

For Release April 5, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

The week following Easter brought many visitors from home, particularly high school students including ninth graders from Ottawa Hills and a group from nine schools with Reverend Hauserman and his wife. The House of Representatives was in recess so we were able to spend quite a bit of time with the visitors.

* * *

The lull in House legislative matters didn't interfere with Senate activity or official functions of an international flavor. The President of France came to town and a full-blown parade with all the fanfare marked the occasion. About 250,000 Washingtonians lined the streets to see Mr. Truman, President Auriol, the cadets from West Point, the midshipmen from Annapolis, and a number of other units of the Armed Forces. It was encouraging to hear the leader of France say his country would stand with America in defense of peace and liberty. He said it with a convincing firmness.

* * *

The 21 foreign ministers of all the North and South American republics convened in Washington to discuss the problems of hemispheric defense. The opening session of this gathering was held at Constitution Hall. Betty and I had invitations so took in this interesting event. President Truman gave the opening address followed by a speech by the Foreign Minister of Brazil. Half of the audience could understand English and without any interpreter could understand Mr. Truman. However, when Ambassador Fontura of Brazil spoke we had to rely on gadgets similar to those used at the meetings of the United Nations.

To understand the speech in a foreign language you put on a set of headphones and tune in to an interpreter who gives you a simultaneous translation. When President Truman spoke the South Americans who didn't understand the English language wore the mechanical headdress just as we had done.

From all indications the American Republics will get together on a mutual defense plan along the lines already being followed in the North Atlantic Treaty alliance. Until now each of the Latin American nations has built up its Army, Navy and Air forces with an eye to its national pride or its national defense alone. Our U. S. officials in conjunction with five South American representatives have submitted a resolution calling for an integrated program for the collective



April 5, 1951

defense of this hemisphere. Argentina isn't too enthusiastic; in addition to the six sponsors others are more or less favorable.

* * *

If it were possible to be entirely unconcerned, one might get a chuckle at the problems the British government is having in Iran. Britain, which has had a Socialist government for five years, has been nationalizing its own basic industries. Recently Iran decided to nationalize its oil industry, including the British-owned oil fields in that country. Prime Minister Attlee and his Labor Government officials in England don't like the socialization of the oil industry in Iran, even though Attlee socialized steel and other industries in Britain. Guess one's point of view varies depending on whose industries are being gored.

* * *

From now until early fall the House and Senate will be in continuous session. Before there is any vacation for Congressmen the President wants a new tax increase bill, authority to spend 98 billion, changes in the Selective Service Act, and a new price and wage control law. It's a heavy schedule, so unless the legislative tempo increases, the Fords probably won't be home until Christmas.

* * *

VISITORS: This past week we've had lots of friends in Washington. Mrs. Mary Milanowski of Grand Rapids was here with Rita Milanowski, Marcia Milanowski (Mike's daughter), and Rosemary Hermann, visiting John and seeing the sights. Also down from Grand Rapids for spring vacation were Esther Thomasma, Jacoba Dalebout, Anna Baar, Elsie Tracey, Helen Williams, Lt. and Mrs. Wendell P. Rehkopf. W. W. Hoagland and also Mr. and Mrs. George Yonkman, all of Grand Rapids, were here on business. Visiting from Holland was the Edward Damson family, Mr. and Mrs. Lyman J. Sicard, Miss Ella A. Hawkinson, and Mr. and Mrs. Alvin Vander Bush. Emil Gaul of Grand Haven is here on business.

For release April 12, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

This past week has been a rough one in our Congressional office. The hours in each day have been far too few to get all the work done on time. In fact, almost missed my deadline on the weekly column.

For example, my subcommittee on Appropriations has been listening to the testimony by the Army Engineers as General Pick and Colonel Potter attempt to justify proposed expenditures totaling \$624 million. Our group of five Congressmen holds hearings from 10 a.m. to noon and from 2 to 5 p.m. In a period of one week the Army Engineers have given facts and figures on 29 out of approximately 130 river, harbor and flood control projects. It will probably take two to three weeks more to finish this testimony and then the committee listens to the group from all over the country who come to plead for a home town harbor or flood control project.

Some will say, "That isn't much of a schedule for a Congressman--only five hours a day." Folks should know, however, that while our hearings are taking place the House itself is in session each day from noon until 5 or 6 p.m. Since one can't be in committee hearings and on the floor at the same time, I have to read the House debate in the Congressional Record. In addition, there is the regular administrative work in the office plus the daily correspondence which must be answered. Your Congressman isn't objecting to the situation--just explaining why there may be some slight delay in responding to your letters.

* * *

Had a visitor from home in the office last week who asked, "Jerry, what do you know about all these huge river, harbor and flood control projects that the Army Engineers are presenting to your committee?" My knowledge and information comes from two sources. During the 81st Congress I served on the Committee on Public Works. This committee didn't appropriate the funds but did investigate to determine whether or not any new projects should be authorized by law.

The rest of my background comes from an analysis of the material which the Army Engineers present both before and during the hearings. Fortunately, I have on my staff for a three-month period Professor Brainard of Michigan State College, who spends all his time reviewing the data from the Engineers. Professor Brainard and



April 12, 1951

I go over each project before the Engineers make their oral presentation to the committee. On the basis of our previous conference I quiz General Pick and Colonel Potter just like a lawyer in a court trial goes after an adverse witness. If there are any weaknesses in the individual cases presented by the Army Engineers, and some have turned up, it is my job and the responsibility of the other committee members to bring out the facts. As you know, it's the obligation of Members of Congress to know where the taxpayers' money is to be spent and this is the only way one can find out.

* * *

If anyone wants a cookbook prepared by the Department of Agriculture, drop me a line. Just ask for a booklet entitled "Family Fare." I took a copy home to Betty a few months ago and she uses it extensively in our home. I can testify that the meals are good, nourishing and of the thrifty type.

* * *

The Congress, by public resolution, has designated April as Cancer Control Month, and the President has issued a proclamation calling upon all of our people to help bring this vicious disease under control. Cancer strikes on the average in one out of every two families. Every day 575 Americans die of cancer. Certainly we will all want to help do something about this terrible disease. We can do something about it, for under the leadership of the American Cancer Society we can furnish the money necessary for the world's foremost scientists and medical men to devote their full time to finding the cause of and cure for cancer.

Join the 1951 Cancer Crusade. Contact the local solicitors and make your contribution to this worthwhile cause.

* * *

VISITORS: All Grand Rapids folks this week. Mrs. Leonard H. Verschoor is visiting in Washington. Abe Chysel's son Dave was here on an educational tour from Annapolis. Mr. and Mrs. B. S. Montague are here for a few weeks en route back from Florida, and Carl McManamy and Britt Gordon were here on a short business trip.



For release April 26, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

In the short period of three days the nation paid high tribute to a great military man, General Douglas MacArthur, and mourned the loss of another patriot of heroic stature--Senator Arthur Vandenberg. The achievements of both men are indelibly written on the pages of history. It is tragic that in this perilous hour the free people of the world no longer have the benefit of the Senator's leadership in the Congress and the General's vast skill, knowledge and integrity in the high councils of the military.

* * *

The passing of Senator Vandenberg brought sadness to all and a feeling of irreparable loss. It was fitting that so many dignitaries from Vice President Barkley on down should come to his home for the final services. The Senator has departed but his work will forever be a guiding light for the generations to follow. His death is a tragic loss to all the free people of the world. He served the nation he loved so well far beyond the call of duty.

* * *

Undoubtedly most of you heard or saw through radio and television General MacArthur's historic speech before a joint meeting of the Congress. The emotional reaction to the speech among members of the House and Senate was undoubtedly similar to your own. It was the General's day and rightly so.

Many friends have asked me whether the Democrats of the Congress applauded the General's remarks. Frankly, I didn't spend much of my time watching the actions of my Democratic colleagues during the 37 minutes General MacArthur spoke. It was my general impression, however, that the Democrats of the House and Senate on all but three or four occasions did applaud. The General's speech, given without rancor or bitterness, was so fair and logical that only the extreme pro-Trumanites could take exception.

The bombshell in the speech was General MacArthur's statement that "from a military standpoint his views have been fully shared by practically every military leader concerned with the Korean campaign, including our own Joint Chiefs of Staff." The General spoke these words with pointed emphasis. It was apparent that he was

disgusted with the recent statements of General Bradley, head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Bradley of late has been echoing the words, phrases and policies of President Truman and Secretary Acheson. It is well known that General MacArthur has documentary proof that the Joint Chiefs supported his military policies. Obviously, it shocked General MacArthur to find General Bradley now reversing his field under White House pressure. Congress must investigate this situation for it is unsound to have the Secretary of State making military policies and decisions where American lives are at stake.

I hope and trust General Bradley has not become a "me-tooer" to the President and Secretary Acheson. General MacArthur, when he is called to testify before Congressional committees will give his own honest views. Bradley should do the same.

Too often in the past witnesses from various branches of the Armed Forces, when questioned by Congress have failed to raise their voices in opposition to programs and policies which they considered detrimental to the best interests of the United States. In many cases, their reluctance to speak their convictions has been conditioned by the practice of President Truman and Secretary Acheson of taking immediate and violent reprisals against those who dared to disagree. Admiral Denfeld spoke his convictions to the Congress—he is on the retired list today. A distinguished American Surgeon, Admiral Boone, spoke his beliefs. He was retired. General Edson of the Marine Corps disagreed with the present bosses in the Administration and dared to tell the Congress so. Edson is now retired. In other words, any critic of Administration policies within the government lives under the shadow of the ax. As shown by the MacArthur-Truman incident, the American public admires a person who is willing to sacrifice a personal career for the best interests of the entire nation.

* * *

The great tributes paid to General MacArthur and the reaction against the President have resulted primarily from a long pent-up disgust with White House policies. Mr. Truman is judged as an appeaser in the eyes of the public. He tolerates White House aides who are mixed up with R.F.C. scandals. He has been soft with men like Alger Hiss and other communist sympathizers. He dismissed General MacArthur who was the symbol of anti-communism in the Far East.

General MacArthur could not compromise principle for expediency. He stands for a strong virile America and we Americans must honor and respect him for his great service to our country and for his selfless devotion to duty.



For release May 3, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

Last week I attended a small dinner with 15 other Congressmen at which Mr. Eric Johnston, Administrator of the Economic Stabilization Agency, was the guest speaker. Frankly, after listening to the problems confronting him I am convinced he has one of the toughest civilian jobs in the nation. It's the responsibility of Eric Johnston under the Defense Production Act of 1950 to keep labor, management, agriculture and all other segments of our population on an equal economic status during this emergency. He has a thankless job. Organized labor is mad because he won't approve all contracts for wage increases. Businessmen lambast him because he restricts their profit margins and mark-ups. Farm groups berate him because he imposes certain ceilings on agricultural products, particularly on cotton.

During the question and answer period after his speech a Congressman asked Mr. Johnston why he took the government job when he was receiving a salary of 175 thousand dollars a year as boss of the motion picture industry. His reply might well be an example to all of us. He said his son-in-law was a corporal in the Army in Korea and if someone in his family could make such sacrifices then he felt it was his duty to his country to accept such a job with all its headaches.

Does Eric Johnston believe in permanent controls? Definitely not. As head of the Economic Stabilization Agency he believes controls will be necessary for two years at the most. Controls to prevent further inflation are essential now while the Armed Forces get the necessary guns, tanks and aircraft, but once our productive capacity is increased the need for regimentation will cease. Let's hope so. In the meantime, let's remember that although we may not like the various government regulations the sacrifices we are making at home are small in comparison to the sacrifices the G.I.'s are enduring on the battlefields in Korea.

* * *

I was very interested in Mr. Johnston's further recommendations for the stabilization of our economy. In his estimation the U.S. must in the next two years increase its productive capacity. He gave some convincing figures to show that our supplies of steel, rubber and other commodities will be expanded tremendously in the months ahead.

Second, Mr. Johnston advocates a sound fiscal policy for the federal government. With that I wholeheartedly agree. Until Uncle Sam balances his budget inflation will increase. Right now the House Committee on Appropriations is doing its level best to achieve a balanced budget. So far the Committee and the House

May 3, 1951

as a whole has made some sizeable cuts in President Truman's budget and we intend to continue hammering away. As you probably noticed, my amendment to cut 5½ million dollars from the funds of the Bonneville Power Administration was approved 110 to 91. This is just a bite in the over-all total, but by nicking away at every item as we go along the Congress can reduce substantially the outrageous budget of President Truman. So far I have voted for every cut in the President's budget affecting non-defense agencies, and it is my intention to carry out such a policy in the future.

Here's the story on my amendment. The Bonneville Power Administration wanted \$69,500,000 for the next twelve months for the construction of electric power transmission lines in the northwest Pacific states. The Committee on Appropriations cut the request by two million. After investigation I felt it could be reduced still further so offered my amendment for a further cut of 5.5 million. After bitter debate it was approved. I only hope the Senate concurs.

VISITORS: Last week William Peterson of Grand Rapids was in Washington on business. Mr. and Mrs. W. Van Eenenaam from Holland were here for a visit. This week Mr. and Mrs. H. J. Barkel and Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Klomparens, all of Holland, visited us; Clarence Boomsma of Grand Rapids and his mother, Mrs. Jennie Boomsma of Wheatfield, Indiana stopped in for a visit; and Rowland L. Hall of Grand Rapids was in Washington on business.

For release: May 10, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

A couple of months ago when the President submitted his 94.4 billion dollar budget to the Congress, he "dared" the House and Senate to make any cuts. This was a silly and brazen statement for the President to make for he well knows because of his service in the Senate that Congress can and undoubtedly should pare down any Presidential budget. Just as an example, here's what the House of Representatives did last week on the appropriations for the Department of Interior. The President proposed 559.2 million dollars for this agency for the next 12 months. The Committee on Appropriations cut 39.2 million dollars off the White House proposals. The House as a whole went even deeper by slicing \$23,267,000 more from Mr. Truman's budget. The fate of the bill is now in the hands of the Senate. The House did some down-to-earth economizing by approving savings totaling over 62 million dollars. This is better than a 11% cut and a good answer to Mr. Truman's "dare." Incidentally, the best way to prevent an increase in federal taxes is to practice some economy in the federal government.

* * * * *

Presumably most of you saw the admission by the British trade officials that since the outbreak of the Korean War the English have sold 120,000 tons of rubber to Communist China and 40,400 tons to Soviet Russia. During debate in the House of Commons it was admitted that the British sold in 1949, the year before the Korean War, only 27,500 tons of rubber to Red China. In other words, British sales of rubber to the Communists have increased heavily since the United Nations undertook to stop Communist aggression in Korea.

In my estimation this deplorable situation calls for strong action. It is unthinkable that the British Labor Government should permit such transactions. How can the British officials in good conscience allow the sale of critical and strategic materials to the enemy when substantial portions of the materials sold to the Communists will eventually be used against our men on the battlefields?

Several months ago when there were rumors of heavy rubber sales by the British to the Reds, I contacted our own State Department concerning the matter and strongly urged that the United States use its influence to stop such sales. The Department of State gave no adequate answer and didn't appear too eager to intervene.



May 10, 1951

The situation can and must be corrected by the United Nations and our State Department should take the lead in forcing the necessary action. The U.N. through collective action can impose effective embargoes on the shipment of goods, including rubber, to Red China and Russia. Failure of the U.N. to curtail such shipments is additional evidence of a lack of policy by the diplomats in the Korean War. If the diplomats in the United Nations condone and permit the sale of rubber and other strategic materials to the Reds, it proves much of what General MacArthur has said since his return. General MacArthur has repeatedly stated that the U.N. had no real policy in Korea, that he and his troops had to operate in a vacuum while the diplomats talked on and on. General MacArthur has repeatedly urged an all-out embargo on the shipment of rubber and other materials to the Reds. Unfortunately, the British have fought him on this and other issues. As the facts come to light it is becoming increasingly evident that the British Labor Government has not supported the Korean War to the fullest extent. It is regrettable that the British have sold rubber to the enemy at a sizeable profit and in addition have blocked any effort in the United Nations for an embargo or economic restrictions. In the light of the disclosures by the British that the enemy has been aided and abetted by English trade practices in the Far East, the Department of State under Secretary Acheson and the American delegation in the U.N. must demand long overdue action by the U.N.

* * * * *

VISITORS: We were pleased to have 18 members of the Chamber of Commerce from Grand Haven here this week, and 20 members from Grand Rapids. Mr. and Mrs. Joseph P. Lynch, Jr. of Grand Rapids mixed a bit of pleasure with business in Washington this week; Maurie Walters of Lamont was here on a hurried business trip; Walter Thomasma of Grand Rapids also had some business in the District this week.

For release May 17, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

All last week the Appropriations subcommittee on Rivers, Harbors and Flood Control carefully moved through 23 hours of hearings. Approximately 200 witnesses from all over the United States made ardent pleas for their pet projects at home. They came from Arkansas, California, Florida, Illinois, Pennsylvania, New York, Hawaii and most of the other states in the Union. Some were farmers who were desperate because the Mississippi River is eating away many acres of highly productive land. Some witnesses were ocean fishermen who need a harbor of refuge or an emergency inlet to protect them from squalls or currents. Others were city dwellers whose homes and businesses have been inundated by repeated floods.

Most of the witnesses were urging the Congress to spend just a little more money in order to fix up that levee down in Arkansas or dredge out that fishing inlet in North Carolina or New York. A few of the 200 witnesses, however, were before the committee urging that certain projects, principally hydro-electric power dams in the Columbia River basin, be stopped once and for all. Among those voicing their protests were representatives of four Indian tribes from the Northwest Pacific area.

In his budget this year President Truman recommended that Congress appropriate sufficient funds to initiate construction on the Dalles Dam in the state of Oregon. The total cost of the Dalles Dam when completed would be over 325 million dollars. The President proposed 18 million to get the project started this year.

It is Mr. Truman's belief and the opinion of others in the Executive Department of the federal government that this huge hydro-electric power dam is essential in the defense effort. The atomic energy plant at Hanford, Washington, is nearly finished and there are some aluminum plants in the same area which would use this electric power. The Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Interior and the Bonneville Power Administration officials all made strong pleas for 18 million dollars from the U. S. Treasury for this project in the next 12 months.

At the same time there is determined opposition to this project from other parties. For example, it is the contention of the salmon fishermen that the construction of the Dalles Dam will ruin this long-established industry. The salmon fishing industry has an annual value of 20 million dollars. Certainly the Congress should move slowly when there is a danger that the livelihood of thousands may be adversely affected by the construction of such a federal project.



In connection with this tremendous power project the committee had witnesses from four Indian tribes who objected strenuously to the building of the Dalles Dam. The Umatilla, Warm Spring, Nuz Perce and Yakima tribes all sent representatives to plead their case. It seems the United States government by a treaty signed with these Indians in 1855 guaranteed certain rights and privileges including salmon fishing rights at Celilo Falls in Oregon. The Dalles Dam, if constructed, would inundate Celilo Falls thereby destroying the salmon fishing locations from which the Indians make their living.

The Yakima Indians were the most colorful witnesses. Watson Totus, one of the Yakimas in a bright red shirt and green scarf, came before the committee with his hair in long braids over his shoulders. He spoke in broken English but was most effective as he pleaded his case with native eloquence and gestures. Another Yakima Indian, Alex Saluskin, spoke no English but gave his testimony through an interpreter from the tribe. Although these witnesses were not fluent, their conviction and sincerity made the committee realize that our government has a serious responsibility to maintain treaty obligations with the descendants of the original inhabitants of America. The national defense needs may require that Celilo Falls be inundated, although our committee has not made a decision so far, but if the Dalles Dam is constructed these Indians certainly deserve, both legally and morally, full reimbursement.

* * * * *

VISITORS: We had a big time with the folks from Holland this week. Janet Kay Walker was here with her parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. Clare Walker. Jimmie (Butch) Glatz and his mother, Mrs. Gerrit Glatz, and his grandmother, Mrs. Harlow Burrows, were also here. Janet and Butch, along with Doris Eash of Holland, distributed tulips tied with tiny wooden shoes to the Congressmen and Senators. Janet and Butch were also on a TV show over WMAL with your Congressman. C. T. Vermurlen was also here from Holland. Manuel Brown, and also Harry J. Kelley, both of Grand Rapids, were in Washington on business. Also here visiting from Grand Rapids were Mr. and Mrs. Clarence G. Werkema and Louis F. Baker.

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

This past week the President refused to approve H.R. 3096, a bill to require that all real estate transactions of the Department of Defense before being signed be submitted to the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services for the information of the Congress. The first veto by Mr. Truman in the 82nd Congress ran into stiff opposition by the top House leaders in both political parties. As a result the President's veto of this measure was overwhelmingly overridden in the House by a vote of 312 to 68 which is considerably more than the necessary two-thirds.

Why did the Congress feel that the House and Senate Committees on Armed Services should be informed beforehand concerning the sale or acquisition of real property by the Army, Navy or Air Force? Here's one answer and it's a good one. When the Department of Defense knows before it makes a sale or purchase, that the "deal" will be scrutinized by the Congress, a better bargain for Uncle Sam usually results. During the debate on whether or not to override the President's veto, Representative Vinson, Chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, cited a specific example. Congressman Vinson told of a "deal" where the Navy wanted to spend 30 million for a factory for the construction of aircraft engines. When the proposed purchase agreement was submitted to the House Committee on Armed Services the committee told the Navy the "deal" didn't look good from the taxpayers' point of view. The Navy after another look agreed and made the necessary arrangements at far less cost to Uncle Sam.

It is interesting to note in this regard that the Navy Department has been operating under such a procedure for the past ten years. The Navy got along very well under this set-up during World War II. The bill vetoed by the President would extend the same review procedure to the Army and Air Force.

During the debate Representative Vinson showed the House a 1944 report from the old Truman Committee. As you undoubtedly recall, Senator Truman was chairman of a committee in World War II that investigated expenditures of the Army, Navy and Air Force. For example, the Truman Committee in the last war investigated the Air Force purchases of many "plush" hotels in Miami, Florida. The Truman Committee in its 1944 report indicated disapproval of these real estate deals by the Air Force and recommended: "The manner in which the hotel acquisition program was carried out



resulted in many injustices which the War Department has shown little inclination to correct. . . . The War Department should review the entire situation in detail and report to the proper legislative committees of Congress. It should be pointed out that the Navy Department advises the legislative committees of its real-estate acquisitions in advance and keeps these committees advised of its situation.

"The Navy showed greater efficiency and care than the Army, both in formulating its original program and in carrying it out with the fairness and courtesy that citizens are entitled to expect from the military."

However, come 1951, President Truman vetoes a bill which seeks to do just what he, Senator Truman, and his Senate colleagues in 1944 proposed as a safeguard for the federal Treasury.

The President in his veto message said this: "Finally I am concerned by what appears to me to be a gradual trend on the part of the legislative branch to participate to an even greater extent in the actual execution and administration of the laws." The House by overriding this veto, in effect told the President that the Congress has a solemn duty to see that the laws of the United States are executed and administered intelligently and economically. In the last few years it has become apparent that the Executive branch of the federal government wants unlimited authority to grow and spend without any check. Congress said NO on this occasion, and I hope the House and Senate say NO more often in the future.

* * * * *

The Department of Agriculture appropriations bill for the next fiscal year was approved last week by the House of Representatives. It now goes to the Senate for action. As passed by the House the funds for the Department of Agriculture would be 7.2 per cent less than the amount for the current fiscal year and 12.5 per cent below the 820 million dollars requested by the President for the next 12 months. One amendment cut \$75,000 off the office operation funds for Secretary of Agriculture Brannan.

* * * * *

VISITORS: Not very many fifth District people in town this week, but we were glad to see C. A. Parrish of Grand Rapids and Ed and Betty Ellis of Grand Haven here.



YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

This column will be in the nature of a progress summary relating to 1952 appropriations for the Army Corps of Engineers. This agency is requesting of Congress \$622,000,000 to carry on its civil functions work for the fiscal year 1952. With this amount of money the Corps proposes to complete, continue and initiate a large number of projects concerned with rivers, harbors, and flood control. The rivers and harbors program involves 41 projects. There are 65 projects in the scheduled flood control program.

The purpose of these programs is to improve and control the waterways of the nation. This means the dredging of harbors and rivers, the construction of locks and canals, the building of levees, and the erection of dams. The benefits derived from such activities are important and significant. Levees reduce flood losses, dredging, locks and canals, speed commerce, and tremendous power in the form of electricity is derived from harnessing our rivers. This is the work of the Army Engineers; it is important work; at the same time it is costly work.

For the past several months a subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has held extensive hearings with General Pick, Colonel Potter and others of the Corps of Engineers to determine the validity of the requested \$622,000,000 for next year. As you know, I am a member of this five-man committee composed of three Democrats and two Republicans. While these long and extensive hearings have been in progress, Professor Brainard, on loan to my Washington staff from the Economics Department of Michigan State College, has made a careful and detailed study of each project. The hearings are now finished and this week the subcommittee will determine the amount of money to be recommended to the Appropriations Committee and the House as a whole.

During the past week Professor Brainard and I have reviewed thoroughly the vast amount of information that has been submitted to the committee. So you will know how much data has been submitted to our subcommittee, the hearings when printed will be in two volumes totalling approximately 1,600 pages. If anyone would like copies, I'll be glad to send them on. This has been done so that I can make specific and sound recommendations to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress with respect to funds for the Corps of Engineers. It is perfectly clear to me that, under



May 31, 1951

present conditions, the full request of the Corps of Engineers will have to be reduced. I am also convinced that much of the work of the Corps must be continued, but it can be done on a reduced scale without jeopardy to the public welfare.

Based on these convictions we have worked out a plan by which substantial savings can be made on a sound basis. In the first place, I am going to suggest to my colleagues on the subcommittee that several projects be postponed at this time. These are new undertakings for which plans have been prepared but on which there has been no actual construction. I do not argue that these projects are not desirable--my position is that other things are more important at this time. The savings in this particular category will be about \$29,700,000.

Many projects are of the continuous type, or almost so. For example, a flood control program will provide for a series of levees which are to be built over a period of years. It is my recommendation that work in progress continue in such instances but that no new phases of such projects be started next year. If this suggestion is followed, another \$17,542,000 can be deleted from the requested appropriation.

For all the rest I am suggesting a uniform 10 per cent reduction in the request for each project, with certain specified exceptions. For example, there are several projects which contribute materially to national defense. Funds for such projects should be available for completion as soon as possible. The savings achieved by this 10% cut omitting any reductions on national defense projects will total \$50,818,000

To summarize, the Army Engineers this year are requesting \$622,000,000 to carry on their civil functions activities. On the basis of hearings and the work of Professor Brainard, I am suggesting that \$523,940,000 be recommended to the Congress. This represents a savings of \$98,060,000. A savings which, in my opinion, will in no way limit the effectiveness of the work of the Corps of Engineers.

The recommendations for cuts I shall make to the four other members of our subcommittee are economically sound and thoroughly justified. Essential work will, of course, be done; non-essential activities must wait.

* * *

VISITORS: We've had a lot of friends enjoying Washington's spring weather this week. From Grand Rapids, Carson and Lillian Snyder, Mr. and Mrs. Otto Frey, Mr. and Mrs. A. Vander Werf, Mrs. R. C. Boelkins and her son, Chuck Boelkins, Mr. and Mrs. William Karpowicz, all vacationing, and William S. Bennett here on business, as well as B. H. Anderson also here on business. Here on vacation from Holland were Mr. and Mrs. E. M. Ten Clay and Mr. and Mrs. R. H. Rewerts.



For release June 7, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

A prime example of how extravagant some departments in the federal government would like to be was illustrated in a recent speech by Senator Homer Ferguson. Frankly, the situation sounded so bad I could hardly believe it. After reading our Michigan Senator's speech I checked the facts myself and everything Senator Ferguson said was entirely accurate.

Here's the story. The State Department officials in February and March of this year presented their budget requests to the Congress. Secretary of State Acheson asked Congress for approximately 284 million for the operations of his department for the next 12 months. This is about ten million more than Congress approved for the State Department last year.

Will Secretary Acheson's department get all the money requested? Unquestionably and emphatically NO. Congress is more than a little skeptical about the activities of this branch of the federal government. Senator Ferguson's speech pointed out a good reason for this skepticism.

According to Senator Ferguson, the State Department in one item asked Congress for \$24,875 as a "lunch fund" for diplomatic visitors from other nations. In the next twelve months Secretary Acheson's department wants to have 175 luncheons for foreign dignitaries at a cost of approximately \$8.70 per plate. It must be awfully good "chow."

Here are some excerpts from the Michigan Senator's speech:

"Now let's analyze the cost of furnishing our foreign visitors with lunch, necessary services or they wouldn't be in the budget.

"As the President would have it, their absence would permit the spread of communism and hazard our defenses. In the functions designated No. 1, there would be 75 luncheons, each for 14 persons--one foreign visitor and 13 State Department emissaries--at a cost of \$125 for each luncheon or \$8.93 for each meal served.

"In function No. 2, there will be 100 luncheons, each for 18 persons--three foreign visitors and 15 State Department emissaries--at a cost of \$155 for each luncheon, or \$8.61 each meal.

"How is it possible to eat \$8 worth of food at one sitting?"

June 7, 1951

Several months ago President Truman demanded that Congress increase federal taxes about 16 billion annually. The federal taxes, those now being paid and those requested by the President, would help to pay for the "eight buck" meals.

The "lunch money" (24 thousand plus) for the State Department would take all the federal income taxes paid by 102 average American families with an income of \$4,200 annually. Will Congress approve this request by the Department of State? I repeat NO--and Senator Ferguson deserves a pat on the back for exposing the situation.

* * *

Here is some information about the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill. The President and Mr. Brannon told Congress the Department of Agriculture could well use 820 million in the next fiscal year. Last year Congress appropriated approximately 773 million for this department so you can see President Truman upped the figure about 57 million.

Did the House of Representatives cut the President's budget for the Department of Agriculture? Yes, by slightly over 100 million. The funds provided by the House will enable essential work to continue. Admittedly, there will not be enough money during the next fiscal year to carry on all the activities of the Department of Agriculture at their present level. This, however, has to be the case, for Uncle Sam at this time must exercise strict economy in each and every non-military agency.

* * *

VISITORS: Mrs. Tony Stank, Mrs. Telmon Caufield, Mrs. Charles Van Dyke of Grand Rapids. Mrs. Edward Fenske, Mrs. J. F. Burkland, Mrs. Myrtle Elderkin, Mrs. Jacob Boss, Joe Weiner, Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Masterson and their daughter, all of Grand Rapids. Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth DePree of Holland with their family.



For release June 14, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

Several weeks ago in this column I made an interim report on what my subcommittee on Appropriations might do with President Truman's budget proposal on project funds for flood control, rivers and harbors. Mr. Truman requested \$640,637,843. This subcommittee, composed of three Democrats and two Republicans, recommended \$514,427,400. In other words, we slashed over 126 million from the President's budget. This is a cut of approximately 20 per cent and the biggest percentage cut in any appropriations bill this year.

In previous years this subcommittee has been accused of being too liberal with the taxpayers' money. The committee members in the past have been condemned for so-called "pork-barrel" spending. This year a disappointed Congressman from Minnesota called our subcommittee the "stingy five." Quite frankly, this label is okay with me for we who serve on the Committee on Appropriations have a real responsibility to make certain that the taxpayers' money is spent wisely and well.

The first true test as to whether or not the subcommittee cut deeply enough came when our bill was up for approval by the full Committee on Appropriation. The five of us on the subcommittee expected some criticism from the other 45 members on the full committee. Our expectations and fears were well founded. Four individual amendments were offered to increase the expenditures for flood control and rivers and harbors. Fortunately for the taxpayers of the country the amendments were all rejected.

Many of you will wonder how the President's budget can be cut so drastically, particularly when Mr. Truman with a straight face "dared" the Congress to make any reductions. The answer is simple. The five Congressmen on the subcommittee just decided Uncle Sam's treasury couldn't afford to spend what President Truman proposed. It might interest you to know that we, over a three-month period, heard testimony from 421 witnesses. Ninety-nine per cent of the witnesses wanted us to approve greater expenditures. Despite their pleas our subcommittee sincerely felt that economy and less federal spending was a better policy.

On what basis were the cuts made in the Truman budget? First, all projects not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget were excluded. Second, all new projects, even the new ones recommended by the Bureau of the Budget were excluded. Third, practically all new segments of projects already underway were excluded. Fourth, other reductions on an individual project basis were made.



By this formula our subcommittee was able to justify a 20 per cent cut totalling over 126 million dollars. The bill still has a long legislative road to travel. It comes before the 435 members of the House this week. Undoubtedly, attempts will be made by some disappointed Congressmen and their constituents to increase the expenditures but I think we can hold the line. From the House the bill goes to the Senate where additional amendments undoubtedly will be offered to cut down our "savings." We can only hope the Senate will vote the economy line. Past history indicates the Senate is rightly called the "upper" house in the Congress inasmuch as the Senate usually increases or "ups" expenditures.

* * *

For some time I've had a pet peeve against the "plush" limousines and chauffeurs that so many federal department heads have at their disposal. Frankly, it's a disgusting situation. Senator Ferguson, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, recently found out that the federal government operates 19,888 automobiles--and this does not include cars used by the Department of Defense. Senator Douglas, Democrat of Illinois, says that the Pentagon alone has 25 limousines. The Senator also said that in Washington "there is one Under Secretary who has one for himself, uses one for his wife, and one for his kids when they come home from school for a vacation."

The federal government hires 7,052 full and part-time chauffeurs. Seems like every other automobile in Washington is a government car with a chauffeur and some big-wig bureaucrat as a passenger. A 1949 automobile, which I drive myself, or the regular Washington streetcars or buses are good enough for members of Congress. Why can't those in the Executive branch of the federal government do the same? In the months ahead, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I intend to get some answers.

* * *

VISITORS: Mr. and Mrs. C. J. Bos with Sylvia, Sue and Sally Bos, Mr. and Mrs. Jack Mitus and Mr. and Mrs. Robert D. Mitus; Robert J. McBain; Reverend Charles A. Salatka; Helen Jean McCabe; Mr. and Mrs. Irving Franson; Margaret Hansknecht; Mr. and Mrs. George Zarafonetis; Mr. and Mrs. James VerMeulen and their three children; and Mr. I. Shapiro, all of Grand Rapids.

In addition, the Byron Center High School and the Sparta High School seniors were in town.

For release June 21, 1951

YOUR WASHINGTON REVIEW
BY GERALD R. FORD, JR.

The Congress recently voted to prohibit any further American aid to other nations which continued to trade with Russia and her satellites. In other words, the House and Senate felt it wasn't good sense to help any nation with American dollars or materials if that nation continued to trade with the enemy. Congress in this law included an "escape clause" whereby the National Security Council could permit certain limited exceptions to avoid working particular hardships upon friendly nations. I can assure you it was not the intent of the Congress that this relief or "escape clause" would be used to nullify the entire law.

How has the President used this law? Mr. Truman has recently made a "blanket" use of the "escape clause." The President decided that American aid should be given to all the various nations even though these nations continue to trade with the enemy. Mr. Truman by this action has clearly circumvented the will of the Congress and the American people. This White House disregard for the legislative intent undoubtedly will lead to more stringent restrictions in future laws.

Naturally I disagree with the decision of the President to continue American aid and assistance to all nations even though these nations send materials to Russia and other Communist countries. In addition, I strongly disagree with the general trend in recent years whereby the Executive Branch of the federal government nullifies or thwarts the acts of the Congress and the decisions of the Courts. There are many examples of this, perhaps the worst being President Truman's impounding of funds Congress appropriated for a 70 group air force. To refresh your memories, Congress several years ago appropriated almost a billion dollars to build up a 70 group air force. The President simply directed that these funds should not be spent and as a result the Air Force was not up to essential strength when the Korean War broke out.

Some folks will contend that no real harm is done by the President overriding the clear directives of Congress. Such an attitude is extremely dangerous for every time the President thwarts the will of the 531 Members of Congress there is another precedent which some future President can use for his own personal gain. Conceivably twenty years from now some occupant of the White House might decide that all power and authority should be in his hands and none in the Congress or the federal courts. This would be un-American and certainly against the best interests of all our citizens.



What can be done to prevent this usurpation of constitutional Congressional rights by the President? As a Member of Congress I intend to fight for the traditional concepts of our tripartite system of government. America grew strong under a balanced form of government. Our Nation will continue strong only if the Executive, Legislative and Judicial branches of the government work as a team. The domination of one over the others will inevitably lead to dire results. Our citizens should be cognizant of what the President has done for our liberties can be lost if we are not alert.

* * * * *

The testimony of Secretary of State Dean Acheson that no officials in the State Department ever wrote off the Chinese Communists as mere "agrarian reformers" has been branded a lie by John C. Caldwell, former State Department attache at the United States Embassy in Seoul, Korea. In a speech June 14 at St. Louis, Caldwell, a veteran of eight years in Far Eastern diplomatic service, said that Acheson "is simply not stating the truth."

The former State Department official said: "All through 1944 to 1947 everyone of us in the Department of State was subjected to indoctrination as to the fact that the Chinese Communists were not really communists and that if we were patient long enough we would find a way to get along with Far Eastern communism."

Caldwell, a life-long Democrat, said he was asked to prepare a report in 1946 on communist propaganda methods in China. He then said: "My report was a revealing document, showing the full scope of anti-American bias, apparent in every medium used by the communists and their propaganda. Even though I was ordered to make the study, I was severely reprimanded for doing so when the full nature of my report was known to Washington. Caldwell's 1946 report on communist propaganda leaked to the press and as a result he was asked to resign his post. He quit in 1947, later rejoined the Department and resigned again in 1948.

* * * * *

VISITORS: There were a good many representatives of Michigan Postal Employee groups here for a conference this week. Among those from this group who stopped in the office were Frank Clark, Fred Van Eck, Fred van Hartesveldt, A.E. Harret, Floyd A. Thornton, M. L. Herlein, L. B. Hoogerhyde, Ed Sargent, T.W. Tanner, Herman Hoogerhyde, J.W. Townshend, G.H. Lindberg, Wm. J. Plaubinger, all of Grand Rapids. Mr. and Mrs. Fred Tanner and Mr. and Mrs. John Iberhof from Grand Rapids were here vacationing. Silas F. Albert, MacGregor G. Scott and Robert Lynn, all of Grand Rapids, were also in the Capital.