

H. R. 4954. An act to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance, under Federal reclamation laws, of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project, Washington;

H. R. 5151. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue to James P. Love a patent to certain lands in the State of Mississippi;

H. R. 5155. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to have made a joint reconnaissance survey of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal;

H. R. 5283. An act to provide for the disposal of surplus sand at Fort Story, Va.;

H. R. 5553. An act to amend paragraph 1772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended;

H. R. 5587. An act to add certain lands to the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5607. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5965. An act to amend paragraph 813 of the Tariff Act of 1930;

H. R. 6056. An act to amend an act of Congress approved February 9, 1881, which granted a right-of-way for railroad purposes through certain lands of the United States in Richmond County, N. Y.;

H. R. 6078. An act to amend section 303 (e) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended;

H. R. 6091. An act to withdraw certain land as available land within the meaning of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act of 1920 (42 Stat. 108) as amended, and to restore it to its previous status under the control of the Territory of Hawaii;

H. R. 6242. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1949, the present suspension of import duties on scrap iron, scrap steel, and nonferrous metal scrap;

H. J. Res. 340. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the American Turners Society in the United States;

H. J. Res. 341. Joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a special series of stamps commemorative of the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of Fort Kearney in the State of Nebraska;

H. J. Res. 384. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purposes of exhibition at the International Industrial Exposition, Incorporated, Atlantic City, N. J., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 395. Joint resolution to extend the time for the release, free of estate and gift tax, of powers of appointment, and for other purposes.

ADMISSION OF DISPLACED PERSONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2242) to authorize for a limited period of time the admission into the United States of certain European displaced persons for permanent residence, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON obtained the floor.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of Members of the Senate for a moment, it seems to me there is some doubt now as to whether all the amendments which have been proposed to the pending bill will be offered. I am wondering whether the time has not arrived when we might ob-

tain a unanimous-consent agreement with respect to voting both on the amendments and also on the final passage of the bill. I respectfully ask those in charge of the bill on behalf of opponents and proponents, and those who may be offering additional amendments whether such an agreement could be entered into. I had in mind something like this: A unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the pending amendment and all other amendments, at a certain hour, allowing plenty of time to those who would like to propose amendments, but at that time to vote upon the pending amendment and upon all amendments, also the third reading of the bill. That would end the consideration of all amendments, and then, possibly one or two hours later, a vote could be had on the final passage of the bill, dividing the time equally meanwhile between proponents and opponents of the measure. I am wondering if such an offer might not be acceptable to the proponents and opponents of the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan has the floor. I appreciate very much his having yielded to me.

Mr. FERGUSON. I merely wanted to say that so far as those interested in the amendments are concerned, there is no desire to prolong the debate.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Any reasonable limitation of time I am sure would be satisfactory.

Mr. WHERRY. How about the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I feel that the remarks of the acting majority leader are entirely in order, and that there is a lack of time. However, I want to point out that there are pending at this time some 20 amendments which have been printed and are lying on the desk, to be called up. So far as I know they will all be called up. I hope at the proper time we can fix a time for voting, and it will be perfectly agreeable to discuss that with the acting majority leader a little later. However, I cannot foresee the situation, and hence cannot agree to fixing such a time at this hour.

Mr. WHERRY. In order to have the suggestion in the minds of Senators, would the hour of 4 o'clock be suitable for voting on the then pending amendment and all other amendments to the bill, and would the hour of 6 o'clock be a suitable time for voting on passage of the bill?

Mr. REVERCOMB. I trust very much the Senator will not insist upon that, or even make the request at this time, until we can see, and see very clearly, what we are going to do with approximately 20 amendments which may be called up. I may say to the Senator that if we were to fix the hour that he suggests, we would hardly have time to vote, much less to discuss the amendments. Without suggesting any time, let us go into the situation and see just how far we can proceed before trying to fix any time. Does the Senator see my point?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I realize that if the distinguished Senator does not want a unanimous-consent request presented at this time, it would be use-

less to proceed further with it. I should like to suggest this, however: Would the Senator from West Virginia consider making the hour 6 o'clock, adding the words "or prior thereto"? That is, in the event debate is concluded on the amendments before 6 o'clock, would that hour be of interest to the Senator?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I ask, as I have asked before, that the Senator at this time do not attempt to fix any hour until we can see what disposition can be made of the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the next amendment, with reference to which I shall speak for a brief time, is to provide—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator please state the lettering on the amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. It is amendment C.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 5, line 13, before the period, to insert the following: "and, except as otherwise provided in this act, to perform all the functions of administration and coordination necessary for the selection, and the transportation to and settlement in this country, of eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans."

On page 7, beginning with the word "but" in line 17, strike out down through and including the period in line 20, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "but the determination of eligibility of displaced persons and displaced orphans under the other immigration laws of the United States shall be by the officials who administer such laws."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, it is very important that if the bill be passed—and the Senator from Michigan hopes that it will be passed—it be such legislation as will best carry out the wishes of Congress and of the people. For that reason the amendment, being amendment C, is very vital and important in connection with the subject.

Let us see what it will provide. Section 4 of the bill as reported by the committee provides as follows:

Sec. 4. There is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Displaced Persons Commission, consisting of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term ending June 30, 1951. Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per annum. The Commission shall be empowered to incur such obligations and to employ such assistants, within the limits of its appropriation, as may be necessary. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums of money as may be necessary to enable the Commission to discharge its duties. It shall be the duty of the Commission to formulate and issue regulations, necessary under the provisions of this act, and in compliance therewith, for the admission into the United States of eligible displaced persons and eligible displaced orphans.

In other words, down to that point the bill provides for the appointment of a commission, and the salaries of its members, and prescribes that the commission shall formulate and issue the regu-

18. Medical services

Chairman: Tracy S. Voorhees, president, the Long Island College Hospital, and special assistant to the Secretary of the Army.

Committee: Dr. O. H. P. Pepper, professor of medicine, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Hugh Jackson Morgan, professor of medicine, Vanderbilt University; Dr. W. C. Menninger, the Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.; Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, Stanford University; Dr. Frank R. Bradley, director of Barnes Hospital, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. R. C. Buerki, director of hospitals, University of Pennsylvania; Charles Rowley, former trustee of Massachusetts Investors Trust; Henry Isham, president of the board of trustees of Passavant Hospital; Dr. Paul R. Hawley, former Chief Medical Director, Veterans' Administration; Dr. Michael DeBakey, associate professor of surgery, Tulane University, New Orleans, La.; Dr. Allen O. Whipple, clinical director, Memorial Hospital, New York City; Goldwalte H. Dorr, of Dorr, Hammond, Hand & Dawson, New York City; former special assistant to Secretary of War Stimson; Edward D. Churchill, M. D., professor of surgery, Harvard Medical School, Harvard University; Alfred Newton Richards, vice president in charge of medical affairs, University of Pennsylvania.

Secretary: Rear Adm. Joel T. Boone, Secretary of the Secretary of Defense's Committee on the Medical and Hospital Services of the armed forces.

19. Indian affairs

Chairman: Prof. George Graham, department of political science, Princeton University.

Committee: John R. Nichols, president, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts; Charles J. Rhoads, former Commissioner of Indian Affairs; Rev. Dr. Gilbert Darlington, treasurer of the American Bible Society.

Project director: Prof. George Graham, Princeton University.

20. Government statistical services

Dr. P. K. Whelpton, Scripps Foundation for the Study of Population Problems, Miami University, Oxford Ohio; Prof. Samuel S. Wilks, department of mathematics, Princeton University; Prof. John D. Millett, department of public law and government, 517 Fayerweather Hall, Columbia University; Mr. Martin R. Gainsbrugh, National Industrial Conference Board, 247 Park Avenue, New York; Mr. George Soule, 3 East Sixth-ninth Street, New York; Dr. Clarence D. Long, national bureau of economic research and department of political economy, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.; Frederick C. Mills, national bureau of economic research and department of economics, Columbia University.

21. Records management

Research director: E. J. Leahy, executive director of the National Records Management Council.

Consultants: Wayne Grover, Acting Archivist of the United States; Robert H. Bahmer, Director of Records Management, Department of the Army; Robert E. Angel, Director of Office Methods Branch, Department of the Navy; Edward Wilber, Department of State; F. M. Root, Westinghouse Electric Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

22. National security organization

Chairman: Ferdinand Eberstadt, president, F. Eberstadt & Co., New York City; chairman, Army and Navy Munitions Board, 1942; and former vice chairman, War Production Board, 1942-43.

Civilian committee: Mr. Thomas Archer, vice president and director of General Motors Corp.; Mr. Charles W. Cole, president of Amherst College; Mr. Hanson Baldwin, of the New York Times; Mr. Robert E. Wood, chairman of the board, Sears, Roebuck Co.; Mr. Lewis Strauss, of the Atomic Energy Commission; Dr. Frederick A. Middlebush, president

of the University of Missouri; Mr. Robert P. Patterson, of Patterson, Belknap & Webb, New York City; Mr. James Knowlson, president of Stewart-Warner Corp.; Mr. John Cowles, president, Minneapolis Star and Tribune Co.; Mr. Raymond B. Allen, president of the University of Washington; Mr. Chester I. Barnard, of the Rockefeller Foundation.

Military advisory committee: Gen. Gilbert R. Cook, Gen. Robert W. Hasbrouck, Col. Truman Smith, Admiral Ben Moreell, Admiral R. S. Edwards, Admiral John H. Towers, Gen. Ira Eaker, Gen. James Doolittle, Gen. Edward Curtis.

Consultants: Mr. John M. Hancock, of Lehman Bros., New York; Gen. Dwight Eisenhower; Gen. Stanley D. Embick; Admiral Ernest J. King; Admiral Chester W. Nimitz; Gen. Carl Spaatz; Gen. Frederick Anderson; Mrs. Oveta Culp Hobby.

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF GOVERNMENT**POLICY STATEMENT ADOPTED AT COMMISSION MEETING ON OCTOBER 20, 1947**

The reorganization of the Government can be approached from three points of view: First, the necessity or desirability of a given function of the Government; second, the exploration of the most advantageous structure of arrangement of these functions; and third, the improvement of its management.

There are certain obvious functions which need not be enumerated which are primary in government. There are certain functions which are useful in the development of national life and in the preservation of national ideals. But in all functions there is the question of priority within national ability to pay. There are still further questions as to boundaries of Federal versus State and local functions which jeopardize local government; and there are boundaries in functions by the overstepping of which government begins to stultify the initiative and productivity of the people.

The questions concerning structure largely revolve around consolidation of the activities of similar major purpose under one direction in order to prevent the waste, overlap, duplication, and to secure unity and formulation and coordination of policies. In this same field of structure there are large problems created by failure in the past to pay full regard to the separation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers; there has been much transgression over our fundamental concept of single-headed responsibility in administrative agencies and joint responsibility of several minds in legislative or judicial agencies.

Assuming proper definition of function and proper structure, the efficiency of internal management becomes the measure of economy or waste in government.

Public Law 162 creating this Commission states that the purpose of the Commission is to study and determine and recommend what changes are necessary in the executive to promote economy, efficiency, and improved services in the transaction of the public business by—

1. Limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of the essential services, activities, and functions;
2. Eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;
3. Consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;
4. Abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of Government, and
5. Defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities.

Thus it is clear that the Commission is not confined to recommending management or structural changes which improve the efficiency of performance of the executive

branch but is clearly directed to exploring the boundaries of Government functions in the light of their cost, their usefulness, their limitations, and their curtailment or elimination.

At various times over 40 years, commissions of investigation and recommendation have been appointed by the Congress and by the President. A mass of effectual information has been secured. At times a limited authority has been given by the Congress to the Executive to act in this field. Useful results have been accomplished by the Congress and the Executive even with the limitations of powers that have been given. A perusal of these reports and of the actions taken in this field indicate that the major consideration has been given to structural changes. In no case has there been such a breadth of authority and instruction for so thorough an examination and recommendation as has been given under this law.

As a matter of fact at no time has there been such a public desire for a complete reconsideration of the province of the Federal Government and overhaul of the business methods of Federal administration and their relationship to the citizen. The need is much greater than at any time in the past. The huge expansion of the executive branch during the past 20 years has been made in an atmosphere of hurry and emergency which now calls for calm challenge.

COMMISSION PROCEDURE

It is imperative that the Commission make a fresh and more vigorous approach to the problem assigned to it than has hitherto been made.

For such a program it is proposed that the Commission should:

1. Denominate (for the purposes of its work) the principal groups of major-purpose activities and such functional problems as may extend over such groups.

2. Determine which of these groups or these functions should be taken up initially for consideration.

3. Enlist eminent and experienced citizens to explore and furnish the Commission with their steady judgment on what action should be taken in respect to each separate group or function. Such leaders would add public confidence to the conclusions of the Commission and would reduce the number of questions for final determination by the Commission. Each leader would need be free to organize his own task force to survey the particular functions assigned to them. They should be furnished with all existing material by the Commission's staff. Should they require further research, they should be authorized to secure their own research assistants.

4. This approach does not require much of an initial or an elaborate regular staff by the Commission, but rather a minimum staff which would coordinate and make available to these task forces the great mass of information now already accumulated by various parts of the Government.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

S. 1035. An act to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., and Schick General Hospital, Clinton, Iowa, for use as domiciliary facilities by the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 1572. An act for the relief of Basque aliens;

H. R. 3638. An act to amend section 10 of the act establishing a National Archives of the United States Government;

6. Public welfare functions

Project director: Dr. Lewis Meriam, vice president, the Brookings Institution, and staff.

7. Fiscal, budgeting, and accounting functions

Project director: John W. Hanes, member SEC, 1938, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, 1938; Under Secretary of the Treasury, 1938-39.

Assistant to director: Kenyon Boocock, New York City.

Advisers: Daniel W. Bell, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, 1940-46; and president, American Security and Trust Co., Washington, D. C.; Roswell F. Magill, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, 1937-38, and partner, Cravath, Swain & Moore, New York City; Edward F. Bartelt, Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury; Walter F. Frese, Chief, Accounting Systems Division, General Accounting Office; Frederick Lawton, Administrative Assistant to the President.

Accounting Phase

Director: T. Coleman Andrews, certified public accountant, Richmond, Va.

Executive assistant and director of research: T. Jack Gary, Jr., certified public accountant.

Advisory committee (members of the committee on Government accounting, American Institute of Accountants): Edward A. Kracke, Haskins & Sells, certified public accountants, New York City; Maurice E. Peloubet, Pogson & Peloubet, certified public accountants, New York City; J. S. Seidman, Seidman & Seidman, certified public accountants, New York City; Weston Rankin, Price Waterhouse & Co., certified public accountants, New York City; Harry Howell, certified public accountant, Washington, D. C.; Donald F. Stewart, certified public accountant, Savannah, Ga.

Budgetary Phase

Project director: A. E. Buck, Institute of Public Administration.

Assisted by: Henry Burke, former budget director of Alabama, of Tennessee, and of North Carolina; Prof. Rowland Eggers, Columbia University; Prof. John D. Millett, Columbia University; Peter Langhoff, director of research, Young & Rubicam, Inc., New York City.

8. Federal-State administrative relationships

Chairman: Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, chairman of the board, United Fruit Co.; Under Secretary of the Treasury, 1934-36.

Committee: John Burton, director of the budget, State of New York; William Anderson, professor, University of Minnesota; Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia; Governor Frank Carlson, of Kansas; William L. Chenery, publisher, Collier's Weekly; John W. Davis, senior partner, Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland & Klendl, Ambassador to Great Britain, 1918-21; Democratic nominee for President, 1924; Charles A. Edison, Governor of New Jersey, 1941-44; Assistant Secretary of the Navy, 1939-40, and president, Thomas A. Edison, Inc.; Dean William I. Myers, Cornell University.

Research director: Frank Bane, executive director, council of State governments.

Secretary of committee: Charles Stockton, Choate, Hall & Stewart, Boston, Mass.

9. Public works functions

Chairman and director: Robert Moses, chairman of the New York State Council of Parks and of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority.

Executive secretary: Holden A. Evans, Jr., former executive secretary, New York State Public Works Planning Commission; former director, New York City Airport Authority.

Assistant secretary: W. Don Wilson.

Advisory committee: R. H. Baldoock, president, American Association of State High-

way Engineers, State of Oregon; S. D. Bechtel, president, Bechtel Corp., San Francisco, Calif.; Gilmora D. Clarke, of Clarke, Rapuano, and Holleran, consulting engineers; Richard E. Dougherty, vice president, New York Central Railroad; Gano Dunn, president, J. G. White Engineering Corp.; Aymar Embury II, architect, city of New York and consultant to Port of New York Authority; Thomas F. Farrell, chairman, New York City Housing Authority; Thomas K. Finletter, Coudert Bros., and recently chairman, President's Air Policy Commission; G. Donald Kennedy, vice president, Automotive Safety Foundation; Ben Moreell, president, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp.; Robert P. Patterson, formerly Secretary of War; Charles H. Purcell, director, Department of Public Works, State of California; John A. Reilly, president, General Contractors Association, vice president, the Arundel Corp.; Thorndike Saville, dean, College of Engineering, New York University; Charles H. Sells, superintendent, New York State Department of Public Works; Luther C. Steward, president, National Federation of Federal Employees.

Consultants: W. Earle Andrews, of Andrews & Clark, consulting engineers, New York; William N. Carey, executive secretary, American Society of Civil Engineers; William S. Chapin, consulting engineer, Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority; Frederick A. Collins, special counsel; G. Frank Dougherty, counsel, Long Island State Park Commission; William F. Heavey, consultant engineer, New York City Department of Marine and Aviation; Arthur S. Hodgkiss, executive officer, New York City Department of Parks; Arthur E. Howland, chief engineer, Long Island State Park Commission, Jones Beach State Parkway Authority, Bethpage Park Authority; William S. Leibold, deputy corporation counsel, city of New York; M. J. Madigan, of Madigan-Hyland, engineers; Emil Praeger, chief engineer, Madigan-Hyland, engineers; John C. Riedel, chief engineer, Board of Estimate, city of New York; Sidney M. Shapiro, deputy engineer, Long Island State Park Commission; Arthur V. Sheridan, commissioner of borough works, the Bronx, New York; George E. Spargo, general manager of the Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority, deputy construction coordinator, New York; Harry Taylor, assistant general manager, Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority; director, office of construction coordinator, New York City.

10. Federal field offices

Project director: Dr. Julius Klein, Assistant Secretary of Commerce, 1929-33, and staff.

11. Revolving funds and business enterprises of the Government other than lending agencies

Project director: Maj. Gen. Arthur H. Carter, former fiscal director, Army Service Forces (Haskins & Sells).

Research director: Col. Andrew Stewart, former deputy fiscal director, Army Service Forces.

Consultant on power and irrigation project: Col. A. B. Roberts, consulting engineer, Cleveland, Ohio.

12. Lending agencies

Project director: Paul Grady, former assistant to the Secretary of the Navy (Price Waterhouse & Co.).

Advisory committee: Paul Bestor, president, the Trust Co. of New Jersey; Donald D. Davis, president, Minnesota & Ontario Paper Co.; Walter J. Cummings, chairman of the board, Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago; Walter D. Fuller, president, the Curtis Publishing Co.; George L. Harrison, president, New York Life Insurance Co.; Arnold B. Keller, senior consultant, International Harvester Co.; Walter Lichtenstein, financial and economic con-

sultant, Chicago, Ill.; James H. McGraw, Jr., president, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc.; Prof. Sumner H. Slichter, Harvard University; Allan Sproul, president, Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

13. Federal personnel management

Chairman: John A. Stevenson, president, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co.

Committee: Lawrence A. Appley, vice president, Montgomery Ward & Co.; Vannevar Bush, chairman, Research and Development Board; Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia; Alvin E. Dodd, president, American Management Association; Franklin D'Oller, former chairman, the Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America; Dr. Alvin C. Eurich, acting president, Stanford University; Dean Earl G. Harrison, University of Pennsylvania Law School; Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president, Temple University; David Lillenthal, chairman, Atomic Energy Commission; James P. Mitchell, vice president, Bloomingdale Bros.; Robert Ramspeck, executive vice president, Air Transport Association of America; A. W. Robertson, chairman of the board, Westinghouse Electric Co.; Dr. George D. Stoddard, president, University of Illinois; Rawleigh Warner, chairman of the board, the Pure Oil Co.; Alfred H. Williams, president, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia; Prof. Leonard D. White, department of political science, University of Chicago.

Project director: Richard Paget of Cresap, McCormick, & Paget, management engineers, New York City.

14. Foreign affairs

Committees: Harvey H. Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State, 1931-33; Assistant to the Secretary of War, 1941-45; James Grafton Rogers, Assistant Secretary of State, 1931-33; professor of law, Yale University, 1935-42.

Adviser: Henry L. Stimson, former Secretary of War and of State.

Executive secretary: John F. Meck, Jr., former assistant dean, Yale Law School.

15. Natural resources

Chairman: Leslie Miller, former Governor of Wyoming.

Committee: Horace Albright, former Director, National Park Service; John Dempsey, former Governor of New Mexico; Donald H. McLaughlin, president, Homestake Mining Corp.; Dr. Isaiah Bowman, president, John Hopkins University; Dr. Gilbert White, president, Haverford College; Ralph L. Carr, former Governor of Colorado; Prof. Samuel T. Dana, dean of school of forestry and conservation, University of Michigan.

Research: Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress.

16. Regulatory agencies

Committee: Prof. Robert R. Bowie of the Harvard Law School; and Assistant to the Military Governor of Germany, 1945-46; Owen D. Young, former chairman of the board, General Electric Co.; Robert LaFollette, former Senator from Wisconsin.

Project director: Prof. Robert R. Bowie.

Executive assistant: Harold Leventhal, Washington, D. C.

17. Agricultural activities

Chairman: Dean H. P. Rusk, Illinois State College of Agriculture, Urbana, Ill.

Committee: Dean H. W. Martin, school of agriculture, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.; Dr. D. Howard Doane, Doane Agricultural Service, St. Louis, Mo.; F. W. Peck, executive director, Farm Foundation, Chicago, Ill.; Prof. John Gaus, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.; Dean W. A. Schoenfeld, Oregon State College, Corvallis, Oreg.; Chester Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank, St. Louis, Mo.; William Rhea Blake, executive vice president, National Cotton Council.

Research director: G. Harris Collingwood. Consultant: Gen. H. P. Seidemann, the Brookings Institution.

The Commission held its first meeting September 29, 1947. There have been regular meetings to date, with practically the entire membership present. Each of us is devoting a substantial portion of time to this work. The Commission is assisted by a relatively small staff, several of whom are devoting services without compensation. We have the full cooperation of the administrative officials of the Government and the advantage of many exhaustive investigations by the Congress.

Early in our work we decided that in such a huge problem we must have the aid of leading and experienced citizens for determination of fact and recommendations as to remedies. We, therefore, divided the work into partially departmental but mainly functional segments; we created some 22 task forces to undertake the work, with authority to them to engage such research aid as they might require. We have been extremely fortunate in the response of outstanding men and women to serve as members of our "task forces." Some of these "task forces" are near completion of their research and near the stage of tentative conclusions. As their fields may, in some cases, partly overlap, we are now initiating a series of conferences between them.

I enclose herewith a list of the investigations and their staffs which we have inaugurated.

We anticipate that all project studies will be completed by the autumn. Then each will be subject to careful analysis by the Commission in formalizing its own report and recommendations to the Congress in January 1949, as provided in the act.

In making our report to the Congress, it is my present opinion that we should present initially a broad review of the fundamental structural reorganization of the executive arm that is needed, this report to be followed by separate reports upon various functions and departments, with detailed recommendations.

In the meantime, the whole Commission believes that it would be unfortunate to announce any findings or tentative conclusions until after the election. Only by keeping our effort entirely removed from the political field will the final report be recognized, as Congress intended, as truly nonpartisan.

Yours faithfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Mr. President, I think it is noteworthy that this Commission is attacking the reorganization of the Government on a functional basis, and has succeeded in dividing that subject into 22 separate functions. I think it is of interest to the Senate to realize that there will be in January a preliminary report, which will be followed by separate reports upon the various functions and departments of the Government.

I shall ask to have printed following these remarks the names of all of the very able citizens who are in one way or another identified with the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Members of the Senate will note that work has been broken down into 22 projects. These projects are: First, Office of the President and its relation to the departments and agencies; second, Post Office Department; third, procurement functions of civilian departments; fourth, transportation and communication functions; fifth, veterans' affairs; sixth, public welfare functions; seventh, fiscal, budgeting, and accounting functions; eighth, Federal-State administrative relationships; ninth, public-works

functions; tenth, Federal field offices; eleventh, revolving funds and business enterprises of the Government, other than lending agencies; twelfth, lending agencies; thirteenth, Federal personnel management; fourteenth, foreign affairs; fifteenth, natural resources; sixteenth, regulatory agencies; seventeenth, agricultural activities; eighteenth, medical services; nineteenth, Indian affairs; twentieth, Government statistical services; twenty-first, records management; twenty-second, national security organization.

I believe that when Members of the Senate read of these different activities and see the caliber of men who were engaged on them, they will have a feeling that when this Commission finally reports next January, it will have given to the people of this country a method whereby their government can become truly economical in the best sense of the word, and—what is even more important—truly effective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my remarks a list of all the very able men and women who are giving of their time and effort to carry out this work.

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

COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Appointed to the Commission by the President: Vice Chairman, Dean Gooderham Acheson, former Under Secretary of State; Arthur Sherwood Flemming, Civil Service Commissioner; James Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; George Houk Mead, former member of Federal Price Control Board.

Appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate: George David Aiken, Senator from Vermont; Joseph Patrick Kennedy, former Ambassador to Great Britain; John Little McClellan, Senator from Arkansas; James Kerr Pollock, professor of political science, University of Michigan.

Appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives: Chairman, Herbert Hoover, former President of the United States; Clarence J. Brown, Representative from Ohio; Carter Manasco, Representative from Alabama; James Henry Rome, Jr., former Assistant Attorney General.

PROJECTS ORGANIZED

1. Office of the President and its relation to the departments and agencies

Project director: Chairman Herbert Hoover. Assisted by (on the presidency): Don K. Price, associate director, Public Administration Clearing House.

Assisted by (on departmental organization): H. Struve Hensel, former Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Assistant to Mr. Price: Stephen K. Bailey. Assistant to Mr. Hensel: Prof. John D. Millett, of Columbia University.

2. Post Office Department

Project directors: Robert Heller & Associates, Inc., management engineers.

Represented by: Frank Elmendorf and staff.

3. Procurement functions of civilian departments

Project director, Russell Forbes, formerly director of the division of research in public administration, New York University; commissioner of purchase, New York City.

Purchasing: Robert R. Nash, formerly director, purchase analysis division, purchasing department, Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.; Joseph L. Ernst, formerly purchasing

agent, Rochester Board of Education, Rochester, N. Y.; Herbert L. Brown, formerly director, purchase analysis of the Lincoln-Mercury division, Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich. Storing and distribution: John V. O'Connell, formerly supervising engineer for the bureau of stores, purchase department, city of New York; J. H. Geary, formerly assistant manager of stores, Erie Railroad Co., Hornell, N. Y.

Inspection: Leon J. Jacobi, inspection and standards engineer, the Detroit-Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.

Standardization of specifications: Dana M. Barbour, on loan from the Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget.

Property identification: Frank A. Cisar and Vladimir S. Kolesnikoff, Division of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget (working at the Bureau).

Property utilization: Geith G. Barr, on loan from the Property Management Section, Division of Administrative Management, Bureau of the Budget.

Traffic management: Bell and Ussery, traffic consultants, Investment Building, Washington, D. C.

Legal problems: Sidney D. Goldberg, attorney, formerly associated with the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of the Budget.

Secretary and office manager: Mrs. Myrtle M. Watson, formerly secretary and administrative assistant to Finance Adviser to Commander in Chief, European Command (OMGUS), Berlin, Germany.

Advisory committee: W. Z. Betts, director, division of purchase and contact, State of North Carolina; Harry Erlicher, vice president in charge of purchases, General Electric Co.; Thomas D. Jolly, vice president in charge of purchases and engineering, Aluminum Co. of America; R. C. Haberkern, vice president in charge of purchases, R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.; Carl Ilgenfritz, vice president in charge of purchases, U. S. Steel Corp. of Delaware; George A. Renard, executive secretary-treasurer, National Association of Purchasing Agents; John P. Sanger, vice president in charge of purchases, U. S. Gypsum Co.; Charles E. Smith, vice president in charge of purchases, New York, New Haven, and Hartford R. R.

4. Transportation and communications functions

Project director: Dr. Charles Dearing, Brookings Institution.

Assistant project director: Dr. Wilfred Awen, Brookings Institution.

5. Veterans' affairs

Chairman: Col. Franklin O'Oller, former chairman of the board, the Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America.

Advisory committee: John Stevenson, president, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co., Philadelphia, Pa.; Edmund Fitzgerald, president, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Paul Clark, president, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.

Survey director: Valentine Howell, vice president and actuary, the Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America.

Assisted on insurance phase by: Albert F. Jacques, vice president, the Prudential Life Insurance Co. of America; William R. Cunningham, Paul C. Sanborn Associates, New York City; Roland Mangini, manager, planning department, John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Co., Boston, Mass.; Mason Sears, Boston, Mass.; Victor Henningsen, comptroller, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance Co., Milwaukee, Wis.

Activities Other Than Insurance and Hospitalization

Director: Thomas M. Searles, president, Equity Co., Philadelphia.

Assisted by: the Trundle Engineering Co., and staff.

1948

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

7039

President's directive has been changed for the same reason. It has been almost impossible to straighten out the records based upon the earlier date.

The Senator has stated that there must have been a record of some kind. The President did not make the date December 22, 1945, the test of eligibility. He simply said, "We now issue the order that displaced persons shall have priority in applying for visas under the regular quota system of the Immigration Service." His directive did not make any change in the immigration laws. It did not do anything except to give priority to certain eligible persons under the laws as they existed. It has nothing to do with the settlement of a period of time in which the package would be wrapped up. Later more displaced persons came into the area. General Clay issued an order setting the date as April 21, 1947. That was the date used by our forces in determining the occupation of the camps. That was the date used by the IRO in determining the deadline for developing this particular package.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a release issued by the Common Council for American Unity, previously mentioned, in which is set forth a definition. It is stated to have been that issued by the Visa Division of the Department of State, in which the Department of State said, in express terms:

A displaced person in Germany or Austria is one who (a) has resided since December 22, 1945, in the zones of Germany and Austria occupied by the armed forces of the United States, or in the British or American sectors of Berlin and Vienna, and (b) is classifiable within one or more of the following categories:

As I understand, the definition given by the Department of State certainly indicates that it was addressing itself to the date December 22, 1945, as the date which was the cut-off in determining who were displaced persons.

Let me say, in concluding this observation, that it seems to me that the Senator from New Jersey has touched upon the vital point very properly, although I disagree with him in his conclusion. The primary question is whether or not the earlier date should be used in determining who shall be considered as eligible displaced persons. I respectfully submit that it is far more logical to select a date only approximately 6 months after the conclusion of the German war as the date on the basis of which to determine what persons were displaced by the ravages and horrors of war, rather than to go forward a year and 5 months or 6 months and say that included in that category are not merely those who were in the various zones 5 or 6 months after the end of the war, but also people who came in a year and a half subsequently. So I associate myself vigorously, and with as much clarity as I am capable of, with the position taken by the Senator from West Virginia, that the pending amendment should be defeated.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I appreciate the observation of the Senator; but as he read the statement of the definition I believe it referred to residence in the zones on a certain date. It did not refer to the time prior to that date.

Mr. DONNELL. It referred to residence in the zones of Germany and Austria, not in the camps, which are entirely different, of course.

Mr. SMITH. However, that is not the point I am making. I agree with the Senator from West Virginia that we must definitely determine a cut-off point. The entire question is whether it shall be the date used in the President's original directive, or whether, in the light of the fact that we are all aware that the poor people who were fleeing from the Jewish pogroms in Poland and elsewhere rushed into our zone, they should be included in our definition of displaced persons. At that point there was no question of definition. We did our defining later. The only question is whether we should receive some of those who suffered from the aftermath of the war, as well as from the war itself, on the same basis as we received people into the camps until the date when General Clay and other authorities felt there should be a deadline. We established such a deadline. We said, "No more can come in. We cannot take care of any more refugees. We are over-run now."

That is the point at which we should determine the question of eligibility. There is a difference of opinion. I submit the position of my colleagues and myself. I respect the position of the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from West Virginia, but I think they have made a mistake in not accepting the cataloging date of both the IRO and our military forces, in order to determine the qualifications, background, and eligibility of all these people. If we continue to accept the earlier date, according to advices which I have received from both the Department of the Army and the State Department, there will be great confusion.

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill several questions.

As the junior Senator from Washington understands, the problem now before us is this: The Senate is seeking, as best it can, to help displaced persons who are most deserving of help, and those who have suffered most from the tortures and ravages of war. If that conclusion is correct, does it not logically follow that if we were to accept the date of April 21, 1947, as advocated by the Senator from Michigan and his colleagues, we would be denying admission into this country, under the terms of the bill, to the very people whom we seek most to help through this legislation?

Mr. REVERCOMB. Undoubtedly that is true. I believe the Senator has placed his finger on the issue involved. The Senate has voted that 200,000 may come in. The Senator from Washington has stated—and I think properly—that we should give preference to those who have suffered most, and who are in fact displaced. If we dilute the number by extending the date, manifestly some of those deserving of first consideration will be deprived of the opportunity for admission.

Mr. CAIN. I am very much interested in the Senator's response to my question. I raise the question because

of my own personal experience in Europe during 3 years of the war, and after the war as a visiting Senator representing this body.

As I understand, there are roughly about 850,000 displaced persons whom we and other nations now seek to help. The bill before us provides for the admission into this country of 200,000. That excludes from consideration by us under the terms of this legislation approximately 650,000 displaced persons. Therefore from my point of view the only sound practice is to accept the date on the basis of which we shall have the greatest reason to believe that every person brought to this country as a displaced person is entitled to the consideration which the bill extends. Whatever happens, we shall be forced to leave behind in Europe many deserving men and women. We cannot bring them all in. For that reason I think the date so ably supported by the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Missouri is deserving of our consideration and support.

Mr. President, I should like to make one further observation. It is obvious to any man who has ever traveled in Europe and through the camps that most of the men and women who live in the camps are fine citizens. A great many of them are deserving of the best we have to offer in this country. However, I want the RECORD to show that it is obvious that a number of men and women who have entered the displaced persons camps in Europe since 1945 have entered of their own free will, and because they considered a displaced persons camp to be a way station on their journey toward the largess of the United States.

Since the displaced-persons problem first came into being, authorities have been concerned over the practice of repatriation—encouraging people to return to the lands whence they came. In our wisdom—and, I think, properly so—it was judged that no men or women would be forced, against their will, to return to their native state. But if the date supported by the Senator from West Virginia is adopted by the Senate and the House of Representatives, I have reason, within myself, to believe that repatriation will come alive again, and a considerable number of men and women and their children, who came into the camps since 1945, will know for the first time in no uncertain language that, "It is time we went back, and went to work where we came from, because the United States of America has gone so far, and is going no farther."

Mr. President, by way of a further affirmative word of support for the date fixed by the bill, I say that it will best serve the purpose of America in giving intelligent consideration to those who are deserving of the greatest care and attention by the opportunity and comfort of our country.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an inquiry?

Mr. CAIN. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I am putting this in the form of an inquiry, but I think it is only simple justice to the Senator from Washington—who has very modestly re-

1948
JUNE 2

7090

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

frained from saying it himself—to say that without being appointed on a committee, as I understand, he went to Europe and visited camp after camp, last fall, in October and November. In my judgment, he made a careful, detailed, and conscientious investigation of the conditions in those camps. I should like the RECORD to show that the Senator from Washington is speaking not merely from some past history of several years ago, but at least in part from his extensive and intelligent investigation and study while he was in Europe last October and November.

Mr. CAIN. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me join my colleague, the Senator from Missouri, in stating that the Senator from Washington has performed a valuable service for the Senate, for the entire Congress, and for the people of the United States in the study which he himself made of the displaced persons problem. Not only did the able Senator from Washington come face to face with the displaced persons problem through the time of his service in the Army of his country and during the closing days of the war and also in the days immediately following the close of the war, but, as has been stated here, he went to Europe at the time of the committee's visit there. He went there at his own expense. He went through the camps, often with members of the committee, and he was a great help to the work of the committee at that time. So it is with particular good feeling that I hear the Senator from Washington today sustain the committee, after its months and months work upon this serious problem. I am glad, indeed, to hear the statement of the Senator from Washington sustaining the committee's position and asking his colleagues in the Senate to vote against the pending amendment, because I feel that this very formula of fixing the eligible and admissible displaced persons is indeed the heart of this bill. If it be destroyed the displaced persons part of this proposed legislation will likewise be destroyed and we will have not a displaced persons bill, but another general immigration bill added to the existing immigration laws of the country. That is the important consideration in connection with the pending question.

The Senator from Washington has made it clear that unless we leave the dates remain as they are in the bill—and they are dates which long have been recognized by the executive branch of our Government, and have been unchanged until this very year of 1948—we shall ruin the chances of the real displaced persons to secure the relief which the Congress and the country are trying to give to them.

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

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] is absent on official business and is paired with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Dakota would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

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

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are detained on official business. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] would vote "yea."

The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] is absent on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 29, nays 49, as follows:

YEAS—29

Aiken	Ives	Murray
Ball	Johnson, Colo.	Myers
Bridges	Kilgore	O'Connor
Brooks	Lodge	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Lucas	Pepper
Downey	McCarthy	Seltonstall
Ferguson	McGrath	Smith
Green	McMahon	Sparkman
Hatch	Magnuson	Thomas, Utah
Hill	Morse	

NAYS—49

Baldwin	Fulbright	Millikin
Bricker	George	Reed
Buck	Gurney	Revercomb
Butler	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Russell
Cain	Hoey	Stennis
Capehart	Holland	Tyge
Capper	Jenner	Tydings
Connally	Johnston, S. C.	Urnstead
Cordon	Kem	Vandenbergh
Donnell	Knowland	Watkins
Dworshak	Langer	Wherry
Eastland	McClellan	Williams
Eaton	McFarland	Wilson
Ellender	McKellar	Ycung
Feazel	Malone	
Flanders	Martin	

NOT VOTING—18

Barkley	Maybank	Taylor
Brewster	Moore	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	O'Daniel	Tobey
Cooper	Robertson, Wyo.	Wagner
Hayden	Stewart	White
McCarran	Taft	Wiley

So amendment G, offered by Mr. FERGUSON for himself and other Senators, was rejected.

ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it will soon be a year since the Congress passed the so-called Lodge-Brown bill setting up a Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. At the time it seemed to me that the action of Congress was historic—not only had it passed this bill unanimously in both branches; it was also the first time that Congress had ever given full authority to search for an over-all solution to the problem of Government reorganization. All previous efforts had been fragmentary. In view of the importance of the problem and the tremendous strides which the Commission has made since it came into existence, under the chairmanship of former President Hoover, I felt justified in seeking a report from Mr. Hoover which would give to the Congress and the public a picture of what has been accomplished and what may be expected in the future.

Mr. Hoover replied to me under date of May 22. The matter is of such importance that I shall read his letter to the Senate:

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: I have your letter of May 11 inquiring as to the progress of the work of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of which authority you were a joint author.

I need scarcely mention that the Commission is deeply conscious of its responsibility to the Congress and to the American people as a whole. As a nonpartisan 12-man group, composed of one-third from representatives appointed by the President, by the Speaker of the House and by the President of the Senate, equally of Democrats and of Republicans, and the wide authorities under the act, it represents the most formidable approach yet made to this national problem. The subject has been the concern of every President and every Congress for over 50 years. But the efforts of reorganization have been fractional. This is the first time full authority has been given to search for a solution as a whole.

That it is imperative is obvious when we consider that the number of persons at 8 years after the First World War who were receiving regular payments from the Federal Government was about 2,200,000, and 3 years after the Second World War it is about 13,400,000. The budget 3 years after the First World War was about \$4,000,000,000 per annum, whereas 3 years after the Second World War it is \$40,000,000,000. There are insufficient savings left in the hands of the people to repair, maintain, and improve the tools of production and distribution upon which our standard of living depends. These figures obviously indicate the necessity for important structural changes in the Government to secure the maximum efficiency and economy.

Our field of inquiry not only concerns every citizen, it concerns the very strength and vitality of democracy itself. The success of this mission may well set the pattern for future joint participation by private citizens and Government representatives on matters affecting national welfare.