jr.
G. Alonzo Stanford
Kenedon P. Steins
Harrison M. Symmes, Jr.
Herbert B. Thompson
John M. Thompson, Jr.
Edward J. Thrasher
Edward J. Trost
Gordon C. Tullock
Francis T. Underhill, Jr.
Viron P. Vaky
Philip H. Valdes
George S. Vest
Theodore A. Wahl
John Patrick Walsh
Milton C. Walstrom
Herbert E. Weiner
Arthur D. Weininger
James F. Leonard, Jr.
William H. Witt
Chalmers B. Wood
Robert C. Wysong
Elmer E. Yelton
John B. Young
Robert W. Zimmermann

John W. Fisher
Wayne W. Fisher
Benjamin A. Fleck
Robert C. Foulon
A. Eugene Frank
James A. Garvey
John N. Gatch, Jr.
Scott George
Howard C. Goldsmith
Herbert Gordon
John G. Gossett
Philip C. Habib
Philip E. Haring
Gregory Henderson
Robert S. Henderson
Converse Hettinger
John H. Holdridge
Walter P. Houk
Paul R. Hughes
Vernon V. Hukee
Edward C. Ingraham, Jr.
Richard G. Johnson
Howard D. Jones
Ralph A. Jones
Harold G. Josif
Abbott Judd
Warren A. Kelsey
Jack T. Kilgore
Richard H. Lamb
James F. Leonard, Jr.
Edward T. Long
Matthew J. Looram, Jr.
Roye L. Lowry
John E. MacDonald
Robert J. MacQuaid
Frank E. Maestrone

To be consuls general of the United States of America

Heyward G. Hill
Paul W. Meyer
Edward D. McLaughlin
Robert E. Ward, Jr.

To be consuls of the United States of America

Robin E. Steussy
Walter E. Kneeland
Joseph H. Rogatnick
Arthur Doak Barnett
Philip J. Conley

To be vice consuls of the United States of America

Peter J. C. Adam
Wilson P. Dizard, Jr.

Robert W. Kerwin
Glenn Lee Smith

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

Robert G. Caldwell

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America

William G. Allen	Henry Lee, Jr.
G. Michael Bache	William B. Miller
Alan L. Campbell, Jr.	Richard D. Nethercut
William R. Crawford	Augustus L. Putnam
Jr.	Robert A. Remole
Robert B. Houston, Jr.	Ralph S. Saul
Richard E. Johnson	Kennedy B. Schmertz
Frederick Joseph	William C. Sherman
Myron Brockway	Robert K. Sherwood
Lawrence	Christopher A. Squire

IN THE ARMY

CHIEF CHEMICAL OFFICER, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND MAJOR GENERAL IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

Brig. Gen. Egbert Frank Bullene, O9708, United States Army, for appointment as Chief Chemical Officer, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

Appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title V of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major general

Maj. Gen. William Maynadier Miley, O11232.

To be brigadier generals

Brig. Gen. William Shepard Biddle, O15180. Brig. Gen. Charles Edward Hart, O15788. Brig. Gen. Charles Draper William Canham, O16496.

Temporary appointments in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of subsection 515 (c) of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., O9325. Brig. Gen. George Jacob Nold, O8888. Brig. Gen. Joseph Sladen Bradley, O12428. Brig. Gen. William Stevens Lawton, O14924. Brig. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650. Brig. Gen. Bruce Cooper Clarke, O16068.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Arthur Seymour Champeny, O8264. Col. Numa Augustin Watson, O14968. Col. William Peirce Ennis, Jr., O16436. Col. Thomas Edward de Shazo, O16479. Col. John Simpson Guthrie, O18228.

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

PROMOTIONS

The nominations of Martin Williams Baumgaertner and other officers, for promotion in the United States Air Force, under the provisions of sections 502, 508, and 509 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 and section 306 of the Women's Armed Service Integration Act of 1948, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 28, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Martin Williams Baumgaertner, which appears on page 5898, and ending with the name of Edna Haley Farry, which appears on page 5900.

APPOINTMENTS

The nominations of Archibald G. M. Martin III, et al., for appointment in the United States Air Force, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on May 29, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Archibald G. M.

Martin III, which is shown on page 5968, and ending with the name of Thomas C. Pinckney, Jr., which appears on page 5969.

IN THE NAVY

PERMANENT APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of rear admiral:

Rear admiral, line

Charles D. Wheelock	John P. Whitney
Richard M. Watt, Jr.	Hugh H. Goodwin
Paul E. Pihl	Edgar A. Cruise
Wilson D. Leggett, Jr.	Thomas B. Brittain
Harold D. Baker	Richard P. Glass
Herbert E. Regan	Clark L. Green
Thomas M. Stokes	Leon J. Huffman
Robert E. Blick, Jr.	Harold A. Houser
Frank T. Watkins	John M. Higgins
Tom B. Hill	John B. Pearson, Jr.
Carl F. Espe	

Rear admiral, Medical Corps

Leslie O. Stone	
Clifford A. Swanson	

Rear admiral, Supply Corps

George F. Yoran	
Robert F. Batchelder	

Rear admiral, Civil Engineer Corps

William O. Hiltabiddle, Jr.	
-----------------------------	--

The nominations of Kemp Tolley and other officers for permanent appointment in the Navy to the grade and corps indicated, which were confirmed today, were received by the Senate on June 4, 1951, and appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Kemp Tolley, which appears on page 6082, and ending with the name of Henry H. Laramore, which is shown on page 6084.

The following-named line officers of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of ensign in the Staff Corps of the Navy as indicated:

Supply Corps

Andrew L. Frahler	
-------------------	--

Civil Engineer Corps

James W. Murray	
Richard K. Pulling	

The following-named officer of the Navy for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of the line as previously nominated and confirmed:

Andrew L. Frahler	
-------------------	--

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Alan G. Lewis (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to be an ensign in the Supply Corps of the Navy in lieu of ensign in the Navy as previously nominated and confirmed to correct name.

Richard Y. Kelly (civilian college graduate) to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps.

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Navy:

Rosemary D. Arent	Betty R. Kunzman
Kathleen D. Beck	Diana McNair
Marion C. Brenner	Bertha S. Miller
Emily J. Byrd	Mary V. Moore
Nancy J. Chapman	Faye P. Overton
Shirley J. Clare	Frances MacD. Patch
Mary T. Connors	Bette J. Pickett
Yvonne C. Fossen-kemper	Mary-Jeannette M. Rayner
Nellie M. Grieve	Louise B. Rogerson
Louise E. Griffin	Agnes I. Rupp
Elizabeth Hart	Mary E. Sheffels
George Hodges	Suzanne S. Shera
Mitzie L. Jacobson	Margaret F. Smith
Ethel R. Klein	Ann Thompson
Sibyl L. Kuhnle	Ruth V. Whitfield

The following-named women (civilian college graduates) to be ensigns in the Supply Corps of the Navy:

Elizabeth L. Childers	
Clair Cook	

The following-named (civilian college graduates) to the grades indicated in the Medical Corps of the Navy:

Lieutenant commander	
Rufus J. Pearson, Jr.	

Lieutenants (junior grade)

Robert H. Palmer, Jr.	Roger P. Smitley
Clifford C. Roosa	James N. Waggoner

Fitzhugh N. Hamrick to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Dental Corps of the Navy.

The following-named to be ensigns in the Nurse Corps of the Navy:

Belva L. Coole	Virginia Marfa
Winifred L. Copeland	Rachel A. Nantz
June M. Elsesser	Margaret E. Nix
Evelyn C. Fohrt	Mary L. O'Donnell
Susan M. Hanley	Elizabeth Pope
Mary H. Harris	Julia E. Scarcello
Viola M. Hofer	Dorothy J. Shields
Regina M. Holland	Iris M. Stock
Wanda J. Humphrey	Mary T. Taylor
Barbara J. Hundley	Annie R. White
Dorothy V. Krause	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the line of the Navy for limited duty only:

Ensigns

Albert Antar	Richard E. Mikkelsen
Harold S. Birdsong	Peter E. Moll, Jr.
Arthur A. Bish	Robert L. Moore
Donald "D" Butler	Aulcey D. Mosley
John J. Bramblett, Jr.	Sylvester F. North
Francis E. Carnicom	James P. Padgett
John T. Childs	John K. Pegues, Jr.
Earl D. Christensen	Robert Pescott
John H. Church	Everett R. Peugh
Ernest L. Coborn	Loyd G. Peterson, Jr.
James E. Criner	Robert E. Pierce
Peter DellaRocca	Joseph E. Panning
Frank Dievendorff	Harry B. Pitcher, Jr.
Charles A. Dodd	Wilbur P. Powers
Philip M. Dyer	Walter A. Ramsey
Otis E. Engelman	Garlin R. Read
George J. Evans	Irvin W. Reed
Julius E. Fuchs	Albert R. Reid
Adolph J. Furtek	Benjamin G. Sailors
Robert D. Gale	William G. Sandberg
Bernard H. Garrett	Albert G. Sentman
Homer A. Giddens	Elroy J. Shafer
Herman E. Goebel, Jr.	George T. Sinclair, Jr.
William L. Halleck	Jack D. Smith
Theodore P. Henrikson	George St. Marie
James "B" Hobbs	Preston G. Thomas
John C. Hounihan	Ted K. Tillotson
Donnie W. Huckabee	William O. Thomson
William L. Hutton	Jackson M. Tomsky
Jack R. Ingram	Mike J. Trems
Robert G. Jacks	John C. Valek
Cecil King	William McK. Villines, Jr.
Everett N. Leach	Willard F. Waterfield, Jr.
William R. Leibold	Arthur C. White
John D. Lewallen	George W. Whitman
Joe J. Lillienfeld	Raymond O. Wilkins
Eugene J. McGuire	George W. Macauley
Sibyl L. Kuhnle	Armidio E. Mancini
	William R. Yarwood

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy for limited duty only:

Ensigns

Donavon E. Abraham	Lowell A. Reade
Charles H. McKenzie	Clarence E. Reed
George W. Nelson	

The following-named officers to the grade indicated in the Civil Engineer Corps of the Navy for limited duty only:

Ensigns

David H. Bodtke
Robert A. Martin

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 19, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Bras-kamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art the Lord God omnipotent and omniscient, may we daily come to the sacrament of public service richly endowed with the grace of insight, the gift of interpretation, and the sinews of moral and spiritual strength.

We pray that we may always have the leading of Thy divine spirit and beseech Thee to create within us those desires which Thou dost delight to satisfy.

May it be the goal of all our aspirations to build a finer and nobler social order and to bring praise and glory to Thy great and holy name.

Grant that the day may be hastened when the blessings of freedom and democracy shall be the glorious possession of all mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 11) entitled "Concurrent resolution reaffirming the friendship of the American people for all the peoples of the world, including the peoples of the Soviet Union."

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. LARCADE asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to address the House on Tuesday, June 26, for 1 hour, and on Wednesday, June 27, for 1 hour, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION BILL, 1952

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] and myself.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4496, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, July 4 in any year, when our people celebrate the anniversary of the day when that famous historic document, the Declaration of Independence, was signed, is a very important day, but this year it is particularly important in view of the fact that it is the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the signing of that immortal document which preceded and which is just as much a part of our fundamental law as the Constitution itself.

The President of the United States has appointed a Commission in connection with the one hundred and seventy-fifth celebration of the signing of the Declaration of Independence consisting of the Vice President of the United States, our beloved Speaker, the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, the majority and minority leaders of the House, and the majority and minority leaders of the Senate.

We are hopeful that in every city and town throughout every State of the Union there will be a most active celebration this year of the anniversary of this historic event. I can assure the Members of the House that already there is a tremendously favorable response throughout the country, but we are hopeful that the open and public manifestation of our love as Americans for that historic document will evidence itself this year to the maximum extent humanly possible by all Americans, and that each Governor will make the necessary proclamation and do everything possible within his State, and the mayors of all cities and the duly constituted authorities of all towns and communities will take such action and give such leadership within their communities that this year the maximum celebration humanly possible will be engaged in and that religious, civic, and educational leaders will do the same thing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the minority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the majority leader in urging a widespread observance of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. At this time when liberty is in peril all over the world, it is an opportune time for the American people to learn the truth and permit

them to rally to the support of the precious rights enunciated by our forefathers. As a member of this Commission, I am pleased that the response to a July 4 celebration is so universal throughout the country. I join my distinguished colleague from Massachusetts in urging the fullest possible observance of the issuance of this sacred document. And it is particularly proper that the center of its celebration should be in old Philadelphia where the cracked liberty bell is a constant reminder of our heritage.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM].

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, may I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the Independence Homecoming Committee of the city of Philadelphia is planning to have a token session of the Congress on the 4th of July in Independence Hall. I hold in my hand a communication addressed to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. He has consulted me, and we are hopeful that we can get a sufficient number of Members to go there and engage in a debate apropos of the questions under discussion at the time, and which in all probability will be televised in that historic center. I call this to the attention of the Members in order to have it before them at this time.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank my friend. I hope the response will be very large. We all know that the State of Pennsylvania and the city of Philadelphia are going to have a historic celebration this year.

There is a bill pending before the House Committee on the Judiciary which has passed the Senate, and which I hope the committee will report soon, because it will have to if it is to be timely. I will do everything I can to try to get it through the House.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. I am glad the gentleman has yielded to me immediately after the encouraging comment just made, because my purpose in asking him to yield has to do with the bill now pending. The State of Pennsylvania has already passed and the Governor has signed a similar bill. The city of Philadelphia is joining in and equally supporting this celebration.

Mr. MCCORMACK. That is \$100,000 apiece.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. That is right. The United States has been asked to show a similar interest as has been evidenced by the other governmental units involved. I do hope the gentleman will do all he can to get a fairly early report on that measure.

May I also say with reference to the matter the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] has mentioned, having confidence as we all have in his ability at research, we hope he will help us to find a suitable revolutionary topic to be debated in a token session, and with the aid of the majority and minority

leaders will help us corral a sufficient number of Members of Congress to sit in a token session and debate of the Congress of the United States on the 4th of July in celebration of this great and important anniversary when liberty was proclaimed throughout the land and unto all the inhabitants thereof.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman from Massachusetts will cooperate to the fullest extent possible, but the gentleman frankly feels that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM] have more persuasive influence with Members than the gentleman from Massachusetts. But I will be glad to cooperate with you.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. The gentleman from Massachusetts is very modest, as usual.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, the legislative branch appropriation, consisting of the sum of \$60,355,370, is before the House for its consideration. The subcommittee is unanimous in its report as to the appropriation dollarwise. It is also unanimous in its expression of appreciation to the staff members of the committee, Claude Hobbs, Carson Culp, and Ken Sprankle. May I be permitted to convey to my colleagues on the Democratic side, as well as to my good friends on the Republican side, my appreciation for painstaking efforts that they made in order to report out a bill that would meet with your approval.

In appropriating the sum of \$60,000,000, there is a reduction under the 1952 estimates of \$8,617,000, and while one looking at the report will find that there is an increase over 1951 in the sum of \$2,016,000, upon further study, will note that \$2,500,000 has been advanced to the Government Printing Office in a revolving fund. This is in effect merely a loan, because it is to be repaid to the Treasury, so that this bill reflects an actual reduction of about one-half a million dollars under fiscal 1951.

No appropriation is made herein for the items of the Senate which follows, of course, the time-honored custom of having the other body prepare its own budgetary requirements.

This subcommittee has before it the matters affecting the House of Representatives, Capitol Police, Legislative Counsel, Architect of the Capitol, Botanical Garden, Library of Congress, and the Government Printing Office.

The House of Representatives shows a decrease of \$78,000 in the 1952 estimate, an increase of \$760,000 over the 1951 appropriation. This is due to many mandatory provisions of various House resolutions, so that this committee has, for practical purposes, simply a mathematical computation as to these matters.

There is an increase of \$700,000 which is reflected in the telephone service of the Members. That is due to Public Law 42, which is set forth at page 34 of the hearings. Briefly, this law provides that each Member of the House will be entitled to 150 minutes of long distance

telephone calls per month and to 1,000 words in telegrams per month sent on official business. Both of these monthly amounts are cumulative, so that if a Member does not use his allotted amount in 1 month, it will inure to his credit during the succeeding month.

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

Mr. MCGRATH. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. On page 4 of the bill under clerk hire of Members and Delegates, I notice the amount is \$8,844,150. Is that an increase or decrease over last year?

Mr. MCGRATH. I am not sure I understood the gentleman. There are some increases in funds for hire of committee employees.

Mr. DONDERO. But not to the Members' staffs.

Mr. MCGRATH. No, not to the employees of Members' offices. For that item the bill contains the same amount as for the current year.

The Architect of the Capitol would receive under the provisions of this bill, \$6,717,000; or, \$1,129,000 under the 1951 appropriation. This is \$2,500,000 under the 1952 estimates. This reduction is caused, to a large degree, by the fact that the Capitol Power Plant, during the next fiscal year, can only expend \$3,000,000, which is \$2,000,000 under the estimates of 1952.

The Library of Congress is allocated \$8,455,000 which is a reduction of \$100,000 under the last fiscal year. The committee feels that that sum will be ample for the continuation of the functions of the Library. While this is an important service of government, yet we feel that it would be unwise at this time for the Library of Congress to engage in any extension program.

There is an increase of \$2,500,000 in the working capital of the Government Printing Office, which sum will, of course, be returned to the Treasury.

This sums up the financial aspects of the bill and we unanimously submit it to you for your consideration.

Among some of the other matters discussed was the question of modern mechanical devices which would aid in the efficiency with which Members of Congress could serve their constituency. This committee has been in close contact with the Committee on House Administration and assures the Members that, if this matter receives the approval of the latter committee, we will be more than willing to act promptly upon their recommendations. We feel that with the rising costs and the increasing demands of the public upon the legislative branch of the Government we have submitted to you a bill that has the unanimous approval of all of its Members and one that is fair and just to all parties concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has consumed 9 minutes.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington is recognized.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a duty that we who have handled this, our own personal housekeeping bill,

should report to you some of our own feelings with regard to such a bill and to find out those things which we feel perhaps we should discuss among ourselves with the object in view of adequate correction. I think it is well for us to realize that the whole system of representative government in this world is very much on trial right now. We here in this House are the very forefront of an attempt to make representative government dignified and effective. We have just finished at least the shooting part of what we term World War II. There is some question, of course, as to whether or not that war is over. We found ourselves aligned in that conflict against executive form of government in the fullest possible flower. In order to win that conflict we have to hold in abeyance some of the things which many of us feel are sacred to our representative form of government. Your subcommittee, very ably led by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MCGRATH] fully weighed that fact in the consideration of this routine housekeeping bill and we are before you now with a bill which in many ways we feel is inadequate, that it needs correction in certain aspects.

One thing, for instance, is the allowance you received for stamps. I am reliably informed that the Delegate from Alaska spends a considerable amount of money out of his own pocket in order to properly answer the mail which comes to him from the Territory of Alaska. It is not right if he is forced to do that in carrying out his duty to the people of the Territory of Alaska. The same thing is true of those who live in the West. Many of the Members have to pay out of their own salaries to make up for the inadequacies of this appropriation bill.

We have seen fit, and it is in the bill, to raise your stationery allowance in this measure for next year to the total of what you were allowed last year, \$500 in the regular bill last year and the \$300 supplemental of last year; nevertheless, that amount of \$800, in the present bill, may not be adequate, because the manager of the stationery room came before our committee and said that if he were required to replace the inventory of the stationery room tomorrow he would have to increase the amount for replacing that inventory by some 25 percent. That cannot help but reflect itself in the cost of running your offices.

Another item that is of interest to me, and I know it is of interest to quite a number of Members on the floor, is the matter of automatic equipment. The folks in America who like to shoot at Congress at all times, and particularly the House of Representatives, perhaps do not know that Members of the House are not supplied with anything but the ordinary typewriters. There is hardly a branch or department of Government but what has automatic machines, calculators, duplicating machines, practically anything that lies within the power of the Representatives of the people of the United States to supply to the executive departments. Down through the years, on the other hand, there has been a tendency, in my opinion, to handicap

the very Members of this House of Representatives who try to protect the American people in the preservation of representative government. However, we on this Appropriations Subcommittee are not a legislating committee. It is our job to pass on the budget which comes before us to supply you with that equipment, but Chairman McGRAH and other members of the subcommittee have scheduled—as soon as we can get the House Administration Committee together—an informal meeting at which we will go over these problems which are important to you.

This is your bill, and it is up to you. If you want to go to war in this world of ours, where representative government is under attack; if you want to purchase the things that will help you to better represent your people and fight this battle of freedom and representative government in this world, you had better help us who are trying in the right way and in such a way that abuse will not be possible to supply you with the sinews of war in this battle of ideologies and political science, which is practically everywhere extant today.

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

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

Mr. CANFIELD. Will the gentleman tell us whether he understands the other body has a program for installing this automatic equipment?

Mr. HORAN. I understand they do have. Of course, the Senate portion of this bill does not show here now. There has been a rule that they pass on their own appropriations. The completed bill, however, as it goes to conference and as it will be signed into law will contain all of it.

In that regard I want to pay my tribute particularly to the chairman of one of the important subcommittees of the House Administration Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE]. He has shown every desire to hold what hearings are necessary and to dig deeply into this whole problem. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. STANLEY] has shown every interest in this matter, and I feel, with the cooperation between that Subcommittee on Appropriations and the full Committee on House Administration on both sides of the aisle, that they will be able to work out those things which properly should be worked out.

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

Mr. HORAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DEANE. I wish to thank the gentleman for his reference to the Committee on House Administration and to say that our committee is vitally interested in furnishing to the membership all the equipment necessary to do a good job. We came to grips with the telephone and telegraphic allowances, which we feel now are fair and equitable, and it would seem that either the Committee on Appropriations or our Committee on House Administration should very easily come to grips with the subject of mechanical equipment for the offices.

For the information of the House, several Members on both sides took the position here some days ago to determine the interest of the Members in such equipment, and of the inquiries received a total of 248 Members indicated that they felt an urgent need, because of the amount of mail that was coming to the offices, to take care of it promptly. I do not know what the correct procedure should be. It was felt, perhaps, that this committee itself has the authority to appropriate sufficient funds for mechanical equipment, just as they would for the typewriters in our offices. I want to do what is right in the matter, but I feel a certain responsibility to these Members, the 248 who replied to Dr. MILLER, and perhaps others who took an interest in the Members. I want to thank the subcommittee for its interest in its willingness to come to grips with this subject, and I wish to assure the membership that I, too, will do everything to do what is right to follow through with the program as it should be.

Mr. HORAN. I thank the gentleman. One reason a Subcommittee on Appropriations sometimes makes reports to the House of Representatives and that you wonder why a legislative committee has not already worked on it is the fact that every year we have to pass on things that seem to be out of our line, whereas sometimes a legislative committee will just pass over those things and keep postponing them, and that is the reason sometimes we members of the Committee on Appropriations get in bad with legislative committees here in the Congress. Now, we did come into contact with some of these problems, but in most of them we thought that an arbitrary action on our part, while we felt that it might be justified, we saw some problems connected with it that ought to, by every rule of thumb that we live by, be investigated by an appropriate committee and be acted on with the fullest of knowledge. Now, that applies to automatic typewriters. I do not doubt but that each one of you about once a month finds occasion to properly answer personal mail with a letter that is almost a form letter, but you feel more serious about it than that, and an automatic typewriter might be helpful. But it only occurs now and then, our subcommittee discussed that, and we wondered perhaps why some arrangement might not be made so that a number of Members might share one machine, or something along that line. It needs to be surveyed. The weight of the need ought to be evaluated so that no money is wasted, but at the same time, whatever the Members of this House need should properly be supplied to them without any argument, with everything done to guard against any automatic abuses on the part of individual Members.

Mr. McGRAH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY].

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations for the good job that they have done on this particular appropriation bill. The gen-

tleman from New York [Mr. McGRAH], chairman of the subcommittee, who sits with me on the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security, is one of the most conscientious Members of this House. I served as a member of Subcommittee on the District of Columbia with the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] during the Eightieth Congress, and I found that he was one of the most able chairmen that we had in the Eightieth Congress, and it was a pleasure to serve with him.

I asked for this time for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRAH], whether or not there are any provisions in this bill to supply the police force with summer-weight uniforms.

Mr. McGRAH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there was some discussion, I might say to the gentleman from Rhode Island, on that question. I personally stated at that time that the police on Capitol Hill should certainly have lightweight uniforms. I must say that they already have enough money appropriated for the purchase of these trousers, although it is not in this bill as a specific item. I personally feel that the Sergeant at Arms should purchase them. They have the money, and it merely resolves itself into an administrative function.

Mr. FOGARTY. I wish the committee would look into that, because I understand the Sergeant at Arms of the House has requested the necessary amount of money to purchase these lightweight uniforms but there has been some mix-up along the line and he has not been able to get a voucher signed for that purpose.

If there was ever a city in this country where the police force should have lightweight uniforms in summertime it is certainly the city of Washington. Practically every other city in the country supplies its police force with these lightweight uniforms during the summertime. I hope that when the request is made by the Sergeant at Arms of the House the request will be granted by whomever has that responsibility.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 35 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, I concur in the previous remarks of my distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRAH] and also the remarks of the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN]. May I also say that as far as the bill is concerned the committee was in unanimous agreement.

I believe the gentleman from New York [Mr. McGRAH] and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] have covered the general points of the bill very well, and I do not intend to take the time of the Members by repeating the points covered by them. However, you will notice in the report of the committee I filed minority views because I thought certain conditions around the House of Representatives should be called to the attention of the full committee. I did

not do this to embarrass anyone, but I thought as a member of the legislative subcommittee it was my duty to make this minority report.

While it is unusual to file minority views on an appropriation bill, I did it in the hope that some of the practices now carried on would be discontinued. Any fair, honest-thinking man would agree that there have been some injustices and illegal practices condoned and permitted under the dome of the Capitol of the United States in the House of Representatives. I filed the minority views in the hope that before we report out the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1953 these injustices and illegal practices will have been corrected, and it will not be necessary for me to file minority views on the next legislative branch appropriation bill.

Every member of this committee should read the hearings and the report on this bill, because this is your bill. If the new Members of the Eighty-second Congress will read the hearings they will learn a great deal about the machinery of the House of Representatives.

One of the matters I discussed in the committee, and it is in the printed hearings, is the subject of pages for the House of Representatives. We were informed that there is an appropriation for 50 pages. I am sure many of you have had the same experience I have had. When we wanted an important document from our offices to use on the floor of the House in debate the page that was sent for that document we needed urgently, had to make four or five, sometimes six or seven additional stops in other offices before he returned to the floor. This, naturally, consumed at least an hour if not more.

Out of the appropriation for 50 pages, we have only 7 pages on the Republican side of the aisle. Seven pages are not enough to take care of the work on the floor of the House, especially when the majority of the Members are present. We found that many of the pages were being used on various doors as guards. I have no fault to find with that; but, in all seriousness, I think most of these door jobs around the House of Representatives should be delegated to adults and not to boys.

I hope the members of this committee will read the hearings and my minority report regarding the publications in the folding room. I made a personal investigation of the situation in the folding room, and, to my amazement, I found stored back in one of the subrooms in the subbasement of the New House Office Building the following documents:

Communism in Action, 77,096; One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism, 57,899; Fascism in Action, 54,166; Servicemen's Rights and Benefits, 72,789; Manual Explanatory of the Privileges and Rights and Benefits Made in the Seventy-ninth Congress, 76,140.

There is one thing in particular I want to call to your attention. The 57,899 copies of One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism are there because they have been allotted to

the Members of the Congress. When they were first printed, each Member of the Congress was allotted 300 copies. It is evident that a large number of the Members of Congress have had no use for them and do not intend to use them.

On the other hand, I found the Committee on Un-American Activities has been out of these documents for some time and has recently placed an order with the Government Printing Office for additional copies. I think it is well that we consider having each Member surveyed as to whether or not he intends to use the documents to his credit. If not, to transfer them to the Committee on Un-American Activities, which so badly needs them.

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

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am not sure, but I thought there was an understanding or rule of some kind where if a Member did not call for the copies of a document assigned to him they were permitted to be assigned to other Members. What is the explanation of that?

Mr. BUSBEY. In reply to the question of the gentleman from Kansas, I do not know of any such rule. In discussing this with the superintendent of the document room, he informed me that he was not permitted to disclose the names of the Members who have these documents assigned to them. Otherwise it would be possible that somebody might contact them to see if they would release them to the committee.

I do not know of any such rule. I would like to ask the chairman of our committee, Judge McGrath, if he knows of any such rule.

Mr. MCGRATH. My information is that there is no such rule.

Mr. REES of Kansas. In other words, the documents just remain there until called for, and if not, they are perhaps finally destroyed; is that correct?

Mr. BUSBEY. I imagine they will eventually be sold for scrap the same as other documents which I am going to discuss in a moment.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I agree with the gentleman that that matter ought to be carefully checked and use made of those documents. I think also a careful accounting should be made so that we know where they go and what happens to them.

Mr. BUSBEY. To me it seems ridiculous to have the Committee on Un-American Activities spend money with the Government Printing Office for documents when, at the present time, there are 57,899 of those same documents in the folding room not being used by anyone.

Mr. REES of Kansas. And if they are assigned to Members of Congress, they should have a record showing the assignment or who owns them.

Mr. BUSBEY. They have the record showing to whom they belong.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Then why not contact these Members to find out whether they want to use them, and if not, let them go to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. BUSBEY. Something should be done. That is the point I am making. Something should be worked out so that the Members of Congress who are not using these documents would release them. I am sure they would be glad to release them if it were brought to their attention in the proper way.

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

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am sure no one would disagree with the statement made by the gentleman when we have a situation where one committee, the Committee on Un-American Activities, is seeking additional copies and these copies are in existence, which are available for Members who have not as yet called for them. The superintendent of the document room, of course, has no control over that.

Mr. BUSBEY. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. Common sense would say that something should be done to meet that situation. I can, however, realize the difficulty of contacting individual Members. It seems to me that a resolution to the effect that Members whose allocation in whole or in part is still there but who do not exercise their right to use the documents on or before a certain date would lose that right would meet the situation; something of that kind, in my opinion, would be the way to meet the situation, and it should be met.

Mr. BUSBEY. I think the distinguished majority leader has made a very valuable contribution to the debate. Before we leave the matter I should like to report that in conferring with Mr. John Carrington, the clerk of the Committee on Un-American Activities, he informed me that he had sent a general letter to all Members of the House requesting the release of documents they were not going to use, especially this document, One Hundred Things You Should Know About Communism; and quite a number of Members did release some of their documents to the committee. On the other hand that does not reach the point of soliciting these Members individually and personally to release the documents.

In my investigation of the folding room I noticed that a great deal of space is taken up with old sets of the bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is my understanding that each Member of Congress is entitled to four bound sets of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for each session of Congress. I can appreciate that some Members would have use for the entire allotment of four sets. On the other hand many Members would not have use for more than one or two sets. The custom has been that after these bound volumes have been taking up the valuable storage space of the folding room for a period of 7 or 8 years they are then sold for scrap. The cost of these bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD runs into a tremendous sum of money. It is my recommendation that this situation should be surveyed and a more efficient method worked out to handle the bound volumes of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. What would the gentleman think about cutting down the allotment to two sets of the RECORD and save expense in that way? The Members could then have one set for the office and one at home, or somewhere else if they wanted it there.

Mr. BUSBEY. I do know that most Members like to have one set here in the office at Washington and another set out home for reference.

I also checked into the shortage of various documents and books reported in the folding room last year. I cannot help but feel that as members of a sub-committee called upon to appropriate money for the various items in this bill, it is our duty and responsibility to know what we are appropriating for and whether the money has been spent judiciously and correctly in the past.

On December 20 of last year, 1950, the majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], introduced the following resolution:

House Resolution 890

Resolved, That appropriations under the head "Contingent expenses of the House, 1951," shall be available for such additional numbers of books, pamphlets, and documents as the Doorkeeper may find necessary to complete allotments to Members.

That resolution was adopted by the House of Representatives to pay for the printing of these documents which were missing from the folding room.

To date, in accordance with that resolution, the following documents have been printed and delivered to the folding room:

Agricultural Yearbooks, 1943-47, 4,000 copies, approximate cost \$8,280.03;

Diseases of the Horse, 1,500 copies, approximate cost \$4,696.58;

Diseases of Cattle, 4,000 copies, \$7,381.41;

Agricultural Yearbook, 1949, 5,000 copies, \$8,864.79;

Agricultural Yearbook, 1942, 54,000 copies, \$79,496.77; which makes a total of 68,500 at an approximate cost of \$108,719.58.

This resolution was adopted after the General Accounting Office had made an inventory check in order to ascertain in its judgment the total amount of books missing from the folding room. From the information I have been able to obtain, I do not believe that a sincere effort has been made to really determine how this shortage came about, whether Members of Congress were given more books than they were entitled to under their allotment, whether they were removed from the folding room by someone, and maybe sold on the outside, or disappeared in some other manner.

At this time no one knows the real amount in dollars and cents value of the documents that were removed from the folding room. Certainly a situation such as this demands a thorough investigation and a report to Congress. There is no evidence, as far as I have been able

to determine, to show whether this shortage occurred in the Eighty-first Congress, the Eightieth Congress, the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Seventy-eighth Congress, or any other Congress. So we cannot point the finger of guilt to any particular Congress.

It is my recommendation that the FBI be requested to go into this phase of the shortage of documents in the folding room and that a detailed report be made to the House of Representatives.

Another recommendation I would make is in reference to employees who are handling documents of so great a value. These employees should certainly be bonded the same as the Sergeant-at-Arms who runs the bank of the House of Representatives or the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the employees of the stationery room. If the folding room employees were bonded I think it would be a very good investment. It would certainly foreclose the possibility of any additional resolutions being presented to the House of Representatives to appropriate a tremendous sum of money to make up any shortage that might occur at some future date in the folding room.

Speaking further of the folding room, the General Accounting Office was called upon to make an investigation in regard to the assignment of personnel charged to the folding room. In its report to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which is included in my minority report, it was disclosed that 30 employees were charged to the payroll of the folding room but doing no work there whatever.

I can truthfully say that while the majority of them in practically every case were doing work some place else around the Capitol, some money was paid to people who did no work at all at the Capitol during certain periods of time.

One of the cases recorded in the hearings to which I refer in my report is the case of a lady who drew her pay at the folding room while she worked in a beauty shop downtown. This was not done after hours but was done during the hours she was supposed to be working in the folding room for which she accepted pay from the Government. She had relatives call up and report that she was too sick to report for work at the folding room and went to work in the beauty shop. I think if an employee is charged up to the folding room the folding room should have the service of that employee. If we need additional employees around the Capitol for other work, they should be charged to that particular department and they should be so justified in the appropriation bill.

Another thing that is particularly ridiculous to me is the fact that after the Civil War there was a division established here in the House of Representatives known as the Soldiers Roll. While it has been many, many years since a veteran of the Civil War has worked around the Capitol, we are still asked in this appropriation bill of 1952 to appropriate for 14 positions on the Soldiers Roll. I understand that most of the people who are charged to that category are

doorkeepers or doormen in the gallery of the House of Representatives. If that is true, and I think it is, why in the name of goodness do we not classify them as door tenders or doorkeepers and appropriate for them as such?

Another thing I recommend is a clerk for the Patronage Committee. This is no reflection on the Democrats in any way, shape, manner, or form, because it would work just the same if the Republicans were in control of the House of Representatives. Personally I think the Patronage Committee is entitled to a clerk. I do not see how a Patronage Committee can operate without the services of a clerk. Certainly, the chairman of the Patronage Committee could not possibly be expected to look after all of the details necessary in screening and allocating the various jobs around the Capitol which come under the jurisdiction of that committee which belongs to the majority party in the House of Representatives. Nevertheless, I think it is certainly unjust to charge the clerk of the Patronage Committee to another department of the Capitol which I am convinced needs that particular position to efficiently carry on its work, and then assign the person to the clerkship of the Patronage Committee. We should provide for a personnel director or some other title to be designated as the clerk of the Patronage Committee and appropriate for that particular job.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] made some reference to automatic equipment in the offices of the Members. I believe that is something we can very seriously consider. I know there are many Members of Congress who are in the same position as I am, and I know I have personally had to spend out of my own pocket over \$1,000 this year for office equipment. In addition, like the majority of the Members of the House of Representatives, I have to pay approximately \$9 a month out of my pockets for an interoffice communication system. I think these interoffice communication systems are necessary to run an efficient office, otherwise I would not have installed one at my own personal expense. In my opinion, the House of Representatives could well afford to pay for that service. As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] said, the departments of the executive branch of Government do not stint themselves. With the responsibility we have, I do not feel there is anything we have to be ashamed of in asking for proper equipment to carry on efficiently the work in our offices.

I also recommend that at a very early date a specific rule and regulation be drawn up so that the employees around the Capitol will know exactly how much sick leave and how much annual leave they are entitled to.

In my investigation of this problem I find there is not an employee around here who has any idea of exactly what he is entitled to. I have not been able to find any directive of any kind specifically stating to the employees what they are entitled to.

I am only sorry I did not have the time to finish a survey I have undertaken in regard to the differential in the number of employees around the Capitol, particularly on the various committees at the present time compared to the number employed before the Reorganization Act of 1946 went into effect, which I believe was at the beginning of the Eightieth Congress.

You may recall when the reorganization of the legislative branch of our Government was before this House for consideration it was to streamline the legislative branch of Government. This was the bill that, instead of having so many different committees handling everything under the sun, would consolidate them into fewer committees for efficiency and economy.

I did not check the exact number, but if my memory serves me right—and if I am wrong I will be very happy to have someone who knows the figures correct me—before the Reorganization Act of 1946 went into effect we had some 48 committees in the House of Representatives, and they were consolidated into 19 committees.

When that appropriation bill comes before the House next year I propose to have the survey completed, and will present it to the House for consideration.

One other thing that I raised in the committee was the bottleneck on Independence Avenue, from the House Office Building to the foot of the Hill, or Second Street. That is a very bad bottleneck as far as traffic is concerned. When the street was laid out, it was in the days before anyone dreamed of automobiles and such heavy traffic on that avenue.

I brought this matter to the attention of the Architect of the Capitol, Mr. Lynn, to have a survey made to see what would have to be done to bring the retaining walls along the south border of the Capitol grounds back in line with the south wall of the grounds of the Library of Congress, which would widen Independence Avenue considerably and certainly expedite traffic during the rush hours.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take any more of the time of the Committee, but I sincerely urge you and every Member of this body to read the hearings and the report of the legislative subcommittee and become acquainted with the housekeeping duties of our own House.

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

Mr. BUSBEY. I yield.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I have listened most intently to the report that has been given to us by the gentleman from Illinois. I certainly compliment him on bringing these matters to the attention of the House. Certainly, once we have knowledge of these things taking place, it becomes our duty to see that improvements are made and that the things that can be criticized are corrected. I think you have done a real service in bringing to our attention these various matters that so often, I think, are just overlooked in the hurry and

under the pressure of probably bigger problems. But it is the accumulation of these little things that really do amount to the big problems in the end.

Mr. BUSBEY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his very complimentary remarks.

Mr. Chairman, what I have done has been done in the spirit of cooperation and in a spirit which I hope will be constructive so far as the future operations of the House of Representatives are concerned. My minority report—and I say this sincerely—I tried to keep on a very high plane. I did not try to embarrass a single soul. I disagreed with my committee when they voted not to ask Mr. Lindsay Warren to make the report which he made on the survey of the folding room available to the full committee in executive session.

I think it is my duty and my responsibility to pursue this during the coming year. So that there will be no mistake about it and no surprise about it, I expect to pursue it diligently to the best of my ability, and I expect to again ask for the suppressed report before and also in committee next year.

In order to conserve time I include, herewith, my minority views as contained in the report on the legislative branch appropriation bill for 1952:

MINORITY VIEWS OF FRED E. BUSBEY

It is my desire to cooperate at all times with the members of any committee of the House of Representatives to which I am assigned. I concur with the other members of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations in their determination and recommendation for appropriations. I also concur in the report submitted by the subcommittee as far as it goes, but feel that information with respect to certain situations should be brought to the attention of the House of Representatives.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee it is my sincere belief that it is the duty of every member of the committee to do everything possible to ascertain whether or not the taxpayers' money which we are asked to appropriate is spent judiciously, economically and, more important, for the explicit purpose for which it is designated in the justification of our hearing. I also believe that if we are to criticize the various departments of the executive branch of our Government for the manner in which they administer funds, we, the Members of the House of Representatives, should be first to see that the funds appropriated for maintaining and running the legislative branch of our Government are properly administered and expended for the purposes for which they are appropriated.

Last year, Mr. NORRIS POULSON, the gentleman from California, made an investigation of his own in regard to moneys which were appropriated for certain divisions of the legislative branch. As a result, the Office of the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, was called upon to make an investigation to determine the true facts, particularly as they applied to the folding room of the House of Representatives.

In order to determine if the funds for the folding room were being legally spent, I addressed a letter dated May 7, 1951, to Mr. Lindsay C. Warren, as follows:

MAY 7, 1951.

Mr. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WARREN: I am a member of the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations,

and we expect to start hearings about the first of next week.

It is my understanding that your office made a detailed survey and report on the situation that developed last year in the folding room and the stationery room of the House of Representatives. Therefore, I respectfully request that I be furnished a complete record of all documents which pertain to this matter. Your cooperation and assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

On May 17, 1951, Mr. Lindsay C. Warren replied to my request of May 7, 1951, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 17, 1951.

Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BUSBEY: In response to your request of May 7, there is enclosed a copy of my report of November 28, 1950, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on an examination of the folding room of the House of Representatives by the General Accounting Office, for use in connection with hearings to be held by the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, Committee on Appropriations.

There are also transmitted herewith one copy each of reports covering audit by the General Accounting Office of the House of Representatives Stationery Room for the periods January 25, 1947-January 31, 1949; February 1, 1949-February 4, 1950; and February 5, 1950-January 16, 1951, respectively.

Copy of the stationery room report for the period January 25, 1947-January 31, 1949, is complete (except for exhibit No. 2-inventory), but I regret it is not very legible; it is the last copy available.

In view of the frequent use of these reports here, it would be appreciated if it be found practicable to return them after your needs have been fully served.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. Warren transmitted with his letter of May 17, 1951, a copy of his report of November 28, 1950, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE
UNITED STATES,
Washington, November 28, 1950.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As a result of information coming to my attention of statements made by Representative NORRIS POULSON, indicating certain employment irregularities in the folding room of the House of Representatives, the General Accounting Office recently made an examination of that organization. I hereby report, for your information, the results of that examination.

On the whole, the records of the folding room as to time, attendance, and work of those employees actually working therein were found to be in excellent condition, and the superintendent of the folding room appears to be discharging his duties conscientiously and in an efficient manner, although apparently handicapped to some extent because no fixed and uniform policy with respect to leave of employees has been established.

The pay records of the folding room for the period July 1, 1949, to August 31, 1950, disclosed that 30 persons had been paid for folding room work during all or a part of this period although none of them had actually worked for the folding room. A list of the 30 persons, showing the period for which they were paid as employees of the folding

room, is attached hereto. Fourteen of these persons were paid as per annum employees and the payrolls therefor were certified as correct by the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives. The remaining 16 persons were paid as hourly workers and the vouchers on which they were paid were certified as correct by the employees, by the superintendent of the folding room, and by the Doorkeeper. In this connection attention is invited to sections 85, 89, and 90 of title 2, United States Code, as follows:

"85. Employees of the House of Representatives under the Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, and Postmaster shall only be assigned to and engaged upon the duties of the positions to which they are appointed and for which compensation is provided, except that in cases of emergency or congestion of public business incident to the close of a session of Congress or other like cause an employee or employees may be assigned or required to aid in the discharge of the duties of any other employee or employees, and in the discretion of the Doorkeeper not more than one folder may, if necessary, be assigned to do clerical work under the direction of the foreman of the folding room, but all assignments made hereunder shall be without additional compensation and shall not constitute the basis of a claim therefor."

"89. The Clerk, Sergeant at Arms, Doorkeeper, and Postmaster of the House of Representatives shall make certificate each month to their respective payrolls, stating whether the persons named in such payrolls and employed in their respective departments have been actually present at their respective places of duty and have actually performed the services for which compensation is provided in said payrolls, and in each case where a person carried on such payrolls has been absent and has not performed the services in whole or in part for which payment is proposed, the reason for such absence and for such nonperformance of services shall be stated."

"90. The violation of any of the provisions of sections 85-89 of this title shall, upon ascertainment thereof, be deemed to be cause for removal from office."

While the subject payrolls and vouchers incorrectly reflect the employment and disposition of the persons involved it should be pointed out that in each instance the person involved actually was employed and performed services elsewhere for the House of Representatives, although the place of employment of one of the individuals, for a short period of time, was not ascertained. In most cases the individuals actually worked as doorkeepers, pages, etc. Three of the individuals had been assigned to a Congressman's office but this situation no longer exists. Three other employees apparently were paid in August 1950 for 28 hours for which they performed no services.

In addition to the 30 employees discussed in the foregoing, 1 employee was put on the rolls and paid from and after March 1, 1950. The employee has sworn to an affidavit, which is on file here, to the effect that she worked "one or more weeks in the office of the Doorkeeper" after she was appointed until a recurring back ailment necessitated her staying away from work for "quite some time." However, the official records and the testimony of the officials in a position to know establish that she did not enter on duty until April 17. Another employee of the folding room who had private employment after hours is shown to have worked at her private employment during the period March 2 through September 21, 1950, on 28 days of which she was on "sick leave" from her folding-room duties. Three other employees of the folding room have been detailed to, and are now working in, the document room.

I shall be glad to furnish additional details or assistance in the matter should you so request.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Folding room, House of Representatives

	From—	To—
PER ANNUM EMPLOYEES		
Margaret M. Ball.....	July 1, 1949*	Aug. 16, 1950
Claudia J. Maddox.....	do.....	Aug. 31, 1950*
Frances M. Dorsey.....	Aug. 17, 1950	Do.*
Derwin W. Darling, Jr.....	July 1, 1949*	Do.*
Thomas J. Duffley.....	do.....	July 31, 1950
Lucien O. Hunter, Jr.....	do.....	Aug. 31, 1950*
Martin Jenkins.....	do.....	Do.*
John J. Durkin.....	do.....	Do.*
C. E. Frazier, Jr.....	do.....	Do.*
Robert Sanford.....	do.....	Do.*
Fred Chatt.....	do.....	Oct. 15, 1949
Amazon E. Turner.....	Mar. 1, 1950	Aug. 31, 1950*
J. D. Reid.....	July 1, 1949*	Feb. 6, 1950
Robert S. Moses.....	do.....	Feb. 28, 1950
	Aug. 8, 1949	Aug. 31, 1949

	Period worked
HOURLY WORKERS	
Juanita M. LaTour.....	August 1949.
Courtland W. Sands.....	July and August, 1949.
Earl J. Mondschein.....	July and August, 1949.
Nicholas Nicastro.....	March to July, 1950.
William H. McClarin, Jr.....	November and December, 1949.
John J. Gordon.....	November and December, 1949.
J. N. Hill.....	February to April, 1950.
Joe E. Burrows.....	April and May, 1950.
Bill Arbogast.....	May to August, 1950.
Gerard M. Cahill, Jr.....	June and July, 1950.
Arthur Cameron.....	June 1950.
Robert P. Curtis.....	June to August, 1950.
Wallace L. Engle.....	June 1950.
Charles W. Hackney, Jr.....	June to August, 1950.
Robert Sikes.....	June 1950.
William Lee Stephens.....	July 1950.

*Asterisk indicates employees carried on Folding Room payroll prior to July 1, 1949, and/or subsequent to Aug. 31, 1950.

Inasmuch as Mr. Lindsay Warren, the Comptroller General of the United States, did not transmit with his letter of May 17, 1951, a copy of the inventory report of the shortage of documents in the folding room and a complete, detailed report as to the findings of fact in regard to each of the 30 employees and their duties when they were charged to the folding room payroll, I wrote Mr. Warren on May 18, 1951, as follows:

MAY 18, 1951.

MR. LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States,
General Accounting Office,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. WARREN: This will acknowledge receipt of one copy each of reports covering audit by the General Accounting Office of the House of Representatives stationery room for the periods January 25, 1947-January 31, 1949; February 1, 1949-February 4, 1950; and February 5, 1950-January 18, 1951, respectively (except for exhibit No. 2—inventory).

In accordance with our telephone conversation this afternoon, I can readily understand how my letter of May 7, 1951, could be interpreted as desiring only the report that was made on the investigation of the House of Representatives folding room, dated November 28, 1950. You informed me that so far as your personal knowledge is concerned, the only inventory report that was made on the folding room by the General Accounting Office was one dated 1949, and that the only copy you had left of that report was your file copy.

I would appreciate very much the loan of this copy until we have concluded the hearings of the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations. In your report of November 28, 1950, to Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, you listed 30 individuals who were carried on the payrolls of the folding room who, you admitted, were not working at any duties pertaining to the folding room but were assigned to other duties around the Capitol. I respectfully request a complete, detailed report as to the findings of fact in regard to each of the 30 employees, specifically with regard to where each was working.

I would also appreciate it if you would make arrangements for me to have a conference with the man from your office in charge of the investigation, in order that I may have in detail the extent of his inquiries. In this regard I would like to have not only the name of the man in charge, but the names of all those who worked with him and under his supervision during the investigation.

Due to the fact that we are just about to begin our hearings in our subcommittee, I shall appreciate your immediate cooperation in regard to the above request.

Sincerely yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

On May 24, 1951, Mr. Lindsay Warren replied to my communication of May 18, 1951, as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, May 24, 1951.

Hon. FRED E. BUSBEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. BUSBEY: I have your letter of May 18, 1951, acknowledging receipt of copies of reports of audits by the General Accounting Office of the House of Representatives stationery room and of my report of November 28, 1950, to the Speaker of the House on an examination of the folding room of the House. Your letter requests the loan, for the duration of the hearings of the Legislative Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, of the file copy of a General Accounting Office report made in 1949 covering an audit of the operations of the folding room, as well as additional information and data not included in my report of November 28, 1950, to the Speaker on the later examination of the folding room.

In accordance with your request, I am sending you herewith the file copy of my report of April 15, 1949, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, covering audit of the records of the folding room for the period ended March 7, 1949. Since this copy is the official file copy of the General Accounting Office its prompt return at the conclusion of the appropriation hearings will be appreciated.

Your request for additional data in connection with my report of November 28, 1950, to the Speaker, on the examination of the folding room, is as follows:

"In your report of November 28, 1950, to Speaker of the House of Representatives, Hon. SAM RAYBURN, you listed 30 individuals who were carried on the payrolls of the folding room who, you admitted, were not working at any duties pertaining to the folding room but were assigned to other duties around the Capitol. I respectfully request a complete, detailed report as to the findings of fact in regard to each of the 30 employees, specifically with regard to where each was working.

"I would also appreciate it if you would make arrangements for me to have a conference with the man from your office in charge of the investigations, in order that I may have in detail the extent of his inquiries. In this regard I would like to have not only the name of the man in charge, but the

names of all those who worked with him and under his supervision during the investigation."

You already have a copy of my official report as sent to the Speaker, which was furnished you with my letter of May 17. The additional information and staff assistance you now desire are in nature and extent the kind of assistance it has been the practice to furnish only upon request of the Committee on Appropriations, a practice sanctioned and followed by that committee as well as by other committees for which the General Accounting Office is required by section 312 (b) of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to furnish assistance. Section 312 (b) is as follows:

"(b) He shall make such investigations and reports as shall be ordered by either House of Congress or by any committee of either House having jurisdiction over revenue, appropriations, or expenditures. The Comptroller General shall also, at the request of any such committee, direct assistants from his office to furnish the committee such aid and information as it may request."

Upon receipt of advice that the Committee on Appropriations desires the additional information and assistance you have requested, or approves my furnishing it for your use, I shall be glad to respond promptly.

Sincerely yours,

LINDSAY C. WARREN,

Comptroller General of the United States.

On Thursday, June 7, 1951, at an executive session of the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations I made a formal request to have Mr. Warren deliver the report in question to our subcommittee for consideration by us in executive session to determine if all of his recommendations had been complied with, and the committee could satisfy itself that the legislative branch of our Government was being operated in accordance with law. This followed the suggestion contained in the last paragraph of Mr. Warren's letter of May 24, 1951, which stated:

"Upon receipt of advice that the Committee on Appropriations desires the additional information and assistance you have requested, or approves my furnishing it for use, I shall be glad to respond promptly."

The subcommittee voted to reject my request. I sincerely regret this action. In all probability the information contained in the suppressed report might have answered the questions in my mind and I, therefore, might not have found it necessary to report minority views.

The Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations had agreed to hear the Honorable THOMAS B. STANLEY, Representative from Virginia and chairman of the House Administration Committee, at 2 p. m. on Monday, June 11, 1951. I was convinced there were apparent discrepancies in the testimony of Mr. William M. Miller, Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, and I had the following letter delivered the morning of June 11, 1951, to the Honorable CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH, chairman of our Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations:

JUNE 11, 1951.

HON. CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH,
Chairman, Legislative Subcommittee
on Appropriations,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JUDGE MCGRATH: It is my understanding that the Honorable THOMAS R. STANLEY, Chairman of the House Administration Committee, House of Representatives, is scheduled to appear before our subcommittee at 2 p. m. today.

Due to apparent discrepancies in the testimony of William M. Miller, Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, when testifying before our committee as a witness, I respectfully ask that Mr. Miller again appear be-

fore our committee at the conclusion of Mr. STANLEY's testimony for further questioning.

Sincerely yours,

FRED E. BUSBEY,
Member of Congress.

The subcommittee met at 2 p. m. Monday, June 11, 1951, as agreed and we immediately started "marking up" our appropriation bill. At the conclusion of this work, I asked if Mr. STANLEY would appear before us as scheduled. I made it known to the members of the committee that I was desirous of recalling Mr. William M. Miller, the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives at the conclusion of Mr. STANLEY's testimony, in accordance with my request outlined in the above letter to Mr. MCGRATH. To my surprise and amazement I was informed that the hearings had been concluded and that we would hear Mr. STANLEY informally at some future date.

I believed then, and still believe, that I had reason to feel there were inconsistencies in the testimony of Mr. Miller, the Doorkeeper, and that it was only fair to him to be given an opportunity to appear again before our committee before the hearings were closed and make any corrections he desired in his testimony.

During Mr. Miller's appearance he was interrogated regarding the employment of Margaret Greenwell as follows:

"Mr. MILLER. She works in the folding room, sir.

"Mr. BUSBEY. I think, according to the Comptroller General's report there was a time when she got paid that she did not do any work in the folding room, but was working in a beauty shop, is that correct?

"Mr. MILLER. I do not know, sir.

"Mr. BUSBEY. Do you know anything about that, Mr. Roberts?

"Mr. ROBERTS. No; I do not know anything about that at all. I knew a doorkeeper by the name of Greenwell.

"Mr. MILLER. He is dead.

"Mr. ROBERTS. Yes. He died about 2 years ago.

"Mr. HORAN. May I interject there? I think in all fairness to some of those people that the wrongs and inequities of the 40-hour week, because there are inequities in the 40-hour week, which help to bring these things about sometimes. I knew a doorkeeper who was running a taxi part time, but he was perfectly within his right in doing that. He was working on the taxi part time and on the door part time. That might be possibly true in other cases.

"Mr. BUSBEY. I think that is probably true also of the people who work in the Post Office Department in the metropolitan areas.

"Mr. HORAN. Sure.

"Mr. BUSBEY. Because it is really tough going for them. Mr. Miller, you know nothing about the situation, about whether Margaret Greenwell was working in this beauty shop and getting paid for working in the folding room?

"Mr. MILLER. I have not seen that report. It was sent to the Speaker, and I have not seen it. It has not been brought to my attention.

"Mr. BUSBEY. Do you know anything about the situation?

"Mr. MILLER. I have heard offhand that happened. I do not have the actual facts or the actual knowledge that it took place.

"Mr. BUSBEY. Did you do anything to ascertain the accuracy of the report?

"Mr. MILLER. That has been looked into, sir, and I am quite certain that this Margaret Greenwell is working in the folding room now and has been working there for some time.

"Mr. BUSBEY. It has also come to my attention that she has offered to make restitution to the Government for the money she received as a folder for which she did not work,

but was working at the beauty shop. Have you any knowledge of that?

"Mr. MILLER. I imagine when she was being investigated she made that offer. That is the only answer I can give, sir.

"Mr. BUSBEY. Well, who has responsibility for checking those things?

"Mr. MILLER. The superintendent of the folding room.

"Mr. BUSBEY. No; I mean as far as this restitution is concerned?

"Mr. MILLER. Should I have?

"Mr. BUSBEY. I am asking you.

"Mr. MILLER. I should not think that I should.

"Mr. BUSBEY. Well, certainly, if an employee has received compensation for something around the Capitol while she is working some place else, and not working here, some provision ought to be made to accept that money, I should think. I understand that she is willing to reimburse the Government, but no one seems to want to take it.

"Mr. MILLER. Well, I will be glad to take that up with her at the first opportunity.

"Mr. BUSBEY. As long as she wants to do it, I think we ought to get the money."

It is obvious that the situation in regard to employees has no bearing on the fact that Margaret Greenwell received pay for working in the folding room when she was working in a beauty shop. Mr. Norman Simpson, the senior investigator from the Comptroller General's Office, discussed this matter with the superintendent of the folding room and informed him that he had ascertained Mrs. Margaret Greenwell had been working at the Katie Dunn Beauty Shop, 739 Eleventh Street NW, Washington, D. C., and at the same time she had relatives call the folding room by telephone and report that she was too ill to report for work at the folding room. Subsequently, the superintendent of the folding room received a signed statement from Mrs. Greenwell offering to reimburse the Government for moneys she had wrongfully received. This and additional information was transmitted by letter to Mr. Miller, the Doorkeeper, the latter part of September 1950. Therefore, I am at a loss to reconcile this information with the statement of Mr. Miller, "I have heard offhand that happened. I do not have the actual facts or the actual knowledge that it took place."

It is my contention that after Mr. Miller had been formally notified in writing that Mrs. Greenwell received money from the Government to which she was not entitled, and had offered to make restitution, he should have taken immediate action to collect the money instead of waiting until I brought the matter to the attention of the subcommittee during hearings.

In Mr. Miller's testimony he cited section 85, title 2, of the United States Code as his authority for placing persons on the payroll of the folding room even though they were not actually employed there. It is quite apparent to me that the Comptroller General was of the opinion that the law had been violated or he would not have felt the need of calling attention to that particular law in his report of November 28, 1950, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Yet, an official of the House of Representatives appeared before our subcommittee and cited the very same law as his authorization to do what the Comptroller General said was illegal.

The survey which I requested this subcommittee to consider in executive session should show, among other things, where each of the 30 persons referred to were or were not employed at the time they were on the payroll of the folding room and receiving compensation for working in the folding room. I believe this survey will show, among other things, that the doorkeeper erroneously or falsely certified that those persons had

been actually employed in the folding room and had actually performed the services for which they were paid, all of which is contrary to the law cited by the Comptroller General.

I do not believe we should be placed in the position of criticizing expenditures in the executive branch of the Government without first assuring ourselves that our own house is in order. I submit that the document I requested of the Comptroller General was necessary evidence for the proper consideration of the legislative appropriation by this committee.

I cite the instances where there were apparent discrepancies in Mr. Miller's testimony to substantiate my written request of June 11, 1951, to the chairman of our subcommittee, the Honorable CHRISTOPHER C. MCGRATH.

The system of assigning employees to certain positions around the Capitol and charging them to payrolls and departments in which they do not work is not only antiquated, unbusinesslike, and a practice that could easily lead to dishonesty, but, in my opinion, a direct violation of the law. I do not see how the Patronage Committee of the majority party of the House of Representatives could possibly function without a clerk to handle and check upon the tremendous amount of detail inherent to the numerous responsibilities and duties of that office. Nevertheless, in my estimation, there can be no justification for charging the position of clerk of the Patronage Committee to another division of the legislative branch of our Government, and then assign the person to handle the details of the patronage office. It is my recommendation that provision be made for a position of personnel director, or some other title, with the understanding that the person holding that position will be assigned to and working for the Patronage Committee.

Mr. Miller, the Doorkeeper, testified to the fact that a total of 68,500 books have been delivered to the folding room in accordance with House Resolution 890, passed by the Eighty-first Congress, December 20, 1950, in the following amounts:

Agricultural Yearbook for 1942	54,000
Agricultural Yearbook for 1943-47	4,000
Agricultural Yearbook for 1949	5,000
Disease of Cattle, 1942	4,000
Disease of Horses, 1942	1,500
Total	68,500

The approximate cost of these books in accordance with the resolution is \$108,719.58.

In view of the fact that these books have such a tremendous monetary value, it is my recommendation that all employees of the folding room charged with the responsibility of the safekeeping of these books be bonded in a manner similar to the Sergeant at Arms and the employees of the stationery room. It is my further recommendation that the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives, Mr. Miller, make a formal demand upon Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, to conduct a thorough investigation regarding the shortage of books in an effort to ascertain how such a large shortage involving such a large sum of money occurred and who is responsible.

The subcommittee was desirous of having the hearings and report printed and presented to the full Committee on Appropriations on Friday morning, June 15, 1951. In view of the shortness of time since the subcommittee closed its hearings, over my objection, last Monday afternoon, I, of necessity, have had to omit many references which should have been included in my minority views. However, I do wish to assure the Members of the House of Representatives that I shall pursue my duties and responsibilities as a member of the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations and bring to the attention of the proper authorities certain recommendations during the

next fiscal year which I believe should be favorably acted upon by the House of Representatives. For example, in the year 1864 there was provided a Soldiers' Roll in the House of Representatives to give employment to veterans of the Civil War. It seems absolutely absurd that we are asked to appropriate funds for 14 positions for the fiscal year 1952 on the Soldiers' Roll. For the most part, I have been informed that employees carried on the Soldiers' Roll are doormen in the gallery of the House of Representatives. It is my contention that these men should be carried as doormen or door attendants, and not as employees on the Soldiers' Roll. This is only one of the many classifications included in the legislative appropriation bill which should be reviewed and corrected.

I do not concur in the general attitude that these conditions should remain as at present because it has always been that way in the past. This condition certainly should have been corrected when the Seventy-ninth Congress passed what is known as the Reorganization Act of 1946. The fact that no steps have been taken in the past to correct situations of this kind is no reason they should not be adjusted at once.

I wish to assure my colleagues that my criticisms and recommendations are presented wholly in the spirit of making my contribution, regardless of how small it may be, to establish a more businesslike and efficient administration in the Congress. It is my sincere desire that when the Legislative Subcommittee on Appropriations makes its report for the fiscal year 1953 I shall not feel compelled to write a minority report, but shall be able to inform the House of Representatives honestly that the situation which I have called to their attention in these minority views has been corrected.

FRED E. BUSBEY.

THE CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [MR. REES].

MR. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois has called our attention to the very unsatisfactory loose handling and poor management of so-called housekeeping right here in and around the Nation's Capital.

There are some of us, and I belong to that group, who criticize agencies downtown with respect to the manner in which they handle their affairs. Now comes a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations who suggests that the FBI ought to look into the matter. I agree with him the matter should not go unnoticed. As a matter of fact, it should have been dealt with long ago. I do think, however, that this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, ought to go into the whole matter and furnish a report to this House.

I do not know who is to blame, but it is very clear that there is something wrong with the management of the folding room when it is discovered that more than \$100,000 worth of property has been removed, and nothing has been done to account for it. I think it is generally understood that yearbooks and other documents assigned to Members of Congress are delivered to the folding room.

For example, some time ago I asked the folding room to deliver 200 yearbooks assigned to my credit and to be sent to the farmers of my congressional district. I was told they did not have a yearbook.

I wrote a letter to one of the officials whom I thought was in charge and was informed that he was very sorry. I wrote to another official. He seemed to be just as sorry as the first one, and that is all there was to it, no responsibility, and apparently not too much concern.

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

MR. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished majority leader, who might be able to give us some information and straighten this matter out.

MR. McCORMACK. I will give you 25 of my yearbooks, if you want them.

MR. REES of Kansas. I will be glad to have them. I am sure my farmer friends will make good use of them.

MR. McCORMACK. That is a promise.

MR. REES of Kansas. It seems rather strange that apparently it became necessary for the majority leader to bring in a request to authorize the expenditure of more than \$100,000, charged to the taxpayers of this country, in order that these documents could be replaced. Of course, if the documents should not have been printed in the first place, that is different, but after they are furnished at the expense of our Government and are put in the Folding Room and then disappear, somebody ought to account for them. I believe the distinguished leader of the House will agree with my statement. Of course, we will be glad to use the extra 25 yearbooks that are from the quota assigned him.

MR. McCORMACK. You are going to have them.

MR. REES of Kansas. The point I am making, and I think the gentleman will agree with me, is that after documents are placed in the folding room and assigned to Members of the House and then disappear, some investigation or accounting is in order. Does not the gentleman agree with me?

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

MR. REES of Kansas. I will yield to the gentleman for an answer to that question, as to whether or not there ought to be an investigation with regard to the loss of these documents.

MR. McCORMACK. There is no question that any inquiry will show that everything is all right.

MR. REES of Kansas. I am glad to have the gentleman's observation on that.

MR. McCORMACK. The gentleman is a practical person. He knows that this has been going on for years.

MR. REES of Kansas. I do not know.

MR. McCORMACK. There is nothing of a criminal nature about it.

MR. REES of Kansas. I do not know whether it is criminal or not, but it does not look right.

MR. McCORMACK. After consultation with the leadership on both sides I offered a resolution.

MR. REES of Kansas. Certainly, and we appreciate that. But at the same time we ought to be able to find out whether there is loose handling or mismanagement in the folding room. If so, it ought to be corrected.

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

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. I hope the gentleman gets his 25 books before I make the following remarks.

Mr. McCORMACK. If I have them the gentleman from Kansas will have them.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BUSBEY. But I think the gentleman from Kansas has some yearbooks to his credit now because they have been replaced.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The thing I regret is that because of loose handling, mismanagement, and irresponsibility, it has become necessary to appropriate funds from the Federal Treasury to pay for documents that have been removed or lost without any accounting therefor. Again, I think an investigation by this committee and a report to the House is in order.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield? We have used all our time on this side, but I do feel, as the ranking minority member of this subcommittee, I should make a brief statement.

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

Mr. HORAN. These matters were brought to our attention and were considered by this Subcommittee on Appropriations. We were advised not only in this but in other things that were peculiar that steps were being taken to correct them, and we did not feel that it was our office to go into them further with the exception that we did feel as both the chairman and myself have reported to you, that we are going to follow up and meet with the Committee on House Administration and really follow through on these matters with the committee. That is the responsibility of keeping our House in order in the regular way.

In the general debate both the chairman and I pointed out one or two other items that should be properly handled and provision should be made for adequate treatment of each Member of the House through this appropriation. But in any event—and the Record will show this and informal discussions that I have had with various men who have responsibilities to their colleagues here—we have pointed out that we want, in every particular, everything done to avoid any abuse of the privileges of a sitting Member of this House.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, I agree wholeheartedly with everything the gentleman from Washington has said. While there has been some criticism of the classification of employees, I want the membership to know that in many instances employees here work longer hours and at less compensation than they would have had they stayed in their original classification. We are going to follow that through to see that everything is done for the proper administration of the House, as the distinguished gentleman from Washington, the ranking member of the subcommittee, has told you.

Mr. Chairman, there are no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the Speaker's table, including \$2,000 for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$30,490.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the committee deserves a great deal of credit today for the way they have gotten to the core of this situation and are investigating something that has been confused and uncertain for years. If my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and other city Members have had the same experience I have in distributing these agricultural yearbooks they have found that many city folks like the agricultural yearbooks as well as the farm folks. I know from my own experience and in connection with one particular publication on trees, my city people made more requests asking for the book than did those living on farms. So these publications are of interest to both city and rural dwellers and I think they contain very valuable information for them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, perhaps the No. 1 problem America now faces here at home is how to fight the dope traffic.

According to investigators, newspapermen, and other observers, the body politic is riddled with the unwholesome and illegal sale of all kinds of narcotics, injurious drugs, dope-packed cigarettes and hypodermic needles overflowing with powerful sedatives and sleep inducers.

These are peddled at will, it is reported, through the streets, at counters, behind the barn or wherever an eager clientele reaches out for such tools of destruction.

The time is ripe for action and I am waiting no longer to perform what I consider to be my duty as a Member of this House. I want to see the dope evil stopped, especially at the most crucial period of our preparedness.

We cannot win the struggle in peace or in war if we are overcome from within by villains who are bent upon subjugating the whole population by plying them with dope. If this is permitted to continue, we are in danger of becoming a Nation of dope fiends.

I want to read a bill which I am introducing today which I think is appropriate and which should be considered as soon as possible by the House of Representatives. It is entitled "A bill to stop illegal traffic in narcotics, injurious drugs and marijuana cigarettes by imposing further penalties":

Whereas there is a flourishing trade in narcotics and doped cigarettes and illegal drugs all over the United States and they can be bought in many quarters as easily as legal beverages; and

Whereas such unlawful distribution of these evil drugs is wrecking morale, lowering standards of public deportment, devastating moral equities, weakening physical, spiritual, and mental fibers of our citizenry, causing degeneracy and inebriating social relations; and

Whereas the application of dope to an ever-increasing segment of the population constitutes sabotage worthy of the Communist underground and is probably an offspring of their diabolical program to destroy America from within and consequently must be stopped: Therefore

Be it enacted, That—

1. All citizens be called upon to actively cooperate with National, State, and local police and public officers in furnishing information, providing direct witnesses, and taking aggressive action against the enemies of America who perpetrate such crimes upon society; and

2. All officials and agents dealing directly in the enforcement of laws to stamp out the sale of marijuana cigarettes, heroin, narcotics and all other injurious drugs shall be charged anew with their responsibility to the citizens of this country and shall accelerate their ceaseless campaign to destroy forever the dope peddlers, the purveyors of narcotics, and the dealers in deadly drugs.

3. Jail sentences for convicted offenders who are the overlords and chief beneficiaries of said dope and narcotics traffic shall be increased to a maximum of 100 years.

The Clerk read as follows:

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

Salaries and expenses: For necessary personal services to enable the Librarian to carry out the provisions of section 203 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, including not to exceed \$20,000 for employees engaged by the day or hour at rates to be fixed by the Librarian; services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a); and supplies and materials; \$700,000: Provided, That no part of this appropriation may be used to pay any salary or expense in connection with any publication, or preparation of material therefor, to be issued by the Library of Congress.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REGAN: Page 16, line 11, after the comma insert "except the Digest of Public General Bills."

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have discussed this with the chairman of the subcommittee. The amendment permits the publication of this important digest that every Member and his office staff uses at one time or another. Without this amendment the publication cannot be furnished to the Members.

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

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

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the majority members and myself of the full committee we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

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

that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MCGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPLETION OF ROTUNDA FRIEZE, CAPITOL BUILDING

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, far up in the rotunda of the Capitol there is an unfinished painting. More than 60 years ago the authorities in charge of decorating the dome of the Capitol decided to have a frieze painted around the dome depicting a series of the important events in American history. It was only natural that the first of these pictures would be that of Columbus discovering America. The great painter, Brumidi, was engaged to do this work. Before he had proceeded more than halfway with this very important task, he died and his work was carried on by another painter.

This frieze is 9 feet high and extends around the dome a circumference of 300 feet. No pictures were painted on about 26 feet of this space. Congress at different times has considered the matter of finishing this frieze but no definite action was taken until I succeeded in getting Congress to pass legislation to that effect. This legislation became effective on August 17, 1950. My main purpose in securing the passage of this legislation was to portray the birth of aviation and thereby give to the Wright brothers some recognition for the great benefaction that has come to the people of the world by reason of their great natural genius and their intrepid spirit.

In the bill that we have been considering today an appropriation of \$20,000 is provided for the finishing of this painting. The legislation authorizing this appropriation provided that this un-

finished 26 feet should be used to portray three important events in American history. These three events are set forth in this legislation which we are now considering in the following language:

Completion of rotunda frieze, Capitol Building: For carrying into effect the provisions of Public Law 708, Eighty-first Congress, approved August 17, 1950, entitled "Joint resolution to provide for the utilization of the unfinished portion of the historical frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol to portray (1) the Civil War, (2) the Spanish-American War, and (3) the birth of aviation in the United States," \$20,000, to be expended by the Architect of the Capitol, as contracting and executive officer, under the direction, advice, and approval of the Joint Committee on the Library.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the other legislative body will appreciate the importance of this matter and will approve this very timely action of the House of Representatives.

I wish to thank the members of the Appropriations Committee that have brought this legislation up for our consideration and for the courteous assistance that they have given this worthy cause.

I was prompted to press this legislation because I felt that one of the greatest of our national accomplishments has been the development of aviation. This is distinctively an American accomplishment. To the Wright brothers of Dayton, Ohio, must go the credit of having been responsible for the birth of aviation. I shall not venture upon a recital of the great benefits that have come to the world by reason of the genius of Orville and Wilbur Wright, two Ohio boys who struggled against great odds to give the world the result of their efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the members of the Appropriations Committee for recommending this legislation and I hope that the other body will prove this legislation promptly and that in due course this unfinished portion of this beautiful frieze will be completed as provided in the bill which we passed today.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MACK] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION BOOSTS YOUR TAX BILL

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the average American next year will pay \$50 more and the average American family \$200 more in new and additional taxes if the proposed Truman tax increase bill becomes law.

This new Truman tax increase bill imposed \$7,208,000,000 in new and additional taxes on the American people. Even at that, the bill falls almost \$3,000,000,000 short of giving the President as big a tax increase as he had asked. This Truman tax increase will raise everyone's

income tax by 12½ percent. This means that more money will be withheld from every worker's pay check every payday.

The following table shows what the American workers now pay and what they will pay under the proposed new tax bill:

Single persons

Total annual income	Now pays—	Will pay under new bill	Increase
\$1,000.....	\$60	\$68	\$8
\$2,000.....	240	270	30
\$3,000.....	422	475	53
\$4,000.....	620	698	78
\$5,000.....	818	920	102

Married couple

Total annual income	Now pays—	Will pay under new bill	Increase
\$1,000.....	None	None	None
\$2,000.....	\$120	\$135	\$15
\$3,000.....	300	338	38
\$4,000.....	480	540	60
\$5,000.....	660	743	83

But higher income taxes are not the only increased taxes the American citizen will have to pay under this new Truman increase-tax bill.

If a citizen today buys a new \$2,000 automobile, he pays a special Federal tax of about \$100 on it at the time of purchase. Under the new bill this tax on a new \$2,000 car will be raised from \$100 to about \$140, an increase of \$40.

Taxes on every cigarette the citizen smokes, on every beer he drinks, on every gallon of gasoline he uses, on sporting goods, tires, auto accessories, films, on many electrical appliances, and many other things he purchases will be also increased to produce this \$200 increase in the taxes on the average American family.

STOP WASTEFUL SPENDING

In my opinion, before the Federal Government imposes burdensome new and additional taxes on the people it should make a sincere and determined effort to eliminate or reduce wasteful, extravagant, and unnecessary Federal spending that is rampant everywhere in the Federal Government. If the Democratic majority, which now controls Congress, did this, it could save five to seven billion dollars a year and no tax increase, or at worst a very small one would be required at this time.

Latest Government figures show a total of 2,409,121 civilians now on Federal payrolls. This is an increase of more than 300,000 during the past year or an average increase of civilian workers, not including those in the armed services, of 6,073 for each average week of the past 52 weeks. Statisticians say it would require 96 buildings of the size of the 102-story Empire State Building, the largest office building in the world, to provide office space for these workers.

Recently, it was revealed that there are more than 7,000 chauffeurs on the Federal payroll. Not only are taxpayers required to provide hundreds of thousands of automobiles for the use of Federal job holders, but in addition, through

taxes, to provide more than 7,000 of the Federal job holders with chauffeurs to drive some of these officeholders wherever they want to go. Last week one of the bodies of Congress ordered the firing of 42 chauffeurs in one department as an unnecessary luxury.

MONEY DOWN THE DRAIN

Within recent months, the Government has published a handsomely bound book of 2,015 pages that contains biographical sketches on the lives of the about 9,900 men and women who have served in the House or Senate since 1776. A staff of editorial workers were employed for 4 years gathering the material for this book. The cost of editing, printing, and binding the 6,500 copies which were published must have run into six figures. It is a nice book but hardly one that will in any way serve the defense effort. Certainly, it should not have been published at a cost running into six figures when the President is seeking to squeeze every dollar possible out of the harried taxpayer.

Then, too, more than 3,000,000 cookbooks have been printed by the Agriculture Department for free distribution to the housewives of the Nation. Only 1 housewife in 15 will get a copy of this cookbook yet the 14 who do not get a book will be forced to pay, in added taxes, for this printing of cookbooks. The cookbooks are a nice gesture but not necessary when equally good cookbooks are available in every book store.

During debate on a House Appropriation bill it recently was revealed that \$85,000 of taxpayers' money had been spent by a Federal bureau to build a dog and cat hospital, which is now being leased to a veterinarian for \$150 a month. Such a small return as \$150 a month—\$1,800 a year—on the Government's investment of \$85,000 in this dog and cat hospital is a testimonial to the absurdity of the undertaking. Congressman LYLE, a Democrat, commenting on this hospital said that "This is disgusting and ridiculous."

These examples of Federal waste which I have given are not in any one case large. Multiplied, however, by the thousands of similar examples of waste that could be found in the Government if the administration would search for them, it is easy to see that billions of taxpayers' dollars are squandered annually. It is this callous waste and the Democratic indifference to it that has resulted in this now proposed biggest-in-history increase in taxes.

EXPENDITURES INCREASE TEN-FOLD

If you ask the administration, "Why must taxes go up so much?" the administration replies, "It is the war."

Do not be fooled.

In the peacetime departments of the Federal Government, which have nothing or little to do with the war effort, the cost of operating many of these non-defense departments have increased ten-fold in the past 10 years.

The Department of Commerce, which has little or nothing to do with the defense effort, spent \$12 in 1950 for every dollar it spent in 1940. The Department of State, under Dean Acheson, cost 15

times as much in 1950 as it did 10 years previously.

Here are figures which show how the cost of operating peacetime departments has increased, from 3 to 15-fold during the past 10 years:

	1940	1950
Department of Commerce.....	\$75,116,535	\$863,082,952
Department of Interior.....	71,385,230	568,435,344
Department of Labor.....	18,576,698	257,043,997
Department of Justice.....	50,813,162	131,290,804
Department of State.....	20,829,487	361,226,112
Independent offices.....	3,269,254,403	9,033,499,925
Total.....	3,505,975,565	11,214,579,034

Now, I do not contend that any business can be operated as cheaply today as it could 10 years ago. However, there is no justification for nondefense departments of the Federal Government increasing their expenses ten to fifteen fold during the past 10 years.

The fact that they have done so is evidence that they are reckless with the money they extract from the harried and harassed taxpayers of this Nation.

THE ROAD TO COMMUNISM

Karl Marx, the father of communism, more than 100 years ago, said:

There's only one way to kill capitalism—by taxes, taxes, and more taxes.

When our leaders persistently turn a deaf ear to all demands for economy and steadfastly continue on a course of uninterrupted wasteful spending and seek continually to finance their spendthrift ways with more and more taxes, they pave the way for communism to take our country without having to fire a shot.

It often has been said, "The power to tax is the power to destroy." The enormous size of the new taxes now being proposed causes one to wonder if we are not already rapidly approaching the brink of national financial and economic disaster.

It is time for the American people to wake up and say to their political leaders, "You are not by taxes, taxes, and more taxes going to shove us into national chaos and national bankruptcy." It is time for the American people to say to their leaders, "Cut wasteful and unnecessary nondefense spending or we will send someone to Congress who will."

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DEANE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT 15 YEARS OLD TODAY—MAGNA CARTA OF SMALL BUSINESS ENACTED INTO LAW JUNE 19, 1936

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago today the Robinson-Patman Act became law. It was the answer to the plea of independent manufacturers and merchants to eliminate discrimination in the buying and selling of goods and services in the United States. For many years large-scale buying and selling of merchandise of all types had been subjected to unjustified rebates, allowances, commissions, brokerages, and other forms of preferential treatment and discrimination. The depression years of the early thirties were particularly ones in

which buying power was abused by the high-handed methods of certain segments of American business. On June 11, 1935, our distinguished colleague and friend, WRIGHT PATMAN, introduced an antiprice-discrimination bill. In this action he was joined on June 26 by the eminent majority leader of the Senate, the late Senator Joseph Robinson, of Arkansas. This was the basis of the legislation which the Seventy-fourth Congress enacted into law and which has become known throughout the country as the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is particularly appropriate at this time not only to give recognition to the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act but to pay tribute to a Member of the House who sponsored the legislation, fought for its passage and who, throughout the years, has championed the cause of small business in every field of endeavor. I might hesitate to make these remarks if WRIGHT PATMAN were on the floor of the House today, as he might not approve. However, I am taking a fair advantage of his absence, which is due wholly to the necessity of undergoing a required physical checkup, to pay my respects to his true worth. WRIGHT PATMAN has been an extraordinary public servant. In the 30 or more years of his public service, nearly 23 of which have been spent in the House of Representatives, he has shown great ability and industry far beyond the call of duty. No Member of this House has been more faithful to his constituency and no Member has ever been more faithful and loyal to his friends on both sides of the aisle than has WRIGHT PATMAN.

I have been particularly impressed with his love for and devotion to the institution of the House of Representatives itself. Certainly I do not believe any one of us has given more of his time and strength to the highest principles of our democracy than has the gentleman from Texas. Perhaps had he spared himself, had he been willing to cut the corners a little, the strain which takes its toll on the physical being of many of our Members would not have occurred, but WRIGHT PATMAN is not built that way. His magnificent fight for small business and free competition over the years is evidence to that fact. For many years, as we all know, he has been chairman of the House Small Business Committee. During his chairmanship the House Small Business Committee has been an inestimable service not only to small business but to our whole economy. The committee has risen to a position of influence wholly through service. The membership of the committee since its formation has been graced by some of the most distinguished Members of the House, men whose service has been recognized by both parties and whose positions of influence and leadership are recognized by all of us. One member of the committee, the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has been the majority leader of the House. Mr. PATMAN and Mr. HALLECK both, I believe, would testify as to the nonpartisan manner in which the affairs of the Small Business Committee have been conducted.

I do not know whether WRIGHT PATMAN would want me to say this or not. However, I shall risk his censure if I am talking out of school, but to me, the test of a man is his answer to the call of duty wherever he believes in his honest judgment his duty lies. Purely by chance, I have learned that WRIGHT PATMAN declined a lifetime position at considerably higher pay in order to continue to serve his constituents and his country in the House of Representatives. Now, it is not always easy for a man to decline security accompanied by a certain amount of ease to continue in a position where the going is often rough and insecurity of position is always apparent. I believe that no greater tribute could be paid to any man than to say he chose the more arduous task because he felt it was his duty to do so.

In his absence I requested Mr. PATMAN's office to afford me the opportunity of looking over any messages which he may have received on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and to place such messages on the record. Although I have not dwelt on the Robinson-Patman Act to any extent because of the opportunity afforded me to offer a few words of praise to a valiant soldier in our ranks, the fact is that the Robinson-Patman Act has been the greatest deterrent to unfair competition that the Congress of the United States has ever placed on the statute books. It is not the mere fact that this act affords protection against discriminatory pricing tactics through its enforcement, but the very fact that this law is on the books is a deterrent to many would-be discriminators, and perhaps this deterring effect bespeaks its greatest usefulness. The treble-damage features of the act are silent policemen of enforcement. If, perchance, there were efforts to remove the Robinson-Patman Act from the statute books, I imagine an unprecedented wave of indignation would emanate from the four million small businesses in this country. Many consider it their last outpost in maintaining free competition in this country.

I have selected a few of the letters and telegrams at random and before asking permission to incorporate them in the RECORD, I desire to read a few brief passages. Each letter and telegram is a congratulatory message to Mr. PATMAN on the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

From Boise, Idaho:

Primarily and secondarily, the entire population of the United States is benefited very materially by the stabilization of conditions through the Robinson-Patman Act. This act is a monument to you and to Senator ROBINSON.

From Cleveland, Ohio:

We know there are negative forces working for its repeal, and we sincerely hope that you and your colleagues will work with the same vigor and forcefulness to maintain this great protective act.

From Baltimore, Md.:

I had the pleasure of listening to some of the debates on the bill, which has been a godsend to the brokerage profession and the independent wholesale grocers.

From New York City:

This legislation which you put through is one of the most important ever introduced in Washington to protect businessmen in general from unfair, selfish practices, which benefited only a few at the expense of many.

From Detroit, Mich.:

In the few short years of its existence, the Robinson-Patman Act has been influential in helping thousands of business operators in the United States to maintain their existence.

From Burlingame, Calif.:

Had Government followed through with the strict enforcement of that law, it would have accomplished as much in promoting and protecting sound business economy within our Nation as any other single piece of legislation.

From Cleveland, Ohio:

It has helped business to stay on a fair, equitable basis for all.

From Philadelphia, Pa.:

We strongly feel that the vigorous attacks now being made on this act, if successful, would be a calamity too far-reaching to be understood.

From Buffalo, N. Y.:

Congratulations on fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act.

From Cheyenne, Wyo.:

We do appreciate the assistance your efforts have given us during the past 15 years.

I could quote from many more letters and telegrams from every geographical section of the country. However, instead of doing so I incorporate these letters and telegrams as part of my remarks where all may see and read the great interest of small business in America in the continuation and preservation of the Robinson-Patman Act:

NATIONAL FOOD BROKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am attaching copy of a resolution that was adopted unanimously by the officers and the members of the executive and advisory committees of the Nation Food Brokers Association.

As president of the National Food Brokers Association, I have been instructed to send a copy of this resolution to you, which congratulates you for the outstanding job you have done for this country by your sponsoring the Robinson-Patman Act.

Sincerely yours,

WATSON ROGERS,
President.

RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING ENACTMENT OF
THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT OF 1936 UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE AND ADVISORY COMMITTEES OF THE NATIONAL FOOD BROKERS ASSOCIATION

Whereas members of the National Food Brokers Association are located in every trade area of the United States and serve as resident sales agents of the many thousands of food canners, manufacturers, and processors who sell and deliver their food and grocery products in interstate commerce; and

Whereas members are in daily personal contact with the hundreds of thousands of wholesale and retail food outlets; and

Whereas the members are therefore on-the-spot witnesses of the day-to-day com-

petition of enterprises constituting the food industry; and

Whereas many members have vivid recollections of the chaotic competitive conditions existing in the food industry prior to the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Anti-discrimination Act, conditions which were rapidly tending toward monopolization of food distribution by elimination of small competitive enterprises engaged in that distribution; and

Whereas the said monopolistic trend was attributable to the employment by some large buying units of coercive economic pressures to get price advantages having no relation to the cost of the goods, and which price advantages were not available to the great majority of the competitors of these large units; and

Whereas more than ever before competition in the food industry is a close competitive struggle in which an unearned price advantage of even a small percentage to one unit represents a loss to the small, competing enterprises at the beginning of the competitive struggle; and

Whereas members of the National Food Brokers Association are overwhelmingly of the opinion that the Robinson-Patman Act as it has been enforced and administered by the Federal Trade Commission during the past 15 years, has done more than any other law to make competition in the food industry free and fair to all competitors: Therefore be it

Resolved, That upon this fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Antidiscrimination Act, the National Food Brokers Association congratulates Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, the United States Representative from the great State of Texas, both for his sponsorship of and fight for the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act 15 years ago and, equally important, for his vigilant and vigorous guardianship of the act ever since; be it further

Resolved, That the president of the association is hereby directed, on behalf of the association and its members, to send a copy of this resolution to the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincere congratulations on occasion fifteenth anniversary passage Robinson-Patman Act which constitutes so important a bulwark preserving fair opportunity for small business in our country. Your own record as consistent champion of small business deserves thanks of millions of American citizens.

JERRY VOORHEES.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on anniversary of Robinson-Patman bill. And best wishes your good health.

E. B. ROUZER.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. Our sincere thanks for all that you have done for its preservation.

JOHN H. VOELKER.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

It is with sincere congratulations that we greet you on the fifteenth anniversary of the

establishment of the emancipation of American free enterprise through the origination and passage of the Robinson-Patman Act. We wish you continued health, happiness, and prosperity and the time in the world to enjoy them.

S. N. BEARMAN BROKERAGE CO.

PORLAND, MAINE, June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulating you on the fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act. May we take this opportunity of commanding you for the fine job you are doing.

WOODSIDE CO., INC.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincere congratulations to you on fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act.

THE H. A. N. DAILY CO.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act.

E. O. DAVIS CO.

LINCOLN, ILL., June 18, 1951.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. If it wasn't for you and your fine work we wouldn't have very many small-business men in this country today. Keep up your good work. We must always have small business. When we lose that we have lost freedom of opportunity.

ROY CLAPPER.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

ROHN & CHAPMAN, INC.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fifteen years of proven worth to all industry under the Patman Act is a tremendous tribute to your business knowledge and foresight. Hearty anniversary congratulations.

HARRY C. FAULKNER.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our sincere congratulations to you on this fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, your efforts in originating and continuing to support that legislation is greatly appreciated.

GENERAL INGREDIENTS, INC.,
FIRMIN C. DEISEL.

ROANOKE, VA., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act we want to congratulate you as author of this fine piece of legislation. Also to thank you for your constant fight against efforts to weaken this act which we believe is

vital to public interest, especially small business.

AMERICAN BROKERAGE CO., INC.
M. P. SNELLER, President.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

WESLEY H. MORROW,
MORROW BROS., INC.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. We appreciate your efforts to help the small-business man and your continued efforts to prevent any weakening of the act.

CAREY & COALE.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.:

My heartiest congratulations and everlasting thanks. Your courage, effort, and accomplishments in behalf of the small-business man for the past 15 years is deeply appreciated.

A. H. PEARLMAN, INC.,
A. H. PEARLMAN, President.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. This has been a fine contribution to industry in general and the brokers fraternity particularly. Hope the continued effort by some factions to disrupt this legislation will not be successful.

HOUSUM KLINE CO.

BROWNSVILLE, PA., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of your Robinson-Patman Act and your continued fight for the small-business man. Best wishes and success for the future.

E. L. SHELBAER,
SHELLY'S, INC.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. The benefits of this act have been a lifesaver to many businessmen against unfair trade practices. We hope the benefits of this act will continue for years to come. Thank God for men like you who continue to fight against unfair business tactics.

M. L. ROOT CO.

BUFFALO, N. Y., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act.

H. A. SLOCUM & ASSOCIATES, INC.

CHEYENNE, WYO., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your helpful work for small business. We do appreciate the assist-

ance your efforts have given us during the past 15 years.

CHAS. E. SANDS.

JACKSONVILLE, FLA., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.:

As a champion of small business for 15 years, accept our congratulations. Keep up the good work for there was never a time in our history when small business needed your help more. In particular fight Senate bill S. 719.

C. R. THEBAUT, JR.

DULUTH, MINN., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your continuous fight for small business. Keep up the good work. OSCAR MATHIESSEN,
MATHIESSEN TIRE CO.

WOODVILLE, MISS., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives

Washington, D. C.:

We extend congratulations to you on this fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. Through your efforts in maintaining this law it has been possible for small firms like ours to exist and render services to a rural community. Thanks so much for your kind assistance.

SEVEN DAY WHOLESALE GROCERY, INC.

BUTTE, MONT., June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building

Ever mindful of exerted effort you put forth toward sponsorship and successful conclusion of Robinson-Patman Act, on this fifteenth anniversary of the President's signature, we extend our congratulations and best wishes for your continued health and happiness.

T. J. LANPHIER CO.

DENVER, COLO., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building

Congratulations, sir. This day, the fifteenth anniversary of your Robinson-Patman Act. With the confusion and turmoil now in evidence, it is important to maintain this important act.

ANDERSON-LUDWIG CO.

ERIE, PA., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building

We offer our hearty congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. May this important legislation continue to survive the attacks of those who would destroy it.

WALTER L. WALKER CO.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building

Congratulations to you today, your fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act. We earnestly solicit your continued sponsorship of this famous law.

THE GITTERING CO.

KINSTON, N. C., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives

Since the Robinson-Patman Act has become law many of the practices detrimental to small business have disappeared and any

weakening of the act would be a step toward the elimination of small business. We thank you for your valiant fight for us over the years.

C. E. GRAY and J. F. OGLESEY.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

On the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, we wish to acknowledge to you our indebtedness for this great piece of legislation. Each year proves its worth to the Nation as a whole. Our sincere appreciation to you.

THE C. H. BREWSTER CO.

BALTIMORE, MD., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

Accept our heartiest congratulations for your vigorous fight for small business, which has continued these many years and especially on this the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act for which you worked so hard.

Sincerely,

CAFFEE TIRE CORP.,
GEORGE E. CAFFEE, JR.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Continue your fight for independent tire dealers on this the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman bill.

CAMPION GAHAM TIRE CO.,
E. CAMPION.

DALLAS, TEX., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The 31 member firms of Dallas Food Brokerage Association note this fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act to thank you for your valiant fight over the years in the interest of small business. Any weakening of the act would be detrimental. Keep up the good work.

RALPH E. TINKLE,
President.

SHREVEPORT, LA., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. This act has proven itself a valuable piece of legislation to the food-brokerage business.

S. D. CARTER CO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of your sponsorship of the Robinson-Patman Act. Best wishes.

ARTHUR C. MARQUARDT & CO.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and the splendid work you have done and are still doing in connection with this act, also against the vigorous attacks being made against it.

B. L. MCCORMICK CO.

BALTIMORE, MD., June 19, 1951.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to extend my congratulations and best wishes on the fifteenth anniversary of the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act.

H. W. LOOCK,
ALLEN SON & CO.

FORT SMITH, ARK., June 18, 1951.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Every independent retailer in the State of Arkansas joins me in wishing you congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. We all deeply appreciate your time and effort in behalf of independent dealers and ask for your continued support.

YANTIS HARPER CO.,
BERNIE HARPER.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Tomorrow being anniversary Robinson-Patman bill we want to again thank you for your support in having this legislation passed and at same time please continue efforts to defeat crippling amendments to this act which would put small concerns such as ours out of business.

RYAN BROKERAGE CO.,
MARTIN RYAN.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Fifteen years ago today, the Robinson-Patman Act was signed. Please accept our sincere congratulations for your sponsorship of this famous law and your untiring efforts protecting business with free and fair competition from monopoly and unfair coercion.

BUSBEE BROKERAGE CO.

ROANOKE, VA., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman bill most effective scotch of monopoly on statute books thus far—has saved business lives of thousands of small businesses—call on them when needed to help repel assaults. Cordially,

HORTON & SNYDER,
Food Broker.

MONTESANO, WASH., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on this day the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and the splendid fight you continue to wage on behalf of all small business to keep this valuable law alive and effective. Will appreciate your continued opposition to Senate bill S. 719 which would emasculate the Robinson-Patman Act if passed.

V. I. WHITNEY,
Director, State of Washington National Association of Independent Tire Dealers.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We extend sincere thanks and gratitude to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the en-

actment of the Robinson-Patman law. We trust that this law will never be repealed and we pledge you our support.

EBELING-EGGER CO.

ROCKY MOUNT, N. C., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The Robinson-Patman Act has eliminated many practices detrimental to small business. Any weakening of the act would tend to kill small business—an interest which the country needs to nourish. Thank you for your long and valiant fight.

GEO. S. EDWARDS & CO.

ATLANTA, GA., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on fifteenth anniversary Robinson and Patman bill. It has served and preserved small business for many years. Your continued support is greatly appreciated as we all know your sincere purpose of representing the small-business man of today.

ABE GOLDSTEIN,
NAITD Director, State of Georgia.

OTTUMWA, IOWA, June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

On the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of Robinson-Patman Act, may I express to you my appreciation and that of my associates for your efforts in the interests of small business.

C. L. PANGBORN,
First Vice President, National Association of Independent Tire Dealers.

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The arrival of the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman bill gives cause for real celebration. We extend our sincerest thanks to you for protection we have been given under this bill and your constant vigilance in upholding it. May it remain in full force.

MEL-WILLIAMS CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Our congratulations are extended to you on this fifteenth anniversary of the constructive act which bears your name. Let's keep this law in effect. Permit of no weakening of its provisions.

THE KENNEDY MENKE CO., INC.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We 11 member firms of the Little Rock Food Brokers Association express our appreciation and extend our congratulations to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. Please accept our best wishes for your health and the continued excellency of your endeavors in the Congress.

LITTLE ROCK FOOD BROKERS ASSOCIATION.

LANCASTER, PA., June 18, 1951.
 The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations to a really intelligent Congressman on this fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act.
 B. P. MILLER & CO.,
Food Brokers.

MISSOULA, MONT., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. Please be assured of our appreciation of your efforts in behalf of small business. Let the good work go on.

O. J. MUELLER,
President, O. J. Mueller Co.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 19, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act I send you repeated thanks for your authorship and continuous, unwavering support of the act that stands as the main bulwark against discriminatory practices in the food industry.

RALPH D. DAVIS,
Past National Chairman of NFBA.

BUTTE, MONT., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our congratulations on this the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

We also want you to know that we appreciate your constant effort to maintain this legislation for the protection of small business.

COONEY BROKERAGE CO.

ROANOKE, VA., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hearty congratulations on the anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. This has been a wonderful blessing to everyone, even if there are some who would destroy it for selfish reasons. We know you are justly proud of a good job well done.

ALBERGOTTI BROS.,
Stokley.

HARRISBURG, PA., June 18, 1951.
 Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Pennsylvania Farm Bureau Cooperative Association extends heartiest congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the signing by the President of the Robinson-Patman Act, and for the part you have played in advancing the best interests of small business. Your efforts to prevent legislation to restrict the effectiveness of this act will be greatly appreciated by this and other farmer cooperatives throughout the Nation.

DAVID PUTNEY,
General Counsel.

DENVER, COLO., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

MORRIS BROS. BROKERAGE CO.

XCVII—426

FORT WORTH, TEX., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:
 Congratulations and thanks to you for good work on Robinson-Patman Act and its fifteenth anniversary so helpful to independent dealers and small businesses.

WAPLES PLATTER CO.,
 J. W. SHUGART.

PORTLAND, OREG., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

On this fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act I take this opportunity to congratulate you and encourage you to continue your effort in the interest of small business and to offer you my wholehearted support if I can be of service to you.

Best regards,

RAY GRIMSHAW.

CEDARTOWN, GA., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives.

Since the Robinson-Patman Act has become law many of the practices detrimental to small business have disappeared and any weakening of the act would be in the direction of hurting small business. We thank you for your grand fight over the years.

INTERSTATE WHOLESALE CO.,
 By E. J. DUGAN.

BALTIMORE, MD., June 19, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN:

It is with great pleasure that we offer our congratulations and felicitations upon this the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. It is the opinion of this organization that the act bearing your name and for which you were originally responsible and for which you have fought so hard to maintain has represented one of the most constructive steps taken by industry within the 40 years of our business experience. May it always stand as a monument to your industry.

THE HARRY B. COOK CO.

DALLAS, TEX., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and we want to express sincere appreciation for your own personal efforts toward protection of small business.

WARREN DAVIS,
Vice President, Johnnie Daniels Tire Co., Inc.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. Also congratulations for your untiring efforts in upholding this law which is so vital to the economy of our country. We pledge our continuing support of your efforts.

J. A. PLAIN CO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 18, 1951.
 The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

We wish to express appreciation and congratulations on the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

LOUIS A. LUDWIG CO.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 18, 1951.
 Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

On the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, may I

on behalf of the Wholesale Confectionery Industry of the United States bring greetings and good wishes to the man who made this law possible and to the one who has always labored diligently in the interest of the small independent American businessman against the discriminatory practices which are so harmful to the American economy.

C. M. McMILLAN,
Executive Secretary, National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc.

SAN ANTONIO, TEX., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman bill. We appreciate your efforts.

RANDAL CHRISTAL CO.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 18, 1951.
 The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Our congratulations to you upon the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and sincere appreciation for you continuing efforts for this fine legislation.

JOHN F. JAMISON CO.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

On fifteenth anniversary of Robinson-Patman Act I thank you for your untiring efforts in behalf of small business. I wish you continued success in your fight against interests who would throttle life of small independents.

CARL E. McCAGUE.

BEDFORD, IND., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives:

Want to thank you for your valiant fight past 15 years to maintain the Robinson-Patman law. It has protected the small business from the evil practices prior to its passage. It should not be altered for special cases such as Congressman McGRAH's proposed amendment.

WHEELER FOUTCH CO.

PIKEVILLE, KY., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Care of Select Committee on Small Business, House of Representatives:

Since the Robinson-Patman Act has become law many of the practices detrimental to small business have disappeared and any weakening of the act would be in the direction of elimination of small business. We thank you for your valiant fight over the years.

KENTUCKY WHOLESALE CO.

BATTLE CREEK, MICH., June 18, 1951.
 The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Small Business,
House Office Building:

It seems appropriate on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act to express appreciation of your vigorous efforts through that act, and otherwise, on behalf of the small-business men of America. We are grateful to you and your committee for your fine work.

BERNARD E. GODDE,
President, Associated Retail Bakers of America.

ADRIAN, MICH., June 18, 1951.
 Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

Congratulations on your record as an outstanding champion of the small-business

men for the past 15 years. You can rest assured of our support in defeating Senate bill S. 719.

C. J. RAMUS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Member of Congress,
New House Office Building:

We desire to tender you our cordial felicitations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and to express our appreciation of your part in the enactment of that law and your constant and unyielding defense of it against all harmful amendments. Your service in this respect has been outstanding and every independent merchant is your debtor.

UNITED STATES WHOLESALE
GROCERS ASSOCIATION,
HAROLD O. SMITH, Jr.,
Executive Vice President.

OAKLAND, CALIF., June 17, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

The past 15 years stand as milestones of tribute to your courage on behalf of Nations smaller businessmen we here are deeply concerned should S. 719 pass. Continued success to you sir.

L. S. SANDERS,
Past President National Association
Independent Tire Dealers.

PAWTUCKET, R. I., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on your continued fight for the rights of small business. It is great comfort to know that men of your caliber are in Government to protect these rights. Business as well as sport must be governed by fair rules in order to survive. Keep up the excellent work.

MORTON BOROD,
Bridge Tire & Supply.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Your continuous fight for small business makes it appropriate we send our congratulations anniversary of Robinson-Patman bill.

R. E. HEGLUND,
General Manager, Tire Dealers, Inc.,
uth Michigan.

ABILENE, TEX., June 16, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Congratulations on this the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

THE ABILENE FOOD BROKERS ASSOCIATION.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Permit me to congratulate you on your fight for the preservation of small business in this country. "Thousands of small businesses are counting on you to continue your good work."

J. EARL STOWE,
President, Earl Stowe Tire Co.

BUFFALO, N. Y., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Cordial and hearty congratulations for your successful efforts anent Patman Act.

G. E. BUTTS CO., INC.

PHOENIX, ARIZ., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our heartiest congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act which has been so all important to the survival of small businesses, such as ours. Our sincere thanks to you personally for your efforts in our behalf.

ED M. RYAN & CO.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Please accept our thanks for your initial and continued efforts on the Robinson-Patman Act. The past 15 years have brought about a substantial elimination of unfair and unethical practices. We encourage intensified vigilance in the detection and prosecution of those persisting in continued violations.

J. L. READ CO.

BUFFALO, N. Y., June 16, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. A good job well done.

LYTLE & STALTER, INC.,
Food Brokers.

DALLAS, TEX., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Sincere congratulations to you on the approaching fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. We recognize now as never before the true value of this act to American business and the necessity for eternal vigilance against those who would destroy it. Thanks for your continued valuable leadership.

A. J. PHILLIPS CO.

SHREVEPORT, LA., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

On eve of fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act you will please accept our most thankful acknowledgment to you for this bill. Indeed the brokerage fraternity and entire food industry have been immensely benefited. Just another example of courageous service you have always so ably and conscientiously rendered.

MASON JACKSON CO.

ABERDEEN, S. DAK., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

Thanks for the good work you have shown us small operators. Keep up the good work. Thanking you kindly.

GIÈSE SUPPLY & TIRE CO.

HENDERSON, N. C., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

Congratulations on fifteenth anniversary Robinson-Patman Act. Your activities on behalf of small business is much appreciated.

HENDERSON VULCANIZING CO.
T. W. McCracken.

ROANOKE, VA., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
The House Office Building:

Hearty congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. It is the most stabilizing influence in industry

today, and we hope it has many, many more anniversaries.

ALLIED SALES CO.

CINCINNATI, OHIO, June 19, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Hail to the King. Congratulations in honor of fifteenth anniversary Robinson-Patman Act. May God continue to guide and protect the Robinson-Patman law from its enemies, namely, the direct buyers and many chiseling buying organizations camouflaged and masqueraded as saving millions for distributors but in reality are grafters, leeches, scheming parasites dividing their ill-gotten gains and planning to stay within the law. Don't give up. Keep on fighting. We are only beginning. There is still much to be done to beat the strong-armed octopus with vast financial backing to continue their lobbying; the National Food Brokers Association of Washington, of which we are members since 1916, is one of your best information bureaus.

THE NICHOLAS J. JANSON CO., INC.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The wisdom embodied in the Robinson-Patman Act is responsible for its unique record during the 15 years of its existence. The act has been a pillar in support of fair-trade practice providing all trade factors an equal opportunity. Your untiring efforts upholding this legislation are particularly responsible for its effectiveness so on this fifteenth anniversary of the act we send thanks to you for your sincere interest and a hope that you will be spared many years to continue this valuable support.

THE PAUL E. KROEHL CO.,
Food Brokers.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 19, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

In behalf of the members of the National Food Brokers Association of this district, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, we extend congratulations on this the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act. It has proved to be one of the most significant laws governing business, protecting free and fair competition from monopoly and unfair coercive practices. It is invaluable, beneficial, and helpful to the small- and middle-class merchants of America. We wish you continued good health and extend our sincere thanks for your fighting efforts in behalf of the average merchant of the United States of America.

ALVIN H. LIVINGSTON,
Regional Director of the
Fourteenth District.

TAMPA, FLA., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

On the anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, we want to congratulate you on being the father of this bill, and since it has become a law it has been most helpful in many ways to the small-business man, and we sincerely hope that no legislation will be passed to weaken this law which is so necessary to keep the small man in business, for he sure is having a struggle, and many thanks for your constance in behalf of the small-business man.

BERGER & RACHELSON, INC.,
Wholesale Grocers.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Someone told me that the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act was on

the 15th and some others tell me on the 19th. I surely should remember the date. It goes without saying that 15 years ago when Congress voted the Robinson-Patman Act it meant this much to independent business: A real break for them on their expectations and hopes that they would remain a part of our economy. The law has saved the day for many thousands upon thousands of small businesses both at the production and distribution level. The law has been made to order to protect small business. The only failure has been in the lack of vigorous enforcement of the law. Small business of this Nation owes you a vote of thanks for this needed legislation and on this fifteenth anniversary our congratulations to you. I believe I speak for the many thousands upon thousands in sending this message to you.

GEORGE J. BURGER,

Vice President in Charge Washington Office, National Federation of Independent Business.

TOLEDO, OHIO, June 18, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Tomorrow will be the fifteenth anniversary of the passage of the Robinson-Patman law and I want to commend you for the passage of this fair trade law which has withstood attacks by its enemies and remains on the statute books in original form. You undoubtedly get a lot of pleasure out of the thought that you were instrumental in getting such worth-while legislation passed. You have always worked in the interests of fair and equitable legislation, and I trust you are enjoying good health and the Lord will give you the help and strength to continue your fine work. Congratulations and best wishes.

IRA E. MERRILL,
President, Merrill Ranft Co.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., June 16, 1951.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

Congratulations to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Patman Act which has so benefited small-business men. As an outstanding legislator championing small business you have done remarkable work. More power to you and may your efforts bear fruit for years to come, and may you be able to successfully defeat Senate bill 719.

Independent Tire Dealers, New Haven, Conn.; Peat & Voigt Service, L. F. Voigt; Byron Tire Shop; George L. Smith; Stevens, Inc.; C. M. Charles Tire Repair; C. Demusis; Ralph J. Weiter; Myers & Schwartz.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., June 15, 1951.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives:

It has come to my attention that next Tuesday, June 19, is the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. On this occasion I want to express my deep appreciation for all the good work you have done in behalf of the small-business man, and extend to you my hearty congratulations on this memorable day. May the good Lord bless you with good health and a long life so that you may be able to continue your efforts in behalf of the small-business man. Sincerely,

HENRY O. STENZEL,
President, H. O. Stenzel Co., and Wisconsin Director, NAITD.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN, Member of Congress,
New House Office Building:

On this the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act may I offer my congratulations to you and the select Small Business Committee of the

House for the diligent persevering and prudent program formulated by yourself and colleagues for the preservation of small business in our country.

Dr. JOHN W. DARGAVEL,
Executive Secretary, Nard.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 14, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

June 19 marks fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. Congratulations to you in the magnificent support you have given to the substance of this act. Our opinion no other law has done as much to sustain American Business as the Robinson-Patman Act. We stand ready to support all its phases.

JAMES J. REILLEY, ASSOCIATES.

KANSAS CITY, MO., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act which has meant much to independent business. You are to also be thanked for your diligent watchfulness of this act and having kept the pirates from destroying it. Good wishes, health and happiness.

MEINRATH BROKERAGE CO.,
Ed W. Jones & Irving S. MEINRATH.

CHICAGO, ILL., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building:

The Robinson-Patman Act has most certainly been the solution to protecting free and fair competition from monopoly and unfair coercive practices in business and on its fifteenth anniversary may we again extend to you our appreciation for your untiring energy in preserving this law.

PICKETT & CO.

MOBILE, ALA., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

DEAR SIR: We offer our sincerest congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. The act is our greatest single protection, allowing us to operate a small business on an ethical basis.

With earnest wishes for continued success.

Sincerely,
REDMOND BROKERAGE CO.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 11, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

Our congratulations to you upon the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. Your sincere devotion to the principles of this legislation and your consistent guardianship of its high ideals and practices is most commendable.

LESTRADE BROS.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 18, 1951.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.:

On the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, may I on behalf of the wholesale confectionery industry of the United States bring greetings and good wishes to the man who made this law possible and to the one who has always labored diligently in the interest of the small independent American businessman against the discriminatory practices which are so harmful to the American economy.

C. M. MCMILLAN,
Executive Secretary, National Candy Wholesalers Assn., Inc.

FALK BROKERAGE CO.,
Phoenix, Ariz., June 15, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: We want to send our congratulations to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robertson-Patman Act, which we believe falls on June 19. We feel that it has been the greatest leveler or equalizer of large and small business ever passed by our Congress. We feel that it is truly American in that it puts everything on an equal basis with favors and premiums to nobody.

We do hope that this will remain on the statutes for many years to come.

Sincerely,

FALK BROKERAGE CO.,
CLARENCE G. FALK.

FRANK C. GLUECK & CO.,
Cincinnati, Ohio, June 18, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: May we extend our congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act. We regard this measure as one of the most significant laws governing business, protecting free and fair competition from monopoly, and unfair coercive practices. Many thanks for the splendid effects it has realized in the food industry.

Very truly,

FRANK C. GLUECK.

W. S. MOUNTFORT CO.,
Buffalo, N. Y., June 18, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: On the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, we want you to know that we approve this law and believe it will continue to help everyone in the food business.

We want you to know that we appreciate your support on this matter.

Yours very truly,

W. S. MOUNTFORT CO.,
W. S. MOUNTFORT.

G. C. LOVILL CO.,
Mount Airy, N. C., June 18, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We want to express to you our appreciation of the service you have rendered the wholesale grocers throughout the country in keeping the Robinson-Patman Act in operation. It has been a great benefit to small business.

With best wishes, we beg to remain,

Yours very truly,

G. C. LOVILL CO.,
G. C. LOVILL,
Secretary and Treasurer.

FRIEDRICH & KEMPE CO., INC.,
Red Wing, Minn., June 16, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As June 19 marks the fifteenth anniversary of the passage of the Robinson-Patman act, we wish to extend to you and your colleagues our best wishes. Since this act became law, small business has had an opportunity to compete. We express our sincere gratitude for your efforts during these many years.

Sincerely yours,

FRIEDRICH & KEMPE, CO., INC.,
J. C. FRIEDRICH.

WITHERSPOON-SIMPSON CO., INC.,
Fort Smith, Ark., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: As June 19 is the anniversary of the Robinson-Patman act we would like to thank you for the outstanding work you did in creating such a fair act, and for your continuous effort to keep the act as it was originally written.

We are behind you in every way.

Respectfully yours,

R. A. COUNCIL.

THE GOULEY BURCHAM CO.,
Phoenix, Ariz., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: As June 19 is the anniversary of your bill that has done so much for us and all business in the United States, we take this opportunity to again express our thanks and appreciation. If we had more men of your caliber serving our country I am sure we would not be in the chaotic condition we are now in.

Yours sincerely,

THE GOULEY BURCHAM CO.
H. B. DUBOSE.

SIMCHUK SALES CO.,
Spokane, Wash., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: We wish to extend to you our congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

You have done an outstanding job in the face of attacks from all sides and you have our full support in your continued efforts to keep the Robinson-Patman Act intact.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW SIMCHUK.

J. C. BLASKEY CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Just as you receive this letter it will be the fifteenth anniversary of enactment of the Robinson-Patman law and we want to again take this opportunity to thank you for that act which we consider was definitely responsible for helping us stay in business.

As a matter of fact many canners and wholesale grocers over the country are likewise indebted to you because the business of special rebates and secret allowances was getting to a point where there would be no place in the picture for the legitimate food broker nor the small chain grocer, small wholesaler, or the independent canners.

We wish you the strength and fortitude to continue in your fight to not only uphold the Robinson-Patman Act but also put more strong teeth into it.

Once again, many thanks and more power to you.

Very truly yours,

J. C. BLASKEY CO.

DOUGHERTY BROKERAGE CO.,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. I should also like to express my personal appreciation to you—the sponsor and champion of this excellent law. Thank goodness, it has withstood the attempts of special interests to emasculate and undermine its provisions.

During the past 15 years, it has especially proven itself the protector of small business against the unfair competition of the giant corporations.

I wish you many more years of health and energy, so that you may continue your fight for fair competition in business, which is the American way of life.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGHERTY BROKERAGE CO.,
JOSEPH C. DOUGHERTY.

WM. G. BONSTEDT & CO.,
Philadelphia, June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Congratulations to you, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

In our opinion the Robinson-Patman Act has certainly eliminated confusion and unfair trade practices in the grocery distributing field, and we certainly hope that the current attacks being made against it in Washington will prove unsuccessful.

We would hate to return to the confusion in the grocery selling field which existed before the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Yours very truly,

WM. G. BONSTEDT & CO.

W. N. MARSHALL CO.,
Norfolk, Va., June 18, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: I and my organization want to take this time to congratulate you on your fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

We feel that it is one of the finest bills and laws that has ever been passed in this country, and we are very glad to have a man such as you for one of our leaders in this great country of ours.

With best regards, we are

Sincerely,

W. N. MARSHALL CO.
W. N. MARSHALL.

RANNEY-HORNUNG SALES CO.,
Wichita, Kans., June 16, 1951.
To the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

We wish to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

I don't know of another law which has furthered fair trade any more in the food industry than this particular act.

It is sincerely hoped that it will stand unchanged during the years ahead.

Our best wishes to you.

ROBERT J. HORNUNG.

E. L. ROBERTS & CO.,
San Francisco, Calif., June 13, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On this the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act, I wish to congratulate you on your sponsorship of this fine law. We are proud to have such farsighted, clear-thinking men as you in our Government.

Yours very truly,

E. L. ROBERTS.

DRAPER, GORDON & WALKER,
DULUTH, MINN., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: Watson Rogers, president of National Food Brokers Association, calls to our attention that June 19 is the anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. We want to take this opportunity to con-

gratulate you and all of your associates who did such a fine job in not only formulating the act but in policing it during these last years. We certainly hope that nothing happens to upset this guardian of small business.

Sincerely,

DRAPER, GORDON & WALKER,
C. D. WALKER.

BURNSIDE & SPENCER,
Erie, Pa., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept our heartiest congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Very truly yours,

BURNSIDE & SPENCER,
W. L. SHAFFER.

STANLEY G. VOELKER & CO.,
Louisville, Ky., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to send you our congratulations on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, and express our thanks for the many benefits derived from same.

With kindest regards, we are,

Sincerely yours,

STANLEY G. VOELKER & CO.
R. M. JOSEPH.

INTERSTATE BROKERAGE CO., OF
SAN ANTONIO, INC.,
San Antonio, Tex., June 14, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since June 19 is the emancipation of the food broker, as well as the emancipation of the Negro, we are giving this anniversary serious thought and we are greatly indebted to you for making this possible, Mr. PATMAN, and we want you to know how much we appreciate it. We believe you know without our telling you the real value of the Robinson-Patman Act to the people of the United States and to the consuming public. It has saved small business and has helped block the huge combines which would have been detrimental to the American people. We want you to know we appreciate it.

Yours truly,

INTERSTATE BROKERAGE CO.,
By B. O. MCRELESS.

JOHN H. LOCK & SONS,
Buffalo, N. Y., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: We should like to congratulate you on this the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. LOCK & SONS,
JOHN H. LOCK.

HUGH B. HUNTER CO.,
Louisville, Ky., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: June 19, I believe, is the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, which is a good act and very beneficial to business, especially small business such as ours.

We all appreciate the untiring effort you have put forth in keeping this bill where it belongs, and that is in the laws of this country.

We as merchandise brokers would appreciate very much if you would continue to fight

to keep this law alive and do hope for your continued efforts in behalf of same.

With best wishes, we are

Yours very truly,

HUGH B. HUNTER CO.

BARNES-TERRY CO.,
Wilkes-Barre, Pa., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the occasion of the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act, I congratulate you and also thank you for the stabilizing influence your great law has brought to the food business and the whole United States economy.

The section 2c of your act particularly has broadened the basis of fair competition in our industry and made markets free. It enables the small-business man to come to the bargaining counter at the same level as his larger competitor and thus to survive and serve his community.

We all agree that a large number of business units, both small and large, is necessary if we are to have competitive markets; and further, that free and fair competitive markets are the basis of our American free-enterprise system itself. Your contribution in protecting this great principle is, indeed, a memorable one.

Very truly yours,

C. F. TERRY.

TERRILL BROKERAGE CO.,
Louisville, Ky., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In recognition of the moral and economic good accomplished with the enactment of the Robinson-Patman bill 15 years ago on June 19, we offer our sincere thanks. Our thanks, also, for the courage and determination you have shown in continuing your work to make this legislation accomplish the purposes for which it was intended. The very fact that June 19 is the fifteenth anniversary of this act is evidence enough that the principles involved are sound and for the over-all welfare.

My voice as one businessman is small, but I am most anxious to add it to the thousands of others who are also grateful to you for the steadfast position you have maintained.

Yours very truly,

TERRILL BROKERAGE CO.,
GLENN R. TERRILL.

E. F. HATFIELD CO.,
Louisville, Ky., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On this, the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, we want to express to you our sincere appreciation for all that you have done in making this law and your sustained efforts to keep the law strong.

We are small-business men who have benefited by and have been protected by the act, and there is no doubt in our minds that we would not be in business today were it not for this equality of opportunity afforded by the act.

Needless to say, the continuing efforts to weaken the act are a source of great concern to us, and we must depend on you and those associated with you to see that what you have fought for so long and so well is not broken down.

May we assure you of our confidence and of our readiness to cooperate in every way.

With best wishes, we are

Very truly yours,

E. F. HATFIELD CO.,
E. F. HATFIELD.

NORMAN L. WILSON CO., INC.,
Rochester, N. Y., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: On the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, we wish to extend our congratulations to you for your efforts in making this act a potent force in the well-being of the small business-men of this country.

We particularly approve of the fact that the act is being properly enforced and also that it is so firmly entrenched, that so far it has been able to withstand the many attacks against us.

With our sincere regards, we remain,
Very truly yours,

NORMAN L. WILSON CO., INC.,
NORMAN L. WILSON.

LYONS BROKERAGE CO.,
San Antonio, Tex., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: We understand that June 19 is the fifteenth anniversary date for the Robinson-Patman Act. We would like to take this opportunity to congratulate you for the wonderful work you did in originating this act, and also for the fine cooperation you have given legitimate and ethical business in fighting the vigorous attacks made against this act.

With kindest regards, we remain

Sincerely,

LYONS BROKERAGE CO.,
By W. J. LYONS.

PILLANS & SMITH CO., INC.,
Ocala, Fla., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN: Since June 19 is the fifteenth anniversary of the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act I would, as a representative of a small business, like to thank you for your fight over the years in keeping this legislation active.

We well realize that had it not been for you many of us would be out of business today.

Again thanking you, we are

Very sincerely,

PILLANS & SMITH CO., INC.,
W. T. ALSOP, President.

HOLLOWAY-OPPENHEIMER CO., INC.,
Louisville, Ky., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We are desirous of congratulating you on the coming fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

This act has been instrumental in protecting our, as well as many other small businesses of like nature throughout the country.

We want you to know that we appreciate your untiring efforts in getting this act across and sincerely trust you and your associates will see to it that those who are and have been striving to destroy it will not be successful.

Very sincerely,

L. J. HOLLOWAY,
President.

CHENEY BROS.,
West Palm Beach, Fla., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since the Robinson-Patman Act has become law many of the practices detrimental to small business have disappeared.

Any weakening of the act would tend to eliminate small business.

Thank you for your fight over the years for this act.

Respectfully yours,

CHENEY BROS.
J. N. CHENEY.

CHARLOTTE, N. C., June 16, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Select Committee on Small Business,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR HONORABLE PATMAN: Since the Robinson-Patman Act has become law many of the practices detrimental to small business have disappeared and any weakening of the act would be in the direction of elimination of the small business. We thank you for your valiant fight over the years.

Your truly,

L. W. PETRIE.

M. L. KNOWLTON CO., INC.,
Memphis, Tenn., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: It has come to our attention, that the 15th Anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act is near at hand, and upon this occasion, we wish to extend to you our heartiest congratulations and best wishes for your future success.

We feel if we had more fine gentlemen in Washington that would look after the interests of the people as you have with the Robinson-Patman Act, we would all be much better off.

With our best wishes for your future success, and kindest regards, we are.

Very truly yours.

M. L. KNOWLTON CO., INC.,
I. H. MAYOR.

DAN JOSEPH CO.,
Columbus, Ga., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Referring to the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, we would like to recommend that you continue to fight for this act, as it means so much to our independent wholesalers. We strongly urge you to continue this work.

Yours very truly,

DAN JOSEPH CO.,
HAMLIN H. FORD.

MURPHY BROKERAGE CO.,
Louisville, Ky., June 15, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Fifteen years ago we of the brokerage fraternity hailed you and your associate in making the Robinson-Patman bill the Moses that led us into a promised land. Personally I want to again thank you for the effort and interest that had such a great part in making your bill a law. Please permit me to assure you that brokers throughout the country will never cease to appreciate what you have done to make it possible for us to conduct our businesses as they should be conducted.

Won't you please continue to be on the alert and try and prevent the passing of amendments that will weaken the law bearing your name? Again thanking you, I am

Sincerely yours,

C. R. MURPHY.

LOUISVILLE FOOD BROKERS ASSOCIATION,
Louisville, Ky., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Remembering that this June 15, 1951, is the fifteenth anniversary of the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, we

wish to again thank you for the great part you had in the enactment of what we consider a great law.

May we urge your eternal vigilance in combatting efforts to weaken this law, and to urge that you continue to cooperate with us in its enforcement.

Again, we thank you sincerely.

LOUISVILLE FOOD BROKERS ASSOCIATION,
C. R. MURPHY, Secretary.

L. G. ALLEN BROKERAGE CO.,

Phoenix, Ariz., June 15, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: June 19 reminds us that it will be the fifteenth anniversary since the Robinson-Patman Act was passed.

We want to congratulate you on the part you had in fostering such a fine piece of legislation and what it has meant to us in the food field.

Very truly yours,

L. G. ALLEN BROKERAGE CO.,
L. G. ALLEN.

SMITH-WHELAN CO.,

Phoenix, Ariz., June 15, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is indeed with great pleasure that we take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

We believe the Robinson-Patman Act has done more good to stabilize business conditions than any other legislation enacted by the Congress.

Again our sincere congratulations and best wishes for your continued success.

Very sincerely yours,

SMITH-WHELAN CO.,
WILLIAM E. SMITH, Jr.

PEMBERTON BROKERAGE CO.,

Oklahoma City, Okla., June 14, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, as one of the small-business firms in Oklahoma, wish to extend our congratulations to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act which you so ably sponsored.

I began my career in the brokerage business at the very depth of the depression and saw the great discriminatory practices that were then going on in the food industry, and then watched the transition as the enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act corrected all these evils.

Best regards.

Sincerely yours,

PEMBERTON BROKERAGE CO.,
GEORGE B. PEMBERTON.

THE NELSON-SPANGLER CO.,

Columbus, Ohio, June 15, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please accept our sincere congratulations upon the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. We certainly hope that this good law continues in force for many years to come.

Respectfully,

THE NELSON-SPANGLER CO.,
W. H. SPANGLER.

GEORGE R. LYONS CO.,

Cleveland, Ohio, June 15, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PATMAN: It has been called to our attention that June 19 is the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

We, as brokers in the food business, feel each year an increasing gratitude to you for your courage and foresight in sponsoring this bill.

Please accept our sincere congratulations on this, the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE R. LYONS CO.

SUGGS BROKERAGE CO.,

Fort Smith, Ark., June 15, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Since June 19 is the anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, we would like to take the opportunity to not only thank you for the outstanding work you did in creating such a fair, workable act, but for your continuous effort to keep the act as it was originally written.

We in Arkansas are behind you 100 percent. Keep up the good work.

Respectfully,

SUGGS BROKERAGE CO.,

ROBERT S. SUGGS, Jr.

COWAN BROKERAGE CO.,

Erie, Pa., June 15, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

Dear Mr. PATMAN: On the 19th, the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, I wish to congratulate you on your judgment and foresight when this act was introduced and passed.

We think this is one of the greatest protections that small businesses have as against the very large chains who formerly threw their weight around to get unreasonable concessions.

Sincerely yours,

COWAN BROKERAGE CO.,
A. H. COWAN.

YOUNG & ROBERTS, INC.,

Columbia, S. C., June 15, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: The coming anniversary on June 19, of the Robinson-Patman Act, is so important to us that we would like to take this opportunity of thanking you for the efforts you have made in behalf of the small-business man, and which you are continuing today.

With very best regards, we are,

Sincerely,

YOUNG & ROBERTS, INC.,
J. C. ROBERTS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., June 16, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: The writer wishes to take this opportunity to congratulate you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Since you have championed the cause of the American businessman unselfishly, we wish you many years of good service to our country.

Our organization stands behind you 100 percent.

Respectfully yours,

MILTON FORD.

M. & M. BROKERAGE CO.,

Baltimore, Md., June 8, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Time flies. It does not seem that 15 years will soon have passed when President Roosevelt signed the Robinson-Patman Act. I had the pleasure of

listening to some of the debates on the bill, which has been a godsend to the brokerage profession and the independent wholesale grocers.

Would that we had in the two legislative branches in Washington a majority as represented by the scrappy, fighting Texan, WRIGHT PATMAN.

Yours truly,

J. D. McDOWALL.

REILLY ATKINSON & CO., INC.,
Boise, Idaho, June 12, 1951.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: The National Food Brokers Association's letter which has arrived this morning reminds me that we are approaching the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act and inspires me to write congratulating you on the work which you did in securing the passage and signing of this act.

We food brokers, who were in business for a few years prior to the effective date of the Robinson-Patman Act, now have had ample experience under the two different conditions and realize more acutely than the newcomers the tremendous benefits which have inured to the merchandising interests of the United States through the Robinson-Patman Act. The benefits of this law may superficially appear to be flowing to the merchandise broker, but the fact is all those who are engaged in merchandising primarily and secondarily the entire population of the United States are benefited very materially by the stabilization of conditions.

This act is a monument to you and to Senator Robinson. I am very happy that I am able to write you this sincerely from one who wants to be a good American citizen.

Very truly yours,

REILLY ATKINSON.

CHAS. A. RIEGLER & CO.,

Cleveland, Ohio, June 14, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: May we thank you for your splendid contribution in helping to make possible the very important and protective law known as the Robinson-Patman Act.

We are very grateful in knowing that this splendid law will celebrate its fifteenth birthday on June 19, 1951, and congratulate you on its effectiveness during this period.

We know that there are negative forces working for its repeal, and we sincerely hope that you and your colleagues will work with the same vigor and forcefulness to maintain this great protective act, which prompted you to make it possible. Thank you.

Yours very truly,

CHAS. A. RIEGLER & CO.,
CHAS. A. RIEGLER.

BACON & TRUBENBACH, INC.,

New York, June 15, 1951.

The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It affords me great pleasure to congratulate you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

It is my opinion, as well as that of practically all other fair-minded businessmen, both large and small, in various lines of business, that this legislation which you put through is one of the most important ever introduced in Washington to protect businessmen in general from unfair, selfish practices which benefited only a few at the expense of many.

I feel it is a privilege to be able to express to you my appreciation of your farsighted

vision in having put through this valuable and necessary act.

Sincerely,

E. TRUBENBACH.

NEW YORK CITY, June 12, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: As a member of the National Food Brokers Association, I wish to be one of the many who will extend congratulations to you on the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act. It has been a godsend to the grocery trade in general, and you are entitled to many plaudits for the splendid pioneering work which you did in making this act law.

My best wishes to you for a long and happy life.

Sincerely yours,

A. R. RODWAY.

J. THEOBALD, JR., INC.,
Cleveland, Ohio, June 14, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PATMAN: At this time we feel that it is certainly becoming that we congratulate you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act for which you were so largely responsible and for which you have kept up continuous fighting support.

We want you to know that your continued interest is highly appreciated.

Your truly

J. THEOBALD, JR., INC.,
ROBERT B. REED, Vice President.

CHARLES K. STONE Co.,
Detroit, Mich., June 14, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Honorable Sir: We note that the fifteenth anniversary since the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act will occur in the next few days. We would like to take this opportunity of congratulating you upon your sponsorship of this most important law.

Since the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act on June 19, 1936, by President Roosevelt, it has become very apparent that of the many laws governing the operation of business in the United States in recent years, this one stands out particularly as having been most influential in protecting free and fair competition from monopoly and unfair coercion.

There is no question but what, in the few short years of its existence, the Robinson-Patman Act has been influential in helping thousands of business operators in the United States to maintain their existence, which probably would be impossible without the help of this law.

Best wishes for your continued success.

Very truly yours,

CHARLES K. STONE Co.,
JOHN L. WHITE.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Burlingame, Calif., June 14, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR WRIGHT: June 15 will be the 15th anniversary of the Robinson-Patman law. I know that the Federation membership over the entire Nation greatly appreciates the effort you have put forth in their behalf as co-author of this important piece of legislation.

Had Government followed through with the strict enforcement of that law, it would have accomplished as much in promoting and protecting sound business economy within our Nation as any other single piece

of legislation. The importance of same is more pronounced today than ever before.

You already have ample evidence that the Federation has as one of its prime objectives, the work for strict enforcement of the Robinson-Patman law.

We of the federation rejoice with you on this important anniversary.

With kindest regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

C. WILSON HARDER,
President.

ALFRED RICE & SON,
Scranton, Pa., June 15, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have just heard that June 19 marks the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and I want to congratulate you on the wonderful job you have done, and are doing, and hope you will be in Washington for many years to come.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED G. RICE.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, June 14, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Wish to congratulate you on the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, next Tuesday June 19. As you are well aware, this act has been of tremendous help to the people of our country by helping to eliminate unfair competition among manufacturers, distributors, etc. through certain discounts, allowances etc. It has helped business to stay on a fair, equitable basis for all.

In these days of attacks on the act, I have every reason to believe that it will stand up under the stress and remain a bulwark against its enemies, and as a protector against unfair competition.

My best wishes to you and thanks again for the great work you have carried on in behalf of the Robinson-Patman Act through these 15 years.

Yours Respectfully,

ARTHUR M. JONES.

R. L. FITZWATER & SON,
Philadelphia, Pa., June 14, 1951.
The Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We wish to congratulate you on a twofold basis, not only because 15 years ago through your efforts the Robinson-Patman Act came into being, but also because for 15 years, as of June 19, 1951, you have put forth consistent efforts to see that this act remained in effect, helping to keep many tens of thousands of small-business men and independent operators in the economic picture in this country.

We strongly feel that the vigorous attacks now being made on this act, if successful, would be a calamity too far-reaching to be understood.

Sincerely yours,

R. L. FITZWATER & SON,
R. L. FITZWATER, Jr.

SPARTANBURG, S. C., June 12, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I believe the 19th of June will represent the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act and I desire to extend to you my heartiest congratulations on this occasion.

We, who know of the fine work you did in bringing about the passage of this act 15 years ago and also your continued efforts to beat down any amendment that would weaken the act in any way, are ever mindful

of what this act has meant to business, particularly small business.

Undoubtedly, there will be continued efforts to amend this bill so as to favor certain large interests and I am sure I speak for the food brokerage fraternity when I say that I feel we are all 100 percent in favor of keeping this act as it is and will resist, through every means possible, any effort to weaken the act in any way.

I trust this letter will find you in excellent health and thanking you again for all that you have meant to the food industry, I am, Respectfully yours,

JACK L. GENTRY.

STUART FOX CO.,
Dayton, Ohio, June 11, 1951.
Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: June 19, 1951, will mark the fifteenth anniversary of the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act and we now have the opportunity to look back over the last 15 years and see of the many good things that have happened as a result of this law.

Despite continued attacks by minority elements, the act has emerged as major deterrent to those who want discriminatory practices in the food and other industries.

All the small businesses, and we believe many large businesses, will be eternally grateful for your interest in the enactment of this legislation, which has done so much to eliminate the many unfair and vicious practices which were prevalent prior to the time of the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Please accept my sincere thanks for the work you have done through all these years in representing the American people as well as those of your own State in Congress.

Respectfully yours,

STUART FOX CO.,
S. C. FOX.

SCHLESINGER-TARRANT BROKERAGE CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., June 11, 1951.
Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: It is our understanding that shortly the Robinson-Patman Act will have been a law over 15 years.

We do not know of any piece of legislation that has been so much to the benefit of the American public as the act sponsored by you and Senator Robinson.

True Americans are all glad to play the game in a fair and honorable manner with all cards face up, and we feel that your law has certainly laid down the rules and regulations under which the game is played.

Any fair-minded person is glad to compete on a fair basis but does not want to be penalized unfairly or unjustly.

We think that you have rendered a distinct service to America and congratulate you on your stand on such subjects.

Wishing you continued good health and strength and happiness, we remain,

Very truly yours,
SCHLESINGER-TARRANT BROKERAGE CO.,
T. O. TARRANT.

Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL], the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKINNON], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and any others who may desire to do so, may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT AND SMALL BUSINESS

MR. HILL. Mr. Speaker, for over 60 years this Congress has stood firmly for the principle of free competition. In this principle we find the cornerstone of the economic philosophy of the people of this country. Our faith in free competition is far more than merely a preference for a particular type of business procedure. It represents nothing less than faith in a way of life.

America is basically a country of small and independent businessmen. To say that we believe in competition is merely another way of saying that we believe in preserving these independent businessmen as the backbone of the economic structure of this country.

For more than 25 years I have operated a small business in my State of Colorado. I am proud to be a small businessman engaged in the hardware business. I know from first-hand knowledge of the difficulties of small merchants in buying and selling merchandise. It is not easy to maintain a competitive position in any community unless you can purchase your wares on a competitive basis. In order to sell competitively you have to buy competitively. Certainly if your neighboring larger competitor or more distant competing mail-order house enjoys preferential discounts, rebates, and other forms of price discrimination, the smaller hardware merchant has imposed upon him handicaps which he cannot overcome. I know whereof I speak and I am convinced that unless the small merchant and manufacturer has an equal opportunity in the market place that competition in this country will become a thing of the past. One of the easiest ways for a strong competitor to drive the legitimate, independent merchant out of the market is to be able to undersell him. This can only be done on the long haul if that large a competitor is the beneficiary of preferential treatment.

Today, 15 years to the day since the Robinson-Patman Act became law, we have a specially fitting occasion for reviewing the plan of this act in our antitrust legislation and of the role of the distinguished coauthor of the act in formulating the antitrust policy of this country.

The Robinson-Patman Act is one of the essential props to our antitrust policy. When the Sherman Act was enacted in 1890, this Congress gave expression to the conviction that monopoly was a threat to the American system and that only the Federal Government could successfully meet the challenge.

When the Federal Trade Commission and Clayton Acts were enacted in 1914, the Congress again recognized the urgency of the problem and introduced a new principle into American antitrust law, namely, that it is not enough merely to prohibit monopoly, the end product. We must also stop those individual practices which, in the aggregate, make monopoly possible. The concept of unfair

methods of competition was thus introduced into American statutory law.

Among those practices which, as the Supreme Court once said, are opposed to good morals and have an undue tendency to suppress competition, none is more vicious than price discrimination. This is a primary weapon in the arsenal of the would-be monopolist. It disrupts the market, destroys normal trading relations, places a premium on economic power rather than efficiency, and wipes out of existence those independent business firms which are not sufficiently powerful to exert the pressure on the sellers of goods necessary to secure favors.

Although the Clayton Act of 1914 was intended to stop the practice of price discrimination, it failed to do so. The rapid growth of mass distributors able to exert terrific pressure on suppliers gave a new focus to the old problem of price discrimination. In the grocery, hardware, and drug trades, in tobacco, tires, and many other industries the small dealer needed protection against the rebates, discounts, fictitious brokerage payments, advertising allowances, promotional advances, and other preferential treatment granted to their larger competitors. As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] aptly stated to this House in 1936, the measure he proposed would "accomplish what so far the Clayton Act has only weakly attempted, namely, to protect the independent merchant, the public whom he serves, and the manufacturer from whom he buys, from exploitation by his chain competitor."

The Robinson-Patman Act stands today as the first, and by far the strongest, defense of the small distributor against the depredations of his large competitor. Its failures—and like every major piece of legislation, it has not been completely successful—are more the result of weak administration and of the lack of funds appropriated for enforcement.

Nor should we forget the role of the House Small Business Committee. Under the able leadership of our chairman, WRIGHT PATMAN, and my friend, the distinguished former majority leader, CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana, the Small Business Committee of the House has compiled an enviable record of service to small business. The committee has achieved this record through its non-partisan approach to the problems of small business. It has waged a continuous struggle for intelligent and vigorous enforcement of the antitrust laws throughout its history. The committee's record in the Eighty-second Congress in attacking the problems of small business during the present national emergency and in solving those problems are accomplishments which cause me to be proud of my membership on the committee.

The committee's work has not been within the narrow confines of one or two problems of small business, but fortunately, we are able in our work to study and investigate along the broadest front of the business world. This includes the general problem of fair competition in our market place, to which the committee

has given much attention in every Congress since it was established.

It is a pleasure to join with my colleagues today in the celebration of the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

MR. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago today, a keystone was placed in the great structure of our antitrust laws with the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act.

On this occasion, small and independent businessmen throughout the Nation are honoring one of the chief architects of that law, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN. Unfortunately, this fine public servant cannot be with us today. He is temporarily absent from the floor for reasons of health, but I trust that before long his great knowledge and his long experience once again will add distinction to our debates. All of us wish that WRIGHT PATMAN will add many more years of service to the more than two decades he has served as a Member of this body.

The Robinson-Patman Act is only one of WRIGHT PATMAN's accomplishments, but certainly it is one of his greatest. It has become known as the Magna Carta of small business, and its place in the history of antitrust legislation is secure. As with all legislative measures which seek to curb and restrain powerful economic interests, it has been the subject of attacks and misrepresentation. WRIGHT PATMAN has been a tower of strength in fighting off all attempts to weaken or destroy the act. His efforts in this respect during the past 15 years have been fully as important as his original battle to have the act placed on the statute books.

Even today, there are powerful forces at work against the Robinson-Patman Act. Therefore, it is important for all of us to recall the circumstances which brought about the passage of the act by a vote of 290 to 16 in the House and by a voice vote in the Senate.

For many years, the Congress has recognized the necessity of preserving independent business and of preventing the growth of monopoly in our economy. The dangers of excessive concentration of economic power long have been recognized. In other nations, such concentration has prepared the way for widespread suffering and strife, and has been the forerunner of totalitarianism in various forms. There is serious question whether our democratic form of government could long endure should the Nation's small and independent businesses be destroyed.

The importance of action to curb monopoly was recognized by Congress more than 50 years ago with passage of the Sherman Act. This was followed by the Clayton Act and by other pieces of antitrust legislation. In the early 1930's, however, it became apparent that existing law was not adequate to meet the circumstances of the day. Throughout the Nation, large buyers and sellers were using their economic power as a club to create unfair price discrimination.

Independent merchants were being driven out of business by unfair competition, and monopoly was taking over wherever independent business lost ground.

Competition is healthy. But unfair, cutthroat competition has the effect of destroying competition by forcing independents out of business and leaving the field clear for monopoly. Just as the foes of democracy can use democratic freedoms with the goal of destroying them, so monopoly interests can use competition to destroy competition. This is the lesson which WRIGHT PATMAN brought home to the Nation 15 years ago. This is the lesson which resulted in the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act.

The Robinson-Patman Act prohibits unfair discriminations in price. Let us examine the meaning of this phrase.

First, it is important to emphasize that the Robinson-Patman Act does not penalize efficiency. What the act does prohibit is rebates, allowances, unjustified commissions, brokerages, and other price discriminations which cannot be justified through savings in cost. It is obvious that a large customer has a great deal of power over his suppliers. If such a customer takes his business elsewhere, he may destroy the supplier's business. Using this threat as a club, some large customers have been able to force suppliers to sell at a considerably lower price than was afforded smaller customers of the supplier, who were in direct competition with the large firms. The supplier then protected himself against any decrease in profits by hiking the prices he charged his small customers—who were unable to protect themselves—at the same time as he decreased the prices charged his large customers.

It is obvious that genuine competition cannot long exist under such circumstances. Inevitably, the small customer—the independent merchant—is forced to the wall, not because of inefficiency, but simply because he does not have the economic club which is wielded by the chain store or other large interest.

Let me emphasize that such black-jack tactics on the part of big interests do not result in a savings to the consumer. As soon as the independent merchant is driven out of business, the monopoly then is able to charge all that the market will bear, and the consumer suffers.

Many specific examples of this type of unfair discrimination were disclosed by the select committee which WRIGHT PATMAN headed to conduct an investigation of the trade practices of large buying and selling organizations. These disclosures shocked the Nation. On March 4, 1936, more than 2,000 small businessmen from throughout the country gathered in Constitution Hall in Washington to urge the enactment of the Robinson-Patman legislation into law. A delegation was appointed to confer with President Roosevelt, who expressed his sympathy with the objectives of the legislation. President Roosevelt's interest in the measure was evidenced when he signed the Robinson-Patman Act one day after the adoption of the conference report.

One standard for judging legislation is that of determining its supporters and its enemies. Throughout the history of the Robinson-Patman Act, the independent businessmen of the Nation—the druggists, the retail grocers, the independent tire dealers, and many others—have been its strongest supporters. They know that the Robinson-Patman Act has given them a fair opportunity to exist, and thereby has increased the competitive forces in the Nation. They have resisted every effort to weaken or destroy the act. Throughout the history of the act, its opponents have been those forces which represent the concentration of economic power in the Nation. These forces still are attempting to destroy the act. Their efforts are proof that the Robinson-Patman Act still is a vital force in encouraging competition and in preventing the further concentration of economic power.

I have discussed the background of the act briefly because we must not forget the conditions which existed before the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act. We must exercise constant vigilance in preserving our antitrust laws. Momentary forgetfulness or lack of vigilance on the part of Congress might result in a weakening of those laws which would take years to repair.

Before I close, I should like to mention one other activity in which WRIGHT PATMAN has distinguished himself for service to small, independent business. He was a moving spirit in the creation of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives 10 years ago, and he has served as its chairman ever since, with the exception of the 2 years of the Eightieth Congress. I have the honor of being a member of this committee, and I know that it is working in a spirit of unity and non-partisanship to provide small business with a fair opportunity to exist in this difficult period.

So long as WRIGHT PATMAN continues to devote his great abilities to the service of the people in the House, independent business and the consumer will never lack a champion. I know that every Member joins me in honoring him on this occasion.

SMALL BUSINESS AND THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act, a law which is regarded by the small enterprises of the country as a symbol of equality of opportunity in competitive business enterprise.

In the years antecedent to the Robinson-Patman Act small businessmen were suffering under the ruthless price-discrimination practices employed by many of the large concerns in their efforts to establish monopolies in particular localities. Unfair price cutting became the death knell for many of our independent operators. Existing monopolies were becoming stronger and new ones were springing into being. As we all well remember, these were difficult times for the average small businessman. The economy of the country was attempting to pull itself out of the cha-

otic conditions arising from the depression of the thirties, and the spirit of competition was keen in all segments of industry. The small concern had to utilize its utmost resourcefulness in order to keep in operation. This picture became more bleak when advantage was taken of existing conditions to destroy competition by predatory pricing practices, to the detriment of the country as a whole. This capitalization on the weakened status of smaller business units had the effect of forcing them out of business.

When it became apparent that the destructive forces of unfair competition would wipe out our system of competitive enterprise, if not further curbed, the Congress passed the Robinson-Patman Act to insure to small businessmen an opportunity to operate on a basis of equality with their larger competitors. This act was not designed as a means of protecting so-called weak-sister enterprises which fell by the wayside under normal conditions; nor has it had that effect. It was a means of codifying into law the principles of fair play which have made the free-, competitive-enterprise system of these United States the foundation of democracy.

Too often, we think of our great Nation in terms of huge industrial plants and skyscrapers. In reality, our Republic is a great unity of thousands of small communities with their own institutions and small businesses. Main Street of these self-governed little commonwealths has its retail stores, its distributing outlets, service establishments, and sometimes one or more factories. Usually these enterprises are independently owned and operated. Thus the strength and happiness of America depend upon the stability of its community life.

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century and the first decade of this century large units of business began to form in our great industrial and financial centers. This was the beginning of accelerated industrial consolidation and concentration. Power to control the market oftentimes became an obsession. The possibilities of fixing prices, restricting output, curtailing investment, and maximizing profits were increased as the number of sellers decreased.

Although this may be a natural result of the growth of a nation's resources and industries, no one doubts the fact that control of the market confers great power over the "little brothers." The large combination, operating in the whole length and breadth of the market, possesses power to harass and even destroy a small competitor. It used this power to demand secret rebates or preferential treatment. For many years, powerful producers made discriminatory discounts and allowances to big buyers, unrelated to cost savings.

It was when these abuses became evident that our colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN, and the late Senator Joseph Robinson introduced their antiprice-discrimination bill to prohibit predatory practices calculated to destroy smaller competitors.

The Robinson-Patman Act became the newest weapon in the antitrust arsenal. It plugged the loophole which

had allowed the large business to take advantage of the small one through unfair price discriminations. Today, 15 years after its enactment, it stands as assurance that small business will be given a fair opportunity to compete in our free-enterprise system.

The original proponent of this measure, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is still an honored and valued Member of this House. It has been my privilege to serve alongside WRIGHT PATMAN, and my colleague, CHARLES A. HALLECK, for 5 years as a member of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House. In that committee, the interests of small business always have been held paramount, with no partisan considerations. We have worked together in a spirit of unity and cooperation, and I know that our chairman and the members have had the welfare of the Nation's small businessmen at heart. It gives me great pleasure to join in the expressions of appreciation which are being paid to WRIGHT PATMAN on this occasion.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. MCKINNON. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with other Members of the House in commemorating the fifteenth anniversary of the signing of the Robinson-Patman Act. This is a great occasion for independent business throughout the Nation. For a decade and a half, the Robinson-Patman Act has protected small merchants from encroachment by monopoly. It has given the independent merchant a chance to exist under fair competitive conditions, and it has benefited the consumer by preserving true competition.

I was not a Member of the House at the time the Robinson-Patman Act was passed. At that time, I was working hard to build up a newspaper which I had established a few years previously. I experienced the usual headaches and problems of the small-business man, and I gained first-hand knowledge of the forces working in our economy. Therefore, I was especially pleased to be made a member of the Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives at the beginning of the present Congress. As you all know, the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN, is chairman of that committee. As a matter of fact, his name is almost synonymous with the committee, since he has been its chairman throughout its existence, with the exception of 2 years of the Eightieth Congress.

Membership on the Small Business Committee, as well as the House Banking and Currency Committee, has given me an opportunity to work with WRIGHT PATMAN. My association with him has been one of the most valued experiences of my tenure in Congress. I know that he is an untiring worker in behalf of the small and independent businessman. I wish that he were here today to listen to the fine tributes that have been paid him. Certainly the Robinson-Patman Act is one of his greatest accomplishments. It stands today as one of the most important antitrust laws, as it is the law which offers protection to the

small retailer against unfair price discriminations.

During the 15 years since the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act, WRIGHT PATMAN has never slackened his efforts to assist small business and to prevent the growth of monopoly. Under his direction, the House Small Business Committee has conducted investigations into the enforcement of the antitrust laws by the Federal Trade Commission and the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice. The committee has conducted a continuing study of antitrust legislation and has recommended many changes to strengthen the present statutes.

During the present Congress, the committee has been particularly active in studying the impact of the national emergency upon small and independent business. The dislocations accompanying the mobilization program have created serious problems for small businesses throughout the Nation. The committee has gathered a great deal of evidence regarding these problems and has recommended legislation to alleviate them.

WRIGHT PATMAN is well aware that in the field of antitrust legislation there is no time to rest on one's laurels. The foes of antitrust legislation never cease their efforts, and the supporters of these laws must be equally untiring in their efforts to preserve and strengthen them. Therefore, I should like to emphasize today that WRIGHT PATMAN deserves credit not only for his great fight to enact the Robinson-Patman Act 15 years ago but for his work since then to maintain small business as a strong, vital force in the economy. I know that WRIGHT PATMAN will never cease these efforts. His interest in independent business is as fresh today as it was when he began his long service in the House.

I understand that small businessmen throughout the Nation have sent telegrams and letters to WRIGHT PATMAN commemorating this anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act. In my own section of the Nation I know that independent merchants regard the act as a cornerstone of their place in the economy. The act is a check upon the tremendous economic power of large interests, which otherwise could be used to drive thousands of small merchants out of business and leave the way clear for monopoly.

All of us who believe in the principles of free, competitive enterprise, and who believe that our system could not endure if monopoly were given a free hand, owe a real debt of gratitude to WRIGHT PATMAN. I am glad to have the opportunity to express my appreciation of his efforts upon this occasion. I know that in doing so I speak for hundreds of small businessmen in my district and State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it gives me pleasure to pay tribute to the Robinson-Patman Act and to its original sponsor on the fifteenth anniversary of the act. No one among us has been more constant to the cause of small business and free enterprise than has WRIGHT PATMAN. His work for the independent businessman of this country has brought him awards of merit from numerous

small-business organizations. His work in strengthening and protecting the antitrust laws has earned him the respect of friend and foe. It is indeed a pleasure to take note of the fifteenth anniversary of an important piece of legislation, but perhaps it is equally or more fitting to say a word of praise for the man who is responsible more than anyone else for this legislation being on the statute books.

We are all agreed that the individual merchants and the small businessman must be treated right; must be assured a place of usefulness in the national economy; must be given a fair opportunity to succeed and prosper, achieving an adequacy for the future of themselves and their families.

Else we fall into the grip of monopoly, cut ourselves off from the common man, losing the strength and stability of his individual enterprise.

His welfare is paramount to that of the large corporations, necessary and useful though they may be.

Time was before the Robinson-Patman Act, when the small merchant, no matter how efficient he might be, was whipped at the start. He had against him advertising allowances which he did not get except a dribble in a few cases but which his powerful corporate competitor received in bountiful supply.

The independent operator had against him brokerage fees paid to the buyer which he did not get but which his mass-buying competitors got in millions; he had against him "off the invoice quantity discounts" which he got not at all but which his chain competitors got in superabundance.

How could he survive so handicapped at the very start of the competitive race?

There was the Clayton Act. It had been on the statute books for 22 years but had not been effective toward stopping these discriminations against the small merchant and in favor of the large operator.

Then 15 years ago came the Robinson-Patman Act, coauthored by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, and the late Senator Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas, then Senate majority leader.

It spelled out in detail prohibitions against these and other forms of discrimination. It made the Clayton Act applicable to trade practices as they were and are. It gave real protection against discriminations that penalized the small merchant through no fault of his own.

In addition to making the competition race more nearly equal for the independent merchant, it has benefited him in many other ways besides. It has bestowed on him freedom from the hopeless effort to obtain even a modicum of the discounts and allowances bestowed with lavish hand by manufacturers on his large-volume competitors.

With this freedom from the catch-as-can buying tussle, he is enabled to devote his attention to improving his own business methods and operations, so that now the wholesaler and retailer, acting as an effective team, can and do sell commodities as cheap as any other form of business enterprise.

The Robinson-Patman Act has given small business a new lease on life, new assurance of survival, new guaranty of success.

Of course, the Robinson-Patman Act is not perfect either in provision or enforcement. What law is? But you may be assured no large industrial or distributive organization disobeys it lightly. It has operated time after time in the protection of small business.

It should be recognized that a law which has dried up the stream of millions on millions of easy dollars would not go unchallenged. For the past several years this law has been under constant attack.

Those who originally opposed this law and their successors in interest have not forgotten. They want a return of the lush old days of price and other concessions to bigness and will try unceasingly to obtain it. They do not forget.

The Robinson-Patman bill passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 290 to 16. It passed the Senate with only a few dissenting voices.

Now we fear some of its friends are forgetting. Many seem disposed to hearken to subtle voices, saying a little change here and there will do no harm. They forget to look beneath the surface where they will see that frequently the changes proposed are not casual or inconsequential, but may amount in fact to nullification. Therefore it behooves us to rally its friends lest they forget.

I do not know how we can celebrate this the fifteenth anniversary of the Robinson-Patman Act better than by resolving that it and the protection it affords for the small shopkeepers of the Nation shall be maintained and preserved, that no hostile hands be laid upon it and that it shall not be changed except to strengthen it.

Yes, I repeat, it is a pleasure to take recognition of the fifteenth anniversary of this legislation so important to small business and to pay tribute to its author. It is often said that there is no crucial time in the affairs of men that does not bring forth a champion to marshal the righteous cause and overthrow the forces of evil. Certainly in the cause of small business and free competition a champion appeared on the American scene at the psychological moment. No man has been more constant and untiring in championing the cause of small business and upholding the integrity of the anti-trust laws than has our friend and colleague, WRIGHT PATMAN. I sincerely wish for him many, many more anniversaries for himself and for the act which bears his name.

ONE HUNDRED AND FORTY-SIXTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF CONSTANTINO BRUMIDI

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 100, Eighty-second Congress, the Chair appoints as members of the joint committee to prepare plans for an appropriate ceremony in the rotunda of the Capitol on the one hundred and forty-sixth anniversary of the birth of Constantino Brumidi the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. FURCOLO, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ANFUSO, Mr. DONDERO, Mr. MORANO.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 15 minutes.

STEEL FOR LOCKERS IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the other day, on June 15, I called the attention of the country to the fact that the NPA has declined to allow the public schools of this country some 5,000 tons of steel for the purpose of building lockers for the new school buildings being completed for the coming school year starting in September. At this time I wish to give additional information with respect to this situation. The architects of the public schools of the country and the school boards throughout the country, as well as members of the parent-teacher associations have all come to the conclusion that in the design and building of these new school buildings locker service should be provided for the school children.

Those schools which have broad schedules of athletics, such as football and baseball certainly need lockers in connection with their gymnasium and physical education work, because there is no other adequate way that the clothing can be stored or protected from damage or theft. Schools that have visiting teams coming there to play the home teams must have locker service for the visiting teams.

Many of these new buildings have been designed in such a way that the locker recesses are made along the walls of the corridors for the lockers to be installed as a part of the wall of the buildings which are now awaiting completion. Communities find they are unable to obtain the steel lockers, and are now planning to fill up those recesses with plywood, which is just about as critical as steel.

Of course if they fill the recesses with plywood, the recesses are tied in with the ventilating and heating system of the school and that creates a new problem, and then great additional costs; because at some future date that wooden material must be torn out and the steel lockers installed. And in the meantime the schools will be without lockers, and thousands of dollars of additional cost will be added to the cost of buildings.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is that because they say there is a shortage of steel?

Mr. CRAWFORD. It is because the NPA officials have told me specifically and categorically they have denied the use of the 5,000 tons of steel for that purpose.

I have said to these officials that in my opinion there is no way on earth they can go before the members of the Parent-Teachers Association and before the 27,789,000 school children of this country and defend the position which the NPA has taken in refusing to allow 5,000 tons of steel for this purpose. I have said to them that they cannot justify that decision in the name of the contest in Korea or 50 Koreas, for that

matter, because if we have come to the place where we cannot find in this country 5,000 tons of steel to complete the construction of public school buildings then I must assume that we have reached a pretty sorry hour in these United States.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Do they say that there is a shortage of steel, that you cannot get the steel?

Mr. CRAWFORD. They take the position that they will not allow this 5,000 tons of steel to be used for this purpose. You can say that it is a shortage or whatever you want to, but they simply take the position that the NPA will not allow the 5,000 tons of steel for the purpose of building these 750,000 lockers. We have 750,000 new enrollments in our public school system each year. In my district there are new school buildings which will be used for the first time this coming September. These recesses in each of them they are now planning to fill with plywood. During the last war a number of the schools had to build wooden lockers. These lockers have to be kept sanitary; otherwise contagious diseases spread among the student body. Those lockers had to be replaced within 3 years. But right now it resolves itself down to 5,000 tons of steel, and I think the NPA's position is absolutely inexcusable and indefensible.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I take it then the gentleman's position is that we ought to do a little something to take care of these generations which are coming on instead of shipping it all across. Is it the gentleman's argument that unless we take care of this—I would not say cannon-fodder crop, but soldier crop, we will not be able to carry on in these wars for the benefit of other nations?

Mr. CRAWFORD. When the local communities go out and raise money locally for the purpose of building schools instead of coming down here to the Federal Government and asking the Federal Government to build these schools for them, certainly the least we can do is to provide them with authority to procure the steel they need to put into the lockers in those schools. Steel lockers are just as necessary as toilet facilities, and I do not think anyone can make any sound argument against that.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield further so we can find out how they operate?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. In the Fourth Congressional District there is a production plant that makes steel furniture. Ninety percent of their orders are from the Army and the Navy. But along comes the NPA and states that they can have only 70 or 80 percent of their previous production and that although the suppliers are writing this

particular production agency telling them they have the steel on hand—that is the one that bothers me and I can get no explanation. I was just wondering if the gentleman could give me any suggestions as to how I could get relief for this manufacturer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am sorry; I cannot give the gentleman any light on that.

ESSENTIALITY OF STEEL LOCKERS IN MODERN SCHOOL BUILDINGS

In a modern school lockers are used in many different ways, and the type of school and the grade level of the pupils involved determine in large part where the lockers are located in the building, the type of lockers installed, and the ways in which the lockers are used.

The installation of steel lockers in school buildings results in a very material saving in cost to the school districts. The lockers are placed in recesses in corridor walls and thereby save on the cubage cost that would be necessary if cloakrooms had to be built to accommodate all of the pupils enrolled in a school.

In the elementary schools lockers are installed in the corridor adjoining the classrooms, or in each classroom, where they are used by the pupils occupying that particular room for storing outdoor clothing, books, and other personal belongings for safekeeping. Practice varies as to the number of pupils using a locker, but in the large urban school which is not overcrowded the usual practice is to assign one or two pupils to a locker. In many communities the assigning of two pupils to a locker is discouraged, due to the incidence of skin and scalp infections at these ages and the tendency for the spread of these infections by joint use of hangers, and so forth.

IN THE JUNIOR AND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS

In those junior high schools which are not departmentalized the situation in regard to lockers is very similar to that described for the elementary school.

In those schools which are departmentalized, that is, the pupils move from one room to another throughout the day for different classes, the provision of lockers becomes extremely essential. Safe storage space must be provided for personal clothing and for the books and other equipment and supplies which are needed in the various classes. These lockers are usually installed in the corridors in sufficient numbers to accommodate all the pupils enrolled in the school with one or two pupils assigned to each locker. In planning a new school building it is usual to consider locker space as the only provision for such storage of personal belongings and no provisions can be made for storage elsewhere without considerable change in building plans and eventually in the manner in which the building is used.

In the junior and senior high schools which have a gymnasium and a shower room, and carry on a regular program of physical education, another set of pupil lockers is usually provided in the locker room adjoining the shower room. In the majority of the schools of the country physical education is a required subject for all pupils, and most school authorities require that the pupils participating in the physical activities must change

from street clothes into gym clothes. Storage for the street clothes while the pupils are in the gymnasium or on the playing field is provided by the lockers mentioned.

The usual practice is to provide sufficient gym locker space to accommodate the largest class enrolled during any one period of the day. Thus in a school with a six-period day it would be necessary to provide lockers to accommodate approximately one-sixth of the pupils enrolled in the school.

Since these gym lockers are exposed continually to steam and water from the showers and to continual usage by different classes of pupils throughout the day, it is essential that they be of sturdy construction—not subject to warping or easily damaged—and that they be made of a material which is easily cleaned and sterilized. During the last war many schools installed wood lockers because steel was not readily available. In many cases those lockers were completely unusable within 2 or 3 years and had to be replaced with steel.

In many of the large high schools with extensive programs of intramural and intermural athletics, supplementary locker rooms and training rooms are provided for the use of the teams of the "home" school as well as for visitors. It is particularly important that the personal belongings of the students participating in such activities be stored safely for as long as 2 or 3 hours. Steel lockers have proved to be the best answer to this problem.

NUMBER OF LOCKERS BASED ON INCREASE IN ENROLLMENTS

According to estimates of the Office of Education, enrollment in the elementary and secondary schools of the country is increasing at approximately 750,000 per year.

To provide 1 locker for each of these pupils would require a minimum of 750,000 lockers.

The average weight of a locker—full size—12x15x60 is approximately 50 pounds.

Of course, a small locker used by the small children in the lower grades would not necessarily be as large.

The schools generally would require from 5,000 to 15,000 tons of steel per year for the purpose of building lockers alone.

The latest statistics I have been able to get with respect to estimated enrollments show that in 1951 and 1952 there will be 41,800 schools and an enrollment of 31,543,000 pupils.

Mr. Speaker, I am here requesting the Department of Education to solicit the support of Members of Congress in an effort to have this NPA ruling changed so that this steel may be made available for the purpose of building these lockers.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is to be complimented upon the fight he is waging to secure steel for the schools. I wonder if the gentleman knows how many hundreds, perhaps thousands, of tons of steel the ECA is buying and shipping overseas?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not have those figures, but there are many thousands of tons of steel sent to other parts of the world under the ECA and military programs.

The SPEAKER. Under previous special order of the House the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LARCADE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

MAJ. GEN. LEWIS A. PICK AND THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday, my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] addressed the House on the question of the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway now under consideration by the Congress, and in the course of his remarks took occasion to attack the Chief of the Corps of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, one of the finest men I have ever known, referring to lobbying activities of the Corps of Engineers and quoting statements made by General Pick at Cornwall, Canada, on the occasion of a dinner tendered the House Public Works Committee at that place while on an inspection trip in connection with the study of the project now under consideration by that committee.

Mr. Speaker, I have the highest respect and admiration for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT], who I consider a fine and patriotic American, and while I do not impugn his motives and his sincerity, and his right to his opinion, either for or against the proposed St. Lawrence seaway or any other subject, I feel that his remarks and criticism directed against General Pick in connection with his accompanying the Public Works Committee in his capacity as Chief of the Corps of Engineers—which committee it is his duty to advise in all matters connected with rivers and harbors and flood-control projects coming before that committee—on the inspection trip of the St. Lawrence seaway project were eminently improper and the charge of lobbying on the part of General Pick or the Corps of Engineers unfair. In making his remarks, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] includes an article by Mr. Eaton, published in the Ogdensburg (N. Y.) Journal, of date June 5, 1951, captioned "Junketing Congressmen boost seaway in Cornwall speeches."

Mr. Speaker, first let me say that the inspection trip by the Committee of Public Works on the St. Lawrence seaway was not a "junket." On the contrary, it is my opinion that by going over the entire project from one end to the other the committee members were able to obtain a much better perspective and evaluation of the project, and has been most valuable in checking the facts and testimony presented to the committee during the hearings held on the project by the committee from February 20, through April 1951.

As one of the members who participated in the inspection trip I desire to say that the trip was made in the least possible time in order that the Members of Congress would not absent themselves from their duties, and a time was select-

ed for a week end and period when very little, if any, business was transacted on the floor, and no Member, to my knowledge missed a roll call as a result of their temporary absence.

It might be interesting to know that the committee was absent for only 7 days, and during that time traveled approximately 3,500 miles, an average of 500 miles per day, by bus, automobile, boats, and plane, and as a result the trip was tiring and certainly was not a "junket"; the cost of the trip being only about \$3,500.

Mr. Speaker, in the second place, I would like to comment upon the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] and quotes in regard to the speech of General Pick in the article by Mr. Eaton, previously mentioned. I will not engage in a discussion of the merits or the demerits of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway for on yesterday, June 18, 1951, I inserted two articles in the Appendix of the RECORD, one titled "Facts About Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway and Power Project," printed on pages A3635-A3639; the other article being captioned "New bill on Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway providing for 50-year bond issue to cover United States cost under self-liquidating provisions," and printed on pages A3639-A3640, both of which articles together answer all objections and arguments of the opponents.

On the inspection trip discussed here it may be proper to say that I was appointed by Hon. CHARLES A. BUCKLEY, chairman of the Public Works Committee, as chairman of a subcommittee to organize and plan and direct this trip, and that it was at my instance and invitation that Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of the Corps of Engineers, was requested to accompany the committee on the inspection trip. I also requested General Pick to be accompanied by Col. W. E. Potter, Deputy Chief of Engineers for Special Projects, and Ray F. Stellar, Special Projects Branch, Office of Chief of Engineers. Representatives of the Department of the Interior, Commerce, State, and Federal Power Commission were also invited to accompany the committee, all of whom could give the committee expert advice on the various phases of the project under investigation, and all of whom accompanied General Pick on the trip, and all of whom were most helpful in furnishing information and answers to questions by members of the committee.

As stated in the beginning of this statement, it is the duty of the Chief of Engineers to advise and consult with the committee in all matters pertaining to the projects and legislation of the committee, and when projects are authorized it is the duty and the responsibility of the Corps of Engineers to build and construct all rivers and harbors and flood-control projects authorized by this committee for which funds are appropriated.

In his capacity as Chief of the Corps of Engineers, General Pick attends all conferences, meetings, and inspections of projects, and I personally, have attended

conferences, conventions, meetings, and inspections in all parts of the United States which were attended by General Pick; in the North, South, East, and West, and General Pick has invariably been invited to address all meetings which he attended in order that he might give the benefits of his views and experience on the matters or projects being discussed at the meetings.

Under these circumstances, it is not unusual for General Pick to have accompanied our committee on the inspection trip for the St. Lawrence seaway project, nor was it unusual for him to address any or all meetings on the trip to give the committee and the people his views on the St. Lawrence seaway trip.

In view of the reputation, experience, and long and faithful service of General Pick to his country as a member of, and as Chief of the Corps of Engineers, I feel that my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] was off-side when he quoted the statement, in the article by Mr. Eaton, by General Pick, and then questioned the statement of General Pick; and while I deplore the statement very much I cannot but reach the conclusion that the statement was made impetuously and without due consideration, for if Mr. VAN ZANDT would know General Pick as others do, he certainly would not have made such a statement in regard to General Pick.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly feel that the statement is unwarranted and unfair to General Pick as I do not know of anyone who has ever before questioned the integrity of General Pick in any way. As a matter of fact, I think that the reverse is true; I do not know of any man who has so great a reputation as an engineer and American; I do not know of anyone who stands higher in the opinion and esteem of those who know him, and his veracity has never before been questioned in all of the years that I have known him.

Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has a long and honorable and successful record in protecting this country against floods, have made our rivers and streams navigable, have made possible the establishment of great ports, have built great dams and reservoirs to control and store water to prevent devastating floods and for irrigation and to supply our cities with pure water for drinking and other commercial purposes; they keep the lanes of commerce open by maintaining the channels of our rivers and ports, protect our great recreation centers against beach erosion, build harbors and places where boats take refuge, and in disasters are the first on the ground to give relief and protection with their equipment and skill. All of this in peacetime.

In war, the Corps of Engineers are the first to be called upon to build camps, airfields, roads, bridges, ports of embarkation for men and for the transport of materiels. They prepare the landing beaches for landings, and are always necessary in the operations of our Army.

Mr. Speaker, over a long period of years the Corps of Engineers has had distinguished men at the head of its organization as the Chief of Engineers,

and all of them have left their imprint upon the country by their great works.

At this time we are indeed fortunate to have as the Chief of Engineers one of the most distinguished and learned and experienced engineers that the Corps of Engineers has ever had, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

I do not have to tell you of his record and his accomplishments as his activities are too well known to the people of the United States.

I will never forget when I first had the opportunity to know this great and good man, General Pick. It was in May 1927, 24 years ago, the year of the great Mississippi River flood. Parts of my State and district were under 2 feet to 20 feet of water; hundreds of lives were lost, millions of dollars of property was destroyed; homes of the people were swept away by the floods, and pestilence was beginning to be rampant. Food was unavailable until the then Secretary of Commerce, Herbert Hoover, arrived on a special train to the scene of a devastated and helpless country and people. Who was the representative of the Corps of Engineers of the United States accompanying Mr. Hoover to give aid and protection to our countryside and people? It was the then district engineer at New Orleans, Col. Lewis A. Pick.

With Mr. Hoover and Colonel Pick on the scene it was no time before they had the full facilities and funds of the United States Government and the American Red Cross to aid the distress and suffering of the people of Louisiana and the entire Mississippi River Valley.

It was Col. Lewis A. Pick who collaborated with the then United States Chief of Engineers Gen. Jadwin and the famous Jadwin plan for the protection of the lower Mississippi River Valley was born and legislation introduced and passed by the Congress, which plan has been followed by succeeding Chiefs of the Corps of Engineers, and is even today being prosecuted, and with a few more years appropriations from Congress the plan and program will be completed and forever give protection and security to the people of the lower Mississippi River Valley.

After the Jadwin-Pick plan got under way on the Mississippi, General Pick was transferred to the Missouri River Basin, and there again who worked out a comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin? You know. Everyone in the Missouri River Valley knows Gen. Lewis A. Pick. There were great reclamation projects under way in the Missouri River Valley at that time, and it was necessary for General Pick to cooperate with the then representative of the Reclamation Bureau, Mr. Sloane. Then was born the Pick-Sloane plan for the protection of the Missouri River Valley. Like the lower Mississippi River plan, the Pick-Sloane plan for the Missouri River Basin is now being completed.

During World War II General Pick was assigned the most difficult tasks that any engineer had ever undertaken, and all his missions were completed.

Ever heard of the Lido Road? And who built it? Gen. Lewis A. Pick, then a brigadier general in World War II, was

given the task of building this road through what was known as impenetrable jungles—through a country where the white man had never before set foot.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the story of the building of the Lido Road in the India-Burma-China theater. Every GI could tell it.

It was said that General Pick was assigned the task of building the Lido Road by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and he was sent a complement of the best engineers in the Corps and engineers of fame from civil life to assist him in planning and building this great strategic undertaking.

When these engineers arrived on the scene General Pick immediately called a meeting of the group to discuss the problem. Maps were checked and the assistants given a chance to inspect as much of the country as possible and make a study and report back to General Pick. A meeting was held by General Pick and the engineers all given an opportunity to express their opinions. Every one of the engineers present stated that it was an impossible task. After all of them had spoken and advised against the undertaking General Pick rose and said "Gentlemen, all right, we will begin building the Lido Road tomorrow morning, and we will build it." And in spite of all the almost seemingly insurmountable obstacles and the opinions and advice of famous engineers, General Pick completed the Lido Road on schedule.

I could go on and on and tell you of the exploits and leadership of General Pick as an engineer and the great works that were built under his supervision. The great dams in the West and Northwest, the works on the Columbia River and others—all will bear the imprint of a great engineer and a great patriotic American.

Last year when the Midwest was in the throes of a blizzard, one of the worst in the history of this country, the President sent General Pick to take personal charge of the operations to save the lives of the people and save thousands of head of livestock from destruction. This he did without much acclaim.

Looking back on the disasters in our country, our people in Louisiana and the entire Mississippi River Valley were reassured and glad to have General Pick in charge of the fight in the greatest of all floods in the Mississippi River Valley, the flood of 1927, when General Pick was a colonel in charge of the New Orleans, La., district engineer's office where he made a brilliant fight with the odds against him.

It has been my pleasure within the last few months to listen to several magnificent speeches given by General Pick before a number of waterway organizations, and if we will follow his advice and recommendations, there is no question in my mind that the country will be more securely protected from floods; that our resources will be conserved, and that most of our water and waterway problems will be solved.

Mr. Speaker, Gen. Lewis A. Pick needs no defense from me to testify to his ability, character, honor, and devotion to his position as a great engineer, his devotion to his country, and the respect

and esteem in which he is held by the American people in all parts of the country, for long ago it has been said "By their works, ye shall know them" and the great works of General Pick as an Army engineer, a soldier, a Christian gentleman, a good and kind man, his dependability will stand, now and long after he has passed this earth, and his great works will stand as monuments to his brilliant career.

I have said before and I repeat, that I hope that General Pick will have the opportunity to build the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project as the crowning glory of a great engineer and a great American.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. TEAGUE and Mr. EVINS (at the request of Mr. PRIEST), for Tuesday, June 19, 1951, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a telegram received from Governor Dever, of Massachusetts.

Mr. RILEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in the Augusta Chronicle.

Mr. BARTLETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. PASSMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an address delivered by Miss Margaret Hunter of Gilbert, La.

Mr. YORTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. POLK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a copy of a bill he introduced yesterday.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORANO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial appearing in Life.

Mr. ANGELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. DONDERO and Mr. AYRES asked and were given permission to extend their remarks.

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUSBEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend the remarks he made in Committee and include extraneous matter.

Mr. RIBICOFF (at the request of Mr. KLEIN) was given permission to extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ADDONIZIO (at the request of Mr. RODINO) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. VAN ZANDT (at the request of Mr. CRAWFORD) was given permission to extend his remarks in two instances and include editorials.

Mr. CLEVENGER (at the request of Mr. CRAWFORD) was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. STEFAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in three instances and include editorials.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. GOSSETT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include an editorial.

Mr. OSTERTAG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks and include a newspaper article.

Mr. BUDGE (at the request of Mr. SAYLOR) was given permission to extend his remarks.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

538. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Annual Report of the Exchange Stabilization Fund created by section 10 (b) of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, pursuant to section 10 (a) of the act, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 262. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 4473, to provide revenue, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 629). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 51. An act for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen; without amendment (Rept. No. 587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 124. An act for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy; without

amendment (Rept. No. 588). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 275. An act for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik; without amendment (Rept. No. 589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 470. An act for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska; with amendment (Rept. No. 590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 631. An act for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Mauerer; without amendment (Rept. No. 591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 879. An act for the relief of Luigi Podesta; without amendment (Rept. No. 592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1229. An act for the relief of Jan Josef Wielkowski and his wife and daughter; with amendment (Rept. No. 593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEATING: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 699. An act for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 579. A bill for the relief of Hendryk Kempski; with amendment (Rept. No. 595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 580. A bill for the relief of Kwangnyeng Chu; with amendment (Rept. No. 596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 581. A bill for the relief of Isabel Tabit; with amendment (Rept. No. 597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 627. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde; with amendment (Rept. No. 598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 677. A bill for the relief of Ramute Alexandra Vallokaitis; with amendment (Rept. No. 599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 870. A bill for the relief of Anton Bernhard Bilkstad; with amendment (Rept. No. 600). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 970. A bill to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant; with amendment (Rept. No. 601). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1136. A bill for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta); with amendment (Rept. No. 602). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer; with amendment (Rept. No. 603). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2158. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Crocefissa and Sister M. Reginalda; with amendment (Rept. No. 604). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2160. A bill for the relief of Sister M. Leonida; with amendment (Rept. No. 605). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2292. A bill for the relief of Jai Young Lee; with amendment (Rept. No. 606). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2787. A bill for the relief of Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards); without amendment (Rept. No. 607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3214. A bill for the relief of Irene Senutovitch; with amendment (Rept. No. 608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOSSETT: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3819. A bill for the relief of Ann Elisabeth (Diana Elizabeth) Reingruber; without amendment (Rept. No. 609). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3823. A bill for the relief of Shozo Ichiwawa; without amendment (Rept. No. 610). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4038. A bill for the relief of Dr. George Alexandros Chromakis; without amendment (Rept. No. 611). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. House Concurrent Resolution 111. Concurrent resolution favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 612). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 623. A bill for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer; without amendment (Rept. No. 613). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 828. A bill for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins; with amendment (Rept. No. 614). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1485. A bill for the relief of R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee; with amendment (Rept. No. 615). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1688. A bill for the relief of James J. Lieberman; without amendment (Rept. No. 616). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1961. A bill for the relief of Guy Christian; without amendment (Rept. No. 617). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JONAS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2275. A bill for the relief of J. Alfred Pulliam; with amendment (Rept. No. 618). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2459. A bill for the relief of Ollie O. Evans, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 619). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Thomas G. Digges; without amendment (Rept. No. 620). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3730. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 621). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2858. A bill for the relief of William C. Reed; without amendment (Rept. No. 622). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GOODWIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3430. A bill for the relief of

the estate of Nora B. Kennedy; with amendment (Rept. No. 623). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3891. A bill for the relief of Paul D. Banning, Chief Disbursing Officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 624). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3966. A bill for the relief of George S. Paschke; without amendment (Rept. No. 625). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4226. A bill for the relief of Walter M. Smith; with amendment (Rept. No. 626). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3246. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills; with amendment (Rept. No. 627). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BYRNE of New York: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4269. A bill for the relief of John S. Downing; without amendment (Rept. No. 628). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. R. 4509. A bill to increase the membership of the District of Columbia Recreation Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4510. A bill providing that gain realized on the sale of a personal residence, if used by the taxpayer for another property as his personal residence, shall, under certain circumstances, be exempt from income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 4511. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Territory of Hawaii certain real property at Kahului, Maui, T. H.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4512. A bill to stop illegal traffic in narcotics, injurious drugs and marijuana cigarettes by imposing further penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution to continue in effect certain provisions of the Defense Production Act of 1950 through July 31, 1951; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MOULDER:

H. J. Res. 272. Joint resolution designating the song entitled "Behold Thy Mother," as the National Mothers' Day song; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. Con. Res. 124. Concurrent resolution providing for the adjournment of the House from June 29, 1951, until July 9, 1951, to enable its Members to seek the views of the people concerning the operation of the Defense Production Act of 1950; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts for Congress to enact certain legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States, relative to enacting certain legislation granting aid to the Israeli Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. HOWELL introduced a bill (H. R. 4513) for the relief of Giovanni Giuseppe Pilato, Leonardo Trani, Michele Sasso, Gioacchino Gaudioso, Francesco Castagna, and Pasquale Di Meglio, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

323. Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin presented a resolution by the Women's Club of Kenosha, Wis., going on record to reaffirm faith in the American, voluntary way to safeguard the Nation's health and insure against the costs of illness and unequivocally oppose any form of national compulsory health insurance as a dangerous step toward complete acceptance of a planned, socialistic economy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 20, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

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

Rev. James W. Elder, minister, Cumberland Presbyterian Church, Lawrenceburg, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, who art above all, yet in all, who knowest our need of Thee and our desire for Thee, give unto us of Thy grace and strength to meet the challenge and the responsibility of this day. Fill our hearts with gratitude for the gift of life with all of its golden opportunities and responsibilities.

Be pleased to bestow upon these Thy servants Thy choicest blessings. Give unto all the mind of Christ, and make us ever to know that the way of righteousness and godliness and truth is the only way of life to genuine and abiding success and accomplishment.

Help us ever to remember what the Lord requires of us: To do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 19, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

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

On June 19, 1951:

S. 1. An act to provide for the common defense and security of the United States and

to permit the more effective utilization of manpower resources of the United States by authorizing universal military training and service and for other purposes;

S. 178. An act for the relief of Zdenek Marek;

S. 223. An act for the relief of Azy Ajderian;

S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelentova; and

S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife Naima.

On June 20, 1951:

S. 648. An act for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kesk.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1025) to expand the authority of the Coast Guard to establish, maintain, and operate aids to navigation to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 4496) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF JOINT MEETING OF THE TWO HOUSES TOMORROW

Mr. MCFARLAND. Mr. President, I desire to announce that the House of Representatives has invited the Senate to attend a joint meeting of the two Houses tomorrow to hear the President of Ecuador. The Senate will recess shortly after it convenes and will proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives about 12:20 o'clock.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a perfecting amendment to the bill H. R. 3880, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be received and lie on the table. This is not the time to offer the amendment, if the Senator wants to offer it.

Mr. LEHMAN. I ask unanimous consent that I may present the amendment out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York will have ample opportunity to offer the amendment when the Senate comes to consider amendments to the appropriation bill. The Senate

is now engaged in transacting routine business.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. LANGER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REDUCTION OF LEAVE OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—RESOLUTION OF COLUMBIA TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION, NO. 101, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, Washington, D. C., protesting against the enactment of legislation to reduce the leave privileges of Federal employees.

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

COLUMBIA TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION, NO. 101, Washington, D. C., June 18, 1951.

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

As officers of Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, we respectfully submit for your consideration the following resolution (adopted June 17, 1951):

"RESOLUTION"

"Whereas we, the members of Columbia Typographical Union, No. 101, in regular meeting assembled on this the 17th day of June 1951, have reason to believe that legislation is intended to be proposed the purpose of which is to reduce the leave privileges of more than a million Federal employees; and

"Whereas we have reason to believe that the legislation intended to be proposed will be submitted as an amendment to the independent offices appropriation bill, presently under consideration in the Senate of the United States; and

"Whereas the enactment of substantive legislation by means of an amendment to an appropriation bill, with no prior hearing upon its merits, is at best a circumvention of orderly, established procedure and at worst, as here, where the legislation intended to be proposed is regressive, a form of legislative chicanery repugnant to all principles of fairness and justice; and

"Whereas there have been submitted for consideration in both the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States bills to amend the Federal leave laws: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That we respectfully petition the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States to enact no amendment to the laws governing the leave privileges of Federal employees without having previously