

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. Res. 600. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Secretary of Agriculture shall prepare new plans and specifications for the establishment of research facilities for the study of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

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

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to their Senate Resolution No. 58, relating to retirement pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOODWIN: Memorial of Massachusetts Legislature relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON: Memorial of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, memorializing Congress relative to the investigation of the Katyn Forest massacre, so-called; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 7435. A bill for the relief of Gabriele Pontillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7436. A bill for the relief of Albino Bergamasco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

H. R. 7437. A bill for the relief of Mr. Jio Botta Podesta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7438. A bill for the relief of Domenico Manzella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 7439. A bill for the relief of Antoni Rajkowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMULLEN:

H. R. 7440. A bill for the relief of Henry Hauri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7441. A bill for the relief of Keiko Shikata; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7442. A bill for the relief of Apostolos Savvas Vassiliadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

668. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Association of the Oldest Inhabitants of the District of Columbia, Washington, D. C., relative to having the Senate restore the amount of \$12,000,000 to the pending District of Columbia appropriation bill, as provided in the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1952

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 2, 1952)

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:

O Lord our God, whose sheltering wings protect Thy children, whose service is perfect freedom; we remember with gratitude the cloud of witnesses about us, the glorious company who in other times that tried men's souls have served the Nation faithfully and well. They have bequeathed to us the heritage of freedom. As in these decisive days we carry the torch of enlightenment or wear the cloak of privilege or stand in places of honor, may our purposes be ribbed with steel to dedicate our enlightenment, our privilege, and our honors to the welfare of all mankind.

Forgive us the broken vow, the unkept promise, the unfulfilled purpose. And, when the shadows fall and evening comes, may we greet the unseen with a cheer, knowing that we have kept the faith. In the Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McCLELLAN, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 7, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination 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 joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL ARRANGEMENTS OF THE PRESIDENT-ELECT OF THE UNITED STATES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Pursuant to the provisions of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 69) authorizing the appointment of a joint committee to arrange for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on January 20, 1953, the Chair appoints the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] members of the joint committee on the part of the Senate.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. THYE was excused from attendance upon the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and Thursday, in order to attend a tax hearing to be conducted by the Small Business Committee at Birmingham, Ala.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SPARKMAN was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

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

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

RESOLUTIONS AND LIST OF OFFICERS OF WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a series of vital resolutions adopted at the annual meeting of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association and sent to me by B. R. Dugdale, association secretary. The resolutions were adopted on March 26, 1952, at the session at Fort Atkinson.

They bear the views of Badger State dairying on such important issues as: (a) the need for continued emphasis on American dairying; (b) the importance of accelerated research into crop and livestock diseases; (c) the significance of an adequate farm manpower deferment program; and (d) the importance of serving butter in school-lunch programs.

I wholeheartedly endorse the sentiments expressed in these resolutions and have personally spoken on all these topics on the Senate floor.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions, together with a list of the able officers and directors of the Wisconsin Dairymen's Association, be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the resolutions and list of officers will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The resolutions were referred as follows:

To the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"1952 ANNUAL MEETING, WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

"RESOLUTION ON IMPORTANCE OF DAIRYING

"Next to the air we breathe and the water we drink comes food as man's greatest life essential. It must be remembered that leading the food parade are milk and dairy products as first in the life needs of civilized man. Recently there has been a tendency to change from dairying to other types of farming, due to a price differential unfavorable to dairying. However, in the long run, no phase of agriculture offers a more reliable economic standard as does dairying. No

kind of production is more conducive to the much-needed concept of soil-erosion prevention and soil-fertility building as does dairy farm operations.

"The physical structure of the dairy cow is conducive to the most efficient utilization of good forage, hay, pasture, and grassland products in general. Wisconsin is favored by climatic conditions that make our State a national hay and grassland center. This favorable situation gives us a natural advantage that, if further developed, gives us an ideal production advantage.

"Therefore, we believe it is paramount now to reaffirm our faith in the dependability and future of dairy farming. We are convinced that in the long run the stability of rural life and endeavor in Wisconsin lies in the building and improving of our great dairy enterprises."

"RESOLUTION ON DISEASE CONTROL"

"Diseases of dairy cattle continue to cause serious losses to dairy farmers. We urge our College of Agriculture, through its experiment station work, to take full advantage of the funds available under the Hope-Flanagan Act, to conduct intensive research on dairy cattle disease, particularly mastitis, brucellosis, vibriosis, and other new diseases that are being found to infect dairy cattle. Hoof-and-mouth disease is a constant threat to the livestock industry of the Nation. Millions of dollars have been spent to stop it, but to no avail. We have had a law passed by Congress, in 1948, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to build a research laboratory to study ways of developing a vaccine to control the dreaded disease. However, no appropriation was made to build such a laboratory. We urge immediate action by the Appropriations Committee of Congress to provide funds for laboratory and research on this dreaded disease, and that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen. We also urge that embargoes be continued on all Mexican and Canadian livestock and livestock products until such time as all danger of transmitting the disease has ceased."

"RESOLUTION ON SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM"

"We continue to support the properly administered hot-lunch programs for school children, but we deplore the serving of butter substitutes in school lunches and ask that only butter be provided."

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION ON MANPOWER AND THE DAIRY INDUSTRY"

"No phase of agriculture employs labor more completely and consistently throughout the year than the dairy industry. Our dairy industry has suffered greatly from loss of manpower recruited by industry and also by the military services. With 4,000,000 less cows in the United States at the present time and with a reduction of more than 200,000 dairy cows in Wisconsin alone, a serious curtailment in milk production has taken place.

"We believe that mobilization of manpower in America should mean utilization of manpower for the greatest total national well-being. It is our feeling that this should mean no unquestioned priority on manpower favoring any group and that careful consideration should be given to the total problem of manpower mobilization so that neither industry, agriculture, nor the military will suffer, on one hand, or enjoy priority, on the other.

"We recommend that a system of per man production of farm products be established on the basis of actual farm products produced. We feel that such a system should be applied as soon as possible. Its application should result in greater uniformity of policy in the various selective-service boards.

It would also help to emphasize the importance of milk production to the whole program of national well-being."

The list of officers of the Wisconsin Dairy-men's Association is as follows:

WISCONSIN DAIRYMEN'S ASSOCIATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Officers

President: P. N. Steffanus, Delavan. Vice president: John D. Wuethrich, Greenwood. Secretary and treasurer: B. R. Dugdale, Madison.

Directors

District I: Russell Fox, Waterloo. District II: Clarence Sheridan, Fond du Lac. District III: William Curtis, Mauston. District IV: John D. Wuethrich, Greenwood. District V: R. I. Dimick, Almena.

At large

V. E. Nylin, Platteville; J. F. Magnus, Appleton.

Directors representing State dairy breed associations

Ayrshire: Lawrence Blank, Ripon. Brown Swiss: Willard Evans, Waukesha. Guernsey: Otto Kline, Waukesha. Jersey: P. N. Steffanus, Delavan. Holstein: Frank Case, Oconomowoc. Milking shorthorn: Robert Traynor, Milton Junction.

COMPULSORY HEALTH INSURANCE—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference eight resolutions adopted by the Pitt County (N. C.) Medical Auxiliary and other prominent organizations in North Carolina, protesting against the enactment of legislation to provide compulsory health insurance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be received and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—RESOLUTION OF COUNCIL OF SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, under date of March 28, 1952, the Council of the City of Seattle adopted a resolution in support of Senate bill 940, to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, which was passed last week by the Senate. A copy of the resolution of the City Council of Seattle reached me on April 7. Because the proposed so-called tidelands legislation is presently in conference between both Houses of the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution adopted by the Seattle City Council be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 16006

A resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation confirming and establishing the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources

Whereas there is pending in the Eighty-second Congress of the United States S. 940

entitled "A bill to confirm and establish the title of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and natural resources within such lands and waters and to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources" and H. R. 4484 entitled "A bill to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to provide for the use, control, exploration, development, and conservation of certain resources of the Continental Shelf lying outside of State boundaries," and under the provisions of each of said bills, the United States would recognize, confirm, establish, and vest in the respective States, including the State of Washington, their grantees and successors in interest, title, ownership, and control of all lands beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of such States and in and to all natural resources within such lands and waters; and to approve and confirm the boundaries of the several coastal States as extending, at least, three geographical miles seaward of the coast line and outside inland waters, and the boundaries of the several States on the Great Lakes to extend to the international boundaries of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Seattle:

That the city of Seattle by and through its city council, concurred in by its mayor, does hereby petition the Congress of the United States to act favorably upon and adopt S. 940 or H. R. 4484 pending in the Eighty-second Congress or similar legislation, designed to accomplish the objects and purposes aforesaid; and

That the Congress of the United States is urged to reject and defeat any legislation which by its provisions will authorize any Federal department or agency to grant leases on or exercise any proprietary right in or to the aforesaid lands lying beneath navigable waters within the boundaries of the States or in and to the natural resources within such lands and waters; and

That the city clerk forward a certified copy of this resolution to the respective clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. 1835. A bill granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1405).

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

S. 1324. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nicola M. Melucci (Rept. No. 1406);

S. 1776. A bill for the relief of Sister Stanislaus (Rept. No. 1407);

S. 2561. A bill for the relief of Susan Patricia Manchester (Rept. No. 1408);

S. 2696. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to consider and render judgment on the claim of The Cuban-American Sugar Co. against the United States (Rept. No. 1409);

S. 2805. A bill for the relief of Susan Jeanne Kerr (Rept. No. 1410);

H. R. 755. A bill for the relief of Dr. Eleftheria Paddoussi (Rept. No. 1411);

H. R. 836. A bill for the relief of Harumi China Cairns (Rept. No. 1412);

H. R. 1968. A bill for the relief of Senta Ziegler (Rept. No. 1413);

H. R. 1969. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Abrahamovic (Rept. No. 1414);

H. R. 2355. A bill for the relief of Nobuko Hiramoto (Rept. No. 1415);

H. R. 2676. A bill for the relief of Andriana Bradicic (Rept. No. 1416);

H. R. 3136. A bill for the relief of May Quan Wong (also known as Quan Shee Wong) (Rept. No. 1417);

H. R. 3271. A bill for the relief of Toshiaki Shimada (Rept. No. 1418);

H. R. 3524. A bill for the relief of Jan Yee Young (Rept. No. 1419);

H. R. 3598. A bill for the relief of Lydia Daisy Jessie Greene (Rept. No. 1420);

H. R. 4220. A bill for the relief of Hazel Sau Fong Hee (Rept. No. 1421);

H. R. 4397. A bill for the relief of Minglean Hammerlind (Rept. No. 1422);

H. R. 4535. A bill for the relief of Nigel C. S. Salter-Mathieson (Rept. No. 1423);

H. R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Harris (Rept. No. 1424);

H. R. 4788. A bill for the relief of Yoko Takeuchi (Rept. No. 1425);

H. R. 4911. A bill for the relief of Lieselotte Maria Kuebler (Rept. No. 1426);

H. R. 5187. A bill for the relief of Rodney Drew Lawrence (Rept. No. 1427);

H. R. 5437. A bill for the relief of Motoko Sakurada (Rept. No. 1428);

H. R. 5590. A bill for the relief of Marc Stefan Alexenko (Rept. No. 1429);

H. R. 5922. A bill for the relief of Karin Riccardi (Rept. No. 1430);

H. R. 5931. A bill for the relief of Holly Prindle Goodman (Rept. No. 1431);

H. R. 5936. A bill for the relief of Kunio Itoh (Rept. No. 1432);

H. R. 6012. A bill for the relief of Gylda Raydel Wagner (Rept. No. 1433);

H. R. 6055. A bill for the relief of Anne de Baillet-Latour (Rept. No. 1434);

H. R. 6088. A bill for the relief of Hisako Suzuki (Rept. No. 1435);

H. R. 6172. A bill for the relief of Manami Tago (Rept. No. 1436);

H. R. 6480. A bill for the relief of Elaine Irving Hedley (Rept. No. 1437); and

H. R. 6561. A bill for the relief of Monika Waltraud Fecht (Rept. No. 1438).

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

S. 997. A bill for the relief of Paula Slucka (Slucki) and Ariel Slucki (Rept. No. 1439);

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of Cesar J. (Raam) Syquia (Rept. No. 1440);

S. 1537. A bill to amend the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the extension of the term of certain patents of persons who served in the military or naval forces of the United States during World War II" (Rept. No. 1441);

S. 1606. A bill for the relief of Sachio Kanashiro (Rept. No. 1442);

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Toshiko Minowa (Rept. No. 1443);

S. 2498. A bill for the relief of Brenda Marie Gray (Akemi) (Rept. No. 1444);

S. 2546. A bill to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States (Rept. No. 1445);

S. 2706. A bill for the relief of Sister Julie Schuler (Rept. No. 1446); and

H. R. 5185. A bill for the relief of Epifania Giaccone (Rept. No. 1447).

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

S. 1360. A bill for the relief of John J. Snoke (Rept. No. 1448);

S. 2256. A bill for the relief of certain persons who, while serving as members of the Army Nurse Corps, were commissioned as officers in the Army of the United States but were not paid the full amounts of pay and allowances payable to officers of their grade and length of service (Rept. No. 1449); and

S. 2334. A bill for the relief of Miguel Narciso Ossario (Rept. No. 1450).

TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF CERTAIN EMERGENCY POWERS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably an original joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952, and I submit a report (No. 1451) thereon.

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

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 148) to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952, reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, an original concurrent resolution, favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 1452) thereon.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 72) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

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

A-5500365, Arlia, Giuseppe or Joe Ross or Jim Ross or Vincenzo Rosso.

A-3523625, Au, Tai Yuen or Au Fook.

A-6979681, Ball, William Walter.

A-5712357, Barendsz, Fytse or Sidney.

A-7197065, Baron, Judith.

A-4464789, Bedyneck, Joseph, or Richard Jensen.

A-7991493, Bernard, Monica Mary Brooks (nee Monica Mary Brooks).

A-1547901, Bernardo, Ralph Ciddio or Raffaele Ciddio Bernardo or Ciddio Raffaele Salvatore Bernardo.

A-4951559, Bettaglio, Antonio.

A-7293023, Bhacca, Nari Sarosh or Norman Sarosh Bhacca.

A-2935597, Brunetti, Margherita.

A-7350065, Bryant, Marie Margaret or Margaret Marie Bryant or Margaret M. Glass or Marie Margaret Glass or Marie Margaret Smith or Marie Margaret McDonald.

A-7687528, Buchanan, Mollie Macfie.

A-5460611, Capela, Manuel Esteves.

A-1979014, Carriere, John Cyprien or Jack Carriere or Jack Currie.

A-4872936, Cazes, Albert Ascher.

A-3486718, Cereceró, Maxima vda. De Duran or Maxima Cereceró Vda. De Reina.

A-7241654, Chan, Annie Maria Siu (nee Annie Maria Siu).

A-1669099, Chang, Tun Yin.

A-7476974, Chang, Wang Kuo or James Kuo-Chang Wang.

A-7457090, Wang, Tsai-Lu Wang or Janie Tsai-Lu Chang.

A-9655778, Cheng, Tim Chee or Tim Chen Cheng or Ting Chin Cheng.

A-5371509, Chivers, Oswald.

A-5891452, Chun, Gordon.

A-4816198, Clarke, Archibald.

A-1223634, Cominsky, Jacob.

A-4121674, Cominsky, Rose.

A-1269971, Sharkey, Betty or Sharky or Sharkansky (nee Claff) also known as Betty Clark or Cummings.

A-2025705, Coris, Costas or Gust Coris or Constantinos Kalouris.

A-1890635, Cosenza, Maria (nee La Verde).

A-6039091, Cruz-Valencia Ramon.

A-3483694, Czarov, Alexander Ivanovich.

A-2445361, Daniele, Peter or Peter Daniel or Vito Pietro Daniels.

A-5709219, De Duran, Dolores Gutierrez.

A-4825320, De Garcia Florentina Gonzalez.

A-7948714, De Vela, Consuela Salas.

A-4569398, Diaccumakos, Demetrius Thomas or James Thomas Dimaxos.

A-6840142, Dimmick, Mary Jane or Mary Jane Murphy or Patricia Schooley.

A-6808021, Murphy, Terence Noel.

A-3852013, Dong, Tung or Wing Tong.

A-4588886, Dugack, Teodoska (nee Fedorka).

A-7427979, Ehrenberg, Arthur formerly Arnold Otto Paul Czabzeck.

A-4666503, Eng, Eleuteria Suarez-de.

A-3893284, Essa, Louis or Louis Essa Douyh.

A-5257777, Fernandez, Luis Antonio or Luis Antonio Fernandes.

A-2128182, Fidalgo, Manuel Gonsalves.

A-3298393, Flannery, Michael Joseph.

A-3564513, Florinchi, Todor or Theodore Florinchi.

A-5012501, Florinchi, Savetta (nee Savetta Varge) formerly Savetta Fontu or Stella Fantu or Elizabeth Florinchi.

A-6774195, Florinchi, Valeria.

A-4720344, Ganczarski, Mary (nee Juwa).

A-6016094, Garcia-Gomez, Pedro Manuel or Peter M. Garcia.

A-7890141, Gardner, Gordon Terence.

A-6744391, Garza-Moreno, Nicholas.

A-6861972, Gaudillat, Josiane Francoise.

A-4674943, Goldberg, Nathan Bernard.

A-5718309, Gomez, Ana or Ana Gomez Ontiveros.

A-6057420, Guerrero-Uballe, Juan.

A-7140234, Han, Yu Shan.

A-5388354, Heeren, Arthur.

A-1297509, Hing, Chow Ling or Chow Shee or Wong Chow Ling Hing or Mrs. Junng Tai Wong.

A-3210708, Hosaki, Totaro.

A-7140421, How, Louie or How Louie.

A-6694208, Hsu, Yao Tung Wu.

A-6509198, Hurtado, Felipe Dominguez or Felipe Dominguez.

A-4692608, Iacovides, Theodosios.

A-5082127, Isbell, Gertrude Hedwig Marthia (nee Breuer) or Gertrude Hedwig Marthia Adams.

A-6435652, Jio-Gonzalez, Ruben or Ruben Gio or Ruben Puio or Ruben Guion.

A-4187777, John, Hugo Paul.

A-5906641, John, Marcel Jean.

A-5907429, Johnson, Norma Laurine (nee Norma Laurine Shannon) formerly Norma Woodfinden or Norma Arthur.

A-4649510, Kajiwaru, Utako.

A-6309614, Kalisher, David.

A-7205704, Karjanis, Lee (nee Sio Lien San).

A-7991497, Kasaper, Kiyork Nabet.

A-3880753, Kerim, Demir or Damir Kerim or Dayan Dalep or Beyram Dalip.

A-7240409, Kidd, Ulrike Amalie Hofer.

A-5055926, Klein, Johann.

A-1283526, Kokkolis, Panagiotis or Pete Kokkolis.

A-4978555, Krenn, Tony.

A-5974267, Kuty, Mossa.

A-7594525, Kwok, Sih-Ung or Edwin Sih-Ung Kwon.

A-6905015, Landa, Samuel.

A-8021645, Larkin, Joyce Muriel.

A-7469583, Laudadio, Rocco.

A-7835225, Lawther, Werner Krethe formerly Werner Krethe.

A-6474031, Le Boriots, Valma May.

A-4050394, Ledakis, Helen E. or Helen Leandris (nee Tbiganos Helen Gus Leandris).

A-3612342, Lee, Kok Sing.

A-7193918, Lemacks, Gisele Gabrielle formerly Lhirondele.

- A-5408671, Locher, Adolf or Adolph Paul Locher.
 A-5379238, Locher, Emma Maria.
 A-7044048, Lulic, Victor Benjamin or Victor B. Lulic.
 A-6859251, Luna-Luna, Hector or Hector Salazar.
 A-2893543, Mac Lean, James Fulton.
 A-3018255, Madonis, Barashos Antoin or Peter Madonis Parshos or Baraschos Mandonis.
 A-7056866, Manesiotis, Maria Nina, formerly Marusopoulos.
 A-6780705, Markowitz, Irene (nee Neufeld).
 A-1009811, Mavrogiannis, Angelos or Giannis.
 A-9021476, Mawro, Krist Grgo or Mavro.
 A-1627117, Mazzulla, Gertrude Barnet (nee Black).
 A-2452703, McCord, William Samuel.
 A-5970774, McEachon, Mary Ann (nee Williams).
 A-4665414, Medford, Eric George.
 A-1319482, Michaud, Dirk or Dick.
 A-5877467, Mininni, Luigi.
 A-1883042, Molas, Angelos, or Spyroevangelas Malataras.
 A-7962241, Monroe, Henry Charles.
 A-7980333, Montoya-Ramirez, Carmen.
 A-7980332, Montoya-Ramirez, Gonzalo.
 A-5470657, Moreno, Guadalupe vda. De Martinez.
 A-4617917, Nakao, Mataichi.
 A-7371653, Nalbandian, Frederik (nee Martin).
 A-2672460, Navarreta, Salvatore, or Rocco Molliaro.
 A-5210566, Neukum, Konrad.
 A-5612607, Neukum, Helen.
 A-7130886, Neukum, Elizabeth Victoria.
 A-5640210, Niksich, Mile John.
 A-6019389, Niles, Lyra (nee Penn).
 A-7483180, Niphoratos, Spiros, or Spiros Nifotatos.
 A-4685358, Norrgran, Lydia Ranghild.
 A-4927772, Papaionnou Epaninondas Konstantine, or Pappas.
 A-5273178, Paquette, Marie Alberta.
 A-2792231, Pentarakionos, Markos or Markos Bentarakianos or Marcus Thomas or Marcos Thomas.
 A-5720965, Phelan, Clara Ann (nee McCarthy) or Clara Ann Gerard.
 A-4550272, Ponte, Severino Rilo.
 A-3508958, Promichlansky, Klara.
 A-4188990, Quan, Kwan Hung or Kwan Lai Hung or Kwan Yee Sun.
 A-8001109, Quon, Chin or Charlie Chin or Chin Shew Yiu.
 A-7864679, Raschke, Irmgard Helen Harriett.
 A-5385101, Richter, Hans Edwin or Edwin Richter or Johannes Richter.
 A-5111744, Robert, Balere.
 A-2924233, Robin, Jeanette or Jennie Robinson.
 A-6989531, Rojas, Melquiades Romero.
 A-3784905, Rondini, Carmela or Carmella Camilucci Rondini.
 A-7387531, Rubalcaba-Gutierrez, Zenaldo or Epollito Reza-Gonzalez.
 A-3715561, Sanchez, Juan.
 A-8031686, Shay, Evelyn, Mavis.
 A-4288667, Simko, Michael or Michael Yovnas.
 A-5770761, Smith, Arthur Wellesley.
 A-5282778, Smith, William Wallace Ellis.
 A-3857451, Spangberg, Carl Arvid.
 A-4718938, Sprovieri, Salvatore or John Sam Perri.
 A-1305125, Stefan, Petru.
 A-6798840, Steinberg, Lila (nee Kruszewska).
 A-7177877, Stoll, Pamela.
 A-4523882, Tai, Gong Hing or Gong Shee or Mrs. Hing Tai Shing.
 A-6085947, Young Shum.
 A-4377216, Thomas, Ethelbert Elias.
 A-7039534, Thomasova, Donata Christina.
 A-5764453, Tong, Lee.
 A-3627969, Too, Sing Samm.
 A-3554845, Torihara, Fumiko or Fumiko Hirai.
 A-4630985, Tsurudome, Hiroshi.
 A-3404541, Tsurudome, Yaye or Yae (nee Yunoni).
 A-3341977, Valles-Alvarez, Agustin.
 A-4310944, Veilleux, Magloire Armidas.
 A-5918260, Vianello, Domenico Sperindeo or Domenico Vianello.
 A-4832140, Vine, Marie Louis Benson or Mrs. Reginald Sommers or Summers.
 A-3246562, Virgili, Andrea.
 A-7826091, Voyce, Christine Evelyn.
 A-5418284, Wada, Iwao.
 A-7879632, Wang, Gung Hsing.
 A-3870264, Wilson, Wilhelmina Anna (nee Mehner).
 A-3199565, Wing, Choken Ralse.
 A-4684757, Wolfarten, Johann or John Wolfarten.
 A-7491368, Wong, Kim Tong.
 A-3357787, Wong, Shiu Yiu.
 A-5344488, Wright, George Fred Henry or Harry Wright.
 A-6709273, Yu, Jung-Chien.
 A-5374158, Zachara, Stanislaw or Stanley.
 A-6569477, Alexas, Hariklea George.
 A-5533704, Arnold, Arthur.
 A-2396445, Ayala-Cortes, Froylan.
 A-8001562, Bachman, Ada Alson or Ada Alson Tight.
 A-8001561, Bachman, John Francis or John Tight.
 A-5725345, Barles, Ann.
 A-5695788, Beilin, Sonia.
 A-4305632, Bianchi, Gaetano Carmelo.
 A-4134714, Bires, George.
 A-2139426, Bousoulas, John or John Evangelos or Ioannis Bousoulas.
 A-1482700, Brander, Vera nee Jadviga Galisky or Virginia Brander.
 A-7847331, Brantley, Elizabeth Lucien.
 A-2303919, Breen, Michael or Melville Borsuk.
 A-7476981, Briones-Barrientos, Martin.
 A-7476151, Briones Frances Hernandez de.
 A-7999439, Bryan, Henry Tolennard.
 A-4399177, Buttner, Harry Herbert Oscar.
 A-4509405, Busch, Julius.
 A-5113476, Cacciola, Giovanni.
 A-3629914, Caravela, Manuel.
 A-7274292, Castro, Wilfredo.
 A-7364864, Castro, Maria Elena.
 A-7365873, Castro, Francisca.
 A-5954837, Cavalas, Ionnis Demetrios or John Gavalas.
 A-7450290, Cela, Sali or Amarra Sila or Charles Schiller.
 A-6918458, Chang, Raymond Lu Yu.
 A-7415094, Chang, Regina Marie.
 A-2651635, Chiang, Hwang Yung.
 A-6420096, Chung, Ki-Kwan or Ki-Kwee Chun.
 A-4657808, Creque, Llvinn Augustus or Elwin Creque.
 A-5998288, Creque, Idalia Sylvanita.
 A-5653239, Dangi, Karl or Charles Denny.
 A-3561532, De Durazo, Esperanza Diega Tyler-Chavez or Esperanza Diega Tyler de Traslavina.
 A-5641241, De Gonzalez, Maria Salas.
 A-7978775, De Gutierrez, Elodia Morales or Elodia Morales de Mosa or Elodia Morales de Garibay.
 A-4787642, Dell, Susanna (nee Vogel).
 A-5727520, De Lopez, Juana Concepcion Acost Vda.
 A-6919715, De Lugo, Damiana Concepcion Montez.
 A-7469556, De Medina, Amalia Martinez or Molly Martinez Medina.
 A-7983505, De Rascon, Sofia Perez.
 A-3446280, De Romero, Carmen Trejo-Saenz or Carmen Saenz de Romero.
 A-7640419, De Sierra, Carina Mancebo or Carina Sierra.
 A-4268177, De Vallejo, Jesusa Hinojosa.
 A-2697484, Dos Santos, Jose or Joseph Santos or Dos Santos.
 A-7463596, Eldridge, Claud'a Tour.
 A-4019727, Elmer, Harty Laurier.
 A-6949324, Ergun, Sabri.
 A-3834739, Ericsson, Thor Gustav.
 A-7372121, Falter, Christel or Christel Mueller.
 A-3273354, Felactos, Nick S.
 A-7389936, Francone, Frank.
 A-1134757, Friedman, Alice (nee Gold).
 A-3195130, Fung, Jan.
 A-7273938, Galanakis, Catina Jean.
 A-4146757, Ganz, Valentine or Wally Ganz.
 A-7130271, George, Peter or Panagiotis Georgiou Isosif or Panagiotis Georgiou.
 A-3043291, Gettinger, Rifka (nee Weinrieb).
 A-5049631, Godfryd, Violet (nee Stuart).
 A-6069444, Goodden, Alexandra or Alexandra Dickerson.
 A-7927395, Graves, Margaret Isobel.
 A-7978840, Greenberg, Jack.
 A-4074263, Grinberg, Dora or Greenberg.
 A-2474659, Grossman, Miriam.
 A-4863957, Gutierrez-Roca, Ruben Oscar.
 A-5505419, Gutierrez, Maria Josefa Morales de.
 A-7445427, Habig, Frank Peter Michael.
 A-7277540, Hamel, Marie Therese Ghislaine.
 A-5223236, Hannivig, Linda (nee Linda Louise Philipps) alias Rose Carroll.
 A-5476760, Huang, Paul Chang-Chih.
 A-9671986, Hunter, Hugh Howard.
 A-7915552, Infante, Giuseppe.
 A-4972756, Jamieson, Lillian Edeline (Edna) Ruth.
 A-5416948, Jansch, Karl Ernest.
 A-4557518, Jensen, Alice Erna (nee Shawcross) or Alice Erna Shawcross Panette.
 A-7982541, Joe, Barbara Pao-Ying Chan or Barbara Pao-Ying Chan or Barbara Chan.
 A-2241075, Johansson, Hedvig Elisabet.
 A-7450417, Judice, Elvira.
 A-4538554, Kampetsis, George.
 A-5541308, Kelemeczeky, Mary or Marishka Kelemeczeky (nee Zwillinger).
 A-8001105, Kincaid, Robert George alias Hanns George Stahl.
 A-1283525, Kokolis, Androgianos Soterios or Androgianos Sam Kokolis.
 A-3525155, Kosciow, George.
 A-5794313, Kostelac, Nilola.
 A-3483906, Krause, Sonia (nee Globerson) or Sonia Krutchik.
 A-3482042, Krause, Herman or Krutchik.
 A-1419929, Laes, Eleonore Julianne, formerly Tilsma (nee Eleonore Julianne Randorf).
 A-3439242, LaVega, Lolita De alias Dolores Bravo Yanez.
 A-3484114, La Vega, Jose De or Jose De La Vega Ruiz.
 A-7367020, Lee, Chi Yuan.
 A-7193917, Lemacks, Jackie Pierre formerly Lhirondele.
 A-5280689, Lenetsky, Fred or Fred Lenett.
 A-7982152, Leonard, Henry Osborne.
 A-7957312, Leung, Dot alias Leung King Do.
 A-4447058, Lipkus, Lena (nee Libka Puzezefsky) alias Libko Richefsky.
 A-5054348, Lowe, Mary (nee Jansa).
 A-5054349, Lowe, Thomas Walker.
 A-7031238, Lowe, Vivian Valerie.
 A-6054492, Lucido-Aguilar, Angel Francisco.
 A-8015826, Lui, Coon alias Goon Lui alias Chong Louie.
 A-2736882, Madsen, Robert Angelov.
 A-5369683, Marketos, Angelos Haralambos.
 A-5435529, Marshall, George Henry.
 A-9825369, McCormick, James Hilbert.
 A-5801734, McLellan, Daniel.
 A-4597364, McLellan, Mary.
 A-4346684, Michalovic, Fantizek alias Frank Michalovic.
 A-7267742, Miranda, Nelson.
 A-3323703, Morais, Duarte Seabra.
 A-3561589, Morett, Angelina Eva (nee Traslivina).
 A-7821135, Muratis, John Stylianos.
 A-6739614, Nadeau, Christiane Helena or Christiane Spilingaerd Nadeau.
 A-4054890, Naeyaert, Marguerite.

A-3373711, Nelson, Egil Hans.
 A-2474658, Nemoy, Margery.
 A-4002895, Nicholas, Athanasios Nicholasos.
 A-2747140, Omachi, Tsuku.
 A-7367024, Ortega-Rodriguez, Rafael.
 A-3759192, Pardo, Henry Vasquez or Enrique Vasquez-Pablo.
 A-4701047, Pellini, Attilio.
 A-7978974, Pennington, Adolphus Barry alias Barry Pennington.
 A-4439971, Perfetti, Marco Michael alias Caspare Corsi.
 A-3179978, Perez, Ursula Monica.
 A-7984786, Perez, Juana Francisca Gonzalez De.
 A-8017514, Perez-Castillo, Maximino.
 A-7984763, Perez-Gonzalez, Felipe.
 A-5693987, Pineda, Maurilio or Maurilio Pineda Sanchez.
 A-4399528, Polydor, Charlie J. or Theophilus Jerry Polydoros.
 A-4622799, Prehn, Anna (nee Kettner) formerly Strauss.
 A-7140739, Puskaritz, Justina alias Mary Angela Marcks.
 A-2310519, Radosevich, Charles Joseph alias Joseph Charles Radosevich.
 A-6389821, Rao, Sanadi Dattatreya.
 A-7115201, Reid, Dorothy Ann.
 A-5082673, Reid, Joseph Francis.
 A-7178066, Rios-Pena, Andres.
 A-5421022, Rodriguez-Benites, Jenadio.
 A-4707387, Rubin, Esther.
 A-8015271, Russell, Brenda Valeria.
 A-3359625, Sakihara, Ikumori alias John Sakihara.
 A-1416420, Sakur, Samat Pary.
 A-7358559, Sankey, Orville David Joseph.
 A-4528629, Senesi, John or Jan or Josef or Jozef Senesi.
 A-7948706, Sham, Kung.
 A-7438930, Shepard, Wolfram Werner or Wolfram Werner Schlicht.
 A-7115200, Sheppard, Rebecca Cohen.
 A-5393248, Silva, Augusto Luz.
 A-5404553, Smimmo, Frances Donahue.
 A-4188714, Smith, Vera alias Glekeria Kitsul alias Vera Cossack alias Vera Kitsul alias Vera Kitsel.
 A-5597753, Spaulding, Myrta Louise.
 A-4870986, Strassman, Hirsch.
 A-4940039, Suarez Juan De Dios Alvarez.
 A-4367483, Sumampow, Philip or Hassan Bin Sumampow or Hassan Bin Sambang.
 A-2949357, Tai, Suekichi.
 A-2948231, Teixeira, Augusto Martins.
 A-8021681, Thomas, Randolph.
 A-7962124, Trejo, Vicenta.
 A-7962125, Trejo, Maria Ausilio Haro.
 A-5876019, Tzetzias, Epaminondas Dimitrios alias Paul Georgis.
 A-4863022, Valdez-Nuncio, Raymunda.
 A-7476651, Valerino, Vincenza Parelo.
 A-4268179, Vallejo-Hernandez, Antonio.
 A-4679896, Vaz, Francisco Maria alias Juan Antonio Carranone.
 A-2772267, Veis, Hassim alias Sam Veis alias Assim Veis alias Hassim Bekolli Veis.
 A-3256738, Vilisides, Nicholas Zanne or Polites.
 A-7848405, Vogt, George.
 A-6756413, Voutyras, Kyriakos Constantine.
 A-9764898, Vurgun, Hasan Hayri or Bill Hayri or Bill Vurgun or Hayri Vurgun.
 A-7128707, Watson, June Eileen.
 A-6972998, Way, Hule Tai.
 A-5461030, Webster, Felicia Grace (nee Hoffman) formerly O'Neil.
 A-8021499, Westerman, Elsie Josephine alias Elsie J. Chapman.
 A-4598119, White, Anna Juliana.
 A-3863628, White, Gladstone Joseph, alias Ziggy White.
 A-9767795, Wilk, John Hilmar.
 A-1558566, Williams, Rafael Torsten, alias Rafael Torsten Lindquist.
 A-7821930, Wilson, Brian Douglas, formerly Maurice Guilmont.
 A-7983226, Woo, Carole Kwan.
 A-8021646, Wright, Florence Louise Wright (nee Kilpatrick).

A-7283661, Xydias, Maria Emmanuel (nee Chryssakis) (Hrisakis).
 A-8039500, Yee, Frank Hung Jen.
 A-7222512, Yu, Thomas Ho-Lung.
 A-5395963, Zutshi, Triloki Nath, alias Nath Zutshi Tirloki.
 A-3855823, Amourgis, Christos or Christ Amour.
 A-5464060, De Zavadski, Joseph or Giuseppe.
 A-2433555, Spigal, Attilio Oreste or Apigal Attilio.
 A-5056170, Embiricos, Andrew Michael.
 A-550963, Katzenmayer, Jacob.
 A-5500964, Katzenmayer, Katherine (nee Strictel).
 A-6682185, Schulgasser, Lew or Lew Shulgasser.
 A-6975072, Schulgasser, Luba or Luba Schulgasser (nee Golante).
 A-5205272, Embericos, Ecaterina Mihail or Catherine Nina Embricos.
 A-9764776, Xydias, Peter or Panagiotis Xideas or Panagiotis Xidias.
 A-7203946, Croy, Frances Ada or Frances Morton or Frances Manning or Anna Hall.
 A-3450155, Stolz, Margaret Lily or Margaret Egerer (nee Margaret Karner).
 A-5238396, Kopsinis, Peter or Panagiotis Kopinis.
 A-6359300, Fong, Rosa An (nee Rosa An Gonzalez).
 A-6535699, Hadjipateras, Constantin John or Constantinos Hadjipateras or Costis Ioannis Hadjipateras.
 A-6897748, Lentakis, John Elias or Jean Elie Lentakis.
 A-6605501, Chu, Florence Chien-Hwa.
 A-6994582, Tung, Pao Chi or Percy Pacchi Tung.
 A-5357472, Grosara, Antonio or Nino Crimani.
 A-7802711, Lisotto, Vittorio Americo.

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation four lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

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. IVES:

S. 2984. A bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act to extend its provisions until December 31, 1954, and to permit the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal Service; and

S. 2985. A bill to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, with respect to the system of courts-martial for the National Guard and the Air National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ives when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2986. A bill to prohibit the procurement for the Armed Forces of any article produced in, or imported from, Communist controlled countries; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 2987. A bill to increase the efficiency of the Federal Government by improving the training of Federal civilian officers and employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 2988. A bill to amend and extend the provisions of the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act of 1951; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 2989. A bill for the relief of Commander John J. O'Donnell, United States Naval Reserve; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. J. Res. 148. Joint resolution to continue the effectiveness of certain statutory provisions until July 1, 1952; reported by Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCARRAN, when he reported the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

MAINTENANCE OF STATE GUARD ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act to extend its provisions until December 31, 1954, and to permit the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal service. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill prepared by me be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2984) to amend subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act to extend its provisions until December 31, 1954, and to permit the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal service, introduced by Mr. Ives was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. Ives is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES IN CONNECTION WITH A BILL WHICH WOULD EXTEND THE RIGHT OF STATES UNTIL DECEMBER 31, 1954, TO MAINTAIN STATE GUARD ORGANIZATIONS

The bill amends subdivision (b) of section 61 of the National Defense Act, extends its provisions until December 31, 1954, and permits the States at any time during that period to organize and maintain military forces at cadre strengths in addition to the National Guard, even if no part of the National Guard is in active Federal service.

Subsection (b) was added to section 61 of the National Defense Act by Public Law 849, Eighty-first Congress, approved September 27, 1950. It authorized the States to organize and maintain military forces (State guards) other than the National Guard while any part of the National Guard was in active Federal service. It was made effective for 2 years from the date of approval of the act. It therefore expires on September 27, 1952.

As authorized by the act, Governor Dewey reactivated the New York Guard in 1950 and directed that it be organized on a cadre basis pending induction of either one of the major New York National Guard units into active Federal service, i. e., the Twenty-seventh Infantry Division (up-State) and the Forty-second Infantry Division (in New York City and the metropolitan area). Thereafter cadres for 39 internal security and supporting battalions of the New York Guard were organized throughout the State. The total strength of those cadres is now approximately 729 officers and 308 enlisted men.

These men are patriotic citizens and take an active and enthusiastic interest in their military pursuits. They receive no pay or other emoluments. They meet regularly and are capable of rapid expansion to full strength in case of mobilization of the National Guard.

While the likelihood of such mobilization is not quite so acute at the present time as it appeared to be in 1950, there is no assurance that the situation will not worsen in the future. Certainly, the authority to maintain these forces should be continued for at least two more years. The next Congress can reappraise the situation in 1954.

Subsection (b) of section 61 authorizes the maintenance of the State guard only while any part of the National Guard of the particular State is in active Federal service. Roughly 20 percent of the New York National Guard is now in Federal service but the terms of active service of the bulk of these men will expire before December 31, 1954. If all of the National Guard are returned from Federal service, a strict interpretation of the Federal statute might require the New York Guard cadres to be disbanded.

The loyal and devoted services of the members of these cadres should not be treated like a faucet to be turned on and off at will. If they are disbanded and thereafter a new emergency arises, an appeal would have to be made to them to return to service again.

This is not only unfair to them, but the international situation has not improved to the extent that such a disbandment is wise, even if the entire National Guard has returned to State service.

During the next 2 years at least, or until December 31, 1954, which is what the bill provides, authority should be given to the States to maintain their State guards in cadre strength, even if no part of their National Guard remains in active Federal service.

COURTS MARTIAL FOR NATIONAL GUARD AND AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, with respect to the system of courts martial for the National Guard and the Air National Guard. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me explaining the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2985) to amend the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, with respect to the system of courts martial for the National Guard and the Air National Guard, introduced by Mr. IVES, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES IN CONNECTION WITH A BILL TO AMEND THE NATIONAL DEFENSE ACT OF JUNE 3, 1916, WITH RESPECT TO THE SYSTEM OF COURTS MARTIAL FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD AND THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The bill to amend sections 102-108 of the National Defense Act relating to National Guard courts martial is intended to remove all doubt as to the legality of a State code of military justice.

It was the intent of the founding fathers that the National and State Governments should work together in making the organized militia a national force as well as a State force—in other words, exactly what it is—a dual status force. In fact—the militia clause of the Constitution is unique in that it is the only clause in the Constitution which imposes a dual responsibility on State and Nation to work together. It is up to the Federal authorities to do their part to make it work and it is up to the States to make sure that they do their share. One way for the States to do this is to see that their military court system functions along the lines of the Federal Code and manual with such changes as may be necessary to adapt it to State needs. The State of New York is doing this in its proposed new State code of military justice.

Practically all the States have court-martial systems under State codes or laws which follow closely the Federal system and which carry out the general intent of the National Defense Act as to punishments even though some States such as Missouri prescribe punishments not specified in the National Defense Act. The intent of the Federal law is that for offenses committed by National Guard men in their armory drill status, they should suffer limited punishments, the maximum fine and jail sentence under the act being \$200 fine or 200 days in jail.

Unfortunately, the National Defense Act would seem to authorize National Guard courts at all times, i. e., in an armory drill or field training status as well as on active State duty, to try all offenses including the heinous crimes which are also offenses under civil law, such as murder, manslaughter, etc. Accordingly, if the National Defense Act provisions are followed literally, a National Guard man could be tried by court martial for manslaughter committed during an armory drill or during summer camp, when he is still essentially a civilian, drilling only 2 hours per week and attending camp for 2 weeks during the summer. He should be subject to trial for military offenses only, and not heinous crimes, when he is in armory drill or summer training status.

On the other hand, when he is on active State duty with his unit under orders of the Governor in case of invasion, insurrection, disaster, etc., the National Guard man should be subject to trial for all crimes and offenses including murder, manslaughter, and the rest, the same as a soldier on active Federal duty. But the National Defense Act gives the same limited punishments, which were obviously meant to apply only to military offenses, for heinous crimes. The result is that a National Guard man could be convicted by court martial of manslaughter and receive a \$200 fine or 200 days in jail, whereas in a civil court and under the Federal Uniform Code of Military Justice he could receive a sentence of 10 to 20 years.

A new State code of military justice has been proposed for New York and has been introduced in the legislature. The new code follows the outline of the Federal Uniform Code of Military Justice but adapts it to the needs of the State's military forces. Some of the language of the Federal Code is not applicable to the State or the State's forces;

yet, the present New York military law incorporates into State law by reference all the provisions of the Federal Code except those relating to punishments and except any which conflict with State law. This is hardly a satisfactory way to establish the jurisdiction of military courts or to write a penal statute into law whereunder men can be sentenced to jail among other punishments. The offenses for which a National Guard man can be tried by court martial and the other aspects of the jurisdiction and procedure of State courts martial should be spelled out in State law so that a person can read it all there, without reference to any Federal statute or regulations.

This has been done in the bill introduced in the New York Legislature. The provisions of the Federal Code which heretofore have been interpreted by State administrative regulations to be applicable to the State's forces have been clearly spelled out and written into the proposed new State code.

The new State code does not go off on a sharp tangent from the Federal Code at any point. In the interest of uniformity which is proper, the State code follows closely, section by section, the articles of the Federal Code. It varies only where the Federal Code is obviously inapplicable to the State's forces. For example, there is no need for a State court of military appeals as provided in the Federal Code. In lieu of this, a review or appeal procedure from State court-martial sentences has been set up. It would be virtually impossible to make the language of the Federal Code fit the State's needs in this regard. Henceforth, all provisions pertaining to military justice will be spelled out in the State law, instead of relying on interpretations made by virtue of an incorporation by reference of the Federal Code.

This would be the end of the matter, except for another factor. It is that the National Defense Act of 1916 (secs. 102-108; 32 U. S. C. 92-98) contains provisions specifically relating to National Guard courts martial.

These provisions were not brought up to date when the Federal Uniform Code of Military Justice was adopted in 1950. For example, they do not include authority to general and special courts martial to impose a bad-conduct discharge in addition to a dishonorable discharge. There are other points where the National Defense Act provisions are out of date. If these provisions are construed to be constitutionally binding upon the States, it would be incumbent upon the State to follow the letter of the National Defense Act provisions, particularly as to punishments. Many States, however, look upon these provisions of the National Defense Act as unconstitutional and contend that National Guard courts martial when the National Guard is not in Federal service are State courts, whose jurisdiction cannot be prescribed by Congress. New York State does not go along with that contention.

It is apparent that the National Defense Act provisions were not well thought out back in 1916. New York State, which did have proper distinctions in its military law prior to that time based on whether the National Guard man was in a drill status or on active full-time State duty, merely followed blindly the National Defense Act provisions when that law was enacted by Congress.

The State's military justice system should not continue in the days to come to rest upon such a shaky foundation. The proposed State code helps to remedy the condition, but the job will not be complete until the National Defense Act provisions are amended to remove any question of conflict between Federal law and State law.

The proposed State code takes away the jurisdiction of State courts martial to try men for certain heinous crimes committed while in an armory drill or summer-camp

status. It retains the jurisdiction of said courts to try men for such offenses committed while on active State duty under orders of the governor, and also retains the limited punishments contained in the National Defense Act of a maximum \$200 fine or 200 days in jail. To be consistent, it should permit such courts to impose the same scale of punishments for offenses committed on active State duty that are imposed by Federal courts martial.

However, the new State code, while correcting certain variances between the Federal Code and the National Defense Act provisions (e. g., by giving general and special courts martial the right to impose a bad-conduct discharge) does not go so far as to increase the jail sentences for offenses committed while on active State duty to those imposed under the Federal Code.

This, it was felt, had better await amendment of the National Defense Act. This bill and its companion measure, H. R. 6592, introduced in the House by Congressman RADWAN, are intended to make such action possible, and generally to remove all doubt as to the legality of all the provisions of the new State code.

The simplest way to accomplish the desired end, and the method adopted in this bill and H. R. 6592, is to amend section 102, N. D. A. (32 U. S. C. 92) to permit any State of Territory to adopt its own code or law pertaining to military justice the provisions of which would be controlling. This avoids any constitutional debate with those States which have adopted their own code. If any State has not adopted a code or law on this subject the National Defense Act provisions would control. They also should remain on the books as a guide to what Congress deems desirable in the interest of uniformity especially with respect to punishments to be meted out for offenses committed while in an armory-drill or field-training status.

There is no need to fear lack of cooperation by the States in this regard. As stated earlier, practically all of them have followed faithfully the forms and modes of procedure of and the jurisdiction given to Federal courts martial. Substantial uniformity prevails throughout the States. Their codes should not be open to question because of possible conflict with the National Defense Act.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUES OF DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE FROM STATE OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 70), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statues of Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, presented by the State of Oregon, one to be placed in Statuary Hall, are accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statues of two of its most eminent citizens, Dr. McLoughlin, illustrious as a great humanitarian, and first to govern the Oregon Country, who often is called the Father of Oregon, and Rev. Lee, illustrious as the first missionary and colonizer in the Oregon Country; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Oregon.

TEMPORARY PLACEMENT IN ROTUNDA OF STATUES OF DR. JOHN McLOUGHLIN AND REV. JASON LEE, OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. 71), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Oregon Statuary Committee is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol the statues of the late Dr. John McLoughlin and the Reverend Jason Lee, of Oregon, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor; and be it further

Resolved, That one statue shall be permanently located in Statuary Hall.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM FOR STUDY OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada has again focused the attention of Americans to the great potential threat that this disease poses to our national food supply. An epidemic in our own land would be a disaster, not only from an economic standpoint but also from the standpoint of our relative defense posture.

So far the only means we have found for controlling the spread of this disease has been the isolation of disease areas and the destruction of affected animals. We know from long experience that such isolation is, at best, a tenuous protection.

The only real measure of protection from foot-and-mouth disease would be the discovery of methods whereby the disease itself can be prevented. Science has made giant strides in all branches, and it is reasonable to believe that the establishment of research facilities for the study of foot-and-mouth disease would be the best means of developing the kind of protective measures we need.

I send to the desk for appropriate reference a resolution which would authorize the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to examine the problem and to submit to the Senate by June 1, 1952, a coordinated plan for the establishment, administration, and financing of a foot-and-mouth laboratory. Although authority exists under law for the establishment of such a facility by the Secretary of Agriculture, I believe the matter should be made more specific by law. No body is better qualified to prepare such a plan than is the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The resolution (S. Res. 301), submitted by Mr. CAIN, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease among cattle have repeatedly posed a great threat to the animal-raising industry of the United States; and

Whereas this threat is again exemplified by the recent outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Canada; and

Whereas the attempt to isolate disease-stricken areas is, at best, a difficult and uncertain protection; and

Whereas the best remedy for the problem is the establishment of research facilities looking toward a scientific preventative or cure of foot-and-mouth disease: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study for the purpose of determining what legislation would be needed to establish and finance a Federal program, together with any needed research facilities, for the study of foot-and-mouth disease for the purpose of finding preventatives or cures for such disease.

Sec. 2. The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate not later than June 1, 1952.

Sec. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

RULES FOR OPERATION OF IRREGULAR COMMON CARRIERS BY MOTOR VEHICLE—AMENDMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado (by request) submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2358) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act by establishing certain rules for the operation of irregular common carriers by motor vehicle, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ANNUITY TO WIDOWS OF JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 16) to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the Territory of the Pacific Islands; and

H. R. 7189. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barrelled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and

for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

PRINTING OF MONOGRAPH ON THE FORESTS OF WYOMING (S. DOC. NO. 117)

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have consulted the majority leader, the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND]; the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; and the minority leader, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], in respect to the monograph I have before me, on the forests of the State of Wyoming. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a Senate document. It is less than 50 pages in length, and therefore comes within the rule.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF ERNEST A. TOLIN TO BE DISTRICT JUDGE FOR SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, and in accordance with the rules of the committee, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 17, 1952, at 9 a. m., in room 229, in the Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., upon the nomination of Hon. Ernest A. Tolin, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California. Judge Tolin is now serving under a recess appointment. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

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:

Text of radio interview conducted by him with Dr. Hugh H. Bennett on the subject Soil Conservation and West Virginia Farm Prosperity.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address entitled "Immigration and Freedom," delivered by him in New York City, April 5, 1952, before a forum sponsored by the National Democratic Club.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

Personal report to the people of North Dakota, written by Senator Young, dated April 2, 1952.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Statement by Cassius M. Clay to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, regarding RFC loans to the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Article entitled "Youth Makes World of Friendship," written by Robert Terry, and published in the Christian Science Monitor of April 7, 1952.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial entitled "Eisenhower as a Military Man," published in the Washington Post of April 8, 1952.

Article entitled "Flasco," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the New York Herald Tribune of April 7, 1952.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article entitled "Cost of Government Exceeds Savings," published in the Life Insurance Caurant of April 1952.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

Editorial entitled "The People Couldn't Lose," published in the Charlottesville (Va.) Daily Progress.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Article entitled "The Foreign Aid Bill," reprinted in the Christian Science Monitor from Business Week.

Article entitled "I Appeal to 531 Modern Kings—Help Save World Peace," written by Clarence Poe, president and editor of the Progressive Farmer.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

Speech delivered by Senator GILLETTE before the District Democratic Club on April 6, 1952.

By Mr. CAIN:

Address on the subject America's Position on the International Front—As I See It, delivered by Hugh G. Grant, at the annual meeting of the Georgia Press Institute, at the University of Georgia, February 21, 1951.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

Letter addressed to him by Anna M. Rosenberg, Assistant Secretary of Defense, concerning alcoholism among soldiers in Germany.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Copies of correspondence between himself and the attorney general of California and members of certain medical associations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Editorial entitled "Anticlimax," relating to the Truman-McGrath conflict, published in the Washington Post April 6, 1952.

By Mr. MORSE:

Address by Miss Dolores M. Gottfried, of Salem, Oreg., winner of Oregon Voice of Democracy Contest, and a newspaper article announcing her award.

Poem entitled "In re the Bryson-Kefauver Juke-Box Bill," written by Miss Flora E. Breck, of Portland, Oreg.

NAVAL RECRUIT TRAINING

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to address the Senate for not exceeding 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Maryland is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Last Saturday I had the privilege of being the reviewing officer in the graduation exercises at the United States Naval Training Center, Bainbridge, Md. During the course of the exercises, I saw men and women who 10 weeks ago were civilians execute most difficult drill maneuvers and demonstrate other military attainments. I think that is a great tribute to the commandant of the Fifth Naval Dis-

trict, and also to the commanding officer of the training center, which during the year it has been operating has graduated 33,000 persons.

I wish to take this opportunity to say that I believe Capt. R. H. Smith, United States Navy, commander, naval training center, and Capt. F. Wolsieffer, United States Navy, commanding officer, recruit training command, and all those associated with them, deserve great credit for the fine work they are doing for our young men and young women at that station, and I heartily commend them.

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute to Senate bill 913.

Mr. STENNIS obtained the floor.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief observation, inasmuch as I am chairman of the committee and in charge of the bill.

So far as I am able to ascertain, there will be only two or three general speeches this afternoon in favor of the bill. We should be able to start voting on amendments within an hour on such a matter, and then proceed to a final vote on the bill today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no amendment pending except a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. A number of amendments have been printed and are lying on the table, but they have not actually been offered.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that they will be offered. I thought it well to make the announcement that we expect to conclude consideration of the bill this afternoon.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I read in the press that the Senator from Arkansas intended to accept a couple of amendments to the bill. I was wondering what they may be.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am going to accept the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which strikes out the paragraph designated "(j)" on page 16.

Mr. AIKEN. Would that still leave in the bill the provision that the membership of the proposed committee shall consist of members from the four committees to which reference has been made?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that since the committee approved the bill in that form, as chairman of the committee I should not feel at liberty to accept an amendment making any change in that respect. That is a matter which will have to address itself to the Senate. I prefer that the Senate take action. As I pointed out yesterday, and as the Senator will observe from the original bill, I introduced the bill with the provision that membership on the proposed joint committee should consist of members of the Appropriations Committees only. However, since my committee reported the bill with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, of course, I feel obligated to support the position of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. I think the Senator's first idea was undoubtedly best, and would lead to considerably less confusion and duplication.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I assume that such an amendment will have to be voted on by the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the Senate will make the change suggested.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I believe that the proper name for the bill under consideration would be "the necessary congressional working tool." I am supporting Senate bill 913 because of my experiences growing out of my connection with the Appropriations Committee. Even though I have never been a member of that great committee, I have been an ex officio member of one of its subcommittees, namely, the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions.

Before I proceed further I wish to pay special tribute to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] for his long, faithful, diligent, and conscientious work on this subject as he tried to cope with one of the practical problems confronting the Congress. I think he has brought forth a bill the reasonable operation of which would go a long way toward meeting the practical conditions which we must combat.

I shall support Senate bill 913, to create a Joint Committee on the Budget. During the time I have been in the Congress I have been greatly impressed by the almost impossible task which confronts the Appropriations Committees in their consideration of the thousands of items of detailed expenditures of more than 60 agencies comprising the executive branch of the Federal Government. It has not been my privilege to be a regular member of the Appropriations Committee, but I have served for more than 3 years as an ex officio member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions. I know from direct observation that it is absolutely impossible for the 21 Senators who com-

prise the Appropriations Committee to give adequate and appropriate attention to a \$80,000,000,000 budget. It simply cannot be done under the present system, even if these 21 Senators give these matters their entire attention night and day. Incidentally, the members of the Senate Appropriations Committee labor long and faithfully and endlessly, trying to cover the innumerable responsibilities of their stupendous task. I happen to know that last year in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill alone, there were 1,863 separate activities for consideration. Indicating the vast range of programs involved, I understand the Treasury Department has 5,000 major accounts against which more than 300,000,000 checks are drawn each year.

BUDGET GROWTH

The budget has grown in the last 30 years from less than \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1923 to more than \$85,000,000,000 during the fiscal year 1953, and the budget document itself has grown to where it now consists of 1,786 printed pages. It is now larger than the average metropolitan telephone book and consists of thousands of detailed budget items.

The Congress has provided the executive branch with adequate machinery to evaluate its programs and to prepare and submit budget estimates to the legislative branch for action, but it has woefully neglected to establish a corresponding agency to serve its own needs.

In 1921 the General Accounting Office was created completely independent of the executive branch so that the Congress would have some agency to check on expenditures of the Federal Government after they had been made. There were then a total of seven employees on the staff of each of the Committees on Appropriations to check on the allocation of funds before they were spent.

The Congress also granted to the President on June 10, 1921, authority to submit an annual budget to the Congress, together with his estimates of receipts, expenditures, and other budgetary data. This act created the Bureau of the Budget, which was then located in the Department of the Treasury, under the direction of the President. Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1939 transferred the Bureau of the Budget from the Treasury Department to the Executive Office of the President. Today the Bureau of the Budget consists of approximately 500 trained and experienced fiscal personnel who provide the President with the essential information he needs to properly and adequately present the fiscal aspects of programs administered by the executive branch of the Government to the Congress in support of his annual appropriation requests.

In addition to these legislative steps, the Congress has taken other important steps to improve the fiscal structure of the executive branch. In 1950 it approved the Budget and Accounting Procedure Act, the Post Office Financial Control Act, and acts improving the financial operations of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. Some of these enact-

ments were in line with recommendations of the Hoover Commission, and as I understand have improved and supplemented previous enactments, which have resulted in vastly improved financial controls in the executive branch of Government.

CONGRESS NEEDS AID

I feel that the Congress must have the necessary working tools to develop the facts that pertain to the needs and operations of various governmental programs and that these facts should be developed from the viewpoint of the Congress, which carries the full responsibilities in our form of government in matters of taxation and appropriations. This bill, S. 913, before the Senate today is not the complete answer of course, but it is certainly a step in the right direction and a necessary step. There is another remedy, and perhaps this is the only certain remedy, and this will be a taxpayers revolution; and this is exactly what is going to happen unless we make these appropriation reductions in a systematic way that will retain the necessary and essential parts of the governmental programs on a sound basis. This revolution of which I speak will follow orderly processes, the principal step of which will be to sweep a Congress out of office which does not use every diligent effort to eliminate unnecessary expenditures.

There are some who believe that the Congress should merely appropriate the money for the use of the executive branch, and that they should be permitted to administer and spend these funds where and how they may determine without interference, guidance, or control. This thinking has largely grown out of the fact that the Congress has failed to carry out its constitutional authority over the control of the purse. With the tremendous increases in taxes that have become necessary incident to the World Wars and the present defense effort, Congress must reestablish its position as the guardian of the public purse. The people of this country have a right to expect each member they elect to the Senate or the House of Representatives to use every possible diligence in eliminating unnecessary expenditures so that every possible tax dollar may be utilized in the defense effort which is so essential to the welfare of the Nation at this time. The people want their government to function, but they do not want to pay \$2 in tax money when \$1 will do.

There are a total of 29 persons presently employed on the staff of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, including 8 on its "watchdog subcommittee," and 36 on the staff of the House Committee on Appropriations.

In other words, Mr. President, 65 employees of the two committees guide Congress, and Congress has the sole responsibility for the expenditure of the \$85,000,000,000. Only 65 employees help Members of Congress say grace over an \$85,000,000,000 budget. It is not within the realm of human capability to perform such a task.

CONTRAST IN STAFFS

Thus, it is seen that while the tremendous demands on Government have in-

creased to the extent that it requires a staff of 500 trained and experienced personnel working 12 months in the year, regarding the budget as prepared by the executive department of the Government, we have increased the staff of the Appropriations Committee during this same period of time from 14 employees to 57, some of whom are on a temporary loan basis from the executive branch of the Government.

Mr. President, let me make doubly clear that there is certainly no reflection on the ability or the capacity of any member of the present staffs of these committees. According to my actual observation of staff members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I do not believe persons can be found who would do superior work; they do a remarkable job far beyond the call of duty and are highly efficient. There are no clock watchers among them. However, they do not have the time, the facilities, nor the opportunity to cover the field work that I think is absolutely essential if the Congress is to perform its proper functions in appropriating money.

Let us daily remember, Mr. President, that the Constitution of the United States puts the sole responsibility for the laying of taxes and the making of appropriations on the Congress, thus placing the representatives of the people in control of the Government by controlling the purse strings. The responsibility rests solely with the Congress.

Mr. President, I emphasize that point because I know we are feeling the tremendous impact of the huge defense spending program. We must not lull ourselves into the feeling that, after all, we are not responsible for this money, that it must go for defense, and we therefore do not have to look at these appropriations as closely as we otherwise would.

As a practical matter, however, the Congress has in part lost the control of its own fiscal affairs because of the immensity of the governmental operations and the present lack of facilities to cope with the conditions that confront us in making appropriations.

We are now into the fourth month of the session that is scheduled to end near the 1st of July. Appropriation bills are being sent over from the House of Representatives which carry reductions below the budget estimates amounting to hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars. Naturally the heads of various departments and bureaus will defend their departments before the Senate Appropriations Committee and testify ably in behalf of a restoration of these funds. This will be virtually all the testimony that the Senate Appropriations Committee will have on the subject except in isolated instances. The committee will not have the benefit of trained field men who have on-the-ground knowledge of the programs gained and presented as representatives of the committee. In other words, so far as the testimony in the case is concerned, Congress will not be represented and it is too late now to send personnel into the field to determine the actual facts.

Mr. President, I remember that one year when I was a member of the sub-

committee 454 witnesses appeared before the subcommittee either in person or by submitting statements. Four hundred and fifty-three of those witnesses testified in favor of increased appropriations. Only one witness was opposed to an increase in the appropriations. That is a fair indication of the trend of testimony before the committees, and such testimony is all that is available to the committees and the Congress unless Congress develops a staff of its own, sufficiently large in size and with sufficient training and ability to be able to obtain the facts from the standpoint of the Congress and to have an on-the-ground knowledge of the facts. If Congress obtains the facts, it will be able to arrive at fair judgment regarding the action it should take.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Has it not been the observation of the Senator from Mississippi that, in the natural course of events, those who want appropriations made are the ones who interest themselves in such matters and take the time and trouble to come before the committees to plead for appropriations, whereas the average citizen relies upon his representatives in Congress to obtain the necessary information and to act judiciously on the basis of it?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Arkansas is eminently correct. At the present time those of us who serve in Congress are without the tools we need if we are properly to represent the public in these matters.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to permit me to ask another question?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yesterday the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], expressed some doubt about the bill, implying that he entertained some fears that the bill, when enacted, might detract from the prestige, influence, or responsibility of the Appropriations Committees as they now are constituted. I know that is not the intent of the bill; and I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi, who has studied the bill, can read into it anything which in any way would impair the effectiveness of the Appropriations Committees; or does the Senator from Mississippi find that, instead of impairing their effectiveness and importance, the bill would augment, fortify, and strengthen the power, effectiveness, and importance of the Appropriations Committees?

Mr. STENNIS. I am certain in my own mind that the bill, when enacted, will facilitate the performance by the Appropriations Committees of their highly important duties. The proposed joint committee would be a subordinate working tool of the Appropriations Committees, and is designed as such, and the bill is drawn up on that basis. I am sure that will be the practical effect of the bill when it is in operation.

Mr. President, the present condition illustrates with great emphasis the absolute necessity for trained personnel employed the year around in developing at the ground level the facts with reference to these programs. Another practical illustration comes to mind: Last year authorization bills for one of the armed services carried items for permanent barracks in the United States, costing from \$2,000 to \$2,400 per unit. Each member of the committee thought that was far too much, but there was no evidence to offset the figures and not time enough to investigate the question. As I understand it, the Appropriations Committee had the same experience in regard to that matter, and the figures were never reduced.

EVALUATE PROGRAMS

This bill would require the staff of the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget to evaluate programs authorized by the Congress and to report to the appropriate committees whether such programs were being carried out as directed under the enabling legislation. The staff would further be required to report to the appropriate committees any duplications that might result from new enactments, and to suggest the repeal or amendment of acts which authorize programs in conflict with new concepts of Federal operations. This phase of the Joint Committee's operations alone should effectuate the saving of many millions of dollars. Too often the Congress, in following recommendations of its committees, establishes a long-term program and then piles program after program upon the original authorization without in any way determining how the basic act is operating or how it should be changed to conform to the new programs. Under the pending bill, the staff would be authorized and directed continually to inform the substantive committees dealing with program authorizations relative to duplication of activities or the lack of need of Federal programs previously authorized by such committees.

The bill would also require each of the committees, in approving legislation, not only to fully apprise the Congress itself of the initial cost of any program authorization, but to submit estimates as to the extended cost of such programs over a period of 5 years. This provision of the bill is something that Congress has long needed for its own guidance, and should result in a better and more complete appraisal of proposed legislation involving the expenditure of Federal funds. This section of the bill will also provide the Congress with the means of obtaining necessary information for placing adequate restrictions and limitations on departmental operations, so as to insure conformance to the intent of the Congress with respect to the funds approved for specific Federal projects.

FOSTER JOINT ACTION

Finally, the bill, while not setting forth any rigid requirement therefor, would encourage the holding of joint hearings in the initial stages of the money bills. This has long been a need

which the Congress has for various reasons heretofore failed to adopt. Operation of this section, as contemplated by the bill, would eliminate the need for extensive, duplicating hearings requiring the attendance of Members of the House and the Senate to hear practically the same presentation of basic facts relative to each of the departmental and agency programs.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me for a question?

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. I take it that the Senator from Mississippi is strongly in favor of the bill now before the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; I am supporting the bill, but I am also supporting some of the amendments proposed to it.

Mr. LONG. One point which occurs to me is that the Armed Services Committee has the function of passing on proposed authorizations for the military budget, which now is more than half of the total budget; in fact, it is perhaps 75 percent of the total. I notice that the bill does not contain a provision that one or more members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate or the Armed Services Committee of the House shall serve on the proposed joint committee. It has seemed to me that the Armed Services Committee was not sufficiently staffed to send one of its members to review the need for vast expenditures for bases and installations, as well as materials, authorizations for which were being requested by the Armed Services. I wonder whether the Senator from Mississippi feels that, therefore, perhaps the Armed Services Committee should be represented on the proposed joint committee.

Mr. STENNIS. I feel that no committee other than the Appropriations Committee should be represented on the joint committee. I take that position inasmuch as the Appropriations Committee has the final responsibility of recommending to Congress how much money shall be appropriated and spent for the various projects.

I believe we can either follow the course of having all the committees have their own staffs of sufficient size and training to be able to examine the field of operations coming within the purview of the respective committees, or we can center and build up that work around the Appropriations Committee. I think the bill strikes the best course, and I shall support an amendment providing that no committee other than the Appropriations Committee shall be represented on the joint committee.

I believe the Armed Services Committee will have to do some work of its own. However, I think we must center this investigatory work somewhere, and I believe it should revolve around the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HUNT. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi whether he does not think it might be quite appropriate if the services of this

joint committee were made available to the various committees? Provision might be made for its members to appear before various committees to advise them, for example, in the case of the Armed Services Committee with reference to the findings of the joint committee regarding authorizations for the armed services.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Wyoming has made an excellent point. As I see it, he has suggested what will be one of the primary functions of the joint congressional budget committee. The view which the junior Senator from Mississippi takes is that it is not to be of service to the Appropriations Committee, alone, but it is to be of service to all of us. I think, however, it should be centered around and built around the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses, working together.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, if I may ask one further question, does the Senator from Mississippi look upon the work of the proposed joint committee as being in the nature of a preaudit of expenditures which are to be made?

Mr. STENNIS. In part, yes; a preaudit—that is a good way to express it—to determine what expenditures are justified, and to ascertain the basic facts. That is to be done in the field by agents representing the Congress—not by someone else; not by the departments, not by the executive branch, but by Representatives of the Congress, which carries the responsibility. It should be a preaudit and a preappraisal of the facts.

Mr. HUNT. One more question: Is there any doubt in the mind of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi that the entire membership of the Senate, and especially the members of the Appropriations Committee, will be far better informed on the question of what the money they are appropriating will be spent for than has ever been the case in the Senate heretofore?

Mr. STENNIS. I think the Senator from Wyoming is correct. I emphasize that this is a necessary step, that something of this nature is absolutely required before Senators, as human beings, can cope adequately with the problems which are placed before them from day to day.

It is my understanding that S. 913 has been endorsed by more than 30 State taxpayers' associations affiliated with the National Conference of State Taxpayers Associations, by the National Association of Manufacturers, and by outstanding political scientists. Officials and members of these great organizations are persons who have to deal with fiscal problems in their everyday operations. They know the importance of attaining economy and efficiency in fiscal affairs, if they are to realize profits in the operation of their businesses. They have, by supporting this bill, clearly indicated that they also recognize the deficiencies in the fiscal operations of the Federal Government, and endorse the objective of the pending bill as being essential to the utilization of tax dollars which they, their employees, and their stockholders pay into the Federal Treas-

ury. I think it is not only appropriate that these groups interest themselves in this type of legislation, but I feel it should carry weight with the Congress itself that these leaders of industry have urged us, as their representatives and spokesmen in tax matters, to take the necessary action to insure more efficiency and economy in the operations of the Federal Government.

The largest single private industry, the General Motors Corp., has an income of approximately one-tenth that of the Federal Government. I am sure that the board of directors of the General Motors Corp., or any other large industry, would not tolerate the lack of fiscal controls within that great corporation comparable to the present fiscal structure of the legislative branch.

Mr. President, I desire to emphasize that picture. Imagine a private corporation, with 10 times the income of General Motors Corp., spending such a sum as \$80,000,000,000 through its board of directors, we will say, and doing it upon the information and advice of only 57 men, who would constitute the only staff they would have to advise them as to what the facts were which justified the expenditure of the \$80,000,000,000. It is unthinkable. In the practical affairs of life it is beyond imagination to think that an average businessman, much less one who is up to date, would consider embarking on such a venture as spending that much money with no more guidance and advice at his command than that of only 57 men.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Speaking of the amount of money involved and the tremendous job the Members of the Senate have, of passing on appropriations, I made a check last year, when this bill was being considered by the committee. I may say to the able Senator from Mississippi that we discussed eight of the largest corporations in the country, namely, General Motors, A. T. & T., Atlantic & Pacific, Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, United States Steel, Sears Roebuck, Swift & Co., and Chrysler. The total of the annual expenditures by those companies, comprising eight of the largest corporations in the United States, was but \$27,000,000,000, or about one-third of the budget we are called upon to consider annually for the National Government.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's contribution of those facts, particularly at this point, because it emphasizes what I was trying to point out by way of comparison between the system under which we are operating in the Senate and the system which is employed by modern business firms.

Any modern business firm would want to know where and how its income was being expanded, and where reductions could properly be made in order to increase its services to the public and realize greater profits in its operations. It is my view that the Federal Government could well follow the example of some of our larger corporations in providing itself with a proper and adequate fiscal

structure to deal with its activities which extend not only into the operations of industry, but into the lives of every citizen of these United States.

FACTS FOR ALL

With such a joint committee and its staff functioning on a continuous basis, studying and reviewing budget requests and program expenditures beginning at the end of each fiscal year, and projecting its surveillance on through until the budget document is submitted in January of each year, the Appropriations Committees and individual Members of Congress would have ready access to any specific budget item. Not only would this bring about a complete understanding of the operations of each and every project, but would enable the Congress to effect scientific cuts in appropriations based on the facts and not by the meat-ax process. Members of Congress would know where cuts could be made and how much, without interfering with the operations of programs approved by the Congress in the public interest.

Under such a program, with full information already developed on all important budget items, action could be expedited, and the appropriation bills approved early in the year well ahead of the end of the current fiscal year period. There would be less need for drastic adjustments in conferences, since decisions would be based on the same basic facts and staff reports, and eliminate many differences that develop between the two Houses under the present policies. This would permit Members of Congress to devote more time to other legislative matters and to the interests of their constituents.

Mr. President, I conclude with the same thought and the same theory that I mentioned in the first sentence, namely, that the practical title of this bill should be "Necessary Congressional Working Tool."

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, during the very able address of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi on the pending measure, I discovered in my file a very interesting article which appeared in Real Estate News Letter of July 30, 1951, entitled "Lasso the Wild Mare."

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

LASSO THE WILD MARE

(By Herb Nelson)

Runaway Government spending and waste in Washington today is beyond the ability of any one person to estimate or comprehend. Nothing like it has ever been known before.

If you take the eight largest corporations in our country—General Motors, A. T. & T.; Atlantic & Pacific; Standard Oil of New Jersey; United States Steel; Sears, Roebuck; Swift & Co.; and Chrysler—and add up their total income, it would be \$27,000,000,000, or about half of what Congress is now appropriating. These companies employ 1,920,000 people, while the Government has 2,390,000 civilian employees and 3,250,000 in the armed services. Such figures are cited in a

report by Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Democrat, Arkansas, on fiscal matters.

Last January NAREB's directors adopted a resolution asking that Congress create a special commission of Members of the Senate and House to review constantly and to hold continuous hearings with respect to expenditures of Government.

President Summer in his speeches has urged this plan to create an emergency commission of the House and Senate with full power to review expenditures item by item.

Worried Members of the Senate and House, faced with defense spending of a billion a week and with forecasts of a \$100,000,000,000 budget, are coming to similar conclusions.

It is good news that the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, headed by Senator McCLELLAN, has unanimously produced a bill, S. 913, to create such a joint commission of the House and Senate as President Summer has urged.

The bill provides for a "watchdog committee" on the budget composed of 18 members, 9 from the Senate and 9 from the House, drawn from the two Committees on Appropriations and on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. This committee would function constantly, holding hearings whether or not Congress is in session. It would review every penny of the vast budgetary requests that are made, which now require a volume as big as a telephone book just to list.

The committee would have a staff of experts, giving full time to the task of analyzing the budget and making recommendation for the elimination of unnecessary spending or waste.

Harried members of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations have tried to do their job through a score of subcommittees, covering different departments and activities. When it is considered that some of the departments are bigger than any single corporation, it is easy to see that a Member of the House and Senate cannot master fiscal problems and approve its budget as an incidental part-time activity.

Encouraging and necessary, bill S. 913 in the Senate is an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It has not yet been introduced in the House, but that will undoubtedly come soon. It is a fine bill and will give the taxpayer at least some assurance that there will be a disinterested expert to cast a quizzical eye on some of the fantastic demands of the departments and bureaus for indefinite and continued expenditure.

The French people have always been saving, but their Government has spent and spent. The French franc, once worth 20 cents, is now worth only one-seventieth as much, and Government threatens to dissolve into impotence and futility. The point is nations can go bankrupt. It isn't true that debt doesn't matter as long as we owe it to ourselves.

Give President Al Summer a lift on this vital part of his program. Help save yourself some money. Take your fountain pen in hand and drop a note to both of your Senators and to your Representative, asking them to read and to support S. 913, to create a "watchdog committee" of the Congress on executive expenditures.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, returned to the Senate in compliance with its request, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 20) to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, and to

provide for the use and control of said lands and resources.

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

H. R. 156. An act to repeal the Alaska railroads tax;

H. R. 4764. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to the participation of certain Provinces of the Dominion of Canada in the Northeastern Interstate Forest Fire Protection Compact, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5998. An act to amend the excise tax on photographic apparatus;

H. R. 7188. An act to provide that the additional tax imposed by section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code shall not apply in respect of coconut oil produced in, or produced from materials grown in, the territory of the Pacific Islands; and

H. R. 7189. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code which relate to machine guns and short-barrelled firearms, so as to impose a tax on the making of sawed-off shotguns and to extend such provisions to Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes.

AFFAIRS IN TUNISIA—ROLE OF UNITED NATIONS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I am not among those whose daily exercise consists in throwing stones at the foreign policy of the United States as it is administered by the President and Secretary of State. When the history of this era comes to be written, the courageous statesmanship of this administration in supporting the principles of peace and collective security under the charter of the United Nations will stand forth in true perspective. Korea will be remembered in world history as Concord is remembered in American history. The Uniting for Peace Resolution sponsored by our Government in the General Assembly in 1950 will stand as an eternal reminder that no nation can veto the aggregate sentiments of mankind.

It is just because our record in support of United Nations principles is so outstanding that I feel impelled to give warning concerning a situation which now confronts us in the United Nations.

There is now being debated in the Security Council of the United Nations a matter which so far has attracted little attention in this country. But it is a matter which may profoundly affect the position and influence of the United States throughout the world, particularly in Africa and throughout the Near, Middle, and Far East.

There is trouble in Tunisia—trouble between the French authorities and the Bey of Tunis, trouble between the French authorities and Tunisian political leaders who were until recently members of the Tunisian Government but who have been replaced and jailed by the French authorities.

The matter has been brought before the Security Council by the Government of Pakistan as one which might lead to international friction, and which, if not resolved, is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Nearly every state throughout the Near and Middle East has evinced an interest in the situation.

The question at the present moment is not how the Security Council should deal with this situation, but whether it should take notice of the situation, whether it should put the question of Tunisia on its agenda.

The case will become in the eyes of the peoples of the Near and Middle East a test case, a test case to determine whether in the future the United Nations can be relied upon even to discuss a case involving the principle of self-determination when that principle clashes with colonialism and the interest of colonial powers.

Until recently I thought that there was no question where the United States stood or ought to stand in this matter. I had thought that we had accepted the United Nations as the cornerstone of our foreign policy and had made clear that all defensive arrangements like NATO were to be in support of the principles of the United Nations and not in the defense of the special interests of one group of states to the detriment of the legitimate rights of any other group of states or peoples.

I had thought that we had taken a firm stand that all matters affecting peace and security should be open to discussion in the appropriate organs of the United Nations. I recall that at the time of the San Francisco Conference President Truman sent Mr. Hopkins to tell Generalissimo Stalin that we could not allow any state the right to veto the discussion of a question affecting peace and security in the Security Council. We stood against any arbitrary limitation on the right to discuss matters affecting peace and security.

But now we are told that the United States is going to abstain from voting on the question whether the Tunisian case should be put on the agenda for discussion. If the United States abdicates its leadership and fails to vote, it seems unlikely that the seven votes required to put the case on the agenda will be secured. The small nations on the Council, some of which are dependent on our power and generosity, will hesitate to vote when the great United States does not take an open stand.

Our failure to take an open stand, Mr. President, would be, in my judgment, a negation of the principles of free discussion in the United Nations for which we have heretofore fought. Our failure to permit issues to come before the United Nations when they are embarrassing to our allies does not dispel or banish those issues. They remain, but our ability to deal with them, our ability to play a conciliatory and honorable part in their solution, is weakened by our own action in denying debate.

Our refusal to vote to put the Tunisian question on the agenda in the Security Council will not help our friend and ally, France. It will not help NATO or the NATO members. On the contrary, it will weaken NATO and cast suspicion and distrust on NATO and its basic purposes.

We must not let the mistaken notion spread that NATO supports colonialism against self-determination; that the NATO powers are concerned to use the United Nations only for their own pur-

poses rather than to uphold the purposes of the United Nations.

The late Senator Vandenberg and others of us in the Senate wisely insisted that NATO should be linked with the purposes and principles of the United Nations so that it would never become a mere power alliance. Let us be careful not to scrap, by our action or non-action in the United Nations, the very principles we insisted upon writing into the Atlantic Pact.

No one realizes more than I do, Mr. President, the important strategic interests we have in North Africa and the Near East, but those interests can only be imperiled and not helped by neglecting and negating the principles of the United Nations.

If we adhere to the proposition on which NATO was founded, that NATO exists to strengthen the United Nations, we will have the friends and allies outside the NATO countries whom we need to maintain the strength and unity of the free world. If we forsake the principles of the United Nations, we will not help NATO, but we will destroy the unity of the free world.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In substance, what the Senator has been saying is that the United States should take a position at this time, either pro or con, in order to get ahead of the game and not allow the situation to come to a crisis and have the United States or NATO called upon to solve the difficulty.

Mr. HILL. The United States should forthrightly take a position in favor of putting the Tunisian question on the agenda for discussion in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not true that some of the criticism of the present administration is that it gets ahead of itself, so to speak, and does not plan far enough in advance? What the Senator is now saying is that we should be sufficiently forewarned—

Mr. HILL. We must be forewarned; we must anticipate; we must stand squarely by the principles of the United Nations and let there be no question about our standing in favor of the self-determination of all nations. As the Senator has suggested, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. I thank the Senator.

THE THREATENED STEEL STRIKE

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, last week there was placed on the desk of each Senator a report from the Office of the Director of Defense Mobilization. This report, by and large, was very encouraging. It showed the growing strength of this country militarily, industrially, and economically in a very practical and clear-cut way. It told of the mobilization pattern, of military production, industrial expansion, material supplies and allocations, agriculture, manpower, and economic stabilization. From this report we got the understanding that the program in this country under the production act has been going

along very constructively and that it has operated effectively. Many new materials have been furnished for industrial production. Allocation of steel to domestic concerns was increasing. The Army had adequate supplies of steel, as had the Navy and the Air Force, to take care of their needs. The same was true of aluminum and copper. The rubber supply is adequate to our needs and to any emergency we might anticipate. Industrial production generally has been on the increase, making the things which the people in this country want to buy, and at the same time keeping an adequate defense program for immediate needs and in anticipation of any further emergency.

We also note that prices were declining rather generally, that costs were down on most products for domestic use. The prices of a great portion of them were below ceiling prices, not only in the soft goods and consumer goods, but likewise in agricultural products. The price of meat was coming down; the price of beef was at or below ceiling; the price of pork was below ceiling. Many prices were below the parity figure, production was constantly going up, and inventories in the country generally were high.

With adequate production of the needs for war and industry, with prices declining, indicating that inflationary pressures were beginning to lessen, and that prices were finally going down, much encouragement was given to the people of our country. We finally felt that we had solved, or were solving and soon might solve, not only the question of production, but likewise the problem of abnormally high prices resulting from an undersupply of goods and an oversupply of money and credit.

Of course, there still existed the constant threat of an unbalanced budget that might again, unless Congress made adequate reductions in appropriations so that they would come within the income of the country, exert a pressure which would result in again increased prices.

Then we noted with considerable alarm that Mr. Wilson had resigned his position. He had come into the Government service from industry, with a fine background, a very constructive approach, and a sincere, patriotic devotion to his duty, and he personally assumed the full responsibility of the office to which he had been appointed.

Mr. President, at this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, as a part of my remarks, an editorial entitled "Mr. Wilson Resigns," published in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch of Tuesday, April 1, 1952.

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

It is extremely unlikely that any businessman, no matter how aware he may be of the deviousness of politics, can ever successfully play a politician's game with other politicians.

It is especially unlikely that he can ever do this successfully if, into the bargain, he is compelled to play under the rules of the professional politician and on the grounds chosen by the politician.

Charles E. Wilson, the recently resigned mobilization director, is the latest example of what can happen to a patriotic citizen who in all good faith answers the call to public service with a sincere determination to help his country.

Mr. Wilson has had to quit because he thought all along that the Government's attempt to avert the threatened steel strike was what it seemed to be. What he forgot in his sacrificial effort to be helpful is that the Government's interference in the steel dispute was not for the purpose of settling it fairly, but was for the purpose of wringing some political advantage from seeming to step into the breach—a breach that could have been far more effectively filled by the process of free collective bargaining between the steel makers and the steel unions—and forcing a settlement which, of course, could be advantageously seized upon at an opportune moment during the coming campaign.

A part of this political maneuvering was the deliberate way in which Mr. Wilson, himself, was set up as a straw man and then mowed down.

He had conferred only a few days before the Wage Stabilization Board's recommendations with the President on the probable terms of a steel strike settlement, and made it clear then that in his opinion any settlement which would set off another Government-supported wage-price spiral would dangerously injure the whole defense effort because of its inflationary results.

He was satisfied in his own mind at that meeting that the Government agreed with him. What must have been his amazement when he learned that not only had the Wage Stabilization Board deliberately ignored this logical and sensible advice, but that almost simultaneously the CIO let loose a devastating blast at him, and this after its representatives, too, had had a private confab with the President.

The hint that he, Mr. Wilson, was off on the wrong foot entirely in trying for a settlement which fitted into the Government's so-called anti-inflationary control policies was strong enough.

The mobilization director awakened too late to the fact that the whole control program is not primarily for the purpose of controls, but is simply a political device for the purpose of interfering, where such interference can be politically advantageous, in behalf of certain political ends and political personalities.

Mobilizer Wilson is only one of many such American businessmen who have given up the security of privacy of their important and constructive business careers to answer the call of public service, only to find that they have been called not for the purpose of serving their country but for the purpose of lending respectability to some of the more questionable activities of the politicians.

The shameful political sacrifice of Mr. Wilson now makes an amicable settlement of the steel labor-management differences more remote than ever. He could hardly do anything else than resign, in view of the circumstances, excepting, of course, as an enlightened and practical businessman he could have refused in the first place to have anything to do with a Government agency whose purposes are economically unsound to begin with.

But that is aside from the point of this discussion. The important thing here is that another lesson has been written in the history of Government control organizations for all to see. And the public, generally, and businessmen, specifically, can learn a great deal by committing it to memory if they only will.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, it seems that the resignation of Mr. Wilson resulted from a difference of opinion between himself and the President of

the United States, and also from the confusion caused by events subsequent to the understanding Mr. Wilson claims he had with the President before he returned to Washington.

The report of the Wage Stabilization Board proposed to give employees of the steel industry the largest increase in wages that has ever been given in the history of our country. In an attempt to adjust the proposed increases with prices of the products of steel companies, Mr. Wilson found himself absolutely frustrated because of the changed position of the President, and so he resigned. I think the resignation of Mr. Wilson was a blow not only to the whole production program of the Nation, but also to the prospects of holding the line against inflation.

I do not know all the details by which the Wage Stabilization Board arrived at its ultimate conclusion, but I know there was a great deal of confusion and dispute as to the reasonableness of their report. Certainly the Wage Stabilization Board in its report went into fields which were never contemplated at the time the Defense Production Act was passed by Congress, and certainly were never in the mind of any member of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency or of the conference committee on which I had the duty of serving.

Before the Senate at present is a bill to extend provisions of the Defense Production Act under which Mr. Wilson was serving, and under which the Wage Stabilization Board was created by order of the President. The bill would have been reported to the Senate almost 2 weeks ago had it not been for confusion in the administration resulting from activities of the Wage Stabilization Board, not only within its proper field of consideration and determination of questions of fact, but particularly in its invasion of other fields, its consideration of matters that were never deemed to be within the province of the Wage Stabilization Board in any way, shape, or form.

In the press last night, in contrast with what I mentioned a moment ago from the report of Mr. Wilson, regarding a reduction of prices and an increasing supply of goods, there was this headline: "All civilian supplies"—and that means steel—"put under freeze; 650,000 ready to quit posts."

A steel strike at this time would be disastrous to our whole domestic production program. Likewise, it might become disastrous to our defense program. Although there is an adequate amount of steel at the present time to take care of military needs under the present program, how long that situation will last will depend entirely on the length of the strike and the destructive results flowing from it.

If the proposed increase in wages goes into effect there will inevitably be a tremendous increase in inflationary pressure throughout the country, because the effect will flow down through all channels of trade. Certainly those workers in industry who are engaged in fabricating steel are entitled to consideration. All across the board there will

be constant and increasing demands for higher wages, which ultimately—and perhaps immediately—will result in higher prices to the consuming public. Such higher prices will not only affect the ordinary consumer in our domestic economy, but they will have a dangerous effect upon the whole defense production program, requiring increased appropriations to take care of increased costs.

So as a result of the strike everyone will suffer. The war effort will suffer. We shall give encouragement to the enemies of our country and of freedom, and the Government will lose a great deal in the form of taxes. To such a program will ultimately increase the general tax burden to the ordinary tax-paying citizen of the United States.

Out of every dollar that the steel companies make within the excess profits range, 82 percent goes to the Government. Of every dollar in these higher brackets which the steel companies lose because of their inability to make up in prices for increased cost, the Government will lose 82 cents. Of every dollar in lower brackets which the steel companies lose because of the squeeze between costs and prices, the Government will lose 70 cents. The loss will run into hundreds of millions of dollars, at a time when the budget is already threatened with imbalance, and the taxpayers have to make up the difference. The inflationary pressure will come not only from decreased production, and from increased purchasing power from the higher wages paid, but also from a sharply increased deficit in the Government budget.

I think Mr. Wilson's resignation has had disastrous repercussions. He should have been encouraged, and supported in negotiations in an attempt to settle this rather sensitive situation between industry and labor. He should have had the full support of the Administration in doing so. He might have been able to avoid what now seems to be an imminent and unavoidable strike.

That leads me to a consideration of the panel board, which is called the Wage Stabilization Board, created under the Defense Production Act. It is made up of so many members representing industry, so many representing labor, and so many representing the public. Their appointments were not confirmed by the Senate. They constitute an interim board, appointed by the President of the United States. So far as the law is concerned, their recommendations and reports are not binding. The only power they have is to recommend. As I stated a moment ago, their recommendations have been accepted by labor as binding upon the Government. Labor insists these recommendations be binding upon management.

That raises a question which the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate must face very soon, namely, the question as to whether or not this board shall be continued, whether or not it shall be permitted to invade the province of the National Labor Relations Board, and whether it shall be permitted to go into matters which it was never intended to consider. The Committee on Banking

and Currency must also consider the very nature of the Board itself. I for one, at the time the other bill was under consideration, opposed a tripartite panel board of this kind. I believe that every member of every board of this kind, if the board is to have any substance at all, or if its recommendations are to be given any credit, ought to represent the public. I believe that in this instance so serious are the results flowing from its considerations that the Senate ought to have the responsibility of approving the membership. If the President wants to appoint someone from the field of labor who understands the problems of labor, and someone from the field of business who understands the problems of business, well and good. However, there ought to be a paramount public responsibility, and the members of such a board should not be answerable to any segment of our society which must be less than the whole public interest.

This impending strike, following the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board, which, as I have said, dealt with many matters not within its province, has discredited the whole wage and price control program. When this program was under consideration many of us felt that it might be politically administered and as a result would ultimately break down. It seems to be breaking down at the present time.

Much credit is claimed for the control of prices by comparing them with prices a few months previous to the time the regulatory authorities were instituted and began operating. The fact is that there is no adequate comparison. The scare buying after Korea is no standard of comparison. No one can prove whether or not the whole price stabilization program has been effective in holding down prices. In the judgment of the Senator from Ohio it is very doubtful if any prices have been held down by the operations of the price control authority. Certainly the first formula which was fixed by the wage stabilization authority has been pierced many, many times, and now I think is made completely useless by the last finding of the Wage Stabilization Board. So we must now again consider whether the whole wage and price stabilization program is operating effectively in the public interest, or whether it is attacking only the consequences of inflation. Certainly the Price Stabilization Agency can take no credit for prices which, as I suggested a while ago, are far below the ceiling at the present time. The price stabilizers have done nothing in regard to those prices, and cannot honestly take credit for the reductions.

For example, the New York market reports that cotton cloth sells for from 15 to 35 percent below the ceiling. Men's suits are down. Women's dresses are down. A larger midwestern retailer estimates that furniture prices are from 10 to 15 percent below ceilings at the present time. These all enter into the calculations of the price stabilization authorities who attempt to take credit for reduced and declining prices.

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

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it not true that there is a general slump in all mercantile business? There are a large number of vacant storerooms in various places in the Nation, which indicates a lowering of prices.

Mr. BRICKER. There is a general lowering of prices and a softening all through our economy at the present time. Many prices are below the ceiling prices. I remember the first order that was issued with respect to edible fats and oils. Within only a few weeks or months subsequent to the issuance of the order fats and oils were selling at half the ceiling prices. But these results did not stem from the order. They were caused by the play of supply and demand upon the price structure.

Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, I do not know what actuated the Wage Stabilization Board in its findings. I do know that it was in confusion and that it had under consideration many things that were not within its province. The recommendations have led directly to the strike which is imminent and likely to be called tonight, and to all the disastrous effects that will flow from it.

Mr. President, if we had had no wage and price-control program under the Production Act—and I certainly voted in favor of the bill so far as the Government's securing adequate supplies for the defense program was concerned—I am confident that by collective bargaining between industry and labor, and with the proper functioning of the Labor Relations Board, there would not have been the increases in wages which have come about, and there would have been as great a decrease in prices as has been experienced under the influence of OPS.

Mr. President, OPS employs many thousands of employees throughout the country, many of whom are paid high salaries. There have been placed in the RECORD from time to time reports from various States with respect to the number of OPS employees and the salaries they are paid.

OPS has issued orders, unlimited in number and confusing in detail. Some of them are unintelligible to the average businessman or to the lawyers practicing in the various communities. Many of them are completely meaningless. However, in addition to that, for every employee of OPS there are an estimated 10 people throughout the economy generally who study and understand, if they can, and put into effect the rules, regulations, and orders.

Mr. President, I daresay that if those persons who are employed by the Government, and required of business, had been put into productive enterprise the effect upon prices would have been just as great as that which has been claimed as a result of the rules and regulations and orders which have been issued by OPS.

We have reached the point discussed in an editorial printed in yesterday's Washington Post. It brings us to the question of the remedy for the present difficult situation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TALK OF STEEL SEIZURE

The current talk about governmental seizure of the steel industry is in striking contrast to President Truman's assertion 2 years ago, when the coal miners refused to obey a court injunction, that he had no authority to seize the mines. It appears that the presidential power in this sphere blooms and withers in accord with the political sympathies of the White House in the dispute. In our opinion, however, the President was right when he told the press that he lacked power to seize the mines in an emergency. And we know of no law that has since given him power to take over steel plants because of a strike or potential strike.

During the Second World War, President Roosevelt enforced the orders of the War Labor Board, when employers refused to comply, by seizing their plants. That action was widely criticized at the time. Even after Congress passed the War Labor Disputes Act authorizing the seizure of plants made idle by labor disputes, if such plants were producing for the war effort, F. D. R. took over the Montgomery Ward retail store in Chicago, presumably acting under vague "war powers." The most that can be said for this high-handed invasion of property rights is that it was done under the pressure of wartime emotions. Today there would be no excuse for repetition of those errors.

The War Labor Disputes Act is no longer on the books, and the law most frequently cited as giving some color of authority to a possible seizure of the steel industry is the Selective Service Act. Under its provisions, the President may compel steel producers to furnish defense contractors with steel needed to fill Government orders. It is scarcely conceivable that Congress intended to conceal in this grant of authority to control the flow of materials the power to seize plants made idle by labor disputes.

Some emphasis is also being given to an opinion of Attorney General (now Justice) Tom Clark a few years ago. It was to the effect that "the inherent power of the President to deal with emergencies that affect the health, safety, and welfare of the entire Nation is exceedingly great." Mr. Clark produced this opinion in an effort to justify the administration's proposal to strike out of the Taft-Hartley Act the provision authorizing 80-day injunctions in labor disputes threatening a national emergency. This newspaper said at the time that reliance upon vague claims to constitutional power to cope with national emergencies of this sort "would be the negation of orderly government. Such a surrender of Congress to executive policy making in this sphere would probably be as great an evil as the paralyzing strikes themselves."

There is good reason, of course, why President Truman would hesitate to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act if the steelworkers strike. That would place the Government in the position of cracking down on the union because of a strike to obtain the benefits recommended by a governmental agency—the Wage Stabilization Board. But even a Taft-Hartley injunction to meet a national emergency, if the strike now ordered should be prolonged, would be less obnoxious than a seizure of steel plants without authority.

This newspaper has often urged that the President be given seizure powers for use against recalcitrant employers in cases of national emergency. In these times the Government should be able to avert paralysis of our economy by either management or labor. If no settlement can be effected, President Truman might well go to Congress with a powerful argument for amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act to include authority for temporary governmental operation of a

struck plant whose continuous operation is essential to the national safety. But the talk of seizing power to seize the steel industry has already gone too far. Officials should not need to be reminded that ours is a Government of limited powers.

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, what is the proper remedy for the situation? There is at least grave doubt in the minds of lawyers generally as to whether or not the President of the United States has the power to seize the steel plants. It was certainly never intended by those who took part in the drafting and enactment of the Defense Production Act that such power be given to the President except in instances where it was necessary to requisition an individual plant which was producing materials of war needed in the defense effort.

Nevertheless, under that act or under the Draft Act, we see an effort—at least it is suggested in the public press—by the President to seize this great segment of American industry, with all the attendant confusion and slowing down of our expansion program. We cannot disregard the billions of dollars which are going into the expansion program from private industry. More damage will follow the turn-back.

The problem arises as to whether or not the Government, having taken over the steel plants, and having entered into negotiations with the unions to give them the wages recommended by the Wage Stabilization Board, will be able then to turn the properties back to the steel companies.

There are other remedies, of course, which are available to the President.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. BRICKER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CAIN. If by way of argument we assume that the Government does seize the steel industry, what are the Government's qualifications and capacity for administering and managing that great segment of America's economy?

Mr. BRICKER. I know of none at all. I do not know of anyone the Government could get, except the persons who now operate the steel business, who could move into the picture and operate the business.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator from Ohio seems to be suggesting that if, for a considerable period of time, the Government attempts to manage and operate the steel industry the net result is likely to be a serious dislocation of that industry, from which it will take many years to recover.

Mr. BRICKER. The Senator from Washington is exactly right. Any taking over will result in deterioration and a breakdown in good management. More serious than that, however, would be the loss of the production we would otherwise get both for the war effort and for the domestic consumers throughout the country. Nothing but confusion or loss can come from a seizure of the plants by the Government.

Mr. CAIN. It seems to me that there is a very real likelihood that the result of Government seizure of the steel industry might be the first concrete step in the direction of the future nationalization of the American steel industry.

Does the Senator from Ohio share my fear to any extent?

Mr. BRICKER. I certainly do. That fear is prompted, I believe, by some of the suggestions which have been made by members of the administration. The President, in addressing Congress, made the suggestion that he should be empowered under the production program to go into the steel business, by building steel plants. Of course, the response of the steel business in building new production facilities almost beyond what anybody would have thought possible has negated any response to that request.

Still, in the minds of the planners, in the minds of the many controllers, and in the minds of many big Government officials, the high taxers and those who believe in a centralized government, the Senator from Ohio sees a determination to break down private enterprise and to give to the Government a reason for moving into the field of heavy industry.

It is a part of the whole socialization program which many people have dreamed about for a long time. I do not charge the administration with it, but some of those connected with the administration help to bring about the confusion and to lay out the pattern as of this hour in order to make necessary the Government's moving into this field, in the hope that as a result there will come the socialization of the steel industry and heavy industry generally.

Mr. CAIN. It is my conviction that if, whatever the reasons for it might be, the Government either manages the steel industry for a long time or nationalizes it, the workers themselves will suffer most in the long run.

Mr. BRICKER. There is no doubt in my mind that that will be the ultimate outcome of this whole program. There is only one source of wealth, and that lies in labor and the utilization of natural resources. If we unbalance our economy and interfere with our productive capacity the workers will be the ones who will suffer ultimately the most.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio for his responses, which in my view ought to be carefully thought about and considered by the workers themselves in America's largest industry.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENIS in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I have been very much interested in the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Ohio and the distinguished Senator from Washington relative to the step to nationalize this great segment of American industry.

Of course, the Senator from Ohio recalls that in World War I the Federal Government took over the operation of the railroads, whereas in World War II the railroads were operated by their own management. The Senator also recalls, I am sure, that in World War I the operation of the railroads was most inefficient; and there was a large deficit, and no taxes were paid by the railroads

to the Federal Government. On the other hand, in World War II very large taxes were paid by the railroads to the Federal Government, and the railroads were much more efficiently operated; the wages paid by the railroads were higher, and they also paid dividends.

Is not that a good example of what we can expect if the Federal Government takes over the steel industry?

Mr. BRICKER. I think it is the best example of what the effect would be, and the same results will come always from Government ownership or Government operation of any great industrial segment of our society.

Mr. President, to return to the suggestion made a moment ago by the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], let me say that, of course, the first place the social planners strike is in the very basic industries; and steel is a basic industry. Of course, the experience in the First World War taught a lesson which was observed by those who were in control in the Second World War, and they were wise enough not to follow the precedent which had been set in the first war. However, the same result will come from the Government's meddling at this time in the operation of private enterprise.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield at this point?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. In the present economy in the United States, steel probably enters into more manufactured articles than does any other commodity. Will not a steel strike and a stoppage of the production of steel have a tendency to discommode the people generally and to interfere with the national economy probably to a greater extent than would happen if any other segment of our industrial life were to be taken over by the Federal Government?

Mr. BRICKER. I believe the only other one which could compare today would be agriculture, and it is so largely diversified and so expensive that no one could hope to have Government operation of it.

However, there is concentration in the steel industry. A considerable amount of it is in the State of the Senator from Pennsylvania, and a considerable amount of it is in my own State. That concentration of industry is available for experimentation, and many of the persons to whom I have referred would like to have an opportunity to experiment in that field.

As I said a moment ago, I do not charge the administration, Mr. Wilson, or others like him, with making that effort. However, in my judgment, there are those who are trying to lay the plans and fix the program to that end.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, if the able Senator from Ohio will yield further, let me say that I think we owe the American people the duty of discussing these matters very minutely on the floor of the Senate. Similarly, they should be discussed very minutely on the floor of the House of Representatives. I make that statement because, as was suggested a moment ago by the Senator from Washington, the persons who probably will suffer more than any others

will be the men and women who work in the various steel plants.

Mr. BRICKER. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is entirely correct.

I should like to suggest, in response to the questions asked by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from Pennsylvania, that in my judgment the workers in the steel industry do not want to strike. I do not think the laborers in the steel plants want to quit; I do not believe they want to go out on strike tonight. If they are out any great length of time, it will be a long, long time before they will be able to make up the personal loss they will sustain. In a strike situation such as this one, every one loses: The Government loses taxes; the production program loses; and the fabricators lose because they cannot get the steel they need. It is impossible to manufacture automobiles, radios, refrigerators, and many other articles which are made of steel, if there is a shortage of steel. Furthermore, the defense production program is bound to suffer. In fact, not only is there suffering in our country, but great encouragement is given to the enemies of freedom, those who are trying to undermine our economy. If there is anything in the world that old Joe Stalin is afraid of today, it is the productive capacity of free enterprise in the United States. I can conceive of no better way to strengthen him and to weaken ourselves than to undermine the American free enterprise system and its great productive capacity. When control of that system is taken out of the hands of labor and management and is placed into the hands of Government, along with such irritants the Government has put into the present situation, the result is bound to undermine that productive capacity.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the statement the Senator from Ohio is making is a very sound one, and it is unfortunate that it cannot be heard by every American.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. CAIN. If the present armistice talks in Korea break down, and if that war is enlarged, what is the result likely to be if the steel workers of the United States are out on strike and the steel industry is not producing any steel?

Mr. BRICKER. Of course, the public generally will not tolerate such a situation for very long; we simply cannot afford to do so. Then the full power of government will have to be used in the situation, and the Government will have to obtain an injunction against the strike or take similar action. If the strike is not solved by the efforts of the parties concerned in it, the Government will move very quickly to solve a strike of this kind. It can be solved, and it would have been solved if it had not been for the meddling of the Wage Stabilization Board created by the President, in going into things into which it had no business to go. That is the cause of the strike. The strike would have been settled if the matter had not been taken out of the hands of the management and the workers. However, the action taken by the Board in this case

amounts to an invitation for an adamant stand by one of the parties. That itself is an invitation to the threatened strike; it is a perversion and a distortion of the Defense Production Act, and is contrary to every intent and purpose of the Congress in enacting that measure and in creating a Wage Stabilization Board.

Mr. CAIN. Even at this late hour, is there not some way by which the controversy between management and labor can be resolved, short of Government seizure?

Mr. BRICKER. I think there would be no question about it if the President were willing to act under the Taft-Hartley Act. However, evidently because of political reasons he is not willing to take action under it. If he were to act under that measure, he could enjoin the parties from engaging in a strike, and there then would be 80 days for negotiation.

I say confidently that if management and labor were able to sit down and negotiate this problem, without Government interference, and especially without the report the Wage Stabilization Board has issued, the strike situation would surely soon be settled or possibly would have been settled before now; it could well be solved within the 80-day period, and production would not cease, and the Government would not have to take over the steel industry.

Mr. CAIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BRICKER. So, Mr. President, as a result of the political manipulation of the wage-and-price and production programs authorized by the Congress, today we are faced with a destructive strike in a basic segment of industry, a strike because of which everyone ultimately will suffer. Labor will suffer; the public will suffer; the steel industry will suffer; the production program will suffer; the consumers will not get the products which otherwise they would get; and if the strike continues for very long, the war program will likewise suffer. Our security is imperiled.

No one wants this strike. I do not think the Government wants it, or that labor wants it, or that management wants it. I know the public does not want a strike at this time. Certainly the Defense Establishment does not want a strike which ultimately will seriously affect both the program for the production of the needed materials of war, and the price of those products to the Government.

So, Mr. President, as the result of political manipulation and interference with free enterprise in the United States and interference with proper negotiation between management and labor, today we are face to face with a very destructive strike. That situation has developed because of the Government's failure to approach this problem properly in the public interest.

The strike should never happen. Every action should be taken to prevent it.

Mr. President, in the next few weeks we shall be confronted with the need for the passage of a new defense production bill. I, for one, believe that if it is to be administered as the Defense Production

Act has been administered up to this time, particularly with regard to the steel industry, a continuance of the wage-and-price-control program will not be in the public interest.

It is a costly program. It has not worked effectively. It has been politically manipulated. It has been a curb on production in many respects, and I do not think it has reduced prices. It has not held down wages. It has not touched the basic causes of inflation, namely, the production of goods and a decrease in purchasing power. Those are the real causes of inflation, and they are matters completely outside the province of this program.

All that the wage and price stabilization program could possibly affect would be the symptoms of inflation; and not very long would they be able to effectuate anything in the public interest in that line, unless the Government itself is willing to curb the expansion of money and credit. But the most effective way to do so would be to balance the budget, so it would not be necessary to have further deficit financing. The Government could encourage the production of industry by taking its hand off the neck of industry. Labor and industry should be free to negotiate properly the things within their province. Greatest encouragement to production would follow a lessened burden of taxes.

So Government interference, and the failure to operate under the price and wage stabilization law in the public interest, have brought us to the brink of a very destructive strike in a basic segment of our industry.

MINERAL LEASES ON CERTAIN SUBMERGED LANDS—CHANGE OF CONFeree

During the delivery of Mr. BRICKER's speech,

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BRICKER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be laid before the Senate the motion I entered to reconsider the vote by which the Senate appointed conferees yesterday on Senate Joint Resolution 20, the so-called tidelands measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). Is there objection to the Senator from Ohio yielding to the Senator from Louisiana without losing the floor? The Chair hears none.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I trust that the request of the Senator from Louisiana will be granted. When the conferees were appointed yesterday morning on the submerged-lands measure the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], the majority leader, a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, was named as one of the conferees. He has since notified me that he would not be available for service on the conference committee, and has asked to be excused. The next two Senators who, in the order of seniority, would be appointed, are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and

the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN]. Both those Senators, like the chairman of the committee, were opposed to the amendment in the nature of a substitute which was added in the Senate to the joint resolution, and both have asked to be excused from service upon the conference committee.

The next Senator in order, therefore, is the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and I ask that his name may be substituted as a Senate conferee in the place of that of the Senator from Arizona, who asks to be excused.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to express my great appreciation for the kind and courteous handling of this matter by the Senator from Wyoming, and also my appreciation of the very proper and wholly fair attitude of the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The motion to reconsider the vote is withdrawn by the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe the motion to reconsider will have to be agreed to in order that the substitution may be made.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unanimous consent was given to the request for a change in the conferees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That being the case, the result is the same.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, the motion to reconsider is withdrawn.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did the Chair appoint the Senator from Louisiana to the conference in the place of the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understood, and it was so announced. The Senator from Arizona was excused by unanimous consent, and the Senator from Louisiana was appointed. By unanimous consent, all these remarks will appear at the end of the address of the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio, and also the Senator from Wyoming.

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the pending bill, Senate bill 913, as reported from the Committee on Government Operations, under the sponsorship of our chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Senate bill 913, which has been explained at some length by the distinguished chairman

of the committee and by other members of the committee, proposes to establish a joint budget committee and staff to provide the two Houses of Congress with badly needed improvements in the legislative consideration of the annual fiscal requirements of the executive agencies. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill, and I trust that it will be enacted into law within a very short time.

Mr. President, I shall comment only briefly concerning the many and difficult aspects of Federal budgeting. This is a subject which would require an expert, one who had had many years of experience, to discuss fully and adequately the intricate details of the budgeting process. But we all know that we are dealing with problems of fiscal control involving a myriad of far-flung activities of present-day government.

Way back in relatively simple Victorian days, before the turn of the century, Prime Minister Gladstone was already insisting that "national budgets are not merely affairs of arithmetic, but in a thousand ways go to the root of prosperity of individuals, the relation of classes, and the strength of kingdoms." Imagine how much more true that statement is today as a result of the enormously expanded Federal operations of the United States during the past half of a century.

Mr. President, I think it fair to point out that while we in the Congress spend a good portion of our time and energy in discussing the Federal budget, and occasionally making some rather unkind remarks about its size, and then shifting the burden over to the executive branch, the fact still remains as a constitutional obligation and duty, that the appropriations for the operations of the Government, must come from the Congress. What I am saying is that the President of the United States and the Bureau of the Budget may submit to the Congress a budget, but at best it is but a recommendation. It has become in recent years more than a recommendation, not because of the strength of the executive branch, but unfortunately because of the weakness of the fiscal-control processes of the Congress of the United States. I remind my colleagues and the public that the Constitution places the burden for all taxation and all appropriations upon the two Houses of the United States Congress. No matter how much we may want to shift this burden to someone else, it still remains with us, and it must be our responsibility to organize our legislative processes so that we may properly handle this budget.

I shall develop only one or two of many possible arguments in support of Senate bill 913 during the short time during which I shall speak today. As an introduction to those arguments, let me summarize briefly six major features of S. 913 as covered by the Committee on Government Operations in its brief but cogent Senate Report No. 576, dated July 25, 1951:

Major feature No. 1: The bill repeals section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which set up the joint committee which has failed repeat-

edly to develop an annual ceiling on total expenditures. Instead, S. 913 sets up a new bipartisan joint budget committee of 18 members—5 each from the 2 Appropriations Committees, and 4 each from the 2 Expenditures Committees of the 2 Houses of Congress.

Major feature No. 2: Under existing law the present joint committee has failed to recommend the maximum total amount to be appropriated annually. Instead, the new joint budget committee is directed (a) to make recommendations to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees which would hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security, (b) to summarize annually the estimated costs of all new legislative authorizations which have been voted by the Congress, (c) to assist standing committees by reporting on actions by executive agencies which violate basic legislative authorizations, and (d) to propose checks or cut-backs which should be made in the legislative authorizations of prior years.

In other words, Mr. President, the proposed joint budget committee would serve not only as a technical and a staff agency for the Appropriations Committees of the Congress but also would perform the function of a watchdog committee, particularly over the authorizations which have been agreed to by the Congress.

Major feature No. 3: The new joint committee is directed to hire an experienced staff, members of which shall be assigned within their areas of special training and assignment to assist the several subcommittees of the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees in turn as appropriation bills move from inception to final passage. Then such staff members will return to the control and the direct service of the joint committee. This joint staff of possibly 50 or more well-trained specialists will supplement the small, separate staffs serving the House and Senate Appropriations Committees who cannot now do more than take care of the many clerical duties placed upon them. It is felt that providing such a large new staff for each of the committees would be a wasteful duplication of manpower and conducive to clashing staff opinions which ought to be kept at a minimum. Moreover, a single professional joint staff would be more likely to achieve intimate and valuable working arrangements with the Budget Bureau during its preparation of annual budget recommendations.

Mr. President, this is the key provision of this bill. Instead of having two separate staffs, one for the Senate and one for the House, there will be one joint staff which, at the time of the preparation of the budget and its consideration by the committees of the Congress, will serve these two committees as technical and trained specialists.

If the Congress of the United States will equip itself with sufficient staff and personnel, it can have some control over the budget; but if the Congress of the United States is going to live in the year 1952 but employ the budget methods of the time of Andrew Jackson, it is not going to be able to control the budget.

What the Congress needs is less griping about the budget and more positive action in order to be able to understand it; to have less complaining about what the executive agencies are doing, and to equip ourselves properly to do our own tasks.

The executive branch is as powerful as it is because the legislative branch has not maintained an adequate and modern staff. Senate bill 913 should have the support of the Congress and the public because it gives to the Congress of the United States the tools, the specialists, the equipment, and the staff properly to manage and control and understand an executive budget which is sent to us for the purpose of our consideration.

Major feature No. 4: Our bill requires that appropriate staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall attend House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittee sessions when so requested, to explain and defend the budget proposals of the President which are contained in the appropriation bills pending before the subcommittees.

This is a very important feature, in the sense that here, again, is a sharing of responsibility between the legislative and executive branches. I said in a committee meeting this morning that while the Constitution provides for the separation of powers, it does not lower an iron curtain between 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue and the Congress of the United States on the Hill. There is no reason why we should not be able to cooperate. We are reaching a point where we almost have three governments—a government by the judiciary, a government by the Congress, and a government by the executive. The pending bill provides for meshing of the talents of the legislative branch and the executive branch, which means the maximum utilization of trained manpower.

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

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very much interested in the point the Senator is making at this time in support of the pending bill. I may say that it was most gratifying to me when I read on the news ticker yesterday that the majority leader, immediately following a conference with the President of the United States, stated that the President favored the bill, subject to one amendment, which amendment I have considered and which I think is a good amendment and which I intend to accept. It is a source of gratification to me, and I think it should be to the whole country, to know that the legislative branch and the executive branch are conscientiously trying to find a way to eliminate waste and extravagance in Federal expenditures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I want to say to the chairman of the committee that his perseverance through the last session of the Congress and this session is the kind of concrete evidence that should meet the complaints or the criticisms of anyone as to the desire of the Congress to do a better job in connection with the budget. It was certainly refreshing to me to see that the President and the executive

agencies have taken a kindly view of the particular proposal, because it does amount to a better control over the fiscal and budgetary policies of the Government of the United States.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If my colleague from Minnesota will yield further, I should like to state that the Director of the Budget, as I interpret his testimony before our committee, also favors the bill, subject to the one amendment to which I referred a moment ago. I think it is encouraging to all of us that there is that spirit of, first, a recognition of the problem, and, second, that the executive branch and the legislative branch are trying to take some action about it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the distinguished chairman of our committee.

I may say that while this proposed legislation surely does not have any of what we might call the political sex appeal that some other bills have, it is one of the most significant pieces of proposed legislation, because it gets at the heart of the problem, which is of a fiscal and budgetary nature, a problem of ever-growing appropriations and a fear and anxiety that the budget is getting out of control. No one knows where to put his finger upon it. If by such a measure as this, with the authority it confers, we can do a better job, if we can make some substantial improvement in budgetary control and in the preparation of budgets and their consideration, we shall have made a great forward step.

Major feature No. 5: Senate bill 913 requires that all committee reports on proposed authorizations of new projects which will require appropriations, must include estimates of probable costs thereof over the next five fiscal years.

Major feature No. 6: The bill as reported also includes a provision authorizing subcommittees of the two Appropriations Committees to hold joint hearings to cut down the wasted time and attention of members of congressional committees, members of the executive branch, and interested groups throughout the country. This provision in no way affects the full freedom of the separate subcommittees then to hold additional separate hearings if they decide to do so.

In my opinion it is very important that we bring together, on occasion, the Members of the House and of the Senate in joint hearings, so that we may save not only the time of citizens who come before Congress to give their testimony, but the time of the representatives of the executive agencies. But, even more important, such joint hearings bring about an exchange of views of Members of the two Houses of Congress. They both get the same story, at the same time in the same place from the same witness. It would indeed be refreshing to have one record as to what the testimony is.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does not the Senator think that as to many of the hearings on appropriation bills, if they were held jointly, it would tend to eliminate much conflict and friction between the two Houses in conferences?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Arkansas has surely cited a very important consideration in the pending measure, because it is true that time after time the two Houses get into prolonged arguments simply because there have been two separate sets of hearings and two sets of conclusions which have been drawn from the hearings on separate occasions. Here is an opportunity to get the evidence directed at one common budget, and the testimony brought to the attention of the House and the Senate, so that when Members go into conference there can be no argument about what was said, because it was said to the same persons at the same place at the same time. I think it will have a very excellent effect upon accelerating the consideration of certain measures on the basis of facts presented in the testimony.

These six features seem to me, Mr. President, to reflect the most important aspects of S. 913, as reported. To them I should add, however, a further provision for an alternate balanced budget which was contained in the original version of S. 913 as introduced, but which was omitted from S. 913 as reported. That important provision is approved in the report of the Expenditures Committee on S. 913, which recommends, however, that it be considered as a separate amendment so that the rather special considerations which are involved may be debated and voted upon. Its success or defeat will thereby be kept apart from action on the bill as a whole.

This alternate budget amendment proposes that the President accompany his annual budget presentation in budget deficit years with a second set of figures showing a balanced condition of total estimated receipts and expenditures for the budget year. Realistic information on the possibilities of budget balancing will then be forthcoming for all interested groups. With such detailed data it is possible then to reach a much more informed decision than at present as to (a) what degree of cuts should be made in anticipated expenditures, (b) how much of the deficit should be met by new taxes, and (c) how much of the deficit should be met by borrowing because of war or other emergency conditions.

Mr. President, before I discuss briefly some aspects of these half-dozen major features of S. 913 as reported by the Senate committee, let me state that this bill does in the expenditure field exactly what the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has been doing on the revenue side for 25 years.

Believe me, Mr. President, we need the utmost help in meeting both the immensity and the technical difficulties of the annual budget.

I shall digress for a moment to say that those who frequently write to us about the budget would possibly do both themselves and the country a service if they would once study the budget. The budget does not happen to be a small document of eight or nine pages. It makes the Sears, Roebuck catalog look like a very small pamphlet. It is a major instrument. It represents much more than facts and figures. It repre-

sents political policy and economic policy; it represents a program; it represents capital expenditures; it represents the defense, the health, and the welfare of the country.

As to immensity of the budget, I refer the Members of the Senate to the striking table and chart in Senate Report No. 576, comparing the financial scope and employment of private and public enterprises in the United States. That material demonstrates that Federal expenditures last year were twice the dollar volume of business of the eight largest business corporations in the United States. Let me repeat that almost unbelievable fact, Mr. President. Last year Uncle Sam spent more than twice as much as all eight of the largest American corporations.

Most of us stand in awe of the great size of any one of those giant enterprises, Mr. President. Let me call the roll: General Motors, the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., the Atlantic & Pacific, the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, United States Steel Corp., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Swift & Co., and the Chrysler Corporation.

Mr. President, these corporations, with all their business actually represented a small part of the total Federal expenditures for the past fiscal year.

I submit, Mr. President, that the companies I have named represent a truly impressive, an overwhelming collection of business enterprises. And, yet when the dollar volume of annual business is added together for all eight of these largest of America's business corporations, the total is less than half of the \$71,000,000,000 of estimated Federal expenditure for the fiscal year 1952, at the beginning of which the defense effort had not yet developed a real head of steam.

Paralleling this story in the field of dollar volume of activity, the committee report on S. 913 shows that the number of persons employed by the Federal Government presents a similar striking comparison. Thus the eight giant corporations I have named hire a little under 2,000,000 employees a year. In contrast, the Federal Government employed 2,400,000 civilian employees last year, along with another 3,200,000 military employees, or in excess in each category of the number of employees in the private business companies I have mentioned.

Mr. President, it is not enough to say that we should reduce the number of employees of the Federal Government, unless we can show by actual scientific tests, and analysis of the budget, that by so cutting we will not jeopardize the very security of the country or the essential services of the Government.

I am confident the American people want a dollar-for-dollar return for Government expenditures. They want a dollar's worth of service for a dollar's worth of expenditure. But the only way in which that can be accomplished is to have the Congress of the United States improve its machinery for fiscal budget control. The sooner we begin to do that, the happier and the sounder the country will be.

The problem of the Federal budget goes far beyond the size of Federal op-

erations, incredibly large as these overall totals show them to be. Thus, I can thoroughly sympathize with the confession of despair voiced by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] in his able report on the huge military appropriation bill a year ago. With the help of but one staff member, he said that, as a civilian, he lacked the capacity to sit in judgment as to the proper share of our economy which should be allocated to our military effort.

How many letters have I received about the military budget? I would not want to bring them all here, because they would literally start to fill up the Senate Chamber. Everybody writes to Senators and Representatives about the military budget and how to cut it. Yet when the last military appropriations bill was considered by the Senate, according to the testimony of the chairman, the subcommittee had but one staff expert to help consider a budget of \$52,000,000,000. I submit that if one operates a fourth-class post office or a filling station, he needs at least one person to help him.

The distinguished and able Senator from Wyoming, a man of experience who knows budgets, came before the Senate—and his statement is a matter of public information in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and made a confession, as he said, of despair over the fact that he had the help of but one staff member. He said he lacked the capacity, as a civilian, to sit in judgment as to the proper share of our economy which should be allocated to our military effort.

Let me say to the American people that when Congress really equips itself to do the job, this sorry sort of situation will not continue to exist. We spend our time saying that Federal executive offices have too many employees. I am not going to say whether they have too many or too few. I have not been able to make a head count, but I know that the Congress of the United States has been penny-wise and dollar-foolish in the terms of equipping committees of Congress with trained technical staffs that know how to handle a large volume of legislation. Particularly is this true in the field of appropriations.

The Government is no small business, and I do not think we appear very intelligent, nor do I think we set a pattern for good judgment, if we go home and tell our constituents that we have cut the legislative budget because we have eliminated some employees. That is like dismissing a heart specialist in an effort to save money when one is dying of a heart attack. Our job here should not be to see whether we can dismiss or get by with one or two fewer employees on the staffs. Our job is to get competent persons who know something about the budget and can make it a full-time business, 365 days of the year. They must start with the budget on the day the very first idea of a new item is thought of and follow it through until the time it comes up and is acted on in the Senate and the House of Representatives. It means going out and making spot checks. Headlines are not going to save the Government money—headlines about the price of shoes, the price of toothpaste, the

price of oyster forks, or whether some admiral got too many spoons. The important question is as to what the facts are, not the allegations, the charges, and the countercharges. The important thing is to know how much was purchased, at what price, and whether the job was done efficiently and well.

How will that be determined? Not by getting hold of a reporter in the President's room outside the Senate Chamber. It will be ascertained by assigning to the field agents who will dig out the facts.

If the detective bureaus of the respective police departments of cities of the United States, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, were no more accurate, no more detailed, or no more conscientious or persistent in finding out who was the culprit than we are about learning what is wrong with the budget, this country would be in the throes of a crime wave.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and his associates do not dare just guess. They must have evidence and facts. We, too, need evidence and facts in our work. The job of checking the budget is the biggest task before Congress. In fact, during this session Congress will spend more than 90 percent of its time upon this one aspect of government—the handling of the Federal budget as sent here by the President in his budget message, through the Bureau of the Budget.

I have remarked about the statement made by the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the tremendous difficulties he had when he worked upon the military budget. I certainly would not criticize him. After all, I am in much the same boat. So are we all on matters such as the hydrogen bomb. I remind Senators of the statement by President Conant of Harvard University. He is quoted in the New York Times as stating that the United States at midcentury had not yet devised "even the first approximation to a satisfactory procedure for evaluating technical judgment on matters connected with the national defense."

I must point out with great force that such a condition is wrong, and that we must take steps to correct it if we are to continue the important and sound doctrine of civilian control over military affairs in our basic plan of government.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Minnesota is making some very important points concerning the need for closer supervision of the budget, particularly the need for studying some of the proposed expenditures before they are authorized. The Appropriations Committee has no tools to work with to prove that perhaps all the money requested is not needed.

It occurs to the junior Senator from Louisiana, however, that we might be in the same situation all over again, even if this bill were enacted, by reason of not having a sufficient staff to do the job. This Congress and previous Congresses have been very reticent about asking for sufficient staffs or sufficient funds to do

the job. At least that is the impression of the junior Senator from Louisiana.

It is my understanding that in the beginning it is contemplated that the proposed joint committee shall have a staff of perhaps 18 assistants to work on this problem. The budget amounts to more than \$80,000,000,000, if I recall correctly. So, on the average each member of the staff would have the task of looking into the expenditure of about \$3,500,000,000 to see if there was waste, or to see where reductions could be made. That would be like one man trying to tell the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which stretches from one end of America to the other, where it could save some money in all its stores. It seems to me that we ought to have at least one man to try to find the waste in \$1,000,000,000 of expenditures.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to my very fine friend from Louisiana, who is one of the most able Members of this body, that he has made one mistake in his comment. The 18 members about whom he is speaking are the 18 members of the joint committee. The staff would consist of more than 18 members. We were speaking of a minimum of approximately 50 technically trained, competent persons, recruited not on the basis of whether or not we like them or whether they come from our State, or whether we are good friends of theirs, but on the basis of their knowledge of particular aspects of the budget. I grant that even if we had a staff of 50 members, possibly that would not be a sufficient number. However, I believe that it would be a decided improvement, particularly when we are able to tie in, under the terms of the bill, members of the Bureau of the Budget, from the executive agency, in a cooperative relationship with the staff of the Joint Committee on the Budget, which, in turn, would be working with the staffs of the Appropriations Committees. What we are attempting to do is to harness the mental power of competent, able and experienced technicians, bringing them together and putting them to work on a particular project, all at one time.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Perhaps 50 staff assistants may be visualized; but the answer which the junior Senator from Louisiana obtained from the chairman of the committee, who is handling this measure, was to the effect that he visualized perhaps 18 staff assistants in the beginning. If that is what is contemplated, the junior Senator from Louisiana thinks that the proposal is still inadequate. As a rule of thumb, it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that it is rather hopeless to think that one man can effectively study more than \$1,000,000,000 of expenditures. In fact, I believe that probably \$1,000,000,000 is more than one man could become a specialist on. But to go beyond that point and expect him to master any more than that would seem to be almost hopeless.

It has been pointed out that the Bureau of the Budget has approximately 500 employees. That represents perhaps one employee for every \$160,000,000

which the Federal Government spends. Even if that were true, we must recognize that not all those employees are experts on expenditures. Probably three-fourths of them are stenographers, assistants, or messengers. Only about 1 in 10 would be regarded as an expert on the expenditures involved in the budget. Therefore, it seems to the junior Senator from Louisiana that a larger staff is needed to make a study of this question than is presently contemplated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me say to the Senator from Louisiana that the bill provides no ceiling on the number of technicians. That would be a matter of legislative appropriation. My feeling is very much the same as that of the Senator from Louisiana, namely, that the important committees which deal with the budget and with appropriations should be adequately equipped. This is one area in which we receive a great deal of comment from the folks back home. This subject justly disturbs the American people. It is my belief that the committees should equip themselves, through the joint committee effort provided for in the bill, with the staffs necessary to do the job. I do not believe that we can justify a situation such as that which existed a year ago in connection with the military budget of more than \$50,000,000,000. That budget was debated on the floor of the Senate. The able and distinguished chairman of the subcommittee had assigned to him one staff member to be of assistance to him. That seems outside the realm of plausibility. It does not amount to good management.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is eminently correct. At this point we get into a difficult situation. The Armed Services Committee makes a study of the authorizations for the military budget, but it has an inadequate staff to make such a study, and by and large, it must accept the judgment of the military. Then when the question comes before the Appropriations Committee for consideration of the appropriation, the Appropriations Committee does not have the necessary staff to question any of the proposed expenditures. The impression of the junior Senator from Louisiana, who has sat in hearings involving military establishments, is that every one of such establishments could be pared down substantially. Surely the military authorities would like to have more money. They would like to have things more convenient. They would like to see the military establishments adequate in all respects for war. But there are a great number of projects which could be postponed, or perhaps never built at all, if there were someone to go over the items of appropriation and ascertain the need and the facts. Certain projects could be postponed for many years, or perhaps never authorized in the first place. I am sure that the same thing is true of all branches of the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The excellent work of the Johnson preparedness subcommittee, with the staff it has, and as a result of the efforts of the members of that subcommittee, has saved the Government of the United States billions of dollars. That is one subcommittee of the Congress which has directed its ef-

forts toward improvement of the operating efficiency of the Military Establishment. It has checked into waste and duplication. It has looked into the rubber program, the tin program, the lead program, the wool program, and others. By reason of the efforts of that one subcommittee—not merely its members, but also the technical staff assigned to it—billions of dollars have been saved to the American people. It is a good investment to expend some public funds for trained and competent personnel who can work with capable and able Senators who are making an honest attempt to save their Government money without at the same time weakening national security.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct; but, of course, he must realize the inadequacy of that subcommittee, because while it is uncovering waste and extravagance and taking remedial measures so far as four or five North African air bases are concerned, and finding out too late about waste, perhaps, in an air base on Greenland, at the same time expenditures are going on in perhaps hundreds of other installations elsewhere, which the committee simply cannot get around to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. One way to check on possible waste and extravagance is to exercise sufficient control of the purse strings and know what is in the budget. We cannot waste too much if we must produce something within the limits of the dollars which are appropriated. I do not in any respect feel that those who are in the executive branch of the Government are any more desirous of waste than are Members of Congress. I am confident that they think they are doing what they ought to do. But there is definitely serious danger when we are dealing with expenditures in terms of billions of dollars for one particular part of the Government, namely, the Military Establishment. There is bound to be some waste in such large expenditures. It is inevitable. There is waste in the family budget of a man with a \$5,000-a-year income. If anyone doubts that, let him look in the garbage can or in the attic. There is always some waste. Our job is to minimize it. We cannot wholly eradicate it.

I believe the Congress of the United States has an obligation to equip itself for modern government. That is one problem which we are very hesitant about meeting. We are hesitant about installing modern mechanical equipment in the Senate. We should have a loud-speaker system, and 101 other things to improve our performance. I think it is time for us to get down to the business of equipping the legislative branch of the Government with the equipment, manpower, and skills required for twentieth century government.

Everyone talks about how big the budgets are. It is said that we spend more in 1 year than the Government used to spend in 100 years; and we spend it with just about the same-sized staff. Our job is to equip ourselves with an auditing, accounting, and scientific analysis system to deal with appropriations, so that we can go back to our peo-

ple and say that at least we have made every effort in our power to attempt to solve the problem.

Mr. President, there is one other point I should like to mention. Years ago every Member of Congress could be an expert in one particular field. Years ago, of course, a Member of Congress received perhaps 10 letters a day. One of the greatest problems with which we are confronted in Congress today arises from the great volume of mail that each of us receives.

How does anyone find the time today to become an expert on any subject? We are supposed to be experts on everything from insecticides to atom bombs, from the hoof-and-mouth disease to cancer research, and from reclamation and public power to the Children's Bureau. It is an impossible task for any one of us to become an expert on any subject. It is necessary, therefore, to rely for advice upon people who are experts within certain fields. It is necessary to have such experts available so that we may go to them and say, "I want you to track down this particular budget item all the way from the beginning and to the very day when we will have to vote on it. I want you to spot check the offices of this particular agency in the field, not merely in Washington. I want you to see whether or not we are getting dollar for dollar of value, or at least whether a substantial improvement is being made along that line."

Mr. President, the pending bill provides at least the mechanism for improvement. It is a forward step. It is a good approach. It does not represent the millenium by any means. It will not resolve every problem. But I guarantee that it will provide a much better mechanism than we have at the present time. Any improvement at this stage, when we are considering a budget of \$35,000,000,000, is an improvement well worth making.

I shall say no more except that I encourage the passage of the bill. I, for one, have been distressed by the many items in the budget. I have refused many times to vote for a 10-percent cut, and I shall continue to do so. I have refused to vote for a 20-percent cut or even a 5-percent cut across the board, because I believe that by so doing the innocent as well as the guilty are penalized. In fact, the person who has been conscientious within a bureau or a unit of our Government would be penalized much more than would one who has not been conscientious. We would probably penalize a conscientious man more than one who has not been conscientious, because the latter may have included some fat in his request on the expectation that some of it would be boiled off anyway. On the other hand, if we cut 10 percent from the request of a bureau whose estimates have been worked down to the point where there is not a single bit of surplus or excess fat, we take the chance of wrecking that agency. We came very close to doing that with respect to the meat inspection service and other matters.

We must try to equip the committees of Congress with expert personnel who

can pick and choose and dissect every item.

Mr. President, when the American public finds out that we have not been doing just that, perhaps they will rise in rightful wrath and let it fall on us.

I am not complaining about the work of the Committee on Appropriations. But if the members of the committee were as wise as the wise men of old, if they had all the intellectual brilliance of an Einstein, they could not possibly know all that is contained in the budget, and certainly could not find out what was in it in the length of time they have to work on it. With the help of many technicians and competent staff work, the job of budget making would be within the realm of reason.

Mr. President, I encourage support of the pending measure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for myself and on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, beginning with line 22, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an assistant staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the majority party on the joint committee and the assistant staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the minority party on the joint committee. Of the other employees of the joint committee, one group shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the majority party on the joint committee and the other group shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the minority party on the joint committee. The number in each such group shall be determined on the basis of the proportionate representation on the joint committee of the majority and minority parties. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], to the committee amendment, the committee amendment being a complete substitute for the original text of the bill.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Bricker	Byrd
Anderson	Bridges	Cain
Benton	Butler, Md.	Capehart
Brewster	Butler, Nebr.	Carlson

Case	Hunt	O'Mahoney
Clements	Ives	Robertson
Cordon	Jenner	Russell
Douglas	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Eastland	Kilgore	Seaton
Ecton	Langer	Smathers
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, Maine
Ferguson	Long	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Martin	Sparkman
George	Maybank	Stennis
Gillette	McCarran	Taft
Green	McClellan	Thye
Hayden	McKellar	Tobey
Hendrickson	McMahon	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Monroney	Wiley
Hill	Moody	Williams
Hoe	Morse	Young
Holland	Murray	
Humphrey	Neely	

Mr. McCLELLAN. I announce that the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] are necessarily absent.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I should like to announce that it is the intention of the majority to remain in session this evening until this bill is passed. I hope we may reach a vote on final passage within an hour or such a matter, or within 2 hours. There are few amendments, and I do not think much time will be required on any of them. I make this announcement so that Senators may govern themselves accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator who is handling the pending bill has told the Senate that we shall be in session until the bill is passed. Let us cooperate by letting Senators speak, who desire to do so, and let us make progress.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in my judgment, Senate bill 913 is long overdue. It is for the purpose of improving

the facilities of the Congress in exercising its responsibilities in connection with its control of the purse strings. The facilities of the Congress in providing appropriations for the expenditures of the Government have not kept pace with the progress of the country. We are attempting to deal with a budget of tremendous size, in an oxcart manner, but in a jet-engine age, stated simply. When I came to the Senate 16 years ago, the Federal Budget of the United States was approximately \$7,000,000,000. The Federal Budget today is \$85,000,000,000-plus. From \$7,000,000,000 to \$85,000,000,000 within 16 short years represents a tremendous increase in the problems of the Congress.

When the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 was passed, it established the principle of the legislative budget. I do not wish to throw rocks at anyone, but I may say that in 1947 and 1948, when my party was in control of the Congress, we made an honest attempt to meet the legislative requirements of the legislative budget, and, no matter what happened, let us remember that those were the only 2 years within the past 20 years that the Federal Budget was balanced, when there was something paid on the public debt, when recessions were made to the extent of \$11,000,000,000, and when taxes were reduced. All of that occurred within the 2-year period, 1947 and 1948, when the Republicans were in control of the Congress.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest that the Senate is not in order. We are unable to hear what is said.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The present occupant of the Chair would be one of the last ones to try to tell any Member of the Senate what he should do, and, therefore, what he must do. But if the speakers are going to be heard, all other Senators will have to be quiet. If the speakers are to be shown proper respect, all other Senators are going to have to defer to them more than they did to me this morning, and to other Senators. Under those circumstances, the Chair feels it is his duty to endeavor to enforce the rules which apply to all Members of the Senate. The Senator from New Hampshire may proceed.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, merely to show the burden of the present tremendous budget, I have some very interesting and late figures, as of April 4. From 1789 to the day when the present President of the United States took office there had been collected in taxes from the American people \$244,200,000,000. From the day Mr. Truman took the oath of office in April 1945 to the present day, or until April 4, which was last Friday, there have been collected in taxes, within that brief period of time, \$310,463,056,589.59, contrasted to the taxes collected during all administrations in our history, from the day George Washington took the oath of office to the time when Harry Truman took the oath of office as President of the United States, during which period, as I have said, taxes were collected from the American people in the amount of \$244,000,000,000 plus. We are today confronted with a budget of \$85,-

600,000,000. The Congress of the United States has inadequate means and methods of dealing with that problem. It is a pitiful thing, with the inadequate facilities at hand, to sit day after day, week after week, and month after month on the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate and to be confronted with thousands of experts from the executive branch of the Federal Government, presenting their case. The thousands of witnesses have ability to call upon tens of thousands more to assist in the preparation of figures to justify their position. Under such circumstances, the Appropriations Committee can at best do but a superficial job. I wonder that it does that job as well as it does.

If we are now in a jet-engine age, if we are now in a position where we must deal with such enormous appropriations, then we must have facilities with which to perform our work.

There is some question about the bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], but I think that he and his committee have done an excellent job. They have brought to the Senate a sound over-all approach to this problem. In the main, I certainly favor the bill. It is one of the long-range constructive measures which I have seen brought forth in this session of the Congress. I believe that, with certain minor amendments, the bill should be supported by Members of both political parties.

Let us remember that at the first of the year we are always confronted with a budget. This year it consists of 1,316 pages and weighs 5¾ pounds. The great bulk of the expenditure proposed is for the executive branch of the Federal Government. Let us bear in mind, for example, that the legislative cost of the Government of the United States, compared to the total budget, is probably less than one-twentieth of 1 percent. The budget for the judiciary and legislative branches together is practically insignificant compared with the total budget. Therefore, in considering the budget, we are dealing almost entirely with the expenditures of the executive branch of the Government. Of the 2,500,000 employees in the Federal Government today, approximately 2,470,000 are in the executive branch. Nineteen million Americans are receiving monthly some form of payment from the Federal Government, whether it be a pension, a salary, a subsidy, or something of that kind.

Mr. President, I think the bill as reported, with some minor amendments, may be one of the answers to the situation. Prior to this time, what have we had? We have had an Appropriations Committee which has been inadequately staffed, an Appropriations Committee which, at best, could do but a superficial job. In addition, Mr. President, we have a joint committee headed by the able Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures. With a very, very small budget that committee has rendered able and distinguished service. I take my hat off to the Senator from Virginia for the great contribution he

has made through the medium of that committee in connection with the elimination of waste and duplication in the Federal budget.

Mr. President, the Reorganization Act provided for a legislative budget. As I previously stated, when the Republicans were in control there was, at least, an attempt made to carry out the provisions of the Reorganization Act. In 1947 and 1948 the Republican Congress attempted to do the job. Some people may say one thing and some may say another thing, but it is a fact that 1947 and 1948 were the only 2 years in the past two decades when the Federal budget was balanced and when something was paid on the national debt.

Apparently those who are now responsible for the conduct of the Congress have seen fit to ignore the legislative budget. That is their responsibility, and I am not quarreling with them, but, nevertheless, that is true.

Mr. President, I can remember making a speech in the city of Manchester, in the State of New Hampshire, many years ago, and talking about Government spending. A man in the audience stood up and said, "Why cry about spending by the Government? Only the rich pay taxes."

We know whether that is true today, Mr. President. Of course, it is not true. From the day that Harry Truman took the oath of office to the present time we have collected approximately \$56,000,000,000 more in taxes than we collected from the day George Washington took the oath of office to the day when Franklin D. Roosevelt died.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the Senator realize that if all the taxes from persons having an income of \$6,000 or more a year were collected, the whole amount would operate the Federal Government only 3½ weeks, and that any additional taxes would have to come from the lower-income brackets?

Mr. BRIDGES. I realized that that was the general situation. I thank the Senator for his comment on the subject.

Mr. President, we are approaching the first two appropriation bills which are ready for a mark-up by the committee. I do not think there is a Senator who would not be glad to act on all the appropriation bills and get away in the early summer. But if we are to do that, Mr. President, we can only do a superficial job. We can only scratch the surface.

As I understand the bill reported by the distinguished and able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], it will provide a service organization to the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and House, just as the Joint Committee on Taxation provides a service for the Committee on Finance and the Committee on Ways and Means. I do not know whether the bill can get through the House, but I hope that it will pass the Senate. It affords an opportunity to improve the working facilities of the Congress. I hope the bill will pass, but first, I ask for a vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr.

FERGUSON] and myself which provides for a division of the staff between the two political parties, based upon the number of members of the minority and majority parties composing the committee. In other words, the members of the staff will be responsible to their respective parties so that they will not have any divided loyalties in whatever is done. I know the Senator from Arkansas is extremely fair, but, nevertheless, we have had some experiences in other places which make me hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I fully appreciate the purpose of the amendment, but, frankly, I cannot understand how it will work under all circumstances. The amendment provides for the appointment of a staff director by the majority party and an assistant staff director by the minority party, with a division of clerical and staff hire at lower levels in proportion to the membership of the majority and minority parties. However, it is conceivable, and it might readily happen, that there would be in the Senate a majority of Democrats, as is the case today, and in the House a majority of Republicans. This is a joint committee and a joint staff, and if we happen to have that kind of a division in the two Houses, I cannot understand how the division called for by the amendment could be made. We would have a majority of Democrats in the Senate sitting with a majority of Republicans in the House, appointing a staff director, and a minority of Republicans in the Senate joining a majority of Republicans in the House and appointing an assistant staff director, with a proportionate share of the staff hire. It looks like an impossible situation. I hope the Senator will help me to understand the amendment by indicating how such a situation could be handled.

Mr. BRIDGES. Answering the Senator from Oregon, I have no pride of authorship, and I do not think the Senator from Michigan has, either. I cannot see how there would be any interference, because if there should be a majority of Republicans in the House and a minority of Republicans in the Senate, the worst that could happen would be that the joint committee and its staff would be evenly divided. If the Senator can suggest an improvement, I would welcome it, but it was the only method or means of procedure it seemed possible to suggest.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon cannot suggest a method by which the end sought could be attained.

Mr. President, I feel it might be well to try the plan contemplated in the bill as it was reported, to have a nonpartisan or bipartisan staff, with a director, assistant director, or what have you, and attempt, in a bipartisan operation, to limit the committee or staff to the field of fact finding only. I recognize that one might be naive in believing that such a plan could work, but I should like to see it tried, at least once, before we frankly split the group and confess that what we have are two partisan groups,

working separately, with separate policies, and answerable to separate bosses.

I have joined with my colleagues in the minority in seeking to have certain members of the staff of the Committee on Appropriations responsible to the minority. I think it has been a good arrangement. I hope we shall continue to follow that practice. But when we go beyond that, there is a doubt in my mind whether the approach is proper.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished minority leader for his favorable comments on the bill, and for his enthusiastic support of it, to the end that the objectives we seek to attain may be given congressional approval.

I have no serious objection to the amendment suggested except for one point. My reason for saying I have no serious objection is that I do not know who will be the chairman of the joint committee, and I do not know which members of other committees will compose the joint committee.

However, I may say that so far as the senior Senator from Arkansas is concerned, I am seeking every way and means to eliminate as much partisanship in the deliberations of the proposed joint committee and of Congress as it is possible to eliminate, particularly when we are undertaking to deal with a matter so vital as the national budget by means of a bill which I think should have the support and energetic efforts of all Americans, including all Members of Congress, irrespective of party.

I happen to be chairman of the committee which reported the bill. I succeeded the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AKEN], who was chairman of the committee during the Eightieth Congress. I was ranking member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments when the Congress was reorganized and the committee was reestablished under the Reorganization Act. I may say that while I was ranking minority member, the distinguished Senator from Vermont conferred with me about every selection that was made for the staff, and we agreed upon it. I have continued that policy since that time, and with the exception of one person, the staff the able Senator from Vermont had developed during his chairmanship of the committee has been retained. That includes the clerical staff, and the professional staff as well. My instructions to every member of the staff has been to serve every member of the committee irrespective of party. Every member of the committee is as free to go to a member of the staff and ask for service as I am.

There is one serious question incident to the proposal of the Senator from New Hampshire. If the proposed joint committee is to meet with the fullest success, the staff should be a truly professional and nonpartisan staff. If instructions were given to serve every member who may compose the joint committee, I do not think there would be a bit of trouble. If the pro-

posed amendment were adopted, every time there was a change in administration, we should probably lose about one-third of the professional staff. They would be cut off, because the other party would step in to select a majority.

The pending bill was reported unanimously. It is not a partisan measure. It is not a Republican bill or a Democratic bill. Members of the committee on both sides have unanimously supported it. I wish to express my personal appreciation to Members on the other side of the aisle who have supported the bill. I anticipate that a very large majority of Members on this side will support the bill on final passage.

I hope we can try what is proposed in the measure as it is now before the Senate. I believe those who will compose the joint committee, certainly those on the Senate side, will have no problem in obtaining members of a staff who will be directed to serve all members of the joint committee, both the majority and the minority.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Would the difficulty suggested by the Senator from Oregon be overcome by providing that in case the Senate should happen to have a Republican majority and the House a Democratic majority, then the majority party within the meaning of the amendment would be the party of which the occupant of the White House was a member.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator that that could be one way of solving the difficulty.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. A nonpartisan President might happen to be in the White House.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from North Dakota that there has not yet been that kind of President in the White House, and I think the time when there will be is a good while off. The Senator may be correct if he is speaking of some far distant time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the point raised by the Senator from Oregon simply means that there would be a staff composed half of Democrats and half of Republicans. That is what it would amount to, because if the staff were composed of 18, 12, 10, or whatever number was finally decided on, the result would be that half would be Republicans and half would be Democrats. The staff would be divided half and half. I think that is the way the question would be resolved. It would not be a question of who was in the White House or who was not, because the bill refers to the membership of the committee, not to the occupant of the White House.

Mr. BRIDGES. In connection with the troublesome points which have been raised by the Senator from Oregon, the Senator from Arkansas, and other Senators, would it not be well to take such a proposed amendment to conference? The House has still to act on the bill. Between what the Senate does and what

the House does the conference committee could certainly work out a proper plan.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, that I have no objection if the Senate cares to follow the course suggested. Then we would know that the minority would have some control over the situation. If the amendment could be limited to providing that the staff director should be under the control of the majority and the assistant staff director under the control of the minority, the minority could then be assured of whatever necessary services it might think should be rendered to it. That is as far as I think I could go. In other words, if the minority wants to have one or two staff members set aside to do work for the minority, I see no objection to it, but I believe it is a mistake to propose an amendment which undertakes a partisan division.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think the Senator from Arkansas has made a good suggestion. If the staff director were under the control of the majority, and if the majority in the House were of one party and the majority in the Senate of the other party, there would not be a division on an even basis so that a majority of both Houses would control the staff director, but the assistant staff director would be under the control of the minority.

When the appointments are made I think matters could be worked out so as to provide for a bipartisan staff. I am satisfied that by having a bipartisan staff, the people would feel that they were represented and that all facts were being brought out. The only purpose of this kind of bill is to be sure to get all the facts, not only facts about the administration in power, but the minority ought to be satisfied that they are getting all the facts, so that when the budget comes to Congress and is considered by the Appropriations Committees, their decisions will be based upon facts rather than upon what one side or the other side may want to present.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can appreciate that perhaps the minority would like to have one such representative as a contact man, to keep the minority advised as to what is going on. If there were nothing written into the law on this subject, I would be in favor of handling the situation in that manner, or having the staff director available to both sides. I am anxious to try to accommodate the minority. Certainly if I were in charge of the committee I would never use the majority position to restrict or hamper the minority in the full expression of its views, or in obtaining full information.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Arkansas understands that there is a different philosophy in the two parties.

Therefore, if both sides were represented, we would be sure to get the facts as they have a bearing on the philosophies of the two respective parties.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If there were a difference of opinion, the minority would be entitled to have staff advice relating to its position, and expert assistance in making its report. For that reason I should have no objection to the minority naming the assistant staff director. Of course, it should be remembered that the staff director would be the director of the entire staff.

Mr. FERGUSON. But if there were an assistant, he would at least know what was going on, and he could advise the minority.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the minority wishes to have an assistant director as a contact man, personally I have no objection.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I shall modify my amendment to meet with the approval of the Senator from Arkansas. I modify the amendment so as to read as follows:

The joint committee shall have a staff director, an—

I shall change the next word, "assistant" to "associate."

The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the majority party on the joint committee and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the minority party on the joint committee.

Then I shall eliminate the following language, down to the period in line 10 on page 2. The remaining language is as follows:

No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I cannot understand how it is to be determined which is the majority party and which is the minority party, if the parties are evenly divided in numerical strength. On this side of the aisle the designation would be that of Republican majority and Democratic minority. On the other side of the aisle it would be a Democratic majority and a Republican minority. Which would be the majority?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon, with his shrewd legal mind, which he brings to the forefront frequently, is probably looking at the situation a little differently than I am. During all the time I have been a Member of the Senate, with the exception of 2 years, the Republicans were in the minority. When I came to the Senate there were only 16 Republican Sen-

ators. So perhaps I did not fully appreciate the problem. However, I think a solution could be found.

Mr. CORDON. Did not President Hoover confront such a situation in the late 1920's? Such a situation would be bound to arise sooner or later. It seems to me that it is not wise to approach the problem legislatively in this manner.

Mr. BRIDGES. We could add a proviso that in the event of an even division of the two political parties the director and the associate director should alternate each year during the Congressional session.

Mr. President, I know that many Senators think I am technical, but I have been through the mill in connection with some of these questions. I have known occasions upon which I have asked members of a staff to help me, and they did not dare to do so. Sometimes I was told that they would have to take the work home and do it on Sunday, because they did not dare to do it in the committee room. Other Senators have faced similar situations. What we want is to have someone upon whom we can count, someone who dares to do what he is asked to do.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. We know from personal experience that on occasion a member of the staff of a committee has advised some member of the minority, and has been criticized by the chairman of the committee for doing so. Let us be realistic about this matter. Do we not find at times that a member of the staff of a committee, if he gives advice to a minority member, is criticized in the committee for giving such advice, or for making a suggestion to a witness on the witness stand?

If this job is to be done right, both sides must be represented, so that all the facts may be developed. The situation which I have described may happen only rarely, but it can happen.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Michigan has made an argument which might well be directed against the passage of the bill; but it certainly cannot be directed in support of the amendment.

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

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President—

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish the floor in my own right.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire yields the floor, let me suggest that I believe it would be advisable further to modify the amendment, so as to substitute the Civil Service Commission in place of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In view of the bill which has recently been passed, it seems that the Civil Service Commission is the agency

to do the investigating in these cases. Personally I have no objection to the Federal Bureau of Investigation making the investigation.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the Senator says may be true; but so far as I am concerned, when legislative representatives are investigated, I want the investigation to be conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and not by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Personally, I have no objection to the Federal Bureau of Investigation making the investigation. I was merely trying to make the amendment conform to the facts of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield the floor?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to speak in opposition to the amendment and in opposition to the bill.

Only a short time ago we heard the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire make the very same argument, almost word for word, which he made today. It was at the time we were considering the La Follette-Monroney bill. If only every Senator could have a legislative assistant; if only every committee could have a little more help, everything would be fine. We were going to save the Government millions of dollars.

Now we have such a situation. I have seen a great many political appointments made. I have seen such employees working in campaigns for the reelection of their Senators.

Mr. President, we have a good committee, a committee which is very familiar with this entire situation. That committee is headed by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. The Senator from Virginia has done an outstanding job for the people of the United States. If the 96 legislative assistants had been turned over to the Senator from Virginia and his committee at the time Congress passed the La Follette-Monroney Act, I believe that that committee would have saved the Government many millions of dollars.

What are we doing here today? Let me read from the bill, on page 14, beginning in line 22:

(g) The joint committee shall, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, employ and fix the compensation of a staff director and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee.

They may hire 10 men, 50 men, or 100 men. They may hire 1,000. I have no objection to providing all the necessary help for a man like the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who, I am satisfied, will be reelected and will be with us for 6 years more. I have no objection to his committee having all the clerical and professional help it needs. It seems to me that when we have a good committee, when we have a going concern which is doing and has done a magnificent job, it would be much wiser for the Congress to turn over to that committee the proposed staff than it would be to enact the proposed legislation which is before us.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with reference to the pending bill. Many Senators, including the Senator from Michigan, have been advocating for a long time what is attempted to be done by the pending bill.

Having been a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, now the Committee on Government Operations, from which committee this bill was reported, I know of the amount of work that has been done on the bill. We should give due consideration to it. I call particular attention to one provision in which I am very much interested, as is the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and other Members of the Senate. It is a provision to cover which a separate bill was introduced by me on several occasions.

Almost daily, Mr. President, we are confronted in the Committee on Appropriations by requests for funds to meet expenses brought about by an authorization passed by Congress. At the time such an act is passed the cost involved seems insignificant. It is looked upon as only another bill. It may even be passed on the call of the calendar. However, by the time the machinery is set up for the operation of the act a considerable cost is involved. Furthermore, Mr. President, frequently we pass acts which are to be administered not by a department already in existence, such as the Department of Justice, for example, but by agencies created by the acts themselves. Then what happens? Such agencies must be staffed with directors, assistant directors, lawyers, economists, public relations experts, stenographers, and even a certain number of messengers. We are constantly confronted with such situations in the Committee on Appropriations.

On page 17 of the bill an attempt is made to take care of cases of that kind. An attempt is made to carry out the idea of the Senator from Michigan and other Senators. It is an idea they have had in mind for many years, but have never been able to have it enacted into law. Certainly I hope this bill will be passed, if for no other reason than to have in the law this provision, which would make it possible for the Senate to have when it passes on a piece of legislation, an estimate of what it will cost per annum as nearly as it can be ascertained from the Budget Director and from those who are to carry out the provisions of the legislation, as well as an estimate of what it will cost from year to year for a period of 5 years.

I feel certain that if Members of the Senate have such information before them they will pass fewer authorization bills. It is very easy to pass authorization bills. Later in the Committee on Appropriations we find that a supplemental appropriation bill is necessary to carry out the provisions of the authorization bill.

Mr. President, there is now before the Committee on Appropriations a deficiency appropriation bill calling for the appropriation of more than a billion dollars. Practically all of it covers activities which have come into existence since the original appropriation bills

were passed, and most requests are brought about by the fact that we have passed authorization bills which call for the expenditure of the money.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has recommended a cut of \$7,000,000,000 in the budget?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the Senator from Michigan believe that if the Senator from Virginia had a competent staff he would accomplish the same purpose that is sought to be accomplished by the pending bill?

Mr. FERGUSON. I will come to the Byrd committee, of which I am a member. I want to speak about the work of the committee, and I shall praise it as much as the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] has praised it. I believe in the committee. What we have in mind is set forth in this provision in this way:

(g) (1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first 5-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than 5 years.

That would give to the Senate control of the purse strings from day to day. When bills are considered the various committees of Congress will be able to obtain figures as to what the proposed legislation will cost and by how much we will have to increase appropriations.

Mr. President, I wish now to speak with relation to the Byrd committee. As has been stated, the pending bill would create a joint committee on the budget. We are faced with a budget of approximately \$85,000,000,000. No matter how large a staff might be employed it would be busy every day of the year considering the budget.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Michigan knows, for example, that as of January 3, 1952, the Department of Defense begins to make its plans for the 1954 budget, and that at the same time it is preparing its 1953 budget and its supplemental 1952 budget. Therefore, if the joint committee is to have the members of its staff obtaining figures from the Defense Department they will have at any one time three budgets to consider and, therefore, they will be extremely busy.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; they will certainly be extremely busy. That will be a tremendous task. The committee will be busy every day looking into the current budget, the budget that will come

along the following year, and the supplemental appropriation request.

The thought has been expressed that the Byrd committee should be abolished. I have recently been appointed to the Byrd committee, although I have known in the past of its good work and have been familiar with the reports the committee has submitted from time to time. I have before me a report issued by the Byrd committee very recently. It is a report on the amount of the Federal grants-in-aid to the States. It is the first time that Congress has had before it a report on Federal grants-in-aid to the States. It shows the amount of money which has been appropriated and the amount of the increases from year to year. It is a very valuable document. Certainly it is worth more than the entire cost of the Byrd committee from the time it was established. The Byrd committee has spent an average of \$15,225 a year. Mr. President, let me emphasize that the Byrd committee, which has been doing such valuable work for the people of the United States, has cost the taxpayers only an average of \$15,225 a year since it was established in 1941.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I wish to commend the Senator from Michigan for his attitude toward the Byrd committee. The Senator from Kansas is a member of the committee which through its distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has reported the pending bill.

I have been asked several times, in connection with this measure, whether it would abolish the Byrd committee. It certainly would not abolish the Byrd committee. As a matter of fact, I want unequivocally to go on record, standing with the Senator from Michigan and many other Senators, as saying that the Byrd committee has rendered signal service to the country and that it is a pity that it was not created much earlier than it was. I believe that with the establishment of the joint committee and by keeping the Byrd committee in existence we can do a great deal in keeping the budget down to the point where it is understandable and workable.

I am very glad to hear the Senator from Michigan make the statement he has made.

Mr. FERGUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, at the time when the Eightieth Congress was organized, with a Republican majority, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] was chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Non-essential Federal Expenditures. At that time when the Republicans were in the majority, no Senator on the Republican side of the aisle even thought of requesting that the chairmanship of that joint committee be changed. The chairman of the joint committee had been and continued to be a Democratic Senator from Virginia. There was no move to have the chairmanship of that committee changed, for it was a joint committee which was looking into facts.

Let me read the purpose of the joint committee:

To make a full and complete study and investigation of all expenditures of the Federal Government, with a view to recommending the elimination or reduction of all such items deemed by the committee to be non-essential.

In other words, that joint committee works not only on the budget, to give advice to the Appropriations Committee, but its job is to work generally on matters relating to unnecessary or nonessential expenditures of the Federal Government.

For instance, let us consider the program of the Byrd committee for the next year. It has discovered that approximately 175,000 civilians—to be exact, I believe the number is 174,612—are on the payroll of the United States Government, employed outside the continental United States. The joint committee makes a survey to determine where such persons are employed, what they are doing in foreign countries, the places in which they are living, and whether they are provided transportation at Government expense.

We know that the Military Establishment pays great sums of money for the transportation expenses of the members of families of persons employed by it. Let me say that not long ago I received a visit from a young man who is employed as an accountant in the Air Corps. He has less than 1 year to remain in the armed services, and at the end of that time he will be discharged. He informed me that he was about to be sent to England, and that he was going to have shipped, to England, at Government expense, his Buick automobile. He told me that a little later his wife would follow there, and that their furniture would also be sent from continental United States to England, even though they were to be there for less than 1 year's time. All those transportation and shipping expenses would be paid by the Federal Government.

So it is wise for the joint committee to determine whether civilians are properly being paid for the transportation of their furniture, their automobiles, and their families. After all, those expenses run literally into the millions of dollars. Those matters should be examined. I think there is a place for post-budget audits while the transactions are occurring.

The joint committee to be established under the provisions of the pending bill will also examine matters relating to cost. However, the so-called Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures will make surveys. For instance, it has made a survey, consisting of more than 200 pages, of the Federal grants of aid to States. Its report on that subject is very valuable, and should be examined by every Senator.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator from Michigan tell us about anything the proposed joint committee would do that the Byrd joint committee cannot do if it has sufficient money and sufficient staff?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. As a matter of fact, I think it would be well to keep the two joint committees separated, with one of them working solely on the budget and advising the Appropriations Committee. I, for one, believe it would be better for the Senate to adopt the amendment providing that only members of the two Appropriations Committees should serve on the new joint committee. I think that would be a better arrangement, rather than to have members of other committees serve with them on the joint committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we are to make the new joint committee workable and if we are to make it an effective aid for the Appropriations Committees, is it not really essential to adopt the amendment, which I understand is to be offered by the Senator from Arizona, providing that the new joint committee shall be composed only of members of the two Appropriations Committees?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; I believe that is proper.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would hesitate to vote for the bill if that amendment were not adopted.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, I believe it is a good amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. While the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is on the floor, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Michigan in regard to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire, providing that a part of the staff "shall be appointed by and responsible to, the members of the majority party on the joint committee" and a part of the staff "shall be appointed by and responsible to, the members of the minority party on the joint committee." I wonder whether the Senator realizes that such an arrangement might upset majority rule in the Senate. For instance, let us suppose that at some particular time the Senate were composed of 50 Democrats and 46 Republicans. Let us assume that 30 of those Democrats went right down the line with the administration, but that perhaps 20 of the Democrats had more sympathy with the Republican point of view. The amendment proposed by the Senator from New Hampshire provides that the majority of the Democrats on the committee will appoint the chief of staff, the staff director, and a majority of the staff members. Such an arrangement would absolutely prohibit a combination—for, after all, we might as well be practical about this matter—of the Republican Senators on the joint committee and certain Democratic Senators on the joint committee who might see things in the same way the Republican members do, and would place in the hands of the majority members of the joint committee the right to select the most important members of the staff. In that case, assuming that the Democrats were in the majority at the time, 30 Members of the Senate would control the entire staff, in-

stead of having the other 66 Members of the Senate have some voice in the selection of the staff of the joint committee.

So I can foresee some difficulties in that connection. I say that we might as well be practical about this matter. After all, apparently there have been good working arrangements between sympathizers of the Byrd joint committee and a majority of the Republican Senators. We might as well realize that, for that has been the situation.

So, Mr. President, if we provide that a majority of the Democrats on the joint committee shall appoint the potent or most effective and most important staff members, it will be impossible for a combination which might represent the will of the entire Senate to appoint the members of the staff of the joint committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement the Senator from Vermont has made of a hypothetical case.

Mr. AIKEN. It is not hypothetical; it comes very near being a reality.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not a reality now, at any rate.

I should like to make a suggestion to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I hope the Senator from Arkansas will consider the suggestion, so that there may be worked out what the Senator from Oregon had in mind in the case of a political division between House of Representatives and the Senate, with one having a majority of one political complexion and the other House having a majority of the other political complexion. The amendment provides for the appointment of a chairman and a vice chairman. If the chief of staff of the committee were of the same political faith as the chairman of the committee, and if the bill as enacted provided merely that the associate chief of staff should be a member of the opposite political party, the problem would be solved and there would not be any conflict regarding the political nature of the majority in the House of Representatives and of the majority in the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a suggestion on this point?

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

Mr. MORSE. I have a suggestion which I think will make the arrangement even more automatic than it would be under the suggestion just made by the Senator from Michigan.

I should like to state my suggestion now, if it is of interest to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Arkansas. I am perfectly willing to accept any modification of the suggested language which Senators may wish to propose either on the floor or in conference, for I have merely jotted down the suggested provision on the floor of the Senate, as I have listened to the debate. Nevertheless, I think the principle I have in mind is perfectly clear. I suggest that on page 2 of the amendment, in line 3, after the word "committee," the following language be inserted:

In the event a majority of the Senate are of one party and the majority of the House of Representatives are of another party,

determination of the authority as between the Members of the two major parties to select the staff director and associate staff director shall be by lot, and the selection of other staff members shall be equally divided between the Members of the two major parties of the committee.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Oregon presents an intriguing solution to the problem, I may say.

Mr. MORSE. It is one with which it is impossible to play politics.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is a new method of settling things. The Senator is a distinguished lawyer; I am not.

Mr. MORSE. It is a very old method but a very fair one, and in my opinion, it eliminates any danger of getting this matter tangled up in any political deal. It is perfectly fair. It faces the fact that the two Houses are divided. One gets the director; one gets the associate director. From then on, there is an equal division of the number of men on the staff. I know of no better way of eliminating what I have a suspicion is passing through the minds of many of us, as to the kind of political manipulation which might take place in the event of the Senate's being of one party and the House of another. Why do we not apply a rule which has served pretty well for centuries?

Mr. FERGUSON. Another method which has been suggested is to provide that the majority party shall be considered to be of the same politics as the President of the United States at the time. That would be the majority party, no matter what the division might be in the Senate and House. The minority party would be the opposition party, no matter where the majority was found. I think either of the suggestions would provide a proper method of making the determination. But I hope we shall not attempt today to abolish the Byrd committee. I hope that that committee will continue to function, because it has a real job to do. The committee has an experienced staff; it has an experienced chairman. It can continue to do that particular job, not in an elaborate way, for it cannot do so with, as has been indicated, only \$15,225 a year. The committee does the work with a very small staff. In fact, the Senator from Virginia, I know, aids the committee in its work through the services of his own staff, which is working on this problem for him, personally. They aid the committee in doing its work, because the Senator from Virginia is so anxious to have the work done properly.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. I should like to say that I agree thoroughly with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan with reference to the support of this measure. I also agree with him 100 percent in his remarks with reference to continuing the Byrd committee. I have had the honor of being a member of the Byrd com-

mittee for quite a number of years. I know something of the good work which has been done by that committee. It is not a legislative committee, though one measure which had its origin in the so-called Byrd committee is the Corporation Control Act. It has not been mentioned in the debate previously, but Comptroller General Lindsay Warren has made the statement that it was one of the most important pieces of legislation of its kind to have been passed by the Congress within the past 25 years. It had its origin in the Byrd committee. The first witness was Mr. Jesse H. Jones, at that time the distinguished head of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

As the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said, the work which has been done by the Byrd committee should not be interfered with as the result of the passage of the pending bill. Later on, after we may have had experience with the new bill, if action is necessary, it could be taken at that time. But I think it would be a great mistake at this time to undertake to abolish that committee by the passage of this bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The amendment to the Bridges amendment which the Senator from Maryland had in mind would be, on page 2, line 3, after the word "committee," to insert a semicolon, and the following:

Provided, however, in any case where the majority in one House is of a different party than the majority in the other, "the majority party," within the meaning of this amendment, shall be that party of which the President of the United States is a member.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I hope that the amendment suggested by the Senator from Maryland will not be adopted, for the reason that I think the Congress ought to determine who the chairman of the committee shall be. I think it would be a mistake if the chairman were of a political faith different from that of the President of the United States, and would have to have as a director one of opposite political faith. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will adopt the suggestion that the chairman be selected from the majority party, that he appoint the director, and that the assistant staff director be of the opposite party. That would solve the problem.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Could there not be a case in which there would be an absolutely equal division in the committee, when what I have proposed might be a very satisfactory provision?

Mr. FERGUSON. Even though there were an equal division, the chairman must be named under the rules, and the chairman ought to have the right to name the director. If he is of a political faith different from that of the President, he ought to be able to appoint a director from the other party, the minority party.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. If it is the object of the amendment in the first place to avoid political considerations in the proposed joint committee, why would it not be better to adopt this amendment which keeps politics completely out of the picture?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not the idea to keep political faith out. We want political faith on the part of the joint committee, because we want to be sure that both sides are getting all the facts. If there is any way by which to get them, it is by having the two political parties represented. The reason Congress does such a good job of investigating is that there is an opposition party, and each side knows that the other is always trying to get the facts as it sees them.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment, that I may ask the Senator from Oregon a question?

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon in connection with the amendment which he proposed, whether there is a basis and precedent in previous laws for determining the matter legally by lot?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair feels constrained to announce that the rule permitting a Senator to yield for a question is the only rule which is applicable in this situation. There are other Members of the Senate who have been waiting a long time to obtain the floor. The Chair feels that he should enforce the rule that a Senator who has the floor may yield for a question only.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in order that there may be no conflict with the rule, I yield the floor.

THE PENDING STEEL STRIKE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have enjoyed very much the speech made by the distinguished Senator from Michigan regarding the pending measure, and I have also enjoyed the speeches made by other Senators, including the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. I desire, however, to speak about something which is of far greater importance than the passage of this bill, though the passage of the bill might well be of some real benefit in preventing inflation. I realize that there are many Senators present who know a good deal about inflation and its evil results. I wish to speak about the problem of inflation and the pending steel strike.

Mr. President, because of the pending steel strike, I, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, have received a great number of inquiries regarding the possible effects of the strike on the action of the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the extension of the Defense Production Act.

The Committee on Banking and Currency, of which I have the great privilege of being chairman, has been charged by

this body with the great and difficult responsibility of considering and recommending to it legislative measures which will expand and promote production for our national defense, and measures which, at the same time, will help maintain economic balance in our civilian economy.

The committee, in my opinion, and, I believe, in the opinion of almost every member of this body and the people of the Nation, has discharged its responsibility faithfully and well. The committee recommended the Defense Production Act of 1950 on August 7, and in 1951 recommended its extension. The recommendations of the committee were in the main agreed to by the Congress and enacted into law.

As soon as these were approved they began to accomplish the production and stabilization effects that they were intended to have. Production of critical materials and the construction of critically needed defense plants were greatly expanded by diversion of whatever materials and resources they required. Steel capacity increased from 100,500,000 tons in 1950 to an estimated 109,000,000 this year and can reach a level of 120,000,000 tons by the end of 1953. Aluminum capacity has increased from 735,000,000 pounds to almost 1,000,000,000 pounds this year and can be at a level of 1,500,000,000 pounds at the end of 1953. Electric power stood at 69,000,000 kilowatts in 1950 and is estimated at about 85,000,000 kilowatts this year and can be at a level of 95,000,000 at the end of 1953. Machine tools were delivered at the rate of \$305,000,000 in 1940, and for this year it is estimated that figure will reach \$1,300,000,000 or more than four times as much. Military delivery rose to \$16,000,000,000 annually in 1951 and the rate of \$40,000,000,000 annually today. This was accomplished mainly through the priority, allocation and loan provisions of the Defense Production Act.

After the price features of the act were put into effect on January 26 prices began to level off and since that date the consumer prices have increased only 3 percent, as compared with 8 percent in the 7 months after the Korea conflict began. I was sorry, Mr. President, that the price features were not put into effect immediately.

Wholesale prices have actually declined 3 percent. As of January 15 of this year only 41 percent of the prices of wide general interest were at peak or ceiling, 20 percent were slightly below ceiling, while 39 percent are significantly below the ceiling or peak. I think from all this it is fairly clear that the committee and the Congress have done an excellent job insofar as they were able.

As chairman of the committee that has helped bring about economic stability in these perilous times and who is anxious that the good job of stabilizing our economy that we started be continued, I am deeply disturbed, as are all good citizens, because of the pending strike in the steel industry.

Mr. President, I am disturbed because I know perhaps as well as does any man in this body what inflation means and where it can lead.

My knowledge about it comes from some tough personal experience with it. I think this experience might be interesting and illustrate in a concrete way what inflation can mean, if it gets out of hand.

Let me give the Senate a little of the personal background, if I may. I regret to refer to any personal experiences I have had. I think they might be of some interest and illustrate in a concrete way that inflation can mean.

I came back from the war in 1919 full of enthusiasm and with a desire to get going in the business world. I had some ideas and thought I knew enough to make some real headway. I had been offered an opportunity to go to Oxford, in fact, but chose instead to go through with my business plans. In short, I did well for myself, and I managed to accumulate a little money.

As one piece of evidence, I hold in my hand a duplicate check for the sum of 100,000 marks which I drew from my account in May 22, 1922, at the Seaboard National Bank and deposited with my banker in Germany.

Let me include in the RECORD a letter acknowledging what was considered a substantial deposit, from my banker, B. Ehrhardt:

B. EHRLHARDT & Co.,
August 7, 1922.

Mr. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Charleston, S. C.

DEAR MR. MAYBANK: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your favor of the 12th ultimo, enclosing check for 100,000 marks, which amount we placed to your credit on our books and which we hold at your disposal at any time you wish to draw same out again.

Many thanks for your kind wishes, which I heartily reciprocate. Mrs. Ehrhardt wishes to be remembered to you.

Always at your disposal, I beg to remain,
Sincerely yours,

B. EHRLHARDT.

Mr. President, I want to say that I was in business in Germany in 1920, 1922, 1924, 1926, and 1930, and I saw what happened to Germany. I saw the destruction of the Hindenburg government. I saw the Hitler government spreading into communism.

Now let me read some personal economic history:

B. EHRLHARDT & Co.,
Bremen, December 8, 1923.

Mr. BURNET MAYBANK,
Charleston, S. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAYBANK: On July 27, 1922, you deposited through my firm in the bank 100,000 marks, but unfortunately the value of the mark has depreciated so much, that the 100,000 marks are practically worth nothing; and, therefore, it is useless to carry such a small amount on our books any longer.

I am exceedingly sorry that your speculation has turned out unprofitable this time and I sincerely wish that your future enterprises in this line will turn out more lucky.

Enclosed I beg to return the 100,000 marks with compound interest and perhaps it will be a pleasure to you to have a souvenir of your first speculation in the shape of an enclosed bill of 1,000,000,000 marks.

This amount sounds like a tremendous profit on an investment of 100,000 marks, but even the billions do not count much in our country any more, which is already seen by the poor paper, that is used for the bill.

The losses, which I suffered, are in the same proportion as yours, but we all have to

make the best of it and we must hope that the next year will be more prosperous to us than the last 10 years.

If you find time, drop me a line and acknowledge receipt of this letter.

I regret very much, that your firm has not thought well of consigning me the cotton, which your uncle promised to consign, when I visited him last spring. From Messrs. Tarter, Steele & Co. we had a good deal of consignments and we are selling same without any trouble on cash terms. I do not see any danger for the American shippers in making consignments to Bremen, as we have a democratic government in Bremen and everything is as quiet and peaceful in Bremen as it is in Charleston and I hope that your firm will soon be convinced of this fact and make us some consignments, especially 9's and special 9's before the season is over.

Wishing you a Merry Xmas and a Happy New Year, I am with kindest regards,
Sincerely yours,

B. EHRHARDT.

Under date of December 19, 1923, I received another letter, as follows:

B. EHRHARDT & Co.,
Bremen, December 19, 1923.

Mr. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Charleston, S. C.

MY DEAR MR. MAYBANK: Your favor of the 30th ultimo just received. If you want to know today's real value of the 100,000 marks calculated into American money, I must call to your attention the fact that 1 dollar or 100 cents equals 4,200,000,000 marks. This means that 100,000 marks are equal to 0.0000025 cent, which is a very small fraction of 1 cent, and you can book your investment of 100,000 marks as a total loss.

When on the 8th instant I sent you the paper money, it was merely a matter of book-keeping for my office and in order to straighten out the account on the books, I sent you the paper marks.

Even the bill of 1,000,000,000 marks, which I sent you, is practically worth only 25 cents, but I thought, it might please you to own a billion marks.

My family wishes to be remembered to you and with best wishes from all of us, I am,
Sincerely yours,

B. EHRHARDT.

Mr. President, I could weather that storm, but there are many workingmen in this country who cannot weather the storm if inflation should return. We could have a round of increased wages, a round of increased prices, and a round of strikes as we had once before. People may think they are going to get a big increase in wages, but the price of steel will be raised, as will the price of other commodities, and farm parities will go up. When they receive their money they will be the losers.

I only hope and pray that the working people and the businessmen of the country will realize the road down which they are going.

I saw what happened to the steel works in Duesseldorf, in Germany, when I was in the cotton business for several years, a few months at a time. I saw what happened to cotton merchants and to the German farmers. I remember that I had a secretary to whom I paid a pretty good salary. I paid him at the end of each month. He asked me on one occasion if I would not pay him half as much at the beginning of the month rather than the full amount at the end of the month, because inflationary forces were so great that at the beginning of the month half of his salary

was worth more in terms of what he could buy on the first of the month than at the end of the month.

I have long been acquainted with growing cotton, buying cotton, selling cotton, and shipping cotton.

I know what will happen if there is a steel strike. As surely as I stand here, there will be another round of wage increases, price increases, and so forth. We cannot overlook the historical background.

There was a conservative government in Germany in 1922 under President Ebert. By indirection, that government put the Communists in power. I was in Berlin in 1924 as a businessman when the first row occurred between the Germans and the Russians. When I say I am disturbed by what is happening in this country today, Senators will understand why, from my experience and from observing what has come to pass in the past three decades, I am disturbed. What happened in Germany can happen here if we do not wake up and act intelligently and consistently in accordance with our own best interests. Believe me, I did not think it would happen in Germany in 1922. Neither did other businessmen, nor did most of the people of Germany.

Everyone suffered—businessmen and wage earners. In fact, the wage earner suffered most. The German workers suffered, and suffered bitterly. I do not want American wage earners to suffer, and I do not want American businessmen to suffer. Nor do I want America—my country, our country—to suffer.

But because I am disturbed, Mr. President, and because I know so well what a strike can mean in terms of production for defense, what it can mean in terms of what the workingman's wages will buy, and what it can mean in terms of maintaining our cherished freedom, yes the very existence of our country, I shall not permit myself to be, and I am confident that the committee will not be, affected by passion or the hysteria of the times, and act hastily or unwisely.

If ever there is a time for careful, considered, and most deliberate action on the question of defense production and economic stability, now is the time. A steel strike will make our job a tremendously more difficult one. It can easily undo all our good work to date. But because it can have such a tremendous effect on our economy in terms of production and prices, so much more the reason for objective and dispassionate consideration by our committee.

I shall not address myself to the equities or the issues involved in the steel dispute—they are difficult and complicated ones, I know. But for the sake of our country, for the sake of all our citizens, for the sake of our sacred heritages, for the sake of Almighty God, for your own sake, I appeal to the good men both management and labor in the steel industry, to settle your differences—you will have to do so sooner or later—do not permit the strike to take place.

For my part, as Chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I do not intend to do anything that will add to the confusion, difficulties and prob-

lems that already exist. Rather, I shall attempt, with the cooperation of the committee, to act calmly, objectively, and intelligently toward the end of maintaining our defense production and our economic stability, come what may.

Mr. President, tomorrow morning at 10:30 the committee will hold the executive session which was scheduled a week ago.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I hope and pray that the workers, management, and all the people of the country realize what will be the result if the workers and management in the steel industry cannot settle their own differences and begin a big strike. Another round of strikes and another round of wage increases will be started in other industries. All of us will find that our dollars will buy much less, prices will go up and up, and we could have an inflationary spiral which would make the 1950 spiral look like nothing.

I hope and pray for guidance to those who will conduct the deliberations in this matter at a most serious moment in our national life and during a critical period in our Nation's defense. I pray that they will act calmly, intelligently, and patriotically. Certainly the Committee on Banking and Currency will act in that way.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate but a minute. I wish to say only that I am happy to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency for his very constructive and statesmanlike address.

Like the chairman, I am not familiar with all the merits and detailed questions involved in the threatened steel strike. However, it is my very sincere hope and prayer that a strike will be avoided.

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

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I am very grateful for the Senator's expressing his appreciation for the few short remarks I have made. No one knows better than the distinguished former Governor of New York and present Senator from New York, by reason of his vast experience with and knowledge of business, especially the banking business, what inflation means and can do.

Mr. LEHMAN. I know that further inflation would be dangerous to our country and the world. I know also that any cessation of operations by the great steel mills, on which we must rely so heavily, would mean not only a very substantial loss to everybody involved, but would inevitably lead to a curtailment in the greatly needed supplies of a product which is already in critically short supply.

A strike at this time, when we are straining every effort to bring about an increase in our Defense Establishment, and are trying to make ourselves and our allies so strong that the Communist powers will not dare attack us, or if they do attack us, that they can be repelled, would be a tragedy that we must do our best to avoid.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say that the junior Senator from New York and the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] about 2 weeks ago helped solve the difficulties of the building trades in New York which grew out of the operating of our defense program and its administration. Since there was a relatively good production of materials available, the solution was made less difficult.

If there is another strike, no one knows what will happen—whether there will be enough materials for defense, let alone building construction, important as it is.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from South Carolina is very correct in his statement. The inevitable result of a strike at this time would not only be a drastic curtailment of very vitally needed supplies for defense, but such a strike would also greatly affect civilian employment, because we know that steel is needed in every industry throughout the country.

I say again that I am not familiar with all the details of the dispute, or, indeed, with all the basic factors involved in it, but I join in the hope and prayer that the threatened strike will be averted, and that employers and workers may get together in good faith and reach agreement and thus avoid what I believe would be a tragic disaster for the country.

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Would my proposed amendment, which I announced on the floor a few minutes ago, starting after the word "committee," on page 2, line 3, of the amendment as modified by the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], be in order at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment would be in order. The Chair had not understood that the Senator had as yet offered an amendment to the amendment offered a while ago by the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MORSE. The Chair is correct. I have spoken to the Senator from New Hampshire, and I understand that he and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] have had the question under advisement.

I am interested only in presenting something which will be available to the conference committee. I do not offer the amendment with any idea in mind

that only the language in which it is framed should be accepted by the conference committee. At least my amendment provides a vehicle for the conference committee in the adoption of whatever language may be agreed upon in settling the problem that would exist if the majority of the House were of one party and the majority of the Senate were of another party. Therefore, I offer my amendment, which reads as follows:

In the event a majority of the Senate are of one party and the majority of the House of Representatives are of another party the determination of the authority as between the members of the two major parties to select the staff director and associate staff director shall be determined by lot and the selection of other staff members shall be equally divided between the members of the two major parties on the committee.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has the Senator from Oregon yielded the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I have yielded the floor.

Mr. LANGER. Are the members of the committee going to flip a coin or draw straws, or just how is the question to be decided?

Mr. MORSE. It will be up to the parties to decide what vehicle or medium they wish to select in order to make the decision by lot.

A while ago the Senator from New Hampshire asked me if I was certain as to the legality of this proposal. I told him that I was. I wish to assure him that I have talked with the Legislative Counsel, who bears out my curbstone opinion. The last time a similar proposal came before the Senate was when the Senate bill providing for universal military training was submitted to the Senate, not so long ago. I read from page 30, line 7, of that bill:

Provided, That the selection of persons for training in the corps shall be by lot until the President shall have determined that the training program is operating at full implementation.

I am having citations brought over, but the Senator can take my word for it that there is plenty of legal precedent for the proposal which the Senator from Oregon makes in this instance.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to have placed in the RECORD, following my previous discussion, a passage from the law on Rule By Lot, which is in 58 Statutes at Large. I quote from chapter 478, which is the surplus property law. The act begins at page 765. I shall quote from page 779, as one of many precedents cited in support of a legal provision in a statute for rule by lot:

The Board shall provide for the selection of the purchaser of each unit by lot from among the applicants for the unit.

We can also find in our election laws similar provisions for rule by lot.

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

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, inasmuch as the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to my amendment has been rejected, I wish further to modify my amendment by inserting the following language:

The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party.

To bring this question to a head, inasmuch as the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] to my amendment was rejected—

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that the modification he is now proposing is a proposal which I would gladly have supported in the first instance. I gained the idea that that proposal had been informally rejected on the floor of the Senate, and that the Senator was looking for some alternative. I proposed an alternative. I am happy to support the proposal the Senator is now offering.

Mr. BRIDGES. I think the Senator from Oregon made a real contribution by the amendment which he proposed; but inasmuch as it was not adopted, I offer this modification. In the amendment which I have previously offered on behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and myself, on page 2, line 3, after the word "committee" and the period, I propose to strike out the language down to and including the word "parties" in line 10, and substitute the language which I have read.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, the amendment the Senator is now offering is a modification of the original amendment which was read at the desk. If I am correctly informed, the following changes are made:

On page 1, at the beginning of line 2, the word "assistant" is stricken, and the word "associate" is inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. On page 2, line 1, the word "assistant" is stricken, and the word "associate" is inserted in lieu thereof. The Senator strikes out the language beginning in line 3, after the word "committee" and the period, down to and including the word "parties" in line 10, and substitutes the language which he has just read.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the language proposed to be inserted be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 3, of the Bridges amendment, after the

word "committee" and the period, it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "parties" in line 10, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the further modified amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] on behalf of himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the proposed joint committee is to function at all, I do not think we could make a worse mistake than to try to organize it on a partisan basis, extending down into the staff. I think it would be a serious error.

This proposed committee is to aid the Appropriations Committee of the Senate. Presumably the majority of the committee itself will represent the majority on the committee. But to carry partisanship down to the staff and say that the director of the staff shall represent the majority party makes the whole effort a bit ridiculous.

We have a Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. We have had such a committee for a great many years. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation works in this manner: It is a bipartisan committee within itself, when it sits, and three Members of the Senate are from the majority party, two Members of the Senate being from the minority party. The same proportion applies to the Members of the House. Under the regulations and rules we have adopted, the chairmanship of that committee alternates annually. The chairman of the Senate Finance Committee is chairman for 1 year, and the following year the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee is chairman of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. That would be the case regardless of whether the Senate might be Republican or Democratic, or whether the House might be Republican or Democratic.

There has never been the slightest suggestion of partisanship on that committee. I am now speaking of the staff. There has never been the slightest suggestion of partisanship extending down to the staff. If there were, it would be utterly no good to the taxing committees of the two Houses. It would be of no service on earth to the House Ways and Means Committee or to the Senate Committee on Finance. The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is a committee in which we must have implicit confidence and faith.

My recollection is that in the Eightieth Congress the chief of the staff, Mr. Stam, remained in that position. He served under a Republican House and a Republican Senate. It is true that theoretically the majority members of the Finance Committee can select the staff, that is, the chief and all the technicians on the staff; but that is not the way it is done at all. When I was chairman of the

Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, and when the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was chairman, Mr. Stam acted as the chief of the staff. When there were vacancies on the staff he would report that fact to me, if I were the chairman of the committee. I would then ask him to prepare his recommendations and to make suggestions as to who should fill the vacancy. When he presented a name to me I would say, "Clear it with the minority party." That is, I would ask him to clear it with the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN]. The same course was followed with respect to the House Members. It would be cleared with both sides.

There has been no partisanship in the appointment of the staff of the joint committee. I do not know how many members of that staff today are Republicans and how many of them are Democrats. I dare say that most of them have no political affiliation. They believe they have a nonpartisan job to do.

What is it proposed to do, Mr. President? It is proposed to have a staff to aid the Committee on Appropriations. It is going to be a subcommittee, so to speak, or a joint committee of the two Appropriations Committees. The joint committee will have a staff to aid it in its work. If the majority of the staff is going to aid the majority party, and the minority of the staff is going to aid the minority party, we will have a partisan question injected into appropriations.

Certainly that is not what we are looking for. That is not desirable at all. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I believe his concept is a good one. Let us have the joint committee. Let the joint committee, when it is organized, select its own staff members. When it has selected its chief of staff, let the chief of staff recommend to the committee whom it should select as members of the staff. Let him make recommendations of men who he thinks will do the work. I remember many years ago, before Mr. Stam was made chief of staff of the joint committee, the then chief of staff came to me one day, when I was acting as chairman of the Committee on Finance, and he said to me, "We have a couple of people on our staff who are good men but who won't work. They are lazy, and we cannot depend on them to do the work."

I said, "Get rid of them. Let them go. Give them notice. I will take it up before the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. They will O. K. it." They did.

That has been the way it has always worked. I do not know who is on Mr. Stam's staff. I dare say that if the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] were in the Chamber he would not be able to say who is on that staff. He may know a few of them. I am sure that he would not know some of them either by sight or by name. However, anyone on the Republican side of the committee or on the Democratic side of the committee, as well as any Republican Member of the Senate or any Democratic Member of the Senate, can call on the committee

for any information he wants, and he will get it. If he does not get it, a single complaint will correct any shortcomings on the part of the staff.

I think that we would make a great error if we tried to make of the proposed new committee a partisan committee, and I believe that would be the result if the amendment should be adopted.

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

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The observations of the Senator from Georgia make horse sense to me. I think it is the ideal way to have the committee staff organized. I can only speak from my experience on the Committee on Armed Services. That is the way the Armed Services Committee functions.

I do not believe any member of the Committee on Armed Services knows the political affiliations of the members of our staff. I do not know what their political affiliations are, if they have any. We have selected professional staff members, and they have served under different chairmen of the committee. If the committee is to select its staff on the basis of a committee conference after the committee has been organized, I do not believe the machinery provided by the amendment would be needed. In view of what we have been confronted with on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, we would get the bill into conference with a provision for conference discussion. However, I would much prefer the proposal made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. That has been my experience.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill as reported by the committee does just what the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] have suggested. The amendment, as now modified, makes no division of the staff, except that the director shall be of the majority party and the associate director shall be of the minority party. That would give one man on the staff, the associate director, definitely to the minority. However, the better course to follow is that which has prevailed in the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, now the Committee on Government Operations. In selecting its staff both under the distinguished chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and since I have been its chairman, no one has ever been employed who has been asked a question with respect to party affiliation. The members of the staff have been selected solely on the basis of their performance.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although there have been some abuses under the present method of selecting staff members on a strictly nonpartisan basis, I do not think this is the time to start selecting a committee staff on a partisan basis and dividing the staff membership between the parties.

I can think of only one instance offhand in which selections were made on that basis in this body. In that case the ranking minority members of the professional staff were selected by the

chairman, with the approval of the full committee—and I may say that it was all done legally enough—and in that particular instance the minority members were not assigned any particular work to do.

I should hate to see that become the custom, and I am afraid that is what it would lead up to, namely, that the staff members selected by the minority, even in the case of the associate director, would not be given the authority to which they would be otherwise entitled.

As the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] has said, when I was chairman of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and when he was the ranking minority member of it, we never chose staff members unless we were in full accord on them. Neither he nor I ever knew what the political affiliation of a staff member was. All members of the committee felt free to go to any staff member at any time for information, and the information was always given. To this day I do not know what the political affiliations of the staff members were, and I know that the Senator from Arkansas has retained most of the staff members, or at least those who wanted to remain with the committee. I do not think that we ought to make such a change at this time.

I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. We are quite frugal on that committee. We have only one professional staff member. I do not know what his political affiliation is, and I am equally sure that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] does not know what his political affiliation is. We know that he is an efficient staff member.

Mr. President, let us not start changing the practice. If we change it in the case of the proposed new joint committee we may succumb later and set up other committee staffs on the same basis. It would not make for good legislative procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN]. Perhaps I misunderstood his modified amendment. As I understand, all the modified amendment would do would be to provide that the chief of staff shall be of one party and the associate chief of staff shall be of the other party.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Not of a party. The minority would select the associate director.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would not apply through the rest of the staff.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would not apply, as the amendment is now modified, through the staff at all.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my understanding. Therefore, if, as the distinguished Senator from Georgia has stated, the majority party were to become the minority party, or vice versa, if the two men, the chief of staff and the associate chief of staff, were persons in whom everyone had confidence and were doing a good job, they would not lose their positions in the event of a change

in the majority or minority status of a party. It would merely mean that the associate chief of staff might become the chief of staff, and the chief of staff might become the associate chief of staff, and that would be the only change that would take place.

Such an arrangement would be similar to the one by which the Secretary of the Senate is appointed. For instance, at the present time the Secretary of the Senate is Mr. Biffle, and the secretary for the minority is Mr. Trice. However, if there were a change in the control of the Senate, the latter would take over the duties of the former. That is the way I visualize this matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with the modification suggested, I was agreeing to accept the amendment and take it to conference. However, as I said earlier in my remarks, I think it would be a serious mistake to try to inject partisanship all the way through the staff of the joint committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Arkansas. I was trying to decide to vote for the amendment as modified, in the form in which the Senator from Arkansas has accepted it. I was prepared to vote for the modified amendment on the basis I have stated.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I agree. Regardless of how the other members of the joint committee's staff might be appointed, the staff would be under the staff director.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I might add that I think it has been customary for the chief of the clerical staff to be close to the chairman of the committee, regardless of whether they are of the same political party. The chief of the clerical staff is customarily a person in whom the chairman of the committee has full confidence. Similarly, the assistant chief clerk has usually been close to the ranking minority member of the committee. I think that arrangement has worked out satisfactorily.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in order to make progress, I am willing to accept the amendment in its present form and take it to conference, because it does not destroy the integrity of the staff of the joint committee, that is to say, under the amendment, as modified, the other members of the joint committee's staff certainly would be dissociated from politics.

Mr. AIKEN. But I would not apply that arrangement to the professional staff members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Arkansas. Can the distinguished Senator give the Senate any idea about how many new employees will be hired?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not know, but I can give the Senator this idea: If the provisions now proposed will not accomplish the desired result, this effort will have been in vain. If every dollar spent

for the operation of the new joint committee will not result in the saving of at least \$100, then I think this effort will have been a futile one.

Mr. LANGER. May I suggest that such an effort was made in connection with the La Follette-Monroney Act?

Mr. McCLELLAN. But I did not make it.

Mr. LANGER. And that act has not been successful, at least insofar as the budget is concerned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If this measure, when enacted, does not work satisfactorily and properly, it can and should be repealed.

Mr. LANGER. Does the Senator from Arkansas suggest that the corresponding portion of the La Follette-Monroney Act be repealed?

Mr. McCLELLAN. No. I am suggesting that if this section of the pending bill does not work satisfactorily, it should be repealed.

If the Senator from North Dakota wishes to introduce a bill providing for the abolishment of administrative assistants, let him introduce such a bill separately. Perhaps he is correct about that matter. However, for goodness' sake, let us not inject that controversy into our consideration of the pending bill. The need for the enactment of the pending bill definitely exists, so let us try to pass the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator from Arkansas give us some idea about the number of new employees who will be required? Will 100 or 1,000 or 5,000 new employees be required?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not think so. As I said yesterday, the building of this staff should be done slowly, with care in the selection of the staff members. They should be selected on a professional basis and on the basis of qualification, disregarding party affiliation. The staff should be built slowly. As experience is gained, additions should be made in cases in which particular talent is needed.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am concerned with whether we are going to set up another committee staff on which a number of consultants, to be paid \$50 a day, can be placed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. No.

Mr. LANGER. If we are to have another big galaxy of professional men receiving such pay, I am opposed to it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That is not the philosophy of the author of the pending bill, and I do not believe the Senator from North Dakota will find that the new joint committee will be inclined to employ unnecessary help, any more than the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], for himself and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. [Putting the question.]

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The amendment, as modified, proposed by Mr. BRIDGES, for himself and Mr. FERGUSON, is as follows:

On page 14, beginning with line 22, strike out all down to and including line 11 on page 15, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil-service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and be responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15, in line 25, and on page 16, in line 1, it is proposed to strike out the words "reports, and estimates of budget requirements," and to insert in lieu thereof the words "and reports."

On page 16, in lines 3 to 9, it is proposed to strike out the words:

(j) It shall be the duty of each agency of the Government to supply to the joint committee any copies of any budgetary request submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which the joint committee or any subcommittee thereof may request, either for regular or supplemental appropriations required for each fiscal year, with the detailed justifications in support thereof.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the Senator from Arizona in regard to the amendment. I have reached the conclusion that, in particular, paragraph (j) should be stricken from the bill. I believe it would be an invasion of the province of the executive branch of the Government and certainly of the prerogatives of the Chief Executive. Therefore, I believe that paragraph should be stricken from the bill; and the proposed modification of paragraph (i) is acceptable.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of the committee I accept the amendment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I discussed another amendment with the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Arizona. I should like to offer it either as a substitute amendment or, if that is not in order because of the amendment of this section, as an amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arizona, namely, on page 16, in line 2, after the words "District of Columbia," to add: "and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it would be more appropriate for that amendment to be offered separately, because it provides for the insertion of certain words between paragraph (i) and paragraph (j).

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry or two, to determine the parliamentary situation. I understood that an amendment was offered to strike out paragraph (j) on page 16 of the bill. Has there been a proposal to substitute anything for it?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the amendment would simply strike it from the bill.

Mr. CORDON. Has action been taken on that amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No; the Chair has not put the question.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I wish to discuss the amendment.

I am in entire disagreement with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who offers the amendment, and with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], who is ready to accept it. If we are going to have any kind of an agency accessory to and a workhorse for the Appropriations Committees, that agency should have before it all the information which can be made available to it. I cannot conceive that there is any right of any kind or character in the executive branch of the Government to maintain inviolate or in confidence the request of an administrative agency for appropriations. It makes no difference whether the request is made to the Bureau of the Budget, to the President, to the head of the particular agency, or to anyone else; in the end it is a claim by an administrative agency, and so many dollars will have to be taken from the pockets of the taxpayers in order to meet it.

One of the basic comparisons we need to make at all times is as to the difference between the opinion of the person who makes the first claim or request for an appropriation and the opinion of the President's group which finally shaves down the claim and offers it to the Congress as a proposed budgetary item. When we receive the proposed budget, it is not a mere total of all the budgetary requests made by the heads of the various executive agencies. They are not the ones who prepare the budget which we receive. The budget we receive is the result of the decision of the President's Bureau of the Budget in regard to the appropriations which it believes should be made by Congress for the various executive agencies.

In other words, the Bureau of the Budget properly attempts to gather into one place, for one consideration, all the agency requests for appropriations. That is done with the thought that by having all of them totaled, the Budget Bureau can at least give some consideration to the major question, which is how much of the total amount the President feels he may properly request of the Congress.

That is a proper proceeding; I do not question that. But I say the Congress,

when it comes to consider the appropriation, is entitled to know what was the original judgment of the administrative officer who was charged with the duty of doing the job, and who ought to know how much would be required. If we have that information, then we are in a better position to perform our function. I believe that subsection (j) ought to remain in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offered this amendment based upon this fact: When we had before the Committee on Rules and Administration Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, which also related to a budgetary plan, as the Senator will remember, I asked for a report from the Director of the Budget with respect to that resolution and its relationship also to the bill which is now pending. I should like to read to the Senator from Oregon the reply which I received from the Director of the Budget, because I think it summarizes the matter in very few words:

Subsection (j) still contains a requirement making it the duty of each agency to supply to the joint committee copies of preliminary budget requests and justifications in support thereof. As I explained in my earlier letters and in my testimony of May 17, these requests are in the nature of preliminary advice to the President, and they are not the official budget estimates which are later presented to the Congress. The Budget and Accounting Act establishes the concept of an executive budget and places the responsibility squarely upon the President for presenting to the Congress a well-considered, comprehensive, and cohesive budget which can serve as the basis for congressional review, modification, and enactment. If a congressional committee is to receive copies of the suggestions which an agency makes which lead to the exercise of a judgment that has been conferred upon the President, it would be difficult to maintain the concept of an executive budget and of Presidential responsibility for that budget. Furthermore, it might be destructive of the normal relationships which our system of government establishes between the President and the subordinate officials of the executive branch. For these reasons, I firmly believe that subsection (j) should be stricken from the bill.

That is the point of view of the Bureau of the Budget. My view—and I insist it is sound—is that the budget is actually made over the course of a year. Until an over-all ceiling is imposed on the budget, followed, so to speak, by subceilings with respect to the various departments and agencies of government, none of them knows exactly what it may ask for. In order to get information at a preliminary stage, when a department has not evaluated the different items which should properly come within its ceiling, it is naturally to be expected that each bureau or each agency will ask for a great many things it would like to have. But when it is confronted with the fact that it can only have so much money, the evaluation then takes place.

We have the right, in the Appropriations Committee, and we exercise it on all occasions when we so desire, to inquire of any agency of the Government, "How much did you ask of the budget?" We can obtain detailed information in

regard to it. But while the budget is in the making, I think we have no right to do that, and such action is entirely improper. As I have previously stated on the floor of the Senate, if I were President of the United States I would not permit anyone to interfere with the process of enabling me to make up my mind as to what kind of budget I would submit to the Congress; as, for example, by having agents of the Congress seek information while preparation of the budget was in process. We have no right to demand that, and I am sure that if this provision remains in the bill, the bill will be vetoed by the President; and properly so.

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

Mr. CORDON. I believe I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

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

Mr. CORDON. Yes; for a question. I have yielded now until I have almost lost the thread of my discourse; but I am happy to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts. I hope the Senator will not get me any further off my course, if possible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I certainly have never been able to get the Senator from Oregon off his course. I believe that the amendment of the Senator from Arizona, with the language which, when he has concluded I wish to add, subparagraph "i" gives exactly the information which the Senator from Oregon has requested as covered by subparagraph "j."

I desire to read my suggested amendment to the Senator, and then ask him whether it does not cover what he has in mind. If the Senator has the bill in front of him, the amendment would be on page 16, line 2, after the words "District of Columbia," and would add the words, "and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President".

The Senator will note if he will refer to page 5, that we would then have the right "to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports," and also the data on which the budget is made up. It seems to me we would have all the information we could possibly get under subsection (j). Does the Senator agree with me?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon takes the view that the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts would undo what the amendment of the Senator from Arizona is designed to accomplish.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. No; not at all.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at this point?

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I wish to express my views. I do not think we are so much in disagreement, except in this respect: How much time would be needed, and how long could we wait, to go over the preliminary estimates which are submitted and refigured and sent back dur-

ing the time the budget is being prepared? For example, there might be a request for \$100,000,000, and the budget would finally come to us with a request for but \$10,000,000. Why should we have wasted our time on the first request, since it is the budget we are going to consider—not what a particular department or agency thought it wanted, not what its first estimate was, not what it sought but did not get. We are going to work from the budget, and the purpose of this bill is to try to discover ways of reducing the budget which is finally submitted to the Congress.

Furthermore, I am of opinion that the President has the first right of passing upon the requests. The agencies submit their requests first to the President, not to the Congress. After the President has put his stamp of approval upon the requests, by approving the budget, the budget comes to the Congress for its consideration.

We are endeavoring to find ways of reducing expenditures, and if the President has reduced them to the level which he recommends, my first impression would be something like that of the Senator from Oregon. I thought it might be well to inquire into everything relating to the budget, but it seems to me we would indulge in a great deal of lost motion by going into the papers and calculations which had been made and discarded. We would eventually reach the final estimate which had been submitted by the Bureau of the Budget. We would go to work on it, and probably we could reduce it.

Mr. CORDON. I am sorry I am unable to agree with my colleagues in this matter. It seems to me that if this new adventure in budgetary control and correction is to have any chance at all of success, if it is to be worth a continental, if it is not merely going to slow up the appropriate process and confuse the issue, it will be because the proposed new committee can keep itself currently advised as to what is being done with the money of the taxpayers every day in the year. If we cannot have more information than we can get from the budget which is handed to us, there is no reason to establish a committee of this kind. We now have all the information contained in the budget. We have it at hand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is nothing to prevent the proposed committee and its staff from examining into expenditures as they are being made, and following them through. But do we want to create a situation requiring the consideration of a great many calculations which have been made in arriving at the budget figure and then thrown away?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, as a practicable proposition, it is not a question of what the joint committee will direct be done; it is a question of what, by statute, it has the right to direct. If it does not have the right to go into the administration of the law—and a part of the administration of the law is the preparation of requests for money with which to pay for the administration of the law—if we are denied that, we are denied a very definite segment of the

information which the staff should have in advance of the time the committee will consider the question.

Mr. President, I am in favor of the approach which this bill makes to the problem. I want to see it work. I know, after 7 years of reasonably diligent effort as a member of the Appropriations Committee, we must have something like this if we are going to have any intelligent approach to the problem of appropriations or any basis upon which we can advise the people of the country as to where their money is going. I am for the bill itself. I believe, however, that we should not short-change ourselves with respect to our right to secure information.

The Senator from Arizona says we can always ask an agency that comes before us, "How much did you ask of the Bureau of the Budget?" Of course we can, but when we get the information it is then too late to do anything with it. The time to use the information is when there is being prepared and evaluated the data we need to have in advance.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me suggest a hypothetical case. The staff of the committee finds out from a department of the Government that one segment of the department will ask for a certain sum of money, and it reports that fact to the committee. The committee does not think it is sufficient, or it thinks it is too much. The next thing to do, having acquired that information, is for some member of the committee to go to see the President and say, "Mr. President, we understand that in making up your budget a certain agency will ask for a certain amount of money. I want to suggest now that when you get to that point you handle it in a certain way."

The President of the United States can very properly say, "I represent all the people of the United States. You represent a State, or you represent a congressional district. Under those circumstances I do not feel that I should take your advice, because I must act in behalf of all the people, and I shall make up my budget in the way I please. When I send it up to you, it is on your doorstep and you can either starve it or feed it and make it fat; but that is your business. My business is to coordinate the whole budget and to determine how much money we can afford to expend in one fiscal year, hoping, of course, to have a balanced budget. In doing that I have reduced the amounts requested by certain agencies, and I have done the things which I think are necessary."

I think the President would have a perfect right to say, "I do not want you to interfere with me in the process of making up my mind as to what kind of a budget I should submit."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] proposed that after the budget reaches the Senate, if we want any data from any agency of Government indicating how a figure was arrived at, it is perfectly proper to ask for it after the President has made up his mind. That would not be interfering with him in any way in the duty he is

called upon to perform in connection with the budget.

Mr. CORDON. No one but a fool would interfere with him, anyway. There has been suggested no argument which strikes me as having any pertinence or any force whatever. We can do the things the Senator suggests, and if we do, the President could answer as the Senator suggests. That should kill it, and we should not attempt to do it a second time. That ends that idea.

Mr. President, if we must have the skeleton out in the open, I would just as soon rattle a few bones myself this afternoon. I happen to know that there are those within the confidence of the President who have been able to get information which has been denied some of the rest of us. It may be said, "Well, the President has a perfect right to release the information to whomsoever he desires." Those who want to follow that philosophy, so far as I am concerned, may do so, but it is not for me. I believe, Mr. President, that there is a certain right that goes with an office in the legislative branch of the Government. I believe there are certain powers which rest wholly within the legislative branch, and we have already surrendered far too many of them. I am not going to be a party to surrendering any more. If I can recoup some of those that are gone, I want to do that.

In this case, Mr. President, I say that if we have the power to make the inquiry, I want the right to do it provided in the statute, granted not to the Congress, but by the Congress to the committee which we seek to establish. Once that committee has the power, it would be up to the committee to use it or not to use it, as the circumstances indicate to be advisable. That is the reason why I think paragraph (j) should remain in the bill.

If the President wants to veto the bill, the Constitution gives him that right, and I am perfectly willing that he should veto it. I certainly would not suggest to him what he should do. If the President feels that it is a transgression upon his power, he has two ways to handle it: one is to veto the bill, and the other is to direct his department to refuse to give certain information, at which time Congress can determine whether that department shall have any further entree into the Treasury. Those questions can be determined as the event indicates.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. May I suggest to the Senator that I basically disagree with him with respect to the power of Congress to pry into the executive branch of the Government at a time when the Executive is making up his mind as to what he shall recommend to Congress in the way of appropriations?

Mr. CORDON. I disagree with the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. The present President will not be in the White House next January.

Mr. CORDON. I am not directing any of my remarks to the present President or to any future President,

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] or the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] or the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] or perhaps the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] should be occupying the White House and looking into what his duty may be with respect to defending the right of the Executive to manage the executive business in accordance with the division of powers between the legislative branch and the executive branch, he would insist that we stay on our side of the line, and he would conduct his business in his own way.

Mr. CORDON. I fully appreciate the fact that the Senator and I approach the question from wholly opposite directions. I believe in the supremacy of the legislative branch with respect to the power of the purse. I think the Senator from Arizona believes in the supremacy of the executive department.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Judging by the Senator's vigorous statement on this section of the bill, I suppose he is in favor of having the staff go into the question.

Mr. CORDON. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY. Would it not be better, since virtually the same point the Senator from Arizona has raised is covered by the preceding section, to accept the amendment than to run the risk of having the entire bill destroyed by an argument between the White House and the Congress over what is, after all, a somewhat technical point?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have no time for any philosophy of fear. I believe that the thing for the legislative branch of the Government to do is that which it thinks it should do. I do not believe we should court vetoes; neither do I believe we should duck them. I think we should pass what, in our judgment, is sound legislation, let the chips fall where they may.

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

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MOODY. I agree with that statement, but I should like to remind the Senator from Oregon that, as the Senator from Arizona has suggested, almost the same authority is given in the preceding section. Therefore, it seems to me to be straining a point to insist upon having included in the bill language which we have been warned will result in the destruction of legislation which both the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Michigan are anxious to have written on the books.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have not been warned. Again, I seem not to be in the confidence of Mr. Big. Because I believe it is a sound provision, I shall vote to retain it in the bill. It will not worry me if the bill happens to pass and is then vetoed. My own judgment is that the bill will not be enacted at this session of Congress anyway. Even so, I am happy the bill is before the Senate, and I shall be happy to have it passed. I believe this kind of debate is most helpful. I think it would have been far bet-

ter had we been able to have it earlier in the session, when there would have been time to think about it.

Mr. President, I undertake to say that, as to 90 percent of the legislation we pass, our great trouble is that there is not one out of ten who knows much more about the measures than the titles or the numbers. I include myself among those who seldom know. It is something I do not like to admit. However, it is a confession.

I should like to see the time come when bills will be considered, discussed, and then put into refrigeration, so to speak, for a week or two, while we think about them. We would have better legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 15 in the amendment of the committee, line 25, it is proposed to strike out the words "reports and estimates of budget requirements" and insert in lieu thereof the words "and reports." On page 16, lines 3 to 9, inclusive, to strike out paragraph (j), reading as follows:

(j) It shall be the duty of each agency of the Government to supply to the joint committee any copies of any budgetary request submitted to the Bureau of the Budget which the joint committee or any subcommittee thereof may request, either for regular or supplemental appropriations required for each fiscal year, with the detailed justifications in support thereof.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now offer a very brief amendment which I understand is agreeable to the Senator from Arkansas. It comes in on page 16, line 2, after the words "District of Columbia," and proposes to strike out the period and insert a comma and the words "and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President."

This is merely an effort to make clear that after the budget is submitted to the Congress, the committee will have a right to obtain data on which the budget was prepared. In my opinion, the proposed amendment completes the section.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I interpret the amendment, it means simply that if a budget of \$100,000,000 for a specific purpose is presented, we will be enabled to see how the figure of \$100,000,000 was arrived at.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It does not cover discarded requests, or what may be called waste paper. It means merely that we could ask how the department arrived at its figures, how it supports them, how it sustains them. We would simply ask, "How is this budget for \$100,000,000 arrived at?"

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is my interpretation of it, and a logical conclusion is reached with the words on the previous page, which have just been read.

Mr. CORDON. I shall not oppose the amendment. I shall vote for it. I merely wish to call attention to the fact that it seeks to recapture the horse after he has been let out of the stable. The data might be valuable to the staff if it could be obtained in time to evaluate it and do something with it. We might never be able to get it, so we provide for obtaining it by including a provision for it in the bill. However, that is a little morsel. I am going to vote in favor of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I propose an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 9, in the committee amendment, beginning with line 21, it is proposed to strike out down to and including line 24, and through line 4 on page 10. In lines 8 and 9, on page 10, it is proposed to strike out the words "and the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments", and on page 10, line 23, after the word "Appropriations" it is proposed to strike out "or the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments."

Mr. HAYDEN. As has been stated a number of times, the object of the amendment is to strike from the bill any reference to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and to provide that the joint committee shall consist of none but members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, by reason of action by our committee, I feel I shall have to oppose the amendment. When I introduced the bill originally, it provided that the joint committee should be composed only of members of the Committees on Appropriations.

A majority of the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, which was the title of the committee at that time, offered and adopted an amendment which would add to the joint committee members of the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments of the two Houses.

I do not believe that adding those members would in any way defeat the purposes of the bill. To some extent, it may inure to the benefit of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments by enabling them to obtain information they would not otherwise get. However, I can appreciate the fact that members of the Committee on Appropriations feel that this is an appropriations job and that, therefore, we should not encumber the joint committee with members of other committees.

Since the joint committee is actually to be a service committee to the Committees on Appropriations, it was thought that the joint committee, or service committee, which is what it

amounts to, should be composed only of members of the two Committees on Appropriations.

There are on the floor of the Senate now other members of the Committee on Government Operations who remember the discussion about the matter when the bill was marked up. I should like to hear from them, if any of them have serious objection to the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I remember well that this point was discussed at rather great length, as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas said. It is my recollection that it came up late in our consideration of the bill.

I certainly agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. HAYDEN], who is also a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that we should not try to intermingle the two committees on this point. If the proposed joint committee is to function, it ought to function for the Appropriations Committees.

Although I should like to see my committee receive the prestige, I believe that rivalry or the difficulty arising from intermingling members of the Committee on Government Operations with members of the Appropriations Committees would not be conducive to the effective working of the proposed law.

To make it work the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses must be as enthusiastic about making it work as we are in passing the bill. Then we shall gain real economy. I wish to join the senior Senator from Arizona in this amendment, because I think it is the only way the bill will work properly after it is passed.

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I wish to support what the Senator from Oklahoma has said. Personally I should like to see the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona adopted. I do not think it would be detrimental at all, and I believe that it would be very appropriate.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, I believe the Senator from Oklahoma is quite right. As all members of the committee will remember, this was not a part of the bill until the very last couple of sessions when we were discussing it, and it was advanced rather strongly by one or two members of the committee. We were all trying to obtain a unanimous agreement on the bill. Therefore it was included in the bill. However, I think the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Oklahoma are quite right, and I hope the Senate will accept this amendment.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, as has been stated, it was late in the discussion of the bill, before it was finally reported, that this phase was injected. I am sure that all members of the committee will remember that it was injected into the measure by reason of the overall authority of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments to examine into expenditures in all branches of the executive department. I concur in the general feeling that we should keep the joint committee in the appropriations field, in view of the objection which is now being offered. While I voted to require that the Com-

mittee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments have representation, I will say that I was not overly enthusiastic about it. In view of the objection, I see no reason why that provision should not be removed from the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in view of the expressions from other members of the committee, I find that there is no objection to the amendment. The sponsor of the original proposal is not present. Therefore I ask for a vote on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] on page 9, line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the chairman of the committee to one further matter. If he will examine the bill, he will see that the language on page 12, paragraph (e) (1) (A) provides as follows:

(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

(1) (A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies.

In the letter commenting on the bill which I received from the Director of the Budget I find the following:

Subsection (e) includes a direction to the Joint Committee to inform itself on "reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office * * * and by other Federal agencies." While it is entirely appropriate that congressional committees have complete access to the reports prepared by the General Accounting Office, I would suggest that the reference to reports prepared by "other Federal agencies" be stricken. While I am sure that it is not the intent of the bill to direct the joint committee to take over confidential reports which might be prepared for the President, the wording might lead to that misinterpretation. The reports of the General Accounting Office under the various authorities cited in the bill should give the committee a relatively complete coverage of the material needed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Of course it is not the intent to go into secret documents; but I feel that the committee should certainly have the authority to examine the reports of any agency with reference to determining what expenditures should be made. I do not feel that I can yield on that point.

Mr. HAYDEN. I wanted to obtain an expression of the intent of the committee. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget expresses the same idea. He is sure that it is not intended to seek authority to obtain confidential documents or to use the words "and other Federal agencies" as a lever to pry into something which otherwise the committee could not obtain. If it related only to appropriations, it would be a very different matter.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It is certainly not the purpose of the committee to obtain top-secret documents, or anything of the kind. However, any public reports of an agency should be considered. I think we are becoming a little technical.

Mr. HAYDEN. I merely wished to have an expression of the intent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I think it is material that we get all the reports possible, so that we can form a proper judgment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, having stated the view of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, and having heard expressed by the chairman the intent of the committee, I shall not offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair invites the attention of Senators to page 9, line 12. The word "eighteen" occurs in that line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in view of the adoption of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], I offer the following perfecting amendments:

On page 9, line 12, strike out the word "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fourteen."

On page 9, line 13, strike out the word "Five" and insert the word "Seven."

On page 9, line 14, strike out the word "three" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

On page 9, line 15, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

On page 9, line 17, strike out the word "Five" and insert the word "Seven."

On page 9, line 19, strike out the word "three" and insert the word "four"; and in the same line, strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "three."

The purpose of these amendments is to make the bill conform to our action in striking out reference to the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and to increase the membership of the joint committee to 14, instead of 10, which would be the number left after omitting reference to the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The amendment also provides that four shall be from the majority party and three from the minority party. I believe that the committee should have a personnel of at least 14 members.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the amendments en bloc?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee a question. Has he proposed to change the figure on page 15, line 7?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am coming to that next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering the amendments en bloc? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the amendments of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are agreed to.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I move, on page 15, line 7, to strike out the word "eleven" and insert in lieu thereof the word "nine."

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would it not be helpful to strike out the entire sentence? It seems to me that the provision that a member of the committee staff shall be relieved of his work only if a certain number of the committee approve such a course would perhaps lead to unpleasantness. It might lead to differences of opinion in the committee. It might lead to a situation in which a man might be dismissed under circumstances which would cause friction. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] referred to a case in which two employees of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation were dismissed because they did not do their work. Such a provision as this might lead to unfortunate publicity for the employee. It seems to me that that question should be left to the committee itself. While I shall not make much of a point of it, I should like to see that language stricken.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I had that in mind before the Bridges amendment was adopted. The amendment offered by the Senator from New Hampshire has eliminated that part of the bill, so I withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I offer a perfecting amendment. On page 17, line 8, I propose to strike out the word "second" and insert the word "first"; on line 9, to strike out the word "Eighty-second," and insert the word "Eighty-third." The amendment refers to the Congress when the law would become effective.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President—

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, may I inquire whether the Senator from Massachusetts desires to offer an amendment?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to offer an amendment, which I have taken up with the chairman of the committee. I understand that it is agreeable to him. It is merely a technical amendment. I offer an amendment on page 15, and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 15 it is proposed to amend lines 12 to 21, to read as follows:

(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, there is no objection to the amendment. I am happy to accept the amendment. I believe it is a good amendment and carries out the intent of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am directed by the committee to offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

I know that Senators wish to hurry along. I may say to the Senate that the majority of the members of the committee who were present at the time the bill was reported from the committee voted in favor of offering this amendment on the floor of the Senate. Previously I have supported the principle which is contained in the amendment, namely, to require the President to submit a balanced budget along with any budget he may send to Congress. I still believe in the principle involved. However, I hope that the Senate will not adopt the amendment. I am presenting the amendment now so that the Senate may pass on it. The bill as now amended is a good bill. If we were to agree to the amendment which I am now offering, and if the President were to comply with its provisions, in a time of war or in a time of huge appropriations for national defense he would merely have to say, "If you require me to send a balanced budget instead of sending a budget for \$85,000,000,000—as he is doing this year—I will just take \$14,000,000,000 or \$10,000,000,000 off the national defense appropriations." It would be an empty gesture.

In times of peace, when we are trying to live within our income, I might be in favor of such an amendment. I have heretofore offered such an amendment. I offered it once as a rider to a bill, and the Senate adopted it. I believe that was in 1949. It was eliminated in conference. I favor the principle involved. However, at the present time, to place the amendment in this bill may very well mean that the bill would be vetoed, and we would thus lose ground. Certainly we would not gain anything if we were to include it in the bill. In my judgment, all that the President would have to do would be to reduce the figure for national defense, and we would not gain anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add the following new section:

SEC. 4. In the event the budget transmitted to Congress by the President under section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, for any fiscal year is not a balanced budget, the President shall transmit to Congress, with such budget, a balanced budget for such fiscal year, which shall set forth in summary and in detail (1) estimates of the receipts of the Government during such fiscal year under laws existing at the time such budget is transmitted, and (2) estimates of expenditures, not in excess of such receipts, for the support of the Government for such fiscal year under laws so existing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I know of no further amendments to be offered. Before we vote on the bill I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point in my remarks a

copy of a telegram sent to me by Mr. Rowland Jones, Jr., president of the American Retail Federation, representing 22 national retail trade associations and 32 State retail associations in support of the passage of this bill.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., April 8, 1952.

HON. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senator,

Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the 22 national retail trade associations, 32 State retail associations comprising the membership of the American Retail Federation I wish to strongly endorse the principles embodied in S. 913. Economy and efficiency in Government can only be attained by providing the legislative branch of our Government with proper tools in the form of expert full-time personnel to accomplish the financial needs of Government, the expenditure of Government funds and to check excessive and wasteful operations. Only through full knowledge of the above operations can the Congress intelligently and effectively approach the problem of a reduction of Government expenditures and increased efficiency.

ROWLAND JONES, JR.,

President, American Retail Federation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Moody
Anderson	Green	Morse
Bricker	Hayden	Murray
Bridges	Hendrickson	Neely
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Robertson
Byrd	Hoey	Russell
Cain	Holland	Saltonstall
Capehart	Humphrey	Schoeppel
Carlson	Ives	Seaton
Case	Jenner	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworschak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Long	Taft
Ecton	Magnuson	Tobey
Ellender	Martin	Watkins
Ferguson	Maybank	Wiley
Flanders	McClellan	Williams
Frear	Monroney	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

By unanimous consent, the committee amendment, as amended, is agreed to.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the question of final passage, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly against what I consider to be a very bad bill. By this bill we are proposing to create another new committee and a brand new staff. As all Senators know, the Senate Committee on Appropriations already has a staff. There is no claim that it is not adequate. No bill has been introduced to increase the size of that staff.

Likewise, in the House of Representatives there is an Appropriations Committee, and it has a staff. So there are two staffs.

In addition, the Byrd Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has a staff. In addition to that, the Senate Committee on Government Operations, formerly the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, has a staff.

Now we have this monstrosity before us. Senators say they want to have a new joint committee. It would be made up of seven members of the House Appropriations Committee and seven members of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and by them a brand new staff would be selected and would be appointed. Why not go on and on and on and let three or four members, and so forth, select more and more committees and staff members to report to themselves.

The distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], when I asked him about this on the floor a few moments ago, did not know whether the staff of the new joint committee would consist of 10 persons, 100 persons, or 1,000 persons. He did not know how many lawyers would be needed for the staff of the new joint committee, or how many technical or professional men would be needed, or what clerical hire would be needed. As a matter of fact, he said he knew nothing about that matter.

We do not know whether this bill is going to cost \$100,000, \$1,000,000, or \$10,000,000. There is but one thing of which we are certain. That is, that if we once establish this new committee with its staff, we are going to have it for years and years and years to come at the expense of the already suffering taxpayers.

Mr. President, I am one of those who believe that we ought to be cutting down the number of Federal employees, instead of hiring more and more and more of them. Sometimes when we go into the corridors we find them crowded with employees, whose number is being added to each day. Now Senators come along and want more and more and more employees, although they yell for economy. I simply submit, Mr. President, that the time of the Senate ought to be spent in doing something for the relief of the taxpayers of the country, instead of passing a bill the cost of which no one knows, as no one knows how many employees will be required. I submit that it is bad legislation, and that the taxpayers want no more new boards, or bureaus, or commissions. Let us reduce, not add to the 2,500,000 Government employees we already have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays having been ordered on the question of the passage of the bill, the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senators from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senators from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT and Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator

from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGSEN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] are absent because of illness.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from California [Mr. NIXON], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are detained on official business.

If present and voting the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—55

Aiken	George	Morse
Anderson	Green	Neely
Bricker	Hayden	O'Connor
Bridges	Hendrickson	Russell
Butler, Md.	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Hill	Schoeppel
Byrd	Hoey	Seaton
Cain	Holland	Smathers
Capehart	Humphrey	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Case	Jenner	Smith, N. C.
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Cordon	Lehman	Taft
Douglas	Long	Watkins
Dworschak	Magnuson	Wiley
Eastland	Martin	Williams
Ferguson	McClellan	Young
Flanders	Monroney	
Frear	Moody	

NAYS—8

Ecton	Langer	Robertson
Ellender	Maybank	Tobey
Kilgore	Murray	

NOT VOTING—33

Bennett	Johnson, Tex.	McKellar
Benton	Johnston, S. C.	McMahon
Brewster	Kefauver	Millikin
Chavez	Kem	Mundt
Connally	Kerr	Nixon
Dirksen	Knowland	O'Mahoney
Duff	Lodge	Pastore
Fulbright	Malone	Sparkman
Gillette	McCarran	Thye
Hennings	McCarthy	Underwood
Hunt	McFarland	Welker

So the bill (S. 913) was passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day, and it was signed by the Vice President.

PROPOSED DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF SENATE RESOLUTION 187

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], members of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I submit a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 187. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution lie over under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and the resolution will be received and lie over under the rule.

The resolution (S. Res. 300), submitted by Mr. HAYDEN (for himself and other Senators), was ordered to lie over under the rule, as follows:

Whereas Senate Resolution 187, to further investigate the participation of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY in the Maryland 1950 senatorial campaign and other acts, to determine whether expulsion proceedings should be instituted against him, was introduced in the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] on August 6, 1951, and was referred by the Senate to the Committee on Rules and Administration; and

Whereas on August 8, 1951, said resolution was referred by the Committee on Rules and Administration to its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections; and

Whereas, in a series of communications addressed to the chairman of said subcommittee during the period between December 6, 1951, and January 4, 1952, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] charged that the subcommittee lacked jurisdiction to investigate such acts of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] as were not connected with election campaigns and attacked the honesty of the members of the subcommittee, charging that, in their investigation

of such other acts, the members were improperly motivated and were "guilty of stealing just as clearly as though the members engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers"; and

Whereas on March 5, 1952, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections adopted the following motion as the most expeditious parliamentary method of obtaining an affirmation by the Senate of its jurisdiction in this matter and a vote on the honesty of its members:

"That the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration request Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, to raise the question of the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and of the integrity of the members thereof in connection with its consideration of Senate Resolution 187 by making a formal motion on the floor of the Senate to discharge the committee; and that Senator McCARTHY be advised by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that if he does not take the requested action in a period of time to be fixed by stipulation between Senator McCARTHY and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that the committee—acting through the chairman of the Standing Committee or the chairman of the subcommittee—will itself present such motion to discharge for the purpose of affirming the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and the integrity of its members in its consideration of the aforesaid resolution;" and

Whereas on March 6, 1952, the said motion was also adopted by the Committee on Rules and Administration and the chairman of said committee submitted to the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, a copy of the above-stated motion; and

Whereas by letter dated March 21, 1952, the Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. McCARTHY, in effect declined to take the action called for by the above-stated motion, repeating his charge that the subcommittee has been guilty of "a completely dishonest handling of taxpayers' money," referring to a preliminary and confidential report of its staff as "scurrilous" and consisting of "cleverly twisted and distorted facts": Now, therefore, to determine the proper jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules and Administration and to express the confidence of the Senate in its committee in their consideration of Senate Resolution 187, it being understood that the following motion is made solely for this test and that the adoption of the resolution is opposed by the members on whose behalf it is submitted, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration be and it hereby is discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 187.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point certain precedents of the Senate relating to expulsion, exclusion, and censure cases unconnected with elections, from 1871 to 1951.

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

SENATE EXPULSION, EXCLUSION, AND CENSURE CASES UNCONNECTED WITH ELECTIONS (1871-1951)

PROPOSITIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

I. The jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges is not limited to election matters, but extends to expulsion, exclusion, and censure cases totally unconnected with the conduct of a Senator in an election

The present source of jurisdiction of the standing committees of the Senate is rule

XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate (sec. 102 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946). Under section 1 (o) (1) (D) of this rule, the Congress has granted jurisdiction to the Committee on Rules and Administration in the following matters: Election of the President, Vice President, or Members of Congress; corrupt practices; contested elections; credentials and qualifications; Federal elections generally; Presidential succession.

The category "credentials and qualifications" authorizes the Committee on Rules and Administration and its subagent, the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, to investigate alleged misconduct of a Senator with a view toward exclusion, expulsion, or punishment. This conclusion is based upon the history of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the precedents of the old standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the general policy of the Reorganization Act against special committees.

(a) The history of the legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 indicates that the precedents of the old standing Committee on Privileges and Elections are relevant in defining the jurisdiction of the present subcommittee.

The history of the act in relation to the Rules Committee indicates that its only purpose was to consolidate six committees, Audit and Control of the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, Library, Privileges and Elections, Rules, Printing, and Enrolled Bills into the single Committee on Rules and Administration (S. Rept. No. 1400, 79th Cong., 2d sess., table II, pp. 12-17). See also Senate hearings, volume 762, page 244, incorporating the remarks of Senator La Follette upon his resolution providing for reorganization of Senate committees. There is no indication that, in the process of consolidation, the functions of the old committee were added to, whittled away, or transferred to other new committees. Hence, the precedents established by the old standing Committee on Privileges and Elections between 1871 and 1947 are relevant in defining the jurisdiction of the present Rules Committee and its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections.

(b) These precedents establish that the old Committee on Privileges and Elections possessed jurisdiction in expulsion, exclusion, and censure cases totally unconnected with the conduct of a Senator in an election.

Since 1871, when the standing Committee on Privileges and Elections was first organized, there have been eight cases of expulsion or exclusion proceedings based on grounds totally unconnected with the election of a Senator. There have also been three cases of censure unrelated to election conduct. These 11 cases are digested in the appendix, with emphasis on the procedure employed in each case. Similar data are also presented in tabular form.

These cases indicate that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and no other standing committee, was presumed to have jurisdiction in expulsion and exclusion cases, even though the matters involved were unconnected with conduct of an election. The Patterson case in 1873 was the only case among the 11 which was considered by some other committee. This was a select rather than a standing committee. However, even in the Patterson case, debate on the floor makes it apparent that the Committee on Privileges and Elections, although considered the proper committee, preferred to relinquish jurisdiction to a select committee because it was then preoccupied with other matters.

In addition to the Patterson case, four of the cases were expulsion cases: William N. Roach of North Dakota (1893); John H. Mitchell of Oregon (1905); Joseph R. Burton of Kansas (1906); and Robert M. La Follette (1917-19).

In the Roach case, the Senate debated but did not vote upon resolutions directing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to investigate charges of pre-election embezzlement.

Mitchell, indicted for selling his influence, answered the charges against him on the Senate floor, withdrew from the Senate, and died before the Senate took any action.

In the Burton case, the Senate by unanimous consent passed a resolution directing the Committee on Privileges and Elections to examine into the legal effect of a final judgment of conviction of a Senator who had received compensation for services rendered before a Government department; Burton, however, resigned before the committee took any action.

The La Follette case was instituted by the presentation to the Senate of the petition of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety calling for the expulsion of La Follette for an allegedly disloyal speech. The petition was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which held hearings and finally exonerated La Follette.

The appendix describes three exclusion proceedings where the alleged grounds were unconnected with misconduct in an election: Reed Smoot of Utah (1903-1907); Arthur R. Gould of Maine (1926); and William Langer of North Dakota (1941).

The Smoot and Langer cases might be categorized as expulsion cases, inasmuch as the Senate superimposed the requirement that exclusion be by two-thirds. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, after considering each case, exonerated Gould, but recommended the exclusion of Smoot and Langer. The Senate, however, voted that Smoot and Langer were entitled to their seats.

It is significant that while the jurisdiction of the Senate to inquire into a Senator's conduct before his election was challenged in these cases, reference of the matters to the Committee on Privileges and Elections was not questioned.

Finally, there were three censure cases since the founding of the old Committee on Privileges and Elections: Senators Tillman and McLaurin of South Carolina (1902) and Hiram Bingham of Connecticut (1929).

Tillman provoked McLaurin into the use of unparliamentary language; whereupon

Tillman left his seat and assaulted McLaurin. It was the Committee on Privileges and Elections to which the matter was referred. The committee reported a resolution of censure, which the Senate adopted.

In the Bingham case, a Judiciary subcommittee investigating lobbies reported that Senator Bingham had appointed an official of a manufacturers' association to his staff and had taken him into a confidential committee meeting considering a tariff bill. The subcommittee, however, did not suggest action against Bingham. The question of punishment was raised on the floor by Senator Norris, who offered a resolution of censure. This resolution was debated, amended, and approved by the Senate.

(c) The language and policy of the Reorganization Act opposed jurisdiction in any other standing committee or in a select committee.

Rule XXV contains no language which would support jurisdiction in expulsion matters in any standing committee other than the Rules Committee. Furthermore, the history of the Reorganization Act indicates that the draftsmen were motivated by a policy against select committees (S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 6), and the Senate bill (S. 2177, sec. 126) contained a prohibition of special or select committees. Although the House eliminated the flat ban on select committees in the final version of the Reorganization Act, it was apparently the hope of the draftsmen of rule XXV that its language would cover the whole field of senatorial action, with the result that any bill, resolution, or memorial could be referred to the appropriate standing committee. Thus, the history and language of the legislative Reorganization Act affirmatively support the jurisdiction of the Rules Committee in expulsion cases and oppose the jurisdiction of any other standing committee or of a select committee.

II. The Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections possesses legal authority to make investigation of charges of alleged misconduct by a Senator, to hold public hearings, and to report to the Rules Committee a resolution of expulsion, censure, or exoneration.

(a) Section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act provides: "Each standing

committee of the Senate, including any subcommittee of any such committee, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to take such testimony and to make such expenditures (not in excess of \$10,000 for each committee during any Congress) as it deems advisable. Each such committee may make investigations into any matter within its jurisdiction, may report such hearings as may be had by it, and may employ stenographic assistance at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman."

Thus, if it is conceded that the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections possesses jurisdiction in expulsion cases, it follows from section 134 (a) that the subcommittee has the power to make investigations and hold hearings in an expulsion case without obtaining specific authorization from the Senate or from the Rules Committee.

(b) The precedents of the old standing committee indicate that investigations have been commenced both with and without specific Senate authorization or direction.

The old Committee on Privileges and Elections was presented with five cases of expulsion or exclusion unconnected with an election. In three of these cases, those of Smoot, Burton, and Gould, the Senate adopted resolutions directing an investigation of the charges against the respective Senators. In the other two cases, those of La Follette and Langer, the petitions and protests of private citizens were referred by the presiding officer to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, which then conducted investigations without obtaining resolutions of authorization from the Senate.

These precedents indicate that the legal power of the subcommittee to conduct investigations of its own motion is not subject to question; and, also, that the subcommittee may act under a resolution formally adopted by the Senate.

Name of Senator	Nature of proceeding	Alleged misconduct	How instituted	Committee proposed for reference	Did Senate adopt resolution directing inquiry?	Committee action	Senate action
James W. Patterson (1873).	Expulsion.....	Participation in Credit Mobilier.	Transmission by House of Representatives of copy of evidence.	Select Committee.	Yes (unanimous consent).	Resolution of expulsion.	Debate. Term ended before resolution considered.
William N. Roach (1893).do.....	Pre-election bank embezzlement.	Introduction of resolutions directing inquiry.	Privileges and Elections.	No.....	None.....	Debate, but no vote on resolutions.
John H. Mitchell (1905).do.....	Indictment for selling influence.	Mitchell answered indictment on floor and withdrew.	None.....do.....do.....	Mitchell died before case warranted action.
Reed Smoot (1903-07).	Exclusion (but with two-thirds requirement).	Encouraging polygamy; supporting union of church and state.	Memorials of Utah citizens protesting admission.	Privileges and Elections.	Yes (unanimous consent).	Resolution that Smoot not entitled to seat.	Added two-thirds requirement and voted resolution down.
Joseph R. Burton (1906).	Expulsion.....	Conviction of statute forbidding compensation for senatorial services.	Resolution directing inquiry.do.....do.....	Burton resigned before committee or Senate took any action.	Adopted committee resolution.
Robert M. La Follette (1917-19).do.....	Disloyal speech.....	Petition of Minnesota Commission of Public Safety.	Privileges and Elections (petition so referred).	No resolution offered.	Resolution dismissing petition.	No action.
Arthur R. Gould (1926).	Exclusion.....	Bribery committed 14 years before election.	Introduction of resolution.	Privileges and Elections.	Yes, after debate and vote.	Resolution of exoneration.	Added two-thirds requirement and voted resolution down.
William Langer (1941).	Exclusion (with two-thirds requirement).	Misconduct as Governor, attorney general, and attorney.	Protest by citizens of North Dakota.	Privileges and Elections (protest so referred).	No resolution offered.	Resolution that Langer not entitled to be Senator.	After debate, passed committee's resolution.
Tillman and McLaurin (1902).	Censure.....	Unparliamentary language by McLaurin and assault by Tillman.	Resolution directing report by Privileges and Elections.	Privileges and Elections.	Yes.....	Resolution of censure.	After debate, passed resolution of censure.
Hiram Bingham (1929).do.....	Employment of lobbyist in confidential committee conference.	Introduction of resolution of censure.	None.....	No.....	None.....	After debate, passed resolution of censure.

APPENDIX OF EXPULSION, EXCLUSION, AND CENSURE CASES SINCE THE ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS

1. JAMES W. PATTERSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, FROM MARCH 4, 1867, UNTIL MARCH 3, 1873

On February 4, 1873, the House of Representatives transmitted to the Senate a copy of evidence reported by a select investigating committee which investigated certain Members of the Senate in the *Crédit Mobilier* bribery scandal.

It was then moved and resolved by unanimous consent to appoint a select investigating committee for referral of the House message, the committee to possess the subpoena power.

On February 27, 1873, the select committee submitted a report (No. 519) accompanied by the following resolution: "Resolved, That James W. Patterson be, and he is hereby expelled from his seat as a member of the Senate."

On March 1 and 3, 1873, the Senate debated the question of taking up the report of the committee for consideration, but adjourned without actually considering the resolution.

Mr. Patterson's term then ended, and he did not return to the Senate.

At a special session in March of 1873 the Senate agreed to a resolution which pointed out that it was impossible to consider the expulsion resolution at the previous session and that it was questionable whether it was competent for the Senate to consider the same after Mr. Patterson had ceased to be a Member. It therefore merely resolved to print Mr. Patterson's pamphlet, *Observations on the Report of the Committee of the Senate of the United States Respecting the Crédit Mobilier of America*.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, pp. 1209-1211; Senate Journal, 42d Cong., 3d sess.; S. Rept. 519, 42d Cong., 3d sess.; debate on appointment of investigating committee, Congressional Globe, pt. 2, 42d Cong., 3d sess., p. 1099; debate on taking up report of committee for consideration, Congressional Globe, pt. 3, 42d Cong., 3d sess., pp. 2068, 2069, 2184, 2185; debate in special session on resolution to print report and Patterson's pamphlet, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 1, pp. 193-197, 204.)

2. WILLIAM N. ROACH, OF NORTH DAKOTA, SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SENATE, MARCH 4, 1893

On March 28, 1893, Senator Hoar introduced a resolution that "the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to investigate the allegations recently extensively made in the public press, charging William N. Roach, a Senator from the State of North Dakota, with the offense of criminal embezzlement, to report the facts of the transactions referred to, and further to report what is the duty of the Senate in regard thereto."

This resolution was followed on April 10, 1893, by a substitute by Mr. Hoar, which added the fact that the alleged criminal embezzlement took place while Mr. Roach was an officer of a bank in the city of Washington.

Still another substitute was introduced on April 14, 1893, asking that "the Committee on Privileges and Elections be directed to inquire and consider the question whether the Senate has authority or jurisdiction to investigate charges made against a Senator as to conduct or offenses occurring or committed prior to his election, not relating to his duty as Senator or affecting the integrity of his election."

Each resolution was ordered to lie over and be printed.

The resolutions were the subject of debate in the Senate April 14 and 15, 1893, but no vote was taken thereon.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, pp. 809-811; Senator Hoar's first resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, p. 37; Senator Hoar's substitute resolution, CONGRES-

SIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, pp. 111, 112; third resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, pp. 137, 138; debate on the three resolutions, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 25, pp. 134, 138, 140-154, 155-159, 160-164.)

3. JOHN H. MITCHELL, OF OREGON, JANUARY 17, 1905

Mr. Mitchell, rising to a question of personal privilege on January 17, 1905, gave his answers to an indictment for receiving \$2,000 to use his influence as a Senator in a conspiracy to defraud the United States out of a portion of its public lands. He then concluded: "Now, having said this much in explanation of and in answer to the charges against me, and thanking you all sincerely for your courteous attention, I will not further intrude on your presence." Mr. Mitchell died before his case assumed such a phase as to call for action by the Senate.

(Citation (not in Senate Election Cases): Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 2, 1907; CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 2d sess., 58th Cong., pp. 959-963.)

4. REED SMOOT, OF UTAH, 1903-7

On February 23, 1905, the credentials of Reed Smoot were read and filed. On the same day Senator Burrows presented a memorial of citizens of Utah, remonstrating against the admission of Reed Smoot to a seat in the Senate; this memorial was placed on file. On March 5, 1903, Mr. Smoot was sworn in, his credentials being in order.

On January 16, 1904, a preliminary hearing was held before the Committee on Privileges and Elections at which counsel appeared for the memorialists and at which Mr. Smoot also appeared in person and by counsel. Statements were made by counsel for the respective parties, stating, in a general way, what they expected to prove and what their claims were as to the legal aspects of the case. (Senate Election Cases, vol. II, p. 956.)

On January 25, 1904, Mr. Burrows, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized and directed to investigate the right and title of Reed Smoot to a seat in the Senate as a Senator from the State of Utah; and said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during the recess of Congress, to employ a stenographer, to send for persons, and papers, and to administer oaths; and that the expense of the inquiry shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers to be approved by the chairman of the committee."

The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate reported this resolution with a minor amendment.

The Senate proceeded by unanimous consent to consider the resolution, and agreed to it as amended.

Voluminous testimony was taken by the committee for over a year.

On June 2, 1906, Mr. Burrows, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, stated that the committee was divided on the question of the nature of the resolution which was to follow the acceptance by the Senate of the committee report; whether it should be one to expel the Senator, or whether a declaration that he was not entitled to his seat would be sufficient.

On June 11, 1906, Mr. Burrows submitted the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections (No. 4253), accompanied by the following resolution:

"Resolved, That Reed Smoot is not entitled to a seat as a Senator of the United States from the State of Utah."

The report concluded that Mr. Smoot was a member of the First Presidency and Twelve Apostles of the Mormon Church, which had encouraged the practice of polygamy contrary to law and had brought about a union of church and State in Utah contrary to the Constitution of Utah and the Constitution of the United States; consequently, Mr. Reed Smoot came to the Senate, not as the accredited representative of the State of Utah in the Senate of the United States, but as the choice of the hierarchy which controls the church and has usurped the functions of the State in said State of Utah.

A minority report of five members of the Committee found that the evidence did not sustain the charges against Smoot.

The Senate debated the resolution in December of 1906 and in January and February of 1907.

It was voted that the resolution be amended as follows: "Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein."

But on February 20, 1907, the resolution as amended was defeated by a vote of 23 yeas and 42 nays.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, pp. 928-986; presentation of memorial of citizens of Utah, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 36, pp. 2496, 2689; swearing in of Smoot, and postponement of contest on qualifications, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 37, p. 1; resolution authorizing and directing investigation of the right and title of Smoot, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 38, p. 1100; reporting of resolution by Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 38, p. 1239; report by Mr. Burrows that Smoot was not entitled to his seat, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 7715; submission of majority and minority reports, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 8218; contains citations to the Senate debate on the Smoot Resolution, Senate Election Cases, vol. I, p. 985; votes on the resolution and amendments, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 41, pp. 3428-3430.)

5. JOSEPH R. BURTON, OF KANSAS (1906)

Senator Burton was convicted of violating the Federal statute forbidding Senators or Representatives from receiving compensation for services rendered before any department of the United States Government.

On May 22, 1906, Senator Hale introduced the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and are hereby, directed to examine into the legal effect of the late decision of the Supreme Court in the case of Joseph R. Burton, a Senator from the State of Kansas, and, as soon as may be, to report their recommendation as to what action, if any, shall be taken by the Senate."

The Vice President then asked: "Does the Senator from Maine desire the present consideration of the resolution just read?"

Mr. HALE. "It is simply directing the committee to investigate. There is no objection, I suppose, to the resolution."

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

On June 5, 1906, the Vice President laid before the Senate the following telegram, which was read and ordered to lie on the table:

"TOPEKA, KANS., June 4, 1906.

"Hon. CHARLES W. FAIRBANKS,
"Vice President of the United States
"Washington, D. C.:

"Hon. J. R. Burton has this day tendered his resignation as United States Senator from Kansas, and I have accepted the same."

No report was ever made to the Senate on the resolution.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. I, p. 995; submission of resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 7211; telegram concerning resignation, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 40, p. 7821.)

6. ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, OF WISCONSIN
(1917-19)

On September 29, 1917, the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety presented a petition to the United States Senate in the form of a resolution, whose resolving clause was as follows:

"Resolved, That the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety respectfully petitions the Senate of the United States to institute proceedings looking to the expulsion of the said Robert M. La Follette from the Senate, as a teacher of disloyalty and sedition, giving aid and comfort to our enemies, and hindering the Government in the conduct of the war."

This petition resulted from a speech of alleged disloyal nature delivered by Senator La Follette in St. Paul, Minn., on September 20, 1917.

Mr. Kellogg presented the petition, and it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Concerning the referral, Mr. Gilbert E. Roe notes in his brief in behalf of Senator Robert M. La Follette, that "Senator La Follette was temporarily absent from the Senate at the time of this proceeding, in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Finance, and had no information concerning the presentation of the resolution or of its references to the Committee on Privileges and Elections until some time thereafter. He had no opportunity, therefore, himself to then move for an investigation of said charges either by special committee or otherwise."

The Committee on Privileges and Elections then adopted a resolution authorizing a subcommittee "to investigate the accuracy of the report of the speech delivered by the Honorable Robert M. La Follette, United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin, September 20, 1917, before the Nonpartisan League at St. Paul; to investigate the accuracy of the statements made by the Honorable Robert M. La Follette in said speech; and to report its findings to the full committee the first day of the next regular session of Congress, in December 1917."

Hearings were conducted by the committee during a 14-month period. Congressional precedents and court decisions were reviewed, but no witnesses testified against La Follette.

The committee on January 17, 1919, submitted a report recommending the adoption of the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the resolution of the Minnesota Commission of Public Safety petitioning the Senate of the United States to institute proceedings looking to the expulsion of Robert M. La Follette from the Senate because of a speech delivered by him at St. Paul, Minn., on September 20, 1917, be, and the same hereby are, dismissed for the reason that the speech in question does not justify any action by the Senate."

Senator Pomerene submitted his minority views.

The resolution submitted by the majority of the committee to dismiss the petition to eject Senator La Follette was adopted by the Senate after a short debate on January 16, 1919, by a vote of 50 to 21.

(Citations: Senate Election Cases, vol. II, pp. 49-98; hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, pt. 1, 65th Cong., 1st sess.; pt. 2, 65th Cong., 1st sess.; pt. 2, 65th Cong., 2d sess., in Senate Hearings, vol. 188, Senate Library; exchanges of correspondence between the committee and Senator La Follette, Senator La Follette's St. Paul speech, brief in behalf of Senator Robert M. La Follette (filed by his counsel, Gilbert E. Roe (also CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 57, pt. 2, pp. 1506-1522)), and Mr. Pomerene's minority views—S. Rept. No. 614, 65th Cong., 3d sess.; Senate vote adopting the committee's resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 57, pt. 2, pp. 1525-1527.)

7. ARTHUR B. GOULD, OF MAINE (1926)

On December 6, 1926, the certificate of election of Arthur R. Gould was presented to the Senate. At that time a resolution was introduced, pointing out that the press had reported that in 1911 the chief justice of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick had found in an official opinion that Mr. Gould, "for the purpose of advancing his own interests," had paid a \$100,000 bribe to the Premier of the Province in connection with a railroad venture. The resolving clause read as follows:

"Resolved, That in that absence of official information concerning the charge thus made, the qualifying oath be administered to the member-elect and that the Committee on Privileges and Elections be, and it hereby is, directed to inquire into the truth of the facts so reported and recited and to report the same at the earliest convenient date to the Senate, with such recommendations touching action by it in the premises as may seem to them warranted."

The resolution was ordered to go over under the rule and the oath was administered to Mr. Gould.

On the next day, the Senate debated the resolution. Three arguments were advanced on behalf of Mr. Gould: That the Senate's authority to investigate the qualifications of Members was limited to questions of age, residence, and citizenship; that it had no jurisdiction to inquire into alleged offenses committed prior to the election of a Senator; and that the people of Maine, though familiar with the charges, had elected Gould by a large majority.

Senator Gould, however, took the floor and stated that he welcomed an investigation because he felt that he would be vindicated by the Senate as a result thereof.

The resolution was adopted and referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections by a vote of 70 to 7.

From January 4 to January 27, 1927, hearings were held by the committee.

On March 4, 1927, the Committee on Privileges and Elections submitted Senate Report No. 1715 exonerating Mr. Gould and recommending that "further action in the instant case be not taken, and that the right of the honorable Arthur R. Gould to a seat in the Senate be confirmed."

(Citations: Introduction of resolution calling for investigation of the charges against Gould, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 68, pt. 1, pp. 8, 9; Senate debate on the resolution and adoption of the resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 68, pt. 1, pp. 38-44; hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, 69th Cong., 2d sess., Senate hearings, vol. 290 in Senate Library; S. Rept. No. 1715, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 68, pt. 5, p. 5914.)

8. WILLIAM LANGER, OF NORTH DAKOTA (1941)

On January 3, 1941, a protest to the seating of WILLIAM LANGER was filed with the Secretary of the Senate by various citizens. On the same day, Senator LANGER was permitted to take the oath without prejudice, and subject to parliamentary ruling that only a majority of the Senate would be required to pass on the qualifications of the Senator-elect.

Senator BARKLEY asked that the papers, charges, affidavits and other documents which were involved in the protest against Senator LANGER's seating be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. The Vice President then declared: "Without objection, it is so ordered."

Hearings were held before the Committee on Privileges and Elections on January 9, 1941, and on January 16, 1941.

A subcommittee conducted preliminary investigations and filed a report for the use of the committee.

The full committee held hearings November 3 to 18, 1941, and voted by 13 to 3 for the following resolution:

"Resolved, That WILLIAM LANGER is not entitled to be a Senator of the United States from the State of North Dakota."

The committee recommended that the Senate cast a vote on the proposition that the case "does not fall within the constitutional provisions for expulsion or any punishment by two-thirds vote, because Senator LANGER is neither charged with nor proven to have committed disorderly behavior during his membership in the Senate." The Senate rejected this proposition by a vote of 45 to 37. The Senate then voted 52 to 30 in favor of Senator LANGER's right to a seat.

(Citations: Filing of protest and swearing in of Senator LANGER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 87, No. 1, pp. 1 and 2; Rept. 1010, 77th Cong., 2d sess.; Senate debate (last 2 days) and vote, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 88, pt. 3, pp. 2959, 2970-2978, 3038-3065.)

THE THREE CENSURE CASES

1 and 2. Senators Tillman and McLaurin, of South Carolina (February 22, 1902)

Tillman charged on the floor that improper influence had been used in changing the vote of McLaurin upon the treaty which ended the Spanish-American War. McLaurin declared on the floor that the statement was a "willful, malicious, and deliberate lie." Tillman jumped forward and struck McLaurin, and they fought till separated.

A resolution was then passed that the two Senators be "declared in contempt of the Senate, and the matter be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections with instructions to report to the Senate what action shall be taken in relation thereto."

The Senate, by a vote of 54 to 12, adopted the recommendation of the committee:

"That it is the judgment of the Senate that the Senators from South Carolina . . . for disorderly behavior and flagrant violation of the rules of the Senate . . . deserve the censure of the Senate, and they are hereby censured for their breach of the privileges and dignity of this body; and from and after the adoption of this resolution, the action adjudging them in contempt of the Senate shall be no longer in force and effect."

(Citations: Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, vol. 2, pp. 1138-1142; description of the encounter, and Senate order of contempt, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2087-2090; report of Committee on Privileges and Elections and vote of the Senate approving the committee's resolution of censure, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 57th Cong., 1st sess., pp. 2203-2207.)

3. Hiram Bingham, of Connecticut (November 4, 1929)

On September 30, 1929, a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee investigating lobbies reported that Senator Bingham had appointed Charles L. Eyanson, assistant to the president of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, as a member of his staff. Eyanson, who was paid \$10,000 by the Connecticut Manufacturers Association, assisted Senator Bingham in connection with the hearings on the tariff bill before the Committee on Finance. Eyanson, whom Bingham had sworn as clerk of the Committee on Territories and Insular Possessions, of which Bingham was chairman, came into secret meetings of the Finance Committee. Eyanson turned over his salary as clerk of the Territories Committee to Senator Bingham, who later transmitted a check of \$1,000 to Eyanson when the latter departed from Washington.

Senator Norris introduced a resolution condemning this conduct.

Senator Bingham replied that there was nothing unethical about hiring Eyanson, since his sole purpose was that he "might

better be prepared to present the case of (his) constituents in Connecticut, both employers and employees, both producers and consumers."

After extended debate an amendment disavowing any imputation of corrupt motives was incorporated into Senator Norris' resolution and the resolution was agreed to—yeas 54, nays 22:

"Resolved, That the action of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Bingham, in placing Mr. Charles L. Eyanson upon the official rolls of the Senate and his use by Senator Bingham at the time and in the manner set forth in the report of the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary (Rept. No. 43, 71st Cong., 1st sess.), while not the result of corrupt motives on the part of the Senator from Connecticut, is contrary to good morals and senatorial ethics and tends to bring the Senate into dishonor and disrepute, and such conduct is hereby condemned."

(Citations: CANNON'S PRECEDENTS of the House of Representatives, vol. 6, pp. 408-410; report on lobbying, S. Rept. 43, 71st Cong., 1st sess.; Senator Norris' resolution, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 5063; resolution as passed, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 71st Cong., 1st sess., p. 5131.)

Mr. HAYDEN. Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of a letter addressed to me by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] and a copy of another letter addressed to me by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 6, 1952.

Re Senate Resolution 187.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,

Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: On August 6, 1951, Senate Resolution 187 was introduced in the Senate by Senator WILLIAM BENTON, of Connecticut, and was referred by the President of the Senate to the Committee on Rules and Administration. As you know, the resolution proposes an inquiry to determine whether the Committee on Rules and Administration should initiate action with a view toward the expulsion from the United States Senate of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, of Wisconsin. The final clause of the resolution is as follows:

"Resolved, That the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate is authorized and directed to proceed with such consideration of the report of its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections with respect to the 1950 Maryland senatorial general election, which was made pursuant to S. Res. 250, Eighty-first Congress, April 13, 1950, and to make such further investigation with respect to the participation of Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY in the 1950 senatorial campaign of Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, and such investigation with respect to his other acts since his election to the Senate, as may be appropriate to enable such committee to determine whether or not it should initiate action with a view toward the expulsion from the United States Senate of the said Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY."

On August 8, 1951, as chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, you referred the said resolution to the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and on Friday, September 28, the subcommittee received in open session an oral statement from Senator BENTON in support of the resolution. An invitation was extended to Senator McCARTHY to attend this public hearing and to appear before the subcommittee to answer

Senator BENTON's charges. However, Senator McCARTHY rejected this invitation by letter dated October 4, 1951, in which he stated:

"Frankly, Guy, I have not and do not intend to even read, much less answer, BENTON's smear attack. I am sure you realize that the Benton type of material can be found in the Daily Worker almost any day of the week and will continue to flow from the mouths and pens of the camp followers as long as I continue my fight against Communists in government."

(A copy of Senator McCARTHY's communication is attached hereto as enclosure A.)

Thereafter, the staff of the subcommittee was ordered to investigate the matters involved. On December 6, 1951, without prior inquiry either to me or to any other member of the subcommittee, Senator McCARTHY falsely and, it must be said, maliciously, accused the committee of "stealing from the pockets of the American taxpayer tens of thousands of dollars" in its handling of this investigation. The scandalous nature of his charges is apparent from the following quotation of them:

"Over the past months, it has been repeatedly brought to my attention that a horde of investigators hired by your committee at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money, has been engaged exclusively in trying to dig up on McCARTHY material covering periods of time long before he was even old enough to be a candidate for the Senate—material which can have no conceivable connection with his election or any other election. This is being done in complete disregard of the limited power of your elections subcommittee. The obvious purpose is to dig up campaign material for the Democrat Party for the coming campaign against McCARTHY."

"When your elections subcommittee, without Senate authorization, spends tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars for the sole purpose of digging up campaign material against McCARTHY, then the committee is guilty of stealing just as clearly as though the Members engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers and turning the loot over to the Democratic National Committee."

"If one of the administration lackies were chairman of this committee, I would not waste the time or energy to write and point out the committee's complete dishonesty, but from you, Guy, the Senate and the country expect honest adherence to the rules of the Senate."

"While the actions of BENTON and some of the committee members do not surprise me, I cannot understand your being willing to label GUY GILLETTE as a man who will head a committee which is stealing from the pockets of the American taxpayer tens of thousands of dollars and then using this money to protect the Democrat Party from the political effect of the exposure of Communists in government. To take it upon yourself to hire a horde of investigators and spend tens of thousands of dollars without any authorization to do so from the Senate is labeling your elections subcommittee as even more dishonest than was the Tydings committee."

(A copy of this communication and of my reply, also dated December 6, 1951, are attached hereto as enclosure B.)

The following day, December 7, 1951, Senator McCARTHY addressed to me a further communication requesting information concerning the personnel of the staff of the subcommittee, their salaries, and an explanation of the nature of instructions issued to them. Since Senator McCARTHY was at that time a member of the Rules Committee, I felt that he was entitled to the information he had requested relative to the personnel employed by the subcommittee and by letter dated December 11, 1951, related information to

him concerning their salaries and the length of time they had been employed. (A copy of this communication and of my reply dated December 11, 1951, are attached hereto as enclosure C.)

Again, Mr. Chairman, on December 19, 1951, after having received from me the complete details with respect to the personnel of the subcommittee and the salaries at which they are employed, Senator McCARTHY deliberately, knowing the charge to be false, again vilified the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections with the same extravagant and irresponsible charges, attributing dishonesty and improper motives to its members. In this letter, Senator McCARTHY stated:

"The full committee appointed you chairman of an elections subcommittee, but gave you no power whatsoever to hire investigators and spend vast amounts of money to make investigations having nothing to do with elections. Again may I have an answer to my questions as to why you feel you are entitled to spend the taxpayers' money to do the work of the Democratic National Committee."

"As I have previously stated, you and every member of your subcommittee who is responsible for spending vast amounts of money to hire investigators, pay their traveling expenses, etc., on matters not concerned with elections, is just as dishonest as though he or she picked the pockets of the taxpayers and turned the loot over to the Democratic National Committee."

All of the above intemperate and outrageous accusations were delivered to the public press prior to their submission to me, as I pointed out in a communication to Senator McCARTHY dated December 21, 1951:

"Unfortunately, our previous correspondence concerning these matters found its way into the public press and your letters to me were printed in full in the public press even before I received them. As a former judge you will appreciate, I am sure, the impropriety of discussing matters pertaining to pending litigation in the public press. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, having referred the Benton resolution to our subcommittee, has placed us in a quasi-judicial position relative to a matter of outstanding importance involving the expulsion from the Senate of a sitting Member."

In this communication I also extended to Senator McCARTHY an opportunity to confer with me in person rather than continue this exchange of correspondence. With respect to his unwarranted, undignified, and wholly unjustifiable attack upon the integrity of the subcommittee, I said:

"May I again assure you that as far as I am personally concerned, neither the Democratic National Committee nor any other person or group other than an agency of the United States Senate has had or will have any influence whatever as to my duties and actions as a member of the subcommittee, and I am just as confident that no other member of the subcommittee has been or will be so influenced."

(A copy of Senator McCARTHY's letter of December 19, 1951, and of my answer, which I transmitted to Senator McCARTHY on December 21, 1951, are attached hereto as enclosure D.)

The invitation contained in my letter of December 21, 1951, was, however, ignored by Senator McCARTHY, and again on January 4, 1952, he addressed to me a communication charging that the jurisdiction of the subcommittee was restricted to matters having to do with elections and asking whether the investigators were ordered to restrict their investigations to such matters. (A copy of this communication and of my reply dated January 10, 1952, are attached hereto as enclosure E.)

No valid argument can be made that the subcommittee does not possess jurisdiction to enter into a plenary investigation of Senator McCARTHY's qualifications and conduct. The matter has been the subject of careful research by the legal staff of the subcommittee and it is clear that Senator McCARTHY's charge that our jurisdiction is limited to matters pertaining to elections is wholly untenable.

However, because of the fact that a question of jurisdiction has been raised by Senator McCARTHY and because he has undertaken, in addition, to impugn the integrity of the members of the subcommittee in communications which have been widely publicized by him, the subcommittee, in an executive session held on March 5, 1952, adopted the following motion by Senator MONRONEY, of Oklahoma:

"That the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration request Senator McCARTHY, of Wisconsin, to raise the question of the jurisdiction of the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections and of the integrity of the members thereof in connection with its consideration of Senate Resolution 187 by making a formal motion on the floor of the Senate to discharge the committee; and that Senator McCARTHY be advised by the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration that if he does not take the requested action in a period of time to be fixed by stipulation between Senator McCARTHY and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration, that the committee (acting through the chairman of the standing committee or the chairman of the subcommittee) will itself present such motion to discharge for the purpose of affirming the jurisdiction of the subcommittee and the integrity of its members in its consideration of the aforesaid resolution."

As chairman of the subcommittee, I transmit this report to you and request that you bring the matter before the Committee on Rules and Administration at its next meeting.

Respectfully,

GUY M. GILLETTE,
Chairman.

ENCLOSURE A

OCTOBER 4, 1951.

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GUY: This is to acknowledge receipt of your letter of October 1 in which you offer me an opportunity to appear before your committee and answer Senator BENTON's charges.

Frankly, Guy, I have not and do not intend to even read, much less answer, BENTON's smear attack. I am sure you realize that the Benton type of material can be found in the Daily Worker almost any day of the week and will continue to flow from the mouths and pens of the camp followers as long as I continue my fight against Communists in government.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

ENCLOSURE B

DECEMBER 6, 1951.

Senator GUY GILLETTE,
Chairman, Elections Subcommittee,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you, of course, know, your Elections Subcommittee has the power and the duty to carefully investigate any valid claims of irregularity or dishonesty in the conduct of campaigns for the United States Senate.

As you and all the members of your subcommittee know or should know, the Elections Subcommittee, unless given further power by the Senate, is restricted to matters having to do with elections. The Senate could, of course, by a majority vote give your subcommittee power to conduct an unlimited investigation of any Senator. Such power was not asked for nor given to your Elections Subcommittee.

However, over the past months it has been repeatedly brought to my attention that a horde of investigators hired by your committee at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money has been engaged exclusively in trying to dig up on McCARTHY material covering periods of time long before he was even old enough to be a candidate for the Senate—material which can have no conceivable connection with his election or any other election. This is being done in complete disregard of the limited power of your Elections Subcommittee. The obvious purpose is to dig up campaign material for the Democrat Party for the coming campaign against McCARTHY.

When your Elections Subcommittee, without Senate authorization, spends tens of thousands of taxpayers' dollars for the sole purpose of digging up campaign material against McCARTHY, then the committee is guilty of stealing just as clearly as though the members engaged in picking the pockets of the taxpayers and turning the loot over to the Democrat National Committee.

If one of the administration lackies were chairman of this committee I would not waste the time or energy to write and point out the committee's complete dishonesty, but from you, Guy, the Senate and the country expect honest adherence to the rules of the Senate.

If your committee wanted to dig up campaign material against McCARTHY at the expense of the taxpayers, you were in all honesty bound to first get the power to do so from the Senate, which the Senate had a right to give and might have given. But your committee did not risk asking for such power. Instead, your committee decided to spend tens of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money to aid BENTON in his smear attack upon McCARTHY.

Does this mean that if a BENTON asks your committee to do so, you will put an unlimited number of investigators at unlimited cost investigating the background of the other 95 Senators so their opponents can use this material next election? Or is this a rule which applies only to him who fights Communists in government? Let's get an answer to this, Guy. The people of America are entitled to your answer.

While the actions of BENTON and some of the committee members do not surprise me, I cannot understand your being willing to label GUY GILLETTE as a man who will head a committee which is stealing from the pockets of the American taxpayer tens of thousands of dollars and then using this money to protect the Democratic Party from the political effect of the exposure of Communists in government. To take it upon yourself to hire a horde of investigators and spend tens of thousands of dollars without any authorization to do so from the Senate is labeling your elections subcommittee as even more dishonest than was the Tydings committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

DECEMBER 6, 1951.

Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter dated December 6 and referring to the work of the

Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections in the discharge of its duties relative to Resolution No. 187 has just been received by messenger. This resolution, on its introduction by Senator BENTON, was referred by the Senate to the Committee on Rules and Administration, of which you are a member. This committee, in its turn, referred the resolution to its Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections, of which I am the chairman.

Our subcommittee certainly did not seek or welcome the unpleasant task of studying and reporting on a resolution involving charges looking to the ouster of one of our colleagues from the Senate. However, our duty was clear in the task assigned to us and we shall discharge that duty in a spirit of utmost fairness to all concerned and to the Senate. We have ordered our staff to study and report to us on both the legal and factual phases of the resolution. On receiving these reports the subcommittee will then determine its course in the light of its responsibilities and authority.

Your information as to the use of a large staff and the expenditure of a large sum of money in investigations relative to the resolution is, of course, erroneous. May I also assure you that no individuals or groups outside of the subcommittee membership have had or will have any influence whatever in the work assigned to us to do.

With personal greetings, I am,

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

ENCLOSURE C

DECEMBER 7, 1951.

Senator GUY GILLETTE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elections,
United States Senate, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: I would very much appreciate receiving the following information:

(1) The number of people employed by the Elections Subcommittee, together with information on their employment background, the salaries they receive, and the length of time they have been employed.

(2) The names of the above individuals who have been working on the investigation of Senator McCARTHY.

(3) Whether they have been instructed to restrict their investigation to matters concerning elections.

(4) If the investigators have been ordered to cover matters other than either my election or any other election in which I took a part then the theory of the law under which you feel an Election Subcommittee is entitled to hire investigators to go into matters other than those concerned with elections.

I am sure that you will agree that I am entitled to this information.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

DECEMBER 11, 1951.

HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I received your letter dated December 7 in which you make inquiry and request for certain specific information.

As you are a member of the Rules Committee, I feel, as you suggested, that you are entitled to the information relative to the personnel employed by the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections. Your first request is as to the number of people em-

played by the Elections Subcommittee, their salaries, and the length of time they have

been employed. The following is the list employed by the subcommittee:

	Employed	Position	Separated (3)	Basic salary
Grace E. Johnson.....	Dec. 19, 1944	Clerk (permanent employee).....		\$4,800.00
Mary K. Yanick.....	Oct. 1, 1951	Stenographer.....		2,280.00
Israel Margolis.....	Aug. 25, 1951	Assistant counsel.....		2,335.47
J. M. Fitzpatrick.....	Oct. 19, 1951	do.....	Dec. 6, 1951	1,149.86
Dan G. Buckley.....	Oct. 16, 1951	do.....	Dec. 8, 1951	928.37
Robt. L. Shortley.....	Oct. 16, 1951	Investigator.....	Dec. 8, 1951	1,218.86

¹ Per annum.

This completes the list of employees of the subcommittee. Three other employees of the Rules Committee have been performing work for the subcommittee, including Mr. John P. Moore, the chief counsel. You will note that three of the six employees of the subcommittee were taken on in a temporary capacity after the middle of October and completed their assigned work within a few weeks time. These men have done some work in connection with the Ohio Senatorial hearing.

You make further inquiry as to what theory of the law the subcommittee holds in connection with its investigatory work. We are not working under any theory. All the powers that we have derived from delegated responsibilities assigned to us by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration. We do not have, and could not have, any power other than so derived as a sub-agency of the standing committee on rules and administration.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

ENCLOSURE D

DECEMBER 19, 1951.

Senator GUY GILLETTE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elections,
United States Senate, Washington,
D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: On December 7, I wrote you as follows:

"I would very much appreciate receiving the following information:

"(1) The number of people employed by the Elections Subcommittee, together with information on their employment background, the salaries they receive, and the length of time they have been employed.

"(2) The names of the above individuals who have been working on the investigation of Senator McCARTHY.

"(3) Whether they have been instructed to restrict their investigation to matters concerning elections.

"(4) If the investigators have been ordered to cover matters other than either my election or any other election in which I took part, then the theory of the law under which you feel an Elections Subcommittee is entitled to hire investigators to go into matters other than those concerned with elections.

"I am sure you will agree that I am entitled to this information.

"Sincerely yours,

"JOE McCARTHY."

On December 11 you wrote giving me the names of those employed by the subcommittee, stating that two others, whom you did not name, were also doing work for the subcommittee. You did not give me the employment background of the investigators as I requested. Why, Senator, do you refuse to give me the employment background of those individuals?

You also failed to tell me whether the investigators have been instructed to extend their investigations beyond matters having to do with elections.

You state that the only power which your subcommittee has was derived from the full

committee. The full committee appointed you chairman of an Elections Subcommittee but gave you no power whatsoever to hire investigators and spend vast amounts of money to make investigations having nothing to do with elections. Again may I have an answer to my questions as to why you feel you are entitled to spend the taxpayers' money to do the work of the Democratic National Committee.

As I have previously stated, you and every member of your subcommittee who is responsible for spending vast amounts of money to hire investigators, pay their traveling expenses, etc., on matters not concerned with elections, is just as dishonest as though he or she picked the pockets of the taxpayers and turned the loot over to the Democratic National Committee.

I wonder if I might have a frank, honest answer to all the questions covered in my letter of December 7. Certainly as a member of the Rules Committee and as a Member of the Senate, I am entitled to this information. Your failure to give this information highlights the fact that your subcommittee is not concerned with investigating elections, but concerned with dishonestly spending the taxpayers' money and using your subcommittee as an arm of the Democratic National Committee.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

DECEMBER 21, 1951.

Senator JOSEPH R. McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Today I received your letter of December 19 quoting former correspondence in which you had asked for some specific information which you feel was not given you in my reply to your former request.

Not only as a member of the Rules Committee, but as a Member of the United States Senate, you were certainly entitled to any factual information relative to the work of our Subcommittee of Rules and Administration or with reference to the members of its staff. I shall be very glad to give you such information as I have or go with you, if you so desire, to the rooms occupied by the subcommittee and aid you in securing any facts that are there available, relative to the employees of the subcommittee or their work.

I am sure you will agree that this is preferable to an attempt to cover matters of this kind through an interchange of correspondence. Unfortunately, our previous correspondence concerning these matters found its way into the public press and your letters to me were printed in full in the public press even before I received them. As a former judge you will appreciate, I am sure, the impropriety of discussing matters pertaining to pending litigation in the public press. The Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, having referred the Benton resolution to our subcommittee, has placed us in a quasi-judicial position relative to a matter of outstanding importance involving the expulsion from the Senate of a sitting Member.

Inquiry has disclosed that it would be impossible for me to call the subcommittee together for further consideration of this resolution and its import before Monday, the 7th of January, and I am calling a meeting for that date at 10 a. m. in my office.

When the Benton resolution was first referred to the subcommittee it developed that there was a difference of opinion among the members as to our responsibility under the reference and the terms of the resolution. The subcommittee ordered its staff to make study and report of the legal phases and precedents pertaining to the questions raised by the resolution and also to report as to certain allegations of fact contained in the resolution. We are awaiting these reports and, on the date of the meeting, which I have called for January 7, it is expected that the subcommittee will make a decision as to what further action, if any, it will take on the resolution.

As I have told you before, if you care to appear before the subcommittee, we should be glad to make the necessary arrangements as to time and place. Your letter and this reply will be made available to the members of the subcommittee by copy and you will be promptly advised as to what action the subcommittee decided to take.

In the meantime, as I have stated above in this letter, I shall be glad to confer with you personally as to matters concerning our staff and its work.

In closing, may I again assure you that as far as I am personally concerned, neither the Democratic National Committee, nor any other person or group other than an agency of the United States Senate has had or will have any influence whatever as to my duties and actions as a member of the subcommittee and I am just as confident that no other member of the subcommittee has been or will be so influenced.

With warm personal greetings and holiday wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

ENCLOSURE E

JANUARY 4, 1952.

Senator GUY M. GILLETTE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Elections
and Privileges, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GILLETTE: Your letter of December 21 has just been called to my attention. As you know, this was in answer to my letter to you of December 19, in which I asked for certain information.

I can easily understand that you might have some difficulty answering some of my questions without first consulting the other members of the subcommittee—for example, the question as to the theory of the law under which investigators are being hired and money being spent to investigate matters having nothing whatsoever to do with elections. There is, however, one simple question which you could easily answer and I am sure you will agree that I am entitled to the answer. It is the simple question of whether or not you have ordered the investigators to restrict their investigation to matters having to do with elections, or whether their investigations extend into fields having nothing whatsoever to do with either my election or the election of any other Senator.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

JANUARY 10, 1952.

Senator JOE McCARTHY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This is an acknowledgment of the receipt of your letter of January

4 which has just been brought to my attention. Your letter makes inquiry as to whether the Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections "ordered the investigators to restrict their investigations to matters having to do with elections, or whether their investigations extend into fields having nothing whatever to do with either my election or the election of any other Senator."

In reply, you will recall that the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration received from the Senate the Benton resolution calling for a preliminary investigation relative to ouster proceedings. The Rules Committee referred the resolution to our subcommittee, as any other piece of legislation would be referred to a subcommittee. The subcommittee met and directed its staff to make a preliminary study both of the legal phases and precedents pertaining to this type of action and also a preliminary investigation of the factual matter charged in the resolution. They were instructed to make these preliminary studies and report to us at as early a time as possible. The report on the legal questions has been received by the subcommittee and we advise that the report on the factual charges will be available to us by the end of this week. The subcommittee then would study the reports and determine what action, if any, they wish to take in making their report to the Rules Committee on the resolution.

The above statement covers the question you asked as to what instructions were given to the subcommittee staff relative to the Benton resolution.

Sincerely,

GUY M. GILLETTE.

MARCH 21, 1952.

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: Some days ago you handed me a letter from Senator GILLETTE, chairman of the Senate Elections Subcommittee, to you as chairman of the full committee. At that time you informed me that a majority of the full committee had adopted the subcommittee's resolution requesting that I bring to the floor of the Senate a motion to discharge the Elections Subcommittee. You further stated that the purpose of this motion would be to test the jurisdiction and integrity of the members of the subcommittee.

As I stated to you the other day, I feel it would be entirely improper to discharge the Elections Subcommittee at this time for the following reasons:

The Elections Subcommittee unquestionably has the power and when complaint is made, the duty to investigate any improper conduct on the part of McCARTHY or any other Senator in a Senatorial election.

The subcommittee has spent tens of thousands of dollars and nearly a year making the most painstaking investigation of my part in the Maryland election, as well as my campaigns in Wisconsin. The subcommittee's task is not finished until it reports to the Senate the result of that investigation, namely whether they found such misconduct on the part of McCARTHY in either his own campaigns or in the Tydings campaign to warrant his expulsion from the Senate.

I note the subcommittee's request that the integrity of the subcommittee be passed upon. As you know, the sole question of the integrity of the subcommittee concerned its right to spend vast sums of money investigating the life of McCARTHY from birth to date without any authority to do so from the Senate. However, the vote on that question cannot affect the McCarthy investigation, in that the committee for a year has been looking into every possible phase of McCARTHY's life, including an investigation of those who contributed to my unsuccessful 1944 campaign.

As you know, I wrote Senator GILLETTE, chairman of the subcommittee, that I considered this a completely dishonest handling of taxpayers' money. I felt that the Elections Subcommittee had no authority to go into matters other than elections unless the Senate instructed it to do so. However, it is obvious that insofar as McCARTHY is concerned this is now a moot question, because the staff has already painstakingly and diligently investigated every nook and cranny of my life from birth to date. Every possible lead on McCARTHY was investigated. Nothing that could be investigated was left uninvestigated. The staff's scurrilous report, which consisted of cleverly twisted and distorted facts, was then "leaked" to the left-wing elements of the press and blazoned across the Nation in an attempt to further smear McCARTHY.

A vote of confidence in the subcommittee would be a vote on whether or not it had the right, without authority from the Senate, but merely on the request of one Senator (in this case Senator BENTON), to make a thorough and complete investigation of the entire life of another Senator. A vote to uphold the subcommittee would mean that the Senate accepts and approves this precedent and makes it binding on the Elections Subcommittee in the future.

A vote against the subcommittee could not undo what the subcommittee has done in regard to McCARTHY. It would not force the subcommittee members to repay into the Treasury the funds spent on this investigation of McCARTHY. A vote against the subcommittee would merely mean that the Senate disapproves what has already been done insofar as McCARTHY is concerned, and, therefore, disapproves an investigation of other Senators like the one which was made of McCARTHY. While I felt the subcommittee exceeded its authority, now that it has established a precedent in McCARTHY's case, the same rule should apply to every other Senator. If the subcommittee brought up this question before the investigation had been made, I would have voted to discharge it. Now that the deed is done, however, the same rule should apply to the other 95 Senators.

For that reason, I would be forced to vigorously oppose a motion to discharge the Elections Subcommittee at this time.

I hope the Senate agrees with me that it would be highly improper to discharge the Gillette-Monroney subcommittee at this time, thereby, in effect, setting a different rule for the subcommittee to follow in case an investigation is asked of any of the other 95 Senators.

Sincerely yours,

JOE McCARTHY.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—ORDER FOR CALL OF THE CALENDAR TOMORROW

MR. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has asked me to make the following announcement:

It is the intention, when the Senate concludes its business this evening, to take a recess until 12 o'clock tomorrow and that in the meantime unanimous consent be granted that the calendar be called tomorrow for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1276. I request such unanimous consent.

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

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, before the request is granted, I desire to say that, in my opinion, if the calendar is called tomorrow, we should not act on bills which have been reported today,

for example, because we shall not have an opportunity to study them.

MR. HAYDEN. If they are printed in today's calendar I think they should be considered. If they are not on the calendar until tomorrow, I should say no.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that some 60 bills were reported today.

MR. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. SCHOEPEL. Does the Senator include in the calendar call those bills which by unanimous consent or by order of the Presiding Officer went over at the last call and were included in the next call?

MR. HAYDEN. That is the understanding.

MR. SCHOEPEL. Is it not also the understanding, if the Senator will yield further, that only bills will be considered which are on the calendar as of this date.

MR. HAYDEN. I understand that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] wishes to have considered a joint resolution having to do with an extension of the War Powers Act.

MR. SCHOEPEL. Is that the only exception?

MR. HAYDEN. So I understand.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that four bills which went over when the calendar was last called will be included in the call of the calendar tomorrow.

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. HENDRICKSON. While we are discussing the calendar, I should like to make the observation that there are some bills which were reported from committees today. I do not think they should be considered tomorrow unless they are accompanied by committee reports so that Members of the Senate can at least read the committee reports.

MR. HAYDEN. I think there is virtue in that statement. The only bill I know of in that category is the bill extending for 60 days the provisions of the War Powers Act. Other than that, I do not think the bills to which the Senator refers should be considered.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course, a Senator can object.

MR. HENDRICKSON. The junior Senator from New Jersey will object unless the bills are accompanied by reports from the committee.

MR. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

MR. HAYDEN. I yield.

MR. MAGNUSON. Without a doubt, some Senator will object to the consideration of the extension of the War Powers Act. If that be the case, is it the intention of the majority to bring up the bill by motion, or will it go over until the next day?

MR. HAYDEN. I have not conferred with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and I do not know what his plan may be. Of course, a majority can do anything.

MR. MAGNUSON. I think many Senators would like to know if that bill will be taken up.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask if the Senator from Arizona will have listed the bills which have been carried over, so that Senators can be aware of them and know what they are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has a list of them, which the clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. Calendar 1088, Senate bill 1331, a bill to further implement the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution.

Calendar 1183, House bill 646, an act for the relief of Mrs. Inez B. Copp and George T. Copp.

Calendar 1184, House bill 643, an act for the relief of Mrs. Vivian M. Graham and Herbert H. Graham.

Calendar 1266, House bill 5369, an act to authorize the exchange of certain lands located within and in the vicinity of the Federal Communications Commission's primary monitoring station, Portland, Ore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on Thursday the plan is to call up for consideration a resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules and Administration from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 187, and then to adjourn until Monday, April 14, with the understanding that on Monday no business will be transacted, but a recess will be taken until April 16, at which time there will be taken up the supplemental appropriation bill, House bill 6947, which is now in the Committee on Appropriations. The committee expects to report the bill during the recess or adjournment. One reason for the announcement of this program is to afford the committee the time between tomorrow and Friday to complete the appropriation bill.

ECA OBSERVATIONS IN THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without my taking time to read and discuss them in detail, I should like to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three news releases regarding the ECA program in the Philippines, together with an editorial from the Manila Bulletin in respect to the same subjects.

I am asking to have this material placed in the body of the RECORD because Mr. Edward J. Bell, Director of the Agriculture Division of the ECA Special Technical and Economic Mission in the Philippines, is one of the leaders of agriculture in my State. He is a prominent farm leader in Oregon, and has been devoting himself during the past 2 years to the question of foreign technical aid. I am greatly impressed with the views he expresses in portions of this material, and I ask, therefore, that the entire material be published in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

ECA OFFICIAL URGES FORMATION OF FREE LABOR UNIONS IN PHILIPPINES

MANILA, January 9.—Valery Burati, Director of the Labor Division of the United States Special Technical and Economic Mission, gave the following address tonight at the Catholic Lay Institute at Assumption Convent:

"Mr. Chairman, members of the institute, it is encouraging to see that groups such as yours are giving increasing attention to the question of labor in the Philippines. As the Nation develops economically it is a question that will come more and more to public light and involve more and more people directly in all walks of life. The great developments in the physical life and thoughts of the human race require constant readjustments in human relations. Labor relations is a specialized branch of human relations. It began when the first employer hired the first worker, but it did not become a social problem until after the industrial revolution had created concentration of industry and of the number of workers employed by individual companies.

"Labor relations in agriculture has been neglected throughout the world, but as mechanization extends to the farm the distinction between industry and agriculture is becoming more and more elusive. Some day it will not even exist, and should not, because human toil is human toil whether expended under neon lights in a factory or under the sun in a field. Here in the Philippines, where large numbers of workers are concentrated on large plantations, labor relations in agriculture is already a problem.

"Man is essentially an orderly creature. He establishes institutions to regulate social or civic conduct and organization. These institutions are usually founded on some basic politico-economic philosophy. In the modern era there are two great schools: Democracy and totalitarianism, including communism and fascism. That branch of mankind which is organized under the great politico-economic philosophy of democracy has established the institution of the free labor union to regulate the complex and often, but not always, conflicting interests between employer and worker. May I call your attention to the fact that I said 'free labor union.' The institution of the labor union exists also in totalitarianism, but not the free labor union. Under totalitarianism labor organizations can exist only as the tool of the domestic or foreign policy of the party in power. Labor unions under dictatorship are not institutions for democracy, they can serve under such conditions only to suppress democracy.

"To the extent that the party in power in any country on earth controls or attempts to control the institution of the labor union except through due process and free processes of democratic action to that extent that country is not democratic.

"The labor union is, of course, a controversial institution. It stands as a participant amid the swirl of the activities of other institutions whose immediate interests may be, or appear to be, contending with its own. To outsiders who do not understand the complex ways of democracy this swirl of activity may appear to be disorderly. Actually it is the only sound and safe way by which men may achieve order and remain free. Democracy is like chemical action; various substances placed in relation to each other react upon, with or against each other in their almost frantic search for equilibrium.

"Strong men will tolerate the inconveniences of democracy, which in point of view of historical time, even at their worst, are temporary. Weak men will rush to embrace the more immediate promise of the totali-

tarians for an orderly society, only to find themselves, like the poor fly, answering the blanchishments of the spider with his symmetric web, hopelessly trapped and bereft of liberty and life itself. The strong men of the world are not the Communists who run from the problems of life into the subjective haven of their anemic ideologies, but the men of democracy with their tolerance and flexibility of mind, their impatient patience, their humanitarianism, and their fierce resistance to encroachments upon human rights and liberties.

"In the modern industrial era abuses against social justice are found more and more in industrial life. I am using industry in its broadest sense and mean to include agriculture with the exception of family farming. The realization of social justice is tending more and more to require industrial democracy. The organization of labor is a prerequisite to industrial democracy. In earlier times, or even today, the small forward-looking employer could give individual attention to each of his workers. He could answer their grievances and assure them of equal treatment. The rise of impersonal corporations, some of them gigantic in proportion, has destroyed the personal relationship between employer and worker. The individual worker found himself unable to deal effectively with a corporation. His individual voice was as nothing. Therefore, he joined with his fellow workers to form a union to bargain collectively with the corporation. Alone he had no power. He could petition but, as an individual, he had no means to give force to his demands. If other jobs were plentiful, he could quit and find another job, providing he was not held down by the responsibilities of family, lack of funds, or simply a lack of desire to live anywhere else. Organization into a union, he found, gave him security, and if not an equal, at least an effective voice, in dealing with management on matters relating to the conditions of his employment. This method of dealing with management came to be known as collective bargaining. It is the mode of action of the institution of the labor union. This is a complex procedure upon which I believe the other speakers before this institute have already spoken, or will speak, in detail.

"Within the democracies the institution of the labor union has come to be accepted as the means by which workers insure themselves of a fair share of the fruits of their labors. This is necessary not only for industrial democracy and social justice, but also for economic health in any nation. The history of economics proves that widespread purchasing power is necessary if industry is to prosper. The workers themselves constitute the greatest number of consumers. They cannot buy unless they have adequate purchasing power. Thus, in performing its function in this regard, the labor union contributes to a sound economy.

"Opponents of organized labor complain that it creates class conflict. The truth is that by functioning to bring about conditions more satisfactory to the workers, the institution of the labor union reduces class conflict. In many cases the union is the result, not the cause, of already existing class conflicts. And it is a fact that class consciousness and contentions are far less pronounced in those countries where organized labor is the strongest.

"Statesmanship is necessary for the most effective labor relations—statesmanship on the part of both union and employers. This is an extremely sensitive field of human relations. The union as an organization is subject to all the emotions of an individual man. If it is unduly opposed, it becomes unduly militant. If it is scorned, it becomes either surly and easily provoked or retaliatory. If it is treated condescendingly, it becomes resentful. If it is ostracized, it

becomes antisocial. The union, as an organization, is also like a man in that it desires to be respectable and to have self-respect. Therefore, it should be accepted into the community. A union should be respectable but not docile. By its very nature it must be dynamic, lending its strength to produce a better life for the people, to safeguard their human rights and to impel society forward.

"A part of the ECA program for the Philippines is to give advice and assistance in the formation of free labor unions, and to help develop harmonious relations and collective bargaining between labor and management. In sponsoring free labor unions ECA is acting under the direct mandate of the Congress of the United States. Public Law 165 enacted by the Eighty-second Congress and approved on October 10, 1951, declares it to be the policy of the United States to encourage free enterprise in those countries which receive American aid. And a major point of that policy, to use the words of the American Congress itself, is 'to encourage where suitable the development and strengthening of the free labor movements as the collective bargaining agencies of labor within such countries.'"

ECA OFFICIAL SEES FILIPINO YOUTH KEY TO STRONG FREE REPUBLIC

MANILA, January 13.—Edward J. Bell, Director of the Agriculture Division of the ECA Special Technical and Economic Mission, gave the following address today at the installation of officers of the Loyalty chapter of the Order of DeMolay in Manila:

"On December 13, 1949, it was my honor and pleasure to address your chapter at the first public installation of officers. It is no coincidence that I am in your country again. On my first visit to the Philippines 2 years ago, I decided that if we had the opportunity, my family should come over here to get better acquainted with your country and its people.

"We are truly living today in one world. Modern methods of transportation and communication have brought the various parts of this world so closely together that it is not possible for any nation or any individual to live to himself alone. We are all neighbors in a very real sense and it is necessary that we in America have the help and the friendship of folks on this side of the Pacific, just as you need our help and support.

"We, Americans, are and intend to remain a strong, free and independent Nation. No nation in the world today can remain strong, free and independent without the help of strong, free and independent neighbors. Making your country strong, free and independent is important to us but it is primarily the job of every Filipino. It is the responsibility of you young men in this organization and the other young men and women throughout this new, young Republic. I congratulate you for the opportunities that lie ahead for you to build this new country on the solid foundations of freedom, integrity, loyalty, industry, and devotion.

"It is my privilege to be associated for a while, with the joint program of economic development in which Filipinos and Americans are working together to build a stronger nation here. This is known as the ECA program.

"The ECA development program is not a one-sided affair. It is a real partnership job—a partnership in which Filipinos and Americans are working together to achieve a common goal vital to all of us. Furthermore, the important part of this job is being done and will continue to be done by Filipinos. We can help in a neighborly way, but permanent improvement in any country can only be brought about by the people who live there.

"My particular end of this job has to do with agriculture. Other phases have to do

with public health, public works, roads, development of industries, public finance, labor and social welfare. In every instance, the program is being carried out by Filipinos with the Americans acting as advisers. Money is provided in the form of dollars by the United States and in the form of peso counterpart funds appropriated by the Republic of the Philippines. So you can see that this is not just an American undertaking but a partnership between two friendly, independent republics.

"I should like to say just a few words about the agricultural part of this program. No nation can remain strong, free and independent unless it has a stable and productive agriculture; unless the men and women who till the soil and live in farming communities receive the full benefit from their labor; unless rural people believe that their way of life is worth while. All too often in the history of mankind, agriculture has been neglected. When that happens, when the people who live and work on farms become discouraged, when they feel that no one is interested in their welfare, food production declines and the seeds are sown for rebellion and revolution.

"One of the hopeful indications that you can and will develop a successful democracy here is the growing interest in the problems of the farmer and a growing appreciation of his importance to the general welfare of all the people. There are many indications that your nation realizes the importance of a stable, productive and prosperous agriculture. For example, your government has requested the United States to send a number of technical experts to advise and counsel with your agricultural leaders and scientists in making farming in the Philippines more productive and more attractive. These technical assistants are helping your leaders to plan programs to increase yields of farm crops through the use of fertilizer, irrigation pumps, gravity irrigation systems, improved seed varieties, soil conservation practices, and control of insect pests, rodents and plant diseases. Your Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources is also bringing in improved breeding stock so that the quality of the hogs, poultry, and cattle can be improved in every barrio.

"Your government is also developing programs to improve the economic and social condition of farmers through land tenure reform, rural credit facilities, cooperative marketing and purchasing, improving living conditions in rural communities and assisting in the resettlement of undeveloped areas. Americans with experience in these fields have been asked to come over here as advisers, but again we should recognize that the programs themselves will be carried out by Filipinos.

"American dollars are being used to purchase scientific equipment, machinery, fertilizer, irrigation pumps, and other material to get the program started; the hope being that after a few years, a self-generating, self-supporting agriculture can go ahead under its own power.

"In the Philippine agriculture of the future, scientific research and educational work will play an important role. The College of Agriculture of the University of the Philippines at Los Baños is being expanded as a source of trained scientists and agricultural leaders and a central experiment station is located there for fundamental research. An agricultural extension service is being developed in which trained local leaders working with farmers and their families in every barrio will help local people solve their local problems. They will help each farmer to use the findings of modern science in improving production on his farm.

"Modern science and know-how have already shown that your soil and climate can be made to produce abundantly. What remains to be done is to show the people on

the land how to apply this knowledge on their farms; and to make it worthwhile for them to do so; for the whole Nation to recognize the importance of farmers and their work and to give agriculture its proper place as a basic industry and way of life.

"I have spoken at some length about your program of agricultural development because it is essential that the future leaders of your country recognize the importance of farming. Also, what I have said about how your agriculture is being developed applies equally to all the other things that your leaders are doing in order to make democracy successful in the Philippines. You have the resources, you have the ability, you have the courage to do the job that needs to be done. With confidence in yourself and in your country and with a willingness to work together in meeting the great challenge of your generation, we have every confidence that the people of the Philippines can and will build a strong, free and independent nation on this side of the Pacific."

FULL IMPACT ECA PROGRAM NOT YET FELT, SAYS MISSION CHIEF

MANILA, January 17.—Dr. Roland R. Renne, Chief of ECA's Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines revealed today that nearly a million dollars has been spent in the Philippines by ECA for technical assistance and that more than \$3,000,000 worth of goods have actually arrived in the country under this United States aid program.

Dr. Renne speaking Thursday before the Manila Rotary Club at its regular meeting in the Manila Hotel cautioned that, "The full effect of the ECA program on the Philippine economy is not yet felt. All of the ECA fifteen million interim aid appropriation and about half of the \$32,000,000 for the current fiscal year has been allocated for the various projects," he said. "More than P8,000,000 have been allocated from the counterpart funds for these projects," he reported, "but to date only about P5,000,000 have actually been expended."

Dr. Renne pointed out that there has been criticism in some circles over "the slowness with which the ECA program has moved forward." "It has been our general policy in the Mission," he pointed out, "to insist upon adequate information, sound and thorough planning, and intelligent budget making. It has not been our major objective to see how much funds we could put in circulation as fast as possible," he emphasized, "rather it is our aim to discover and undertake projects and programs which will do the greatest possible good in improving the Philippine economy with the limited amount of funds available." "ECA wants," he assured his audience, "to move as rapidly as possible, but we are not sacrificing sound and effective projects or programs for more speed of action."

Dr. Renne said that the ECA program is a joint undertaking of two free nations. "What makes the program so promising," the ECA Chief said, "is that the two nations can supplement each other so that a stronger program results than could be possible from either one working alone." "The United States has the advanced technical 'know-how' and the capital; and the Philippines has the natural resources and the labor supply." "The important thing," he pointed out, "is that the projects undertaken not require a total number of pesos greater than that which the Philippine economy can support along with its other commitments and responsibilities, and that each and every project makes a significant contribution to increased production and better living conditions."

Dr. Renne pointed out that in many cases grants of ECA funds for particular projects are made contingent upon specific action by the Philippine Government to increase its

efforts along certain desired lines and to make certain reforms which will assure lasting benefits. "It is our policy," he said, "not to use ECA funds for regular recurring expenditure of the Philippine Government. Our aim is to use ECA funds as completely as possible for capital investment and economic development." "Where such funds are made available during an interim period," he went on, "such funds will not continue unless the Philippine Congress makes substantial effort to accept its responsibilities for regular recurring overhead expenditures for its operations."

"The ECA mission definitely favors industrial development in the Philippines," Dr. Renne said. He pointed out, however, that a sound program of industrial development will necessarily be a gradual, evolutionary growth and not a dramatic, revolutionary development overnight. He said ECA believes that a fundamental prerequisite for a great expansion of industrial development and specialization of labor in the Philippines is increased efficiency in agricultural production. Agricultural production must increase, according to Renne, not only enough to provide an adequate food supply for the Philippines but it must increase exports. Exports are essential to make possible the securing of venture capital and credit for industrial development, he said. "Furthermore, he stated, 'increased efficiency in agricultural production will release workers for employment in nonagricultural undertakings.'

"It would indeed be shortsighted," Dr. Renne told the Rotarians, "for Americans to take the view that the Philippines should not work toward sound industrial development." "In the interests of mutual security, with the great distances involved we Americans are certainly concerned with strengthening the economy of this and other free countries of southeast Asia so that they are more diversified and more able to meet internal and external crises if and when they develop," he said.

Diversified development of a nation expands the economic horizon of that nation's people with resulting increased demands for varied goods and services obtainable only through international trade, Dr. Renne said.

"Only the future can tell how effective will be this great mutual aid program," Renne concluded. "We should not forget that in the long run the policies and programs developed for sound economic development and the honesty and social responsibility exemplified by our leaders may prove to be of more significance to the ultimate improvement of living levels and the peace and security than the immediate and very urgent mutual defense efforts of the free nations of the world."

The complete text of Dr. Renne's address follows:

"There are many evidences that the Philippines is entering a period of marked economic expansion and growth which will raise the level of living of the average Filipino significantly and make the Islands more secure as a free, democratic nation from perils both from within and from without. The basic soil and mineral resources to support economic expansion and growth are present as well as an abundant labor supply, and coupled with technical assistance and capital, only the determined support and guidance of socially responsible, honest leadership are necessary to assure achievement of the desired results.

"I have been impressed by the extraordinary friendliness, hospitality, and intelligence of the Philippine people, and by the feeling of optimism and growing confidence in the Nation's future and its role among the free nations of the world. I have also been impressed with the realistic appreciation in important government and business circles of the existence of serious economic and social problems which must be solved. This growing confidence and serious realism

together create a climate of clear thinking and intelligent understanding which are essential if sound programs are to be developed and carried out.

"The enthusiastic acceptance and widespread interest in the ECA program by Filipinos is somewhat frightening although heartening to those of us concerned with the execution of the program because in reality, the number of dollars and pesos available is definitely limited and, compared with several other programs of foreign aid both current and previous, the amounts of money are relatively small. For example, American aid to the Philippine economy from VJ-Day to June 30, 1951, exceeded two billion dollars (\$2,056,000,000) of which some \$864 million was for outright grants and relief, principally through the Philippine Rehabilitation Act, and \$600 million was for armed-forces expenditures. In contrast, only \$47 million have thus far been made available for the ECA program in the Philippines—\$15 million for the 1951 fiscal year remaining after the bilateral agreement between the two nations was signed in April, and \$32 million for the current fiscal year ending June 30 next.

"The great hopes placed upon the ECA program must spring from other sources than the number of dollars involved. Perhaps they spring from the conviction that following the great physical and human rehabilitation efforts involving large sums of money immediately after war's end the time is ripe for a period of sound growth and expansion, possible only through the applications of modern science and technology, honest and intelligent leadership, and capital investment. In other words, emphasis and the hopes, rather than being placed on direct payments or grants for consumers' expenditures, are placed upon a joint program or team approach to development in which the technical 'know-how' and capital of an older more advanced industrial nation are combined with the rich natural resources and the abundant labor supply of the Philippines.

"The most striking consequence of war is not its physical destruction, but the tremendous acceleration it gives to the spread of ideas, including social concepts and technology. It is said that World War I pushed the technological advance of the world forward some 75 years. Obviously World War II which was more extensive advanced technology perhaps a hundred or a hundred and fifty years forward. It also created in its wake some major revolutions in social and political concepts. I certainly have no intention to advocate war, but merely to point out some of its significant historic consequences. These great changes which emerge from wars are consistent with the basic theory of challenge and response—during wars we are united in near superhuman efforts to overcome perils at hand. These efforts bring forth corresponding sweeping changes and impacts.

"The most striking thing about the last war is that the really great changes occurred not in Europe or Germany, but in Burma, India, Indonesia, and the Philippines where nine new nations were created—the Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Burma, India, Pakistan, and Ceylon—comprising more than one-fourth of the world's population. Never before have so many new nations involving so many millions of people emerged in so short a time or under such difficult conditions. These new nations are the result partly of events in these countries and partly of events in Britain, Holland and the United States—great psychological events. As the people of the East were groping toward self-determination, so were the people of the West growing more opposed to domination and oppression of one people by another.

"In reality, the people of the West were themselves fighting against the domination of Hitlerism, but many did not at first ap-

preciate the implicit content of their own ideal—the ideal of the freedom and integrity of men and, therefore, of its races, nations, and leaders. In this setting, it is not so difficult to understand why some of the older more fortunate independent nations are desirous of helping new nations become strong and maintain their independence. A truly democratic nation could consistently follow no other course. It is indeed consistent with the Rotary ideal of international service, and as a Rotarian all of us I am sure, are fully aware of the tremendous importance of such ideals in the minds and hearts of men."

THE PHILIPPINE PROGRAM

"In the Philippines, the ECA program was developed following the report of the Bell Economic Survey Mission. The Bell Mission analyzed many aspects of the Philippine economy on the invitation of the Philippine Government at a time (the summer of 1950) when economic conditions, particularly in the financial sector, were in a serious state. This analysis was summarized in the Bell Report published in October 1950, which included, in addition to extensive analysis and discussion, seven major recommendations as follows:

"1. That the finances of the Government be placed on a sound basis and to carry out this intention that additional revenues be raised by equitable, efficiently administered taxes and that fiscal policy be established to give support to productive enterprises and to avoid inflation.

"2. That agricultural production be improved and that the agricultural sector of the economy be developed by related measures providing better public services to farmers such as research and extension services, and by undertaking rural credit arrangements, assistance to new settlers, land redistribution, tenancy reform, and similar measures.

"3. That steps be taken to diversify the economy of the country by encouraging new industries, developing adequate power and transportation facilities, exploring natural resources, and examining laws and practices with respect to use of the public domain.

"4. That steps be taken to guard against further deterioration in the international payments position, including a special emergency tax of 25 percent for a period not to exceed 2 years on certain imports and that the present trade agreement be reexamined in the light of the new conditions.

"5. That an adequate program of public health and improved education and housing be undertaken and that the right of workers to organize free trade-unions, protection against unfair labor practices and guarantees of minimum-wage standards be provided by legislation.

"6. That public administration be improved and reorganized and that civil-service salaries be increased. That the United States send a technical mission to assist the Philippine Government in carrying out its agricultural and industrial development, fiscal controls, public administration, and labor and social welfare program.

"7. That the United States Government undertake financial assistance of \$250,000,000 through loans and grants to help carry out a 5-year program of economic development and technical assistance and that this aid be strictly conditioned on steps being taken by the Philippine Government to carry out the recommendations outlined above. It should be noted that the recommended expenditure of approximately \$250,000,000 over a 5-year period included loans and not just grants.

"After the Bell report was published October 9, 1950, with the concurrences of the two Governments, President Truman designated Mr. William C. Foster, Administrator of ECA, to meet with President Quirino to consider the steps which might be taken to

put into effect measures to improve Philippine conditions. This meeting took place in Baguio on November 14, 1950, and resulted in what is known as the Quirino-Foster Agreement. Many of the provisions of this agreement could be carried out only by action of the Philippine Congress. Action taken by the Philippine Congress included the passage of the 17-percent import license law and the minimum wage law, and ratification of the bilateral agreement between the Philippines and the United States. This bilateral agreement is the basic document under which the ECA program operates. Briefly, it provides that the United States shall give assistance in the form of technical experts and materials purchased with United States appropriations. In turn, the Philippines will undertake as priority measures the accomplishments of the major recommendations made in the Bell report. Consequently, the major objectives of the two nations in the ECA program are to accomplish as quickly and as efficiently as possible the measures recommended and the developments envisaged as resulted of the Bell Mission Survey."

ORGANIZATION AND PROCEDURES

"In October 1951, the United States Congress passed the Mutual Security Act of 1951 establishing the Mutual Security Agency to replace the former Economic Cooperation Administration under which the ECA program operated. This new agency is now headed by W. Averell Harriman who reports directly to the President of the United States. The act brings together under one agency most of the American foreign programs of military, economic, and technical assistance. The act authorizes a Deputy Director to be appointed to have general supervision over the technical and economic assistance phase of the mutual security program.

"We have been authorized to continue to use the ECA symbol, although the name of the agency has been changed from Economic Cooperation Administration to the Mutual Security Agency. The letters ECA are now interpreted to stand for Economic Cooperation with Asia, and the particular mission which I head is referred to as the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines and abbreviated as STEM.

"The work of our mission is divided into six major functional divisions, each with a director: (1) Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; (2) fiscal and trade policy; (3) industry and public works; (4) labor and social welfare; (5) public administration and education; and (6) public health.

"In addition, there are administrative divisions, including an office of requirements dealing with specifications, procurement, and supply of essential items; an office of program coordination; an office of controller; and an office of information. In addition to the division heads and strictly administrative personnel, there are 41 technical specialists now on duty in the Philippines. Although these cover all the major categories mentioned, the largest number of specialists are working in the fields of agriculture and fiscal and trade policy. These were requested by the Philippine Government for assignment to government agencies.

"In the Philippine Government, the Philippine Council for United States Aid, known as PHILCUSA, has been established. It is composed of 16 individuals, including members of the executive branch of the government, members of the senate and house of representatives, and other leading citizens from the business and professional world. The chairman of PHILCUSA is Mr. Jose Yulo.

"A professional staff has been set up in PHILCUSA, headed by an Executive Secretary responsible for the day to day activities involved in carrying on the joint program and in providing liaison between public and private agencies in the Philippines and the

ECA Mission. The professional staff is organized to provide counterpart divisions for the major functional divisions of the ECA Mission. Thus a proposed project such as the purchase of boars and bulls for improving Philippine meat production would first be considered by a representative of the agriculture division of PHILCUSA, a representative of the agriculture division of the ECA Mission, and a representative of the agency concerned in the Philippine Department of Agriculture and Natural Resources. The planning of projects and the formulation of detailed plans and budgets, therefore, involves a three-way participation of PHILCUSA, ECA, and the interested Philippine department, bureau, or agency.

"The Philippine Congress authorized the expenditure of 50,000,000 pesos as the Philippine contribution or counterpart for ECA dollars. No funds may be expended from either the ECA appropriation or the PHILCUSA pesos counterpart funds without the approval both of ECA and PHILCUSA. In other words, the program is strictly a joint program of two free, independent nations in the interests of mutual security and progress.

"Up to the present time, nearly a million dollars has been spent in the Philippines for technical assistance, and more than \$3,000,000 worth of goods have actually arrived in the Philippines. All of the 15,000,000 interim appropriation and approximately half of the 32,000,000 for the current fiscal year have been allocated for various projects, and procurement has been initiated for much of this. More than 8,000,000 pesos have been allocated from counterpart funds for various projects, but to date only approximately 5,000,000 pesos have actually been expended. The full effect of the ECA program on Philippine economy is, consequently, not yet felt. Before 1952 ends, however, the effects on the economy should be more significant.

"There has been considerable criticism, particularly in some circles, over the slowness with which the ECA program has moved forward. Various reasons are ascribed for this slowness, and various Philippine agencies are singled out for criticism. I personally wish to say that I do not feel any one agency is primarily responsible for the delay, and certainly ECA itself has at times contributed to the slowness with which some programs have moved forward. It has been our general policy in the mission here to insist on adequate information, sound and thorough planning, and intelligent budget making. It has not been our major objective to see how much funds we could put in circulation fastest, but to undertake projects and programs that would do the greatest possible good in improving Philippine economy with the limited amount of funds we have available. This has meant disappointing some individuals or groups with particular projects and programs, but we believe that in the long run a sound beginning and insistence upon sound policies and procedures will pay good dividends. We want to assure you that we are anxious to move as rapidly as possible, but we are not sacrificing sound and effective projects or programs for mere speed of action.

"We have set up certain criteria for evaluating projects and proposals in relation to the over-all goal of strengthening Philippine economy and improving living conditions. These criteria include:

"1. Will the effect to be achieved increase agricultural and industrial production?

"2. To what extent will the benefits of the project be spread among a great number of people?

"3. How readily available from any free nation source are the materials and equipment required for the proposed projects?

"Unless these three criteria are kept constantly in mind, the limited dollars and pesos available for the joint program of economic development could easily be frittered away

and lose their effectiveness in making a major contribution through capital investment and application of science and technology to increase production and achieve higher living levels. Our emphasis has, therefore, been throughout on staff well trained in sound economics and engineering in order to achieve these goals.

"The fact that the ECA program is a joint undertaking of two free nations does not necessarily mean that each nation must put in an equal amount of funds. As a matter of fact, in a program such as this a factor which makes the program so promising is that the two nations can supplement each other so that together a stronger program results than would be possible from either one working alone. The United States has the technical 'know-how' and the capital, and the Philippines has the resources and the labor supply. If the United States appropriates a total of \$32,000,000 which it has allocated for the current fiscal year, it does not mean necessarily that the Philippine Government should put in 64,000,000 pesos. Some projects have much less peso requirements than a 2 to 1 ratio of dollars, and some have a much higher requirement. The important thing is that the projects undertaken not require a total number of pesos greater than which the Philippine economy can support along with its other commitments and responsibilities, and that each and every project make a significant contribution to increased production and better living conditions.

"Funds for the \$50,000,000 counterpart account are created in part by expenditure of ECA dollars themselves. For example, when fertilizer or rubber tires or some other essential commodities are bought with ECA dollars and sold to individual farmers or through commercial channels, pesos which are secured for the goods, less necessary operating expenses, go into the counterpart fund. About \$10,000,000 of the current \$32,000,000 allocated to the Philippines has been earmarked for the purchase of essential commodities in short supply, these items to be procured and sold through commercial channels. Consequently, in the neighborhood of \$20,000,000 will be created for the counterpart fund by these dollars and will reduce correspondingly the demands made upon Philippine funds for the counterpart. Also, since counterpart funds do not revert to the general fund at the end of each fiscal year but are a continuing fund, pesos from the sale of irrigation pumps or other capital improvements on a 5- or 10-year contract period will result in counterpart funds being available for economic development perhaps several years after the formal ECA program has ended."

MAJOR POLICIES

"The ECA program is designed to present a balanced approach to sound economic development and expansion. It is not merely a program of providing technical assistance alone. It is rather a means of assisting to create the kind of an environment—economic, social, and political—within which a sound program of economic expansion can develop and grow. Such an environment necessitates existence of satisfactory economic conditions, a rather stable medium of exchange, and an honest, efficient public administration. Because of the ravages of war and peculiar trade situation of the Philippines, the ECA program provides for making considerable sums available to supplement the dollar exchange of the central bank to maintain the peso on an even keel. For example, making dollars available for the purchase of essential commodities in short supply relieves the pressure on the national budget and helps to supplement the limited dollars of exchange built up through export-import trade balances.

"A significant drop in the prices of Philippine export commodities such as occurred

during the past summer and extensive destruction to a major export crop such as occurred in the case of sugar by Typhoon Amy can upset the best-laid plans of honest and able Government fiscal experts. The amount of import exchange for the first 6 months of 1952 recently released by the central bank shows a drop from the preceding period of \$32,000,000. Oddly enough, this just happens to be the exact amount currently available for the total ECA program. However, only one-third of this sum will be used for the purchase of essential commodities in short supply to supplement Philippine exchange and bolster the stability of the peso. While the ECA dollars amount to only a small percentage of the total exchange available for imports, their marginal effect in reducing the inflationary pressure on the economy is much more significant.

"In many cases, grants of ECA funds for particular projects are made contingent upon specific action by the Philippine Government to increase its efforts along certain desired lines and to make certain reforms which will assure lasting benefits through the programs undertaken. Consequently, in addition to the technical know-how which is made available through technical specialists, certain fundamental improvements and basic changes are achieved as a result of the joint undertaking and the mutual agreement of the two countries. For example, recently ECA approved more than \$1,700,000 for equipment and educational and demonstration aids for the Philippine Extension Service with a proviso that legislation be enacted during the coming Congress to centralize all agricultural extension activities in a central extension service in the department of agriculture and natural resources. ECA has made funds available for equipment, laboratories, and library at the Los Banos Agricultural College and for interim educational staff to take care of the increased student load with the understanding that the Philippine Government will take steps to more adequately meet its responsibilities for the regular operating expenses and overhead for the institution.

"It is our policy not to use ECA funds for regular recurring expenditures of the Philippine Government. Our aim is to use ECA funds as completely as possible for capital investment and economic development. Where funds are made available during an interim period to meet certain critical situations, such funds will not continue to be made available unless the Philippine Congress makes substantial effort to accept its responsibilities for regular recurring overhead expenditures of its operations.

"The ECA mission definitely favors industrial development in the Philippines. It believes, however, that a sound program of industrial development will necessarily be a gradual, evolutionary growth and not a dramatic, revolutionary development overnight. We believe that a fundamental prerequisite for a great expansion of industrial development and specialization of labor in the Philippines is increased efficiency in agricultural production which will not only provide a more adequate food supply for the population but will increase exports, making possible the securing of venture capital and credit for industrial development and will release workers for employment in non-agricultural undertakings. A very important part of the ECA program is, therefore, directed toward increasing agricultural production and agricultural efficiency. This explains our interest in and our efforts in increasing agricultural research facilities, particularly at Los Banos, the agricultural extension service effectiveness, the land settlement and development program in Mindanao, the abaca and coconut-disease research and control programs, the improvement of meat production through importation of high-quality breeding stock, increased yields

through provision of commercial fertilizer, more adequate water supply through provisions of irrigation pumps and gravity irrigation systems, and improvement of basic seed stocks of food plants.

"It would indeed be short-sighted for Americans to take the view that the Philippines should not work toward sound industrial development. In the interests of mutual security with the great distances involved from our western shores to this spot in the Pacific, we are certainly concerned with strengthening the economy of this country so that it is more diversified and more able to meet internal and external crises that may develop. But aside from the military security aspects, we are also concerned with a more diversified development of the agricultural and industrial resources of this Nation because diversified development of a nation expands the economic horizon of its people with resulting increased demands for varied goods and services attainable only through international trade.

"It is significant that the Mutual Security Act specified that at least 10 percent of the economic aid funds made available must be spent in the form of loans. There are several rather promising industrial development projects which are now being considered for possible loans and, in addition, the Export-Import Bank has indicated an interest in making a loan of twenty-five to thirty million dollars for the Ambuclo hydroelectric power project. These developments speak well for significant industrial expansion in the years ahead.

"The Mutual Security Act also provides guaranties to cover risks which foreign private investors must assume. These investment guarantee provisions will prevent major losses to investors because of major changes in exchange rates or economic decline within a nation. Also, the ECA is concerned with and responsible for assistance to the Philippines in processing requests for priorities and other types of defense orders for materials which are scarce because of the defense needs in the United States. ECA is also directly concerned with projects now underway providing for mineral surveys, industrial surveys, and technical assistance to industry. I emphasize these at this time in order to indicate that while a very important part of our ECA program is devoted to the improvement of agricultural production and land settlement, we are, nevertheless, very much interested in and anxious to assist with sound industrial development.

"Time does not permit analyzing each of the programs which are being undertaken in the other major fields such as public health, transportation, education, and public administration. Briefly, in the field of public health we are making major efforts in malaria control which is a serious bar to the development of virgin lands in Mindanao and some other islands. We also have a large school health program directed toward curing remediable children's diseases, primarily intestinal, as well as emphasizing the health education of the children and, through them, their families. We have a sanitary water supply project for rural barrios, and are supporting projects for rehabilitation of laboratories and to strengthen efforts in reduction of tuberculosis and nutritional diseases, establish rural health centers, and rehabilitate hospitals.

"In the transportation field, a major effort is being made to purchase road construction and maintenance equipment to establish adequate maintenance and service centers, and to provide technical specialists to advise and work with the bureau of public works highway officials.

"In the field of education, our efforts are concentrated upon the rehabilitation of vocational schools and colleges, particularly for vocational agriculture training and training in trades and industries vocations. Funds

are also being made available to establish a forestry-products laboratory and provide more adequate facilities for the engineering, medical, and nursing schools of the University of the Philippines.

"In the field of public administration, our staff members are working with Philippine officials to improve the revenue collection and administration procedures, the classifications of the Civil Service Register, more adequate salaries for public servants, and other means to improve the general efficiency of the government service."

THE FUTURE

"Appropriations for operation of the ECA program in the second half of fiscal year 1952 have, of course, not yet been made either by the United States Government or the Philippine Congress. Undoubtedly, the level of appropriations will be determined not only for the coming fiscal year beginning July 1 but in future years by three major factors:

"1. Progress of the Philippine economy, including the maintenance of strong, democratic institutions and efficient public administration, as well as increased production efficiency and expanded export trade balance;

"2. United States economic and fiscal conditions, and

"3. World developments.

"The Bell mission suggested loans and grants totaling \$250,000,000 over a period of 5 years, or an average of some \$50,000,000 annually. With the prospective Export-Import Bank loan to Ambuclo and our current appropriations, we are about on schedule. However, there is no firm commitment to make these sums available—they were strictly suggestive. Certainly if the economic development program is effective in bringing about its avowed goals there will be an increase in production, an expansion of the gross national income, and an increase in taxable property so that the Philippine Government will be able to support a major development program and thus set in motion the foundations for a still greater production of goods and services and resulting higher levels of living.

"In closing I would like to add one warning comment. Many people ask me from time to time, 'When is the ECA going to start building roads in Mindanao?' or 'When is the ECA going to do this or going to do that?' The ECA program in the Philippines as in other countries does not provide for direct United States participation in actual operations. ECA is not a road-building agency. The roads will be built by the Bureau of Public Works. It is our responsibility, under the terms of the bilateral agreement, to work with Philippine officials from the first stages of planning through the many stages leading to the end results in an advisory capacity, but not in an actual operating capacity. We do have authority to approve or to refuse approval of undertakings in which ECA programs are involved, both dollars and counterpart pesos, and in turn PHILCUSA has corresponding authority, but the initiative and the effort required to carry out the programs agreed upon must come largely from the Filipinos. ECA's role is to provide the technical assistance needed to initiate legislative or administrative measures to help in the planning and operation of the projects, to provide some of the financial means whereby needed materials can be imported, and to provide the control over the use of United States funds which the law requires. Beyond this, it is in every sense of the word a Philippine program.

"We have faith in the Philippines, and a special interest in making this cooperative undertaking work, because of the special ties that bind our two free republics in close friendship, mutual respect and understanding. Only the future can tell how effective will be this mutual aid program, and important as are the immediate military defense

considerations, and large as are the appropriations for this important phase of our mutual-security program, we should not forget that in the long run the policies and programs developed for sound economic development and the honesty and social responsibility exemplified by our leaders will be of more significance to the ultimate improvement of living levels and the maintenance of peace and security than the immediate and very urgent defense efforts."

[From the Manila Bulletin]

A WORD ON ECA

The ECA program in the Philippines, or rather the MSA program—Mutual Security Agency—needed explaining and bringing to life with words in order to have it mean something more than a vaguely beneficial and probably experimental effort on the part of the United States to help this country.

This function Dr. Roland R. Renne, head of the ECA mission here, undertook yesterday in a well-integrated talk with a representative group of international businessmen. He got down to fundamentals, opened up a lot of potential sore spots for close inspection, and explained in detail ECA's relationship to the local government. We are printing the address in full today because of its importance to every individual who will take the pains to read it.

These global assistance efforts have a way of becoming so complicated in terminology that they cause general confusion. The local ECA is no exception. Its name has been changed as indicated above in accordance with a law passed in the last Congress to MSA, but the original "ECA" has become so well established here that the local mission sought and obtained permission to retain it, only now it means "Economic Cooperation with Asia" rather than "Economic Cooperation Administration." But ECA is all you have to remember. Even Dr. Renne's mission, the Special Technical and Economic Mission to the Philippines (STEM) will always be known to Filipinos as "ECA."

Dr. Renne left an important impression. It was that the efforts and accomplishments of his mission cannot properly be measured in dollars and cents, or pesos and centavos. It is the uses to which local pesos and foreign dollars are put that really counts in the long run. Double the amount of dollars put to work on behalf of the Philippines, and if it were poured in too fast without being applied to the right things, the results might be very much less effective than with wise usage, even damaging.

Another thing was apparent from what Dr. Renne said. The ECA program is not being fabricated in Washington and plastered on the Philippines, take-it-or-leave-it fashion. It is being worked out step by step as it goes along, and every step has to be approved both by the local mission and by PHILCUSA, the Philippine governmental counterpart, before any money can be spent. That is what makes it a partnership effort.

There is good reason to believe ECA is on the right track, both from the Philippine viewpoint and the viewpoint of the American taxpayer who foots the United States end of the bill. Editorials appearing in American newspapers indicate satisfaction that sensible control is being exercised over the way money shall be spent in the Philippines, and this area has been held up as something of a model in contrast to some of the lavish spending in Europe.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR WALLACE H. WHITE, OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution

adopted by the Federal Communications Commission upon the death of former Senator Wallace H. White, Jr., of Maine.

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

RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.

The following resolution was adopted by the Federal Communications Commission at its meeting today:

"The Commission notes with deep regret the death on March 31, 1952, of former United States Senator Wallace H. White, Jr., at his home in Auburn, Maine.

"As coauthor of the Radio Act of 1927, Senator White exercised profound influence on the legislative foundation of the American system of broadcasting.

"At the time this act was being considered chaos reigned on the air waves. The utility of this great instrument of mass communications was being effectively frustrated.

"Senator White, on the basis of searching, sympathetic study, played a leading role in determining the broad base for the regulation of broadcasting in the public interest. He planned and fought for the maximum freedom of the broadcaster consistent with the unique technical requirements of orderly radio transmission.

"Although technological improvements have been made since 1927, his basic premise that broadcasting must operate in the public interest endures as a sound and vital principle. It has met the test of the years and has not been found wanting.

"The Nation's far-flung and flourishing system of broadcasting encompassing 3,000 aural stations is a living tribute to the foresight of the distinguished legislator.

"Senator White also performed outstanding services to his Nation as her representative at important international conferences on radio.

"Be it resolved, That a copy of this expression of the Commission's sorrow on the death of Senator White be entered in the permanent minutes of the Commission and that a copy be sent to his family."

Adopted April 3, 1952.

THE THREATENED STEEL STRIKE

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, today on the floor of the Senate two distinguished Senators spoke with reference to the impending steel strike. I wish to say that I agree thoroughly with what was said by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

The Washington Star of April 3, 1952, published an article by the distinguished columnist, David Lawrence, which states in the headline: "United States moving toward economic crash worse than in 1929; first steps in cycle certain to come with a steel strike."

Mr. President, I ask that the article be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

DECISION NOW UP TO THE WHITE HOUSE—UNITED STATES MOVING TOWARD ECONOMIC CRASH WORSE THAN IN 1929; FIRST STEPS IN CYCLE CERTAIN TO COME WITH A STEEL STRIKE

(By David Lawrence)

America is moving slowly toward an economic catastrophe which may be worse than the one that was ushered in back in 1929.

The decision whether such a disaster shall be averted rests with White House action in

the next few days. The 10-year repression period—1929 to 1939—started with very little warning. At least, the Nation was not prepared for it.

The next crash will come in a matter of months—not years—if the White House persists in driving to the edge of the precipice. The Nation will be able to see the cycle start. No one will be able to say this time that no warning note was sounded.

The first steps in the cycle of disintegration will come with a steel strike. This is due to start next week. Then will come seizure of the steel companies by the Government.

Immediately after seizure, the Government will surrender to the unions by ordering the recommendations of the Truman stabilization board to be put into effect at once.

The financial structure of the steel companies thus will be sabotaged. Their stockholders will interpret this to mean that from now on the Government intends to allow unlimited wages to union workers but will refuse to pay fair wages to the investors.

When this happens, it is the beginning of the end of the free-enterprise system. Investors generally will lose confidence. For the same pattern followed in steel will be exhibited to all industries—higher and higher wages will have to be paid or seizure will be the penalty.

With a rising wage level and no offsetting of costs through higher prices, it is only a question of a few months before the backbone of the entire defense program in America—the steel industry—will have its back to the wall. Stalin could hope for nothing more useful to his purpose.

President Truman is being advised that he must not permit any price increase in steel and that the companies must absorb all wage increases out of current profits. Actually there is a basis for compromise in a modest wage increase and a moderate increase in prices.

What Mr. Truman may do this very week, therefore, is to set the wage levels for the lean years that must come when the defense program tapers off. Peace is always a possibility, and any decided turn for the better in the international situation can catch the American economy in a trap.

High wage levels cannot be deflated. Instead of allowing the steel companies to build a reserve and to accumulate funds now to buy new machinery so as to operate more efficiently and to reduce prices, especially for future construction needs, the President is being told by Economic Adviser Leon Keyserling that he now can boost the wage levels to unprecedented heights. It was Mr. Keyserling who upset the applecart on Mr. Truman's return from Key West by telling him the steel companies could pay the wage increases based on "normal profits" and "normal operations." His reasoning has not been divulged, but it is not in accord with facts put in evidence at the recent hearings.

The Keyserling formula means that the Government will lose hundreds of millions in tax money. Other sources of revenue will have to be found. The stockholders in steel will face a wage cut. It means, moreover, that such a high level of wages will have been forced upon the steel industry that, with the slightest contraction of defense orders, there will be extensive casualties among the marginal steel companies. This will result in widespread unemployment and further loss of tax money.

The design for an economic crash is being made this very week in Washington. The 1929 debacle was the result of overspeculation by private citizens, but the crash that lies ahead will be Government-made. It is doubtful how much of the wreckage a new administration taking office in 1953 can possibly repair. The momentum of a downward cycle is hard to arrest. It can be stopped in its tracks now if Mr. Truman will allow an

impartial group of economists to study the facts for him.

If the Government, under the guise of an international emergency which it is believed will last another decade anyway, is to set up a permanent system whereby wages are to be increased whenever the labor unions demand it, but no price increases are to be permitted to compensate the producers, then the collapse of the major industries becomes a realistic threat.

Mr. Truman says he is not a candidate to succeed himself, but he wants to see a Democratic Party victory. Hence Trumanism becomes the issue. The campaign debate may determine how far Trumanism has tended to coincide with State socialism in depriving those who save their money from receiving a fair return on their investments.

Inflation is slowly depreciating fixed investments. Trumanism is now about to impair the only hedge the investor has had—the opportunity of equity stocks to rise. But, with Government seizure and with Government dictation, there can be no hope of reasonable dividends.

There are more wage earners than stockholders, so on a political basis Trumanism holds to the false premise that it is politically sound to increase wages no matter what happens to the financial position of the companies.

The crash that will result from such a misguided policy will do the workers of America more harm than any wage increase can do them good, for, if private enterprise is crucified, if incentive is impaired, and if efficiency is retarded, the end result is Government control and then operation of all major enterprises. This was the instinctive purpose of the New Deal and it is the obvious purpose of the so-called Fair Deal. The political crisis of 1952 will have a direct bearing on the economic crisis that is certain to come if Trumanism is to be the dominant philosophy of the Nation in economics as well as in politics.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, undoubtedly other Members of the Senate, like myself, have received numerous letters from persons who are very much concerned about what is called the steel strike. The fires in the steel mills are being banked.

We hear talk about statesmanship. There are three areas which call for statesmanship now, one among the labor leaders, one among the management of the great steel industry, and the third one at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue. The public interest is the large interest which should be considered. Selfish interests should be set aside for the promotion of the general welfare.

The common, average citizen realizes that if, through failure of responsible leaders to see and adopt the proper course, a spiral is started, it will mean the beginning of what is referred to in the editorial written by David Lawrence which was just inserted in the Record.

Mr. President, this is a momentous hour in our economic history, and thinking men and women are more greatly concerned about the present situation than they have been about the war in the East and in Europe.

I say to the President of the United States, therefore, "Get the best advisers you can gather. You have indicated that you no longer want the office of President. Therefore there is no need to cater to any particular interest or any particular segment. There is need, however, to look at what is best for America and the general welfare."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McCLELLAN. 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 PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of James O'Connor Roberts, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

James O'Connor Roberts, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board;

William Joseph Fleniken, Sr., of Louisiana, to be United States attorney for the western district of Louisiana, vice Harvey L. Carey, resigned;

Phillip A. Hart, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Edward T. Kane, resigned; and

Edward C. Boyle, of Pennsylvania, to be United States attorney for the western district of Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Clarence H. Adams to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that this nomination be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

UNITED NATIONS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stuart A. Rice to be a representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Arthur J. Altmeyer to be a Representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward F. Bartelt to be a Representative of the United States of America

on the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Henry A. Byroade to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed this day.

RECESS

Mr. McCLELLAN. 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 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 9, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 2, 1952):

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

James O'Connor Roberts, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for a term of 2 years.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 8 (legislative day of April 2), 1952:

UNITED NATIONS

Stuart A. Rice, of Virginia, to be representative of the United States of America on the Statistical Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Wisconsin, to be representative of the United States of America on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

Edward F. Bartelt, of Illinois, to be representative of the United States of America on the Fiscal Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term expiring December 31, 1954.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Henry A. Byroade, of Indiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

**DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

George P. Shaw, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Paraguay.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS

To be consul general

Willard Galbraith

To be consuls

Henry L. Coster	Arthur S. Alberts
Joseph F. McFarland	Bryan R. Frisbie
Robert S. Hoard	Stephen N. Sestano
Robert J. Jantzen	vich

To be vice consuls

Miss Ellen Gavrisheff
William D. Killea
Eugene D. Sawyer

To be secretaries in the diplomatic service

Teg C. Grondahl	Roy L. Wade
John A. Loftus	Lester Ziffren
Norman P. Seagrave	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1952

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast entrusted us with the high vocation of public service, grant that we may know how to discern and interpret rightly Thy wise and gracious purpose for all mankind.

May we bear calm and courageous testimony to a steadfast and unwavering confidence in that divine wisdom which never errs and that divine strength which will never fail.

We pray that we may seek to be used by Thee and our beloved country in lifting the shadow of fear from human hearts everywhere and in leading them into the joy and liberty of the Son of God.

At the close of each day may we receive the benediction of peace which Thou dost bestow upon all who live by faith, labor faithfully, and walk humbly with the Lord.

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. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day.

RIGHT OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TO BRING SUIT AGAINST STATES

Mr. RAMSAY. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 4, during the consideration of

H. R. 7289, a bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Commerce, and Justice, and the judiciary, the House, to the surprise and disgust of at least some of the Members, amended the bill to take from the Government of the United States the right to bring suit in its own courts against any State of the Union. The amendment adopted reads, in part, as follows:

On page 29, after line 4, insert the following:

"Sec. 207. None of the funds appropriated by this title may be used in the preparation or prosecution of any suit or proceeding in any court by or on behalf of the United States (1) against a State of the Union."

It must not have occurred to the good Congressman that such powers are guaranteed to the Federal courts by the Constitution of the United States and that it was an effort to limit and destroy not only the constitutional authority and jurisdiction of the courts of the United States as well as a limitation and destruction of the sovereign and necessary powers of our Government.

The admitted purpose and intent of this amendment is to prevent the Federal Government from ever suing a State of the Union.

I feel certain that if my good friends had realized the danger and futility of such legislation, they would not have lent their aid to such an absurd move.

We must remember the powers of the legislative branch of the Government are not granted to Congress, but they are vested in Congress by the Constitution. This is also true of the executive powers, and the judicial powers of the Supreme Court as well as all courts created by Congress. Congress has no inherent sovereign process in the realm of domestic legislation—*Kansas v. Col.* (206 U. S. 46).

In 1818 it was argued, as it was last Friday in the House, that the United States be denied the right to sue a State without an act of Congress, but the Court said there was no doubt about the jurisdiction of the Federal courts to do so—*Dugan v. U. S.* (3 Wheat. 172).

The Supreme Court has jurisdiction of a suit in equity by the United States against a State to determine boundaries.

In *Marbury v. Madison* (174 2 L. Ed. 60) the Court held:

If Congress remains at liberty to give the Supreme Court appellate jurisdiction where the Constitution has declared their jurisdiction shall be original, where the Constitution has declared it shall be appellate, the distribution of jurisdiction made in the Constitution is form without substance.

The Constitution itself, in article III, section 2, provides the judicial powers of the United States extend to all cases in law and equity arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States and to controversies to which the United States shall be a party, whether that party be a State or an individual.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. RODINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, after the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

BATAAN DAY

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the Members of the House to join with me in recalling Bataan, when tomorrow we commemorate the tenth anniversary of the fight which we waged against the forces that would overwhelm democracy and freedom. In that fight we had the valiant support of our Filipino friends and allies.

We cannot, we should not, forget Bataan. In that besieged peninsula, the United States showed to the world what a benevolent and friendly attitude toward another people can do to win that people's loyalty and allegiance. The Filipinos fought to the death side by side with our American boys because they knew they were fighting for a cause that was also theirs, because during our association with them we made them feel that liberty is their heritage as well as it is ours.

I take pride in saying that many of those who fought and fell on Bataan hailed from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts. In their memory, and in the memory of the other American boys who fought for us in America's darkest hour in the Pacific; in grateful appreciation of the loyalty of the Filipino people who risked their everything when to do so meant for them unspeakable agony, torture, and death, I have the honor to propose the following joint resolution (S. J. Res. 147) designating April 9, 1952, as Bataan Day, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Whereas April 9 of this year marks the tenth anniversary of the end of the epic struggle of American and Filipino forces on Bataan; and

Whereas this common sacrifice more solidly forged the traditional friendship of the United States and the Philippines and between the peoples of the two countries; and

Whereas Bataan symbolizes the spirit which moves men of different races and different creeds to fight shoulder to shoulder for their freedom; and

Whereas the rallying of the people of the Philippines to the side of the United States and the other United Nations in the current struggle in Korea is a further expression of American-Filipino unity; and

Whereas the people of the Philippines have demonstrated to all other nations in the Asian sphere the fact that mutual friendship and mutual security are common goals and the role of the United States in Asia is that of a friend of peoples; regardless of race; and

Whereas President Elpidio Quirino has designated April 9 as Bataan Day in the Philippines; Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That April 9, the tenth anniversary of the fall of Bataan, should be observed as Bataan Day and that the Congress recommends that on that day the flags of the United States and the Republic of the Philippines be flown, and that encouragement be given to the holding of appropriate services in schools and churches and in other gatherings.

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