

us and mutually formulate a policy for the future of the Philippines.

Nothing is binding. The Commission has no more authority to bind this Government and the Filipino Government than the Prime Minister of Great Britain has. All they can do is hear facts and recommend to Congress, in a report, a proper policy dealing with the Philippines from now on. That is all there is to it.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Philippine Legislature had the say, I do not believe for one moment they would create nine \$10,000-a-year jobs for any commission of this kind. In effect, we are the trustees of the people of the Philippine Islands when they are under Japanese occupation. Their funds are here. I cannot see that we have any more right to vote their money away than to vote our own money away for the American members of the commission. There are to be three United States Senators and three Representatives on the commission, who will not receive any pay in addition to their regular salaries. Three can be appointed by the President from any group, nine \$10,000 Filipinos and three Americans, passing on questions which the Senator says will not determine anything, who will merely make a recommendation. We can get a recommendation without cost from the War Damage Insurance Corporation on the policy involved and as to what we should pay or not pay for damages in the Philippines.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me tell the Senator that there is more involved in this matter than merely a consideration of war damages. The Army and the Navy want to have the future of our national defense in the Philippines determined. We have already been in consultation with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy about the matter. The whole question of bases has to be settled. The Army and Navy, theoretically, and the President of the United States, might take these bases, but the Filipinos have been willing, so far as I know, to give us, within reason, any bases we want them to give us.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator will yield, is not the question of bases covered in the joint resolution we have already passed this afternoon? Is that involved in any way in the pending measure? We passed a measure providing for bases and for immediate independence. That does not have anything to do with this measure.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is correct. I am merely telling the Senator that there is the question of American rights in the Philippines; the question of the investments in property which has never been liquidated, which will pass under Filipino law; there is the question of land; there is the question of future trade. All those matters were provided for in the original independence bill. In the measure passed in 1934 it was provided that this commission should be set up 2 years before independence to consider the overlooked problems which would result from independence. If the commission could in any way legislate, if it could bind this Government, the objections of the Senator from Ohio would

be well taken, but all it can do is to recommend policy. If anyone thinks that a policy is going to be recommended without any action being taken to set up a proper commission to determine and deliberate on it, in my judgment he is making a very serious mistake.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I suggest to the Senator that consideration of the joint resolution might well be postponed until the next session of the Senate. It would not make a tremendous difference. If the commission were a simpler set-up, if there were to be a few members on each side, or if it were to be postponed for another 6 months or a year, until we were somewhere near the time when these questions will have to be considered, I do not know that I would have any objection. Perhaps some amendment could be worked out. If the Senator would let the measure go over until the next session of the Senate, and have it made the pending order of business, I should think that would be the best course.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be very glad to have it made the unfinished business, but in view of the fact that I am forced to leave to go to western Maryland tomorrow night to keep an engagement of long standing, I should like to have unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock Monday afternoon the Senate shall proceed to vote on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto. That will allow 4 hours of debate, and I think we can decide all questions long before that time.

Mr. TAFT. Did the Senator say 4 o'clock?

Mr. TYDINGS. Four o'clock Monday afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. I hope the Senate may not be in session on Monday for so long.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will make it at not later than 4 o'clock, and I am willing to move the hour up to any time suggested, just so the Senate itself may understand what is involved when the vote is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Why can it not remain the pending order of business, and not be called up until the Senator is present?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall be here Monday.

Mr. TAFT. Let us bring it up, then, the first thing Monday.

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that at not later than 4 o'clock on Monday the Senate proceed to vote on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto.

Mr. TAFT. That would be entirely satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair suggests that before entering into an agreement of that kind it would be necessary to have a quorum called.

Mr. BARKLEY. Has the motion been agreed to to make the joint resolution the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest we act on that.

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

of the Senator from Maryland that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 94), establishing the Filipino Rehabilitation Commission, defining its powers and duties, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs with an amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in connection with the request of the Senator from Maryland that at not later than 4 o'clock Monday there be a vote on the joint resolution and all amendments, I ask unanimous consent that the requirement for a roll call before such an agreement is made be waived.

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

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

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the request is granted.

INVESTIGATION OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk Senate Resolution 197, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. The purpose of the resolution is to provide authority for an investigation of the R. E. A. I report the resolution favorably, with an additional amendment. I ask for immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BARKLEY. Reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Illinois whether before the Committee to Audit and Control any basis was set out for an investigation of the R. E. A. What is it that is to be investigated?

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator may recall that some time ago the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] raised a question on the floor of the Senate about the investigation. At that time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry sought \$15,000 to make the investigation, and a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the resolution directly to the Committee to Audit and Control, and I refused to consider it. The Senator may recall that the Chair ruled with the Senator from Illinois on the point raised.

Later the resolution went back to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, but there was no testimony before that committee with respect to the investigation. As I recall, the original \$15,000 was sought for the purpose of employing a lawyer to go through certain books and records. I do not know what those books

and records are. It was disclosed that someone had a trunk load of information which it would take a lawyer 3 or 4 months to go through. After discussion of the entire question the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry cut the appropriation from \$15,000 to \$2,500.

I report the resolution at this time with that kind of an understanding. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is present. He is responsible for the resolution. He probably can enlighten the majority leader with respect to what the investigation is all about.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to inquire of the Senator whether it involves a matter which has in a sense been floating around Washington regarding the proposal that the Rural Electrification Administration use funds appropriated for it by Congress to set up some sort of a cooperative insurance company, and whether it involves a legal opinion on the part of the legal counsel of the R. E. A. that such funds could not be used for that purpose under the appropriation of Congress. Does it involve that question?

Mr. LUCAS. In reply to the inquiry, I may say to the Senator that that question was discussed. Candidly, I do not yet know why the \$2,500 is wanted. All I know is that originally the subcommittee said it wanted \$15,000 to employ a lawyer to go into all the books and records for the purpose of ascertaining what was in the record and then make some kind of report. The Senator from Minnesota has been instrumental in pushing this investigation, and he knows more about the subject matter than does any other Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I simply wish to make an observation. It has become habitual in the Senate for one Senator or another to submit a resolution to investigate something. Sometimes he may have a grievance against an institution which he wishes to investigate, and he submits a resolution, has it referred to the committee of which he is a member, and gets the committee to report it favorably. Then it goes before the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and pressure is brought on that committee. I make no such statement with respect to the pending resolution. But it seems to me the practice has become habitual to present loosely drawn resolutions for the purpose of investigating something against which a Senator has a grievance or cannot understand. It seems to me we should look a little more carefully than we have been doing into resolutions which provide for investigations.

I shall not object to consideration of the resolution, but I wish to utter a word of warning—and this does not apply simply to the pending resolution but to all similar resolutions—that we should be careful with respect to making expenditure of money from the contingent fund of the Senate simply for the purpose of indulging in the pleasure of investigating something. We should not make the expenditure unless there is a real basis for the investigation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to assure the Senator that I have no personal interest in this matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. No, I am not intimating that the Senator has. I did not even know that the Senator was the author of the resolution.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has unanimously recommended that the proposed investigation be made. I can assure the Senator that it is not my intention to ask for any investigation for the purpose of reflecting on any one for any personal reason of my own at all. I have the deepest and the most profound interest in the R. E. A., and I am sure that so far as I am concerned, and so far as the other members of the committee are concerned, there is no other motive.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the investigation involve the question of the legality of an expenditure of funds appropriated by the Congress to the R. E. A., for the creation of a cooperative insurance company?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That also has been mentioned. That is to be determined only on the evidence.

Mr. BARKLEY. It has been mentioned that that subject is involved in the investigation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. It is involved in the investigation in some way; yes. I cannot say how it is involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. In other words, as I understand, an effort has been made to induce the R. E. A. to use funds appropriated for the development of rural electrification to create an insurance company, and the Solicitor of the R. E. A. held, and I think rightly, that they had no authority to use the funds appropriated for the R. E. A. for that purpose.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. That is what I have heard, but I have not seen the opinion.

Mr. BARKLEY. I shall not object to the consideration of the resolution, but I think the time has come when we must look into these routine, formal resolutions which are brought to the Senate for the purpose of spending money to investigate something simply because someone whips himself up a little grievance.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 197) authorizing the employment of assistants and the expenditure of funds in a proposed investigation of the administration of the Rural Electrification Act, submitted by Mr. SMITH on October 25, 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments, and from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an additional amendment.

The amendments of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry were, in line 1, after the word "That", to strike out "the subcommittee of"; in line 2, after the word "Forestry", to strike out "appointed by the chairman of such committee" and insert "or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized"; in

line 5, after the word "act", to strike out "is authorized" and insert "and"; and in line 8, after the word "of", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "\$15,000" and insert "\$2,500"; and the further amendment of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate was, in line 6, after the word "inquiry", to insert "to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had; and."

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any duly appointed subcommittee thereof is hereby authorized to inquire into the administration of the Rural Electrification Act and, for the purposes of such inquiry, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words to report such hearings as may be had; and to employ clerical and other assistants and to expend during the Seventy-eighth Congress not in excess of \$2,500, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, which shall be in addition to any other funds available for expenditure by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or any subcommittee thereof.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I simply wish to reiterate what the Senator from Kentucky has said with respect to the question of investigations. As chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I am as much interested as is any other Senator in investigating anything in connection with the executive branch of the Government or the war effort where there is an honest-to-God case based upon factual data. But as the Senator from Kentucky well says, resolutions are constantly being submitted, the purpose of which is to investigate something, and before very long someone is likely to submit a resolution to investigate the investigating committees, because there are so many of them.

I think Senators should seriously consider the question of investigations before resolutions are submitted. If a committee considers a resolution it should take some testimony, and bring it before the Senate in the way of a report, the same as is done with respect to a bill. I have not, however, succeeded in inducing any committee to do so. I have not succeeded in inducing a committee to submit a report to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, advising that committee in certain language what the investigation is about, and what the evidence taken in connection with the resolution shows.

We should have some knowledge concerning the resolution in order to form an intelligent opinion as to how much money should be spent. I have talked until I am blue in the face about this matter. Although I have talked and talked on the subject, whenever a resolution goes to a committee, it comes out without testimony having been taken on it. It comes out as did the resolution

just passed, and as practically every other resolution comes out, without a single line of evidence, without a report as to why the committee wants the money. That, I contend, is unfair to the Committee to Audit and Control. I am the one who has to take it on the chin. I am the one who has to assume the responsibility, as chairman of the committee, for spending the taxpayers' money on the investigations.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in view of the statement of the Senator from Illinois, I feel compelled to remind the Senator that standing committees have charge of certain problems and charge of certain bills dealing with activities of the Government. It is a long standing rule of the Senate that a standing committee determines whether or not legislation shall be recommended to the Senate. The committee holds hearings. It may make investigations. The rule of the Senate is that a standing committee has complete charge with respect to the merits of an investigation to determine whether or not an investigation should be made.

I shall not take up the time of the Senate to show the proceedings in that connection. But a standing committee has full charge of the matter referred to it by the Senate. The question of whether there should be an investigation must be determined by the standing committee. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate may determine the question of the money which may be expended. I think the Senator from Illinois is in error when he says that he thinks his committee has any jurisdiction over the merits of the subject matter, or over anything except the matter of finding the funds with which to make the investigation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, assuming that what the able Senator from Minnesota says is correct, how does the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate determine the amount of money that is necessary if all it gets from any standing committee is a resolution which says "We want \$25,000 to investigate"? How are we going to determine whether the committee should have \$25,000, or \$15,000, or \$10,000 on that sort of blanket request?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, let me tell the Senator how we acted in this connection. When an investigation is begun, it is difficult to determine how much money is needed. The subcommittee was appointed in this case to take charge of this resolution, and it labored for about 2 months to determine first of all whether or not an investigation should be undertaken. The subcommittee worked assiduously. A great deal of work was done to determine whether or not it was necessary to have an investigation, and then the report was made to the committee.

Mr. LUCAS. The only thing I know is what was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The original resolution reported by the subcommittee provided for \$15,000 for the single purpose of employing a lawyer.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think the Senator misunderstood the Senator who made the report. I do not wish to continue the discussion, however.

Mr. BARKLEY. Some time back the Senate amended its rules regarding these matters in order to avoid the unnecessary expenditure of money for investigations. It provided that when a resolution is submitted it must go to the standing committee to which it ought to go. That committee is responsible. It has placed upon it the burden of making a showing.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Absolutely.

Mr. BARKLEY. If necessary it should call witnesses. It should not simply report a resolution as a matter of courtesy and good will merely because some Senator happens to be a member of the committee. Such action is not fair to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. If that committee has the power to determine how much money should be appropriated it has the power to determine whether any money should be appropriated. I make these remarks in order that standing committees may accept the responsibility of going into these questions and determining on its merits whether any situation justifies an investigation.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I venture to suggest that in 9 cases out of 10 standing committees have not in recent years or months held any hearings on whether there ought to be any investigation at all. They report a resolution and then camp on the doorstep of the Senator from Illinois, as chairman of the committee, to get the money, and frequently they have the lawyer already named and have him in mind before the appropriation of the money is ever made for his employment.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky that the subcommittee of which I was a member had charge of this resolution for nearly 3 months before it decided to ask for power to make an investigation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I desire to make a further statement in connection with the matter. I find it more and more annoying as I am required to consider the resolutions which are constantly being presented. I am not saying this because the able senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] submitted the resolution just now agreed to.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I understand.

Mr. LUCAS. That resolution is merely another one on top of another one. I do not propose to continue to assume the responsibility for the spending of money for investigations, especially when a resolution touching a new subject matter is submitted.

The Truman committee is a different proposition. We know exactly what that committee is constantly doing, and its activities are matters of public knowledge and are in the public interest.

But when a Senator submits a resolution dealing with a new subject matter,

such as the one which is the subject of the resolution just agreed to, I think some kind of a showing should be made. I am becoming tired of being constantly hounded, as the majority leader suggested awhile ago, by those who are responsible for such resolutions. The job is not worth it.

As chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I am attempting to do a conscientious piece of work, and so long as I am chairman of the committee, I shall continue to do so. But I do not propose to continue to take it on the chin with respect to the type of resolutions which are constantly being reported by committees. A Member of the Senate submits a resolution to a committee, and says, "I want it agreed to." The committee says, "That is fine. We will report it to the Senate, and it will be passed on to the chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. He will have to make the decision about giving you the money." That is the situation.

There are resolutions now pending which I do not propose to pass upon until a showing is made. If Senators do not want to have that done, they can have me discharged as chairman of the committee, and that will be perfectly all right so far as I am concerned.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. 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 REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:
Sundry postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in the chair). If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy. Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.