CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

SEPTEMBER 28 (legislative day, SEPTEMBER 19), 1951.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. LODGE (for Mr. WHERRY), from the Committee on Rules and Administration, submitted the following REPORT together with the INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. HAYDEN

[To accompany S. Con. Res. 27]

The Committee on Rules and Administration, to whom was referred the resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) providing for a consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the resolution be passed.

The resolution follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the 'Consolidated General Appropriation Act of ' (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private Acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

(ii) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the
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respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such contract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private Acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

“(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

“(A) the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

“(B) estimates of the amounts to be transferred between such appropriations;

“(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from each appropriation referred to in clause (A);

“(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in such fiscal year from the balances of prior appropriations;

“(E) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C) and (D); and

“(F) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of such fiscal year from the appropriations referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during such fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

“(4) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and any conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, for each wholly owned Government corporation or other agency of the Government which is authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury of the United States and which uses a checking account maintained with the Treasurer of the United States for that purpose (A) the estimated expenditures (other than retirement of borrowing) to be made out of such checking account for the fiscal year, (B) the estimated receipts (other than borrowing) to be deposited in such checking account for such fiscal year, and (C) the difference between (A) and (B).

“(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

“(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

“(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

“(d) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized when requested by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives to transmit to said chairman, as soon as possible, a current estimate of the over-all Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year.”

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) was introduced on April 17, 1951, by Senator Byrd for himself and Mr. Gillette, Mr. O’Connor, Mr. Wherry, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Butler of Nebraska, Mr. Ferguson, Mr. Knowland, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Bricker, Mr. Butler of Maryland, Mr. Cain, Mr. Capehart, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Clements, Mr. Cordon, Mr. Dirkson, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Duff, Mr. Ecton, Mr. Flanders, Mr. Hendrickson, Mr. Hennings, Mr. Hunt, Mr. Ives, Mr. Jenner, Mr. Johnson of Colorado, Mr. Kem, Mr. Lodge, Mr. Martin, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Robertson, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Schoeppel, Mr. Smathers, Mrs. Smith of Maine, Mr. Smith of New Jersey, Mr. Smith of North Carolina, Mr. Taft, Mr. Thye,
Mr. Tobey, Mr. Welker, Mr. Wiley, Mr. Williams, Mr. Young, and Mr. Malone.

The general purposes of the resolution are—

(a) To consolidate all regular annual appropriations into one regular annual appropriations bill;

(b) To limit the amounts of obligations under multiple-year appropriations during each fiscal year; and

(c) To provide pertinent information for the Congress, showing the estimated effect on expenditures of the obligational authority provided by appropriations for each fiscal year. Information also would be provided for appropriations made in prior years, appropriations made available for more than one fiscal year, and authority for the use of receipts.

In more detail, this concurrent resolution would amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, effective on the first day of the second regular session of the Eighty-second Congress. It would require a consolidated general appropriation bill covering all appropriations for each fiscal year, except deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations, and divided into separate titles corresponding so far as practicable to regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted.

The resolution directs that with certain specified exceptions each consolidated general appropriation bill and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during each fiscal year shall set limitations on the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of appropriations available for obligation beyond the close of the year. It further directs that each consolidated general appropriation bill limit the net amounts to be obligated during the fiscal year from prior appropriations available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. The required limitations are not to be construed as prohibiting contracts otherwise authorized, provided the value of property delivered or services rendered during the fiscal year is not in excess of applicable limitations on obligations.

The resolution would require committee reports, including conference reports, accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, to show in tabular form pertinent information as to the amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations; estimates of amounts to be transferred between appropriations; estimates of the net amount to be expended during the fiscal year from each appropriation and from the balances of prior appropriations; and estimates of the total amount available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year. Committee and conference reports accompanying deficiency and supplemental appropriation bills and appropriation rescission bills would be required to include cumulative revisions of the tables.

Information would also be required in committee reports as to the estimated expenditures, other than retirement or borrowing, to be made out of checking accounts of Government corporations or other agencies authorized to receive and expend receipts without covering such receipts into the Treasury, estimated receipts, other than borrowing, to be deposited into such checking accounts, and the net
difference between receipts and expenditures. Appropriations of trust funds and transactions involving public debt retirement would be exempt from the limitations and informational requirements of the resolution.

Other provisions of the resolution would authorize the Appropriations Committee to hold simultaneous or joint hearings on general appropriation bills and would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, when requested by the chairman of either the House or Senate Appropriations Committee, to transmit a current estimate of the overall Federal receipts for the ensuing fiscal year.

The idea of a consolidated appropriation bill has been advanced twice before, and actually tried in one session of the Eighty-first Congress.

In 1947, on March 24, May 1, and June 24, hearings were held on Senate Concurrent Resolution 6 providing for a consolidated appropriation bill. This resolution was unanimously approved by the Committee on Rules and Administration and put on the Senate Calendar, but was never acted upon.

In 1949 the idea was again advanced in the form of Senate Concurrent Resolution 18. Hearings were held on this measure by this committee on May 23 and May 26, 1949. The committee reported the resolution to the Senate, which approved it on September 27, 1949, but no action was taken on it in the House of Representatives.

Meanwhile the House, in 1950, on the initiative of its Committee on Appropriations, had taken up the one-package idea, and there had been introduced in that chamber the bill (H. R. 7786) entitled "The General Appropriations Act" which carried all the general appropriations of all the agencies and departments in one package. This measure came to the Senate on May 11, 1950, and was passed on August 4, 1950. The President signed the bill on September 6, 1950.

When the same idea was proposed as an act of the House Committee on Appropriations, however, in this session of Congress, it was rejected by a vote of the committee. Nonetheless the majority of this committee believes that one more trial, at least, should be had on the omnibus appropriation bill. This belief is based in substantial part upon the conviction that a single-package bill will mean substantial reductions in appropriations.

This concurrent resolution, if adopted, also will add vastly to the information to both branches of Congress on governmental expenditure. It will make it impossible for the House Appropriations Committee to change the procedure of appropriation from year to year. Under its provisions limitations on obligations against current appropriations along with those being carried over from prior years would be written into one appropriation bill. That part of those appropriations which would be carried over for obligation in later years would be shown in committee reports. Thus, this bill would show what part of the appropriation made in one year would be expended in the next year or subsequent years thereto, and likewise what expenditures would be made in this current fiscal year from appropriations of prior years.

Since this Government is now running on a cash basis of receipts and expenditures, no provisions for obligations are made to take care of obligations which have to be met in the next fiscal year. Hence, this resolution would make one general appropriation bill show what
moneys would be spent in future fiscal years, together with what expenditures were carried over from previous appropriations. In this way it would be possible to get an expenditure budget in comparable comparison to revenue receipts and a better idea whether the Government is operating with a surplus in the year to come or with a deficit.

As drafted, the concurrent resolution does not do away with contractual obligations, but would provide a limitation on the amount of cash that may be spent against any contractual obligation within any particular fiscal year.

This concurrent resolution will provide a limitation on how much may be spent in a particular year so that any appropriation bill can be put on an expenditure, rather than an appropriative, basis. There are many expenditures carried over from previous appropriation bills not included in a succeeding fiscal year but under this resolution a consolidated appropriation bill will set them forth as separate items.

Congress has difficulty in determining actual expenditures even after such detailed studies as those made by the Bureau of the Budget have been made. Budget studies by the Bureau begin many months in advance and the actual figures arrived at in the President's message in January may have changed within the months consumed to prepare them. Congress, therefore, has a right to know more of what to expect in the way of actual expenditures than of intended expenditures. This consolidated appropriation bill will show just that. For this reason paragraph (b), page 5, of the resolution is a direction upon the two committees to get up-to-date estimates from time to time.

It may be very burdensome to operate on a pay-as-you-go basis, but it will at least hold down expenditures to that point where the people being apprised of Government expenditures and experiencing increased taxation will ultimately demand that excessive spending be reduced. This is the only salvation for this Government in the future.

It is one method, also, whereby public attention may be focused on the total impact of general appropriations requested of and made by the Congress for the support of the Government during any certain fiscal year.

Under the bill, committee reports on the consolidated general appropriation bill will show, in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals:

(a) The amount of each appropriation, including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations—we have three or four different kinds of appropriations, as you know.
(b) Estimates of amounts to be transferred between appropriations—that is quite important. The President has the right, as the chairman knows, to transfer.
(c) Estimates of amounts to be expended from each of the appropriation items.
(d) Estimates of amounts to be expended from balances brought over from prior appropriations, which is a very considerable item each year.
(e) Total expenditures from all sources; and
(f) Estimates of amounts to be carried over for expenditure in later years.

We make an appropriation this year and frequently it is not spent for probably 1 or 2 years.

Committee reports accompanying deficiency, supplemental, and rescission bills, along with reports from conference committees, would include appropriate cumulative revisions in the tabulations in the report on the consolidated bill.

Under paragraph 4 on page 4 the bill sets forth the manner in which receipts and expenditures of Government corporations and those from Treasury checking accounts should be shown in the committee reports tabulations.
Paragraph (d) on page 5 authorizes the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee to request the Secretary of the Treasury to transmit current estimates of over-all Federal receipts for the coming year to be covered by the appropriation bill. This in itself, if used sympathetically and realistically, would be a tremendous step in the direction of balanced budgets. At least we will know with more definiteness and certainty when we pass appropriation bills whether we are going into deficit spending or not.

(The foregoing quote is from the transcript of Senator Byrd's appearance in this connection before the Rules and Administration Committee.)
INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF MR. HAYDEN

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATION BILL

STATEMENT

A consolidated general appropriation bill was again tried last year, during the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, as a legislative procedure, after a lapse of more than a century.

The bill proved to be bulky, unmanageable, and impracticable. Originating in the House of Representatives, it placed legislative burdens on both branches of Congress which became intolerable. That the House of Representatives, itself, was discouraged with the idea was conclusively shown by a vote taken last January in its Committee on Appropriations. At that time a motion was presented to again consolidate all the supply bills into one as a policy of that committee to be accepted by the House. The motion, according to newspaper reports, was rejected, 31 nays to 18 yeas, and the House has since sent the customary separate appropriation bills to the Senate. Hon. Sam Rayburn, of Texas, Speaker of the House of Representatives, has stated:

"I was opposed to this method of appropriating funds from the beginning but many of our friends wanted to give it a try. After what has happened in the last Congress, I am more convinced than ever that it was a mistake."

As will appear in the statements by other members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, there are numerous valid objections to a consolidated appropriation bill, in all of which I concur. Two considerations appear to me to be of particular importance.

1. **Evasion of congressional responsibility**

For lack of time toward the close of a session of Congress, the Senate cannot give as careful consideration to the details of one large appropriation bill as has been customary when separate bills are received from the House of Representatives in the earlier months of the year. Blanket reductions or percentage cuts are therefore proposed, the effect of which is to transfer responsibility from the Congress, where it belongs, to the heads of departments or agencies who can pick and choose as to what authorized activities shall be retarded or abandoned. Senators and Representatives thereby concede either that they do not have the ability or lack the courage to bring about specific reductions in expenditures.

If it becomes a practice for Congress to make across-the-board reductions in annual budget estimates, the departments and Federal agencies will be under temptation to pad their requests for funds in anticipation of such "meat ax" cuts.
2. Presidential veto

The consolidated appropriation bill opens the way to legislative riders being attached to it, and consequently to the threat of a Presidential veto to overcome such riders.

A veto, if sustained, would result in great confusion, coming, as it must, toward the end of a session of Congress when amendments to any and all parts of the consolidated bill, when reintroduced, would be in order.

OBJECTIONS BASED UPON EXPERIENCE

Based upon their actual experience last year, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and the chairmen of all of the subcommittees of that committee are opposed to the enactment of Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, as is shown by the following extracts from statements by each of them which appear in the printed hearings:

KENNETH MCKELLAR, a Senator from Tennessee, chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and chairman of the Subcommittee on Army Civil Functions:

"1. 'Complete picture of appropriations' a misnomer

"The comment is made that by the one-package bill the Congress and the public can have a complete picture of the amount of appropriations and expenditures.

"Last year, the one-package bill for 1951 was enacted into law by September 6, providing about $34 billion, of which 4 billion for foreign aid was added by the Senate. Immediately behind it, the first supplemental for 1951 was enacted into law on September 27, providing for 17 billion, and then before the session adjourned in December the second supplemental for 1951 was passed, providing for almost 20 billion additional. Then in this year, the third supplemental for 1951 and the fourth supplemental for 1951 were enacted in May and June, providing for 400 million and for over 6 billion additional. Therefore, the one-package bill for 1951 gave the Congress and the public a picture, not of 100 percent of the 1951 funds, but actually of only 43 percent of those funds.

"The fact is that, particularly under present-day conditions, it is impossible to have all of the appropriations required during a fiscal year in one package.

"2. Unequal consideration by committees of House and Senate

"In order to report the one-package bill for 1951 by March 21, the House began hearings early in January and divided its committee membership into subcommittees of five, so that they could hold nine meetings simultaneously. Attendance of committee members at the hearings was assured, since that is the sole committee function of each of the members.

"The one-package bill was passed by the House on May 10 and was reported to the Senate on July 8. In the intervening 8 weeks the Senate committee had to complete hearings by all of its subcommittees on all chapters of the bill, consider and mark up the individual chapters, and have them approved by the full committee. There were many complaints by Senators that they had notices of four subcommittees meetings simultaneously, and the usual result was that the subcommittee chair-
man on each chapter held most of his hearings alone, or with intermittent attendance by two or three of his subcommittee members. Some of the subcommittees tried to meet the situation by holding portions of their hearings before the House bill was reported, but the action on the mark-up and approval by the full committee must necessarily await the passage of the House bill.

"3. Timing of appropriation bills

"Last year the one-package bill for 1951 funds was reported to the House on March 21, passed the House on May 10, reported to the Senate on July 8, passed the Senate on August 4, and was approved by the President on September 6.

"Comparing the dates with prior years, the 1946 bills were all enacted by July 3, the 1947 bills were all enacted by July 26, the 1948 bills were all enacted by July 31, and the 1949 bills were all enacted by June 30. In the year before the one-package bill, the 1950 bills were all enacted by September 6 except for Interior, civil functions, and military. And this year, all 1952 bills have been enacted except for civil functions, legislative, defense, and State-Justice-Commerce-Judiciary, and two of these are awaiting appointment of conferees by the House.

"4. Availability of Senators for appropriation meetings

"The time of the regular members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is not completely available for the business of the committee at all times, as is the case with members of the House committee. Included among the regular members of the Senate committee are the President pro tempore of the Senate, the minority leader of the Senate, 9 chairmen out of the 15 standing committees, 2 ranking minority members of standing committees, and the balance of the regular membership holding important positions of lesser seniority on standing committees of the Senate. Also, among the ex officio members of the committee are two chairmen and two ranking minority members of other standing committees. While the wide scope of this representation of the business of the Senate is of the utmost value to the committee in its work, the time consumed by their duties on legislative committees serves to greatly shorten the time available to members for attending hearings and considering and deciding upon individual items of appropriations. While an appropriation bill is passing through the procedure from subcommittee to full committee to floor consideration and adjusting differences in the conference committee with the House, there is constant conflict in the times and dates set for the various meetings required. In addition, since each member of the committee is a member of four or five subcommittees, Senators can never find the time necessary to spread their attendance over all of the meetings it is necessary to schedule.

"5. Delay in providing needed funds

"In the cumbersome and unwieldy procedure of the one-package bill, it is necessary to plow through the hundreds of pages of such a bill and complete the action on the whole bill before the required
funds would be available for any part of the operation of the Government, no matter how important the function may be and no matter how urgent may be the need for such funds.

"In addition, if there should be a deadlock in the conference with the House on any part of the bill, the entire bill must suffer the delay, regardless of the importance of the other portions of the bill which could otherwise become law without such delay. Conceivably, a powerful bloc could indefinitely tie up all the funds of Government in order to force an issue which might affect the funds of only one agency.

"The delay incident to the one-package bill also becomes extremely important in connection with an item which is so urgently required that the funds are made immediately available on the passage of the bill.

"6. Comprehensive score of estimates and appropriations available

"The comment is made in support of the one-package bill that Congress never has any comprehensive idea of the total score of its money measures until the last bill is passed.

"As a matter of fact, the comprehensive tables submitted with the President's budget in January of each year give a clear picture of the estimates of appropriations, expenditures, and receipts, and even an estimate of the surplus or deficit; and all of the work of the Committees on Appropriations and on revenues are directly related to that January budget submission. Every item in every appropriation bill is 'scored' on the basis of how much it is below the budget estimates, and every consideration by the Congress ties directly back to the proportion each item bears to the total budget and to the estimated deficit.

"The figures on the progress and the 'scoring' of appropriations in relation to the estimates is always available in the committees. In fact, the Congressional Digest now carries a summary table at the end of each month, which is obtained from committee data and printed in the Congressional Record, showing the relation of appropriations to estimates for each bill, and how much each bill has reduced the estimates."

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, a Senator from Georgia, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Agriculture:

"The principal argument of the proponents of the bill that it will promote economy is, I think, disproved by the facts and by experience. In dollars and cents I daresay we have reduced the appropriations more for the fiscal year of 1952 under the separate bill idea than was done in the one-package bill for the year 1951.

"The principal extravagance of the one-package bill, however, is the waste and inefficiency it promotes in Government. Under the one-package plan, not a single agency, bureau, or activity of Government can definitely plan its work until the President has signed the one-package measure. Under normal circumstances, all but one or two of the departmental bills are cleared by the beginning of the fiscal year, or the 1st of July. The agencies affected by the appropriations know exactly what the Congress proposes for them to do and can set about their work. We will indeed be fortunate if we can ever get a one-package bill to the
President before the middle of September. This means that not a single agency of Government whose appropriations are in controversy can really plan its work for the fiscal year before that time. For more than 2½ months the departments are marking time at very wasteful expense without knowing definitely what the Congress proposes for them to do.

"Experience teaches us that the appropriations for public works and for foreign aid usually cause more controversy than any others. Consequently, they are the last to be agreed upon in the Congress. There can be no earthly excuse for permitting delay on these measures to cause the state of wasteful confusion and uncertainty for 2½ months in all of the other activities of the Federal Government. By way of illustration: Why should vital research work in the Department of Agriculture, or the nature and scope of the farm program for the next year in that Department be delayed for 2 or 3 months while the Congress debates whether or not we will build a certain dam?"

"It is my considered opinion as a result of my service upon the Committee on Appropriations during my tenure in the Senate, that appropriations will be more carefully considered and more dollar-and-cent economies effected under the separate-bill theory. I know that the separate bills make for much greater efficiency and economy in the expenditure of the appropriations finally voted. Millions of dollars are practically wasted by causing those agencies affected by 9 or 10 appropriations bills to mark time until the Congress agrees upon highly controversial items which should be in a tenth or eleventh separate bill."

Pat McCarran, a Senator from Nevada, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary:

"The basic argument that is advanced for having a 'one-package' bill is that it will show Congress in one bill what they will be called on to appropriate, and that as a result great savings can be made. The proponents argue that the 'one-package' bill will force the Congress to make savings, whereas when appropriations are carried in a number of bills, such is impossible. With this basic concept in mind, following are the reasons why I do not look with favor on this proposal:

"I contend that the omnibus appropriation bill will not accomplish its primary purpose of making it easier to economize in governmental expenditures. Economy is an attitude which takes an act of will to place into operation. The final decision must be made by the respective Members of the Congress as to each item of appropriations, taking into account any or all of the facts that each Member wishes to consider in regard to a particular item. After a review of all of the facts, each Member must then reach a decision as to whether he individually favors a reduction, an increase, or the budget estimate. I submit that in arriving at this decision the Member is not influenced in the least by the fact that all of the appropriations are in one bill, any more than he would be if the appropriation bills were printed on yellow paper."
"The Senate is not set up to handle efficiently an omnibus appropriation bill. There are too few Senators for subcommittees; therefore they cannot handle the various chapters simultaneously, as is done in the House. In addition, many Senators on the Appropriations Committee are also chairmen of other major legislative committees. While this is extremely valuable to the Appropriations Committee, it does constitute an additional drain on the time of individual Senators. These factors become important when viewed in relation to the timing involved as to when the omnibus bill is received from the House and the subsequent period allowed for consideration by the Senate.

"The omnibus bill lends itself to across-the-board cuts, a system with which I very much disagree. I strongly believe that each individual item should be considered on its merits and a separate decision arrived at for that particular item. This is a system which the Subcommittee for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary has followed, since I have been chairman of that subcommittee. I believe that the system has worked very well, that economies have been made, and that at the same time each item has received full and fair consideration.

"As you know, the omnibus bill last year contained a section wherein authority was delegated to the Bureau of the Budget to assess a $550,000,000 cut. Part of this cut was placed against hospital construction, and there was an immediate protest from Congress that it should not have been placed against that item, but against some other item. I submit that Congress should have made the cuts in the first place.

"The omnibus bill system puts before the Appropriations Committee and before the Senate a bill which contains so many varied items that it is impossible to digest these items intelligently. Senators who are not members of the Appropriations Committee find it impossible to give adequate and full consideration to all the many appropriation items in the omnibus bill, when it reaches the floor for debate. The pressure to secure passage of the bill at the late date it is presented is tremendous.

"I strongly favor economy in government and favor curtailing appropriation requests wherever it is possible. However, I also strongly believe that before any cuts are made, fair and adequate consideration should be given to each request. Then an individual decision should be made on each item as to whether a change in the item is necessary. If enough Members of Congress feel the same way about the item, the change should then be made by the Congress.

"I again stress the point that economy is an act of will. Orderly procedure is necessary so that an intelligent decision may be reached. However, no procedure will substitute for the ultimate decision that must be made; the most that any procedure can do is to make the facts more readily available. The omnibus bill, as a method of procedure, does not, in my opinion, make the facts more readily available. It tends to confuse the issues involved. If the Congress is ever to achieve intelligent economy, each individual Member must arrive at his individual decision that a reduction is what he will support. This decision must be based on the
merits of the issue involved; it cannot be based on the procedure used in arriving at the facts with which to make the decision."

Joseph C. O'Mahoney, a Senator from Wyoming, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Armed Services:

"In response to your request for an opinion on the relative merits of the so-called one-package appropriation bill as compared with several different bills for departments and agencies, it is my frank opinion that the latter method is by far the better. "It is not only easier for the Appropriations Committee as a whole, but it is easier for the subcommittees charged with the responsibility of the various appropriations categories. More important, however, it seems to me to be decidedly in the public interest because it makes it possible for Congress to pass at least some of the bills before the beginning of the fiscal year, and thus eliminates dependence upon continuing resolutions. The latter device, it seems to me, is not economical because it results in authorizing the departments affected to use appropriated funds without the detailed scrutiny to which they should be subjected. "When we have a one-package bill, every department must wait for its funds until all the chapters of the single package have cleared. "As you know, the Armed Forces bill did not pass the House until August 9. Fortunately, our subcommittee began hearings on June 7. Although the Senate passed the bill on September 13, the House is not yet ready to go to conference, and we have not had final action upon the defense bill. Under the one-package system all of the departments would still be waiting for their bills, and would be operating under continuing resolutions. "It seems to me there is no economy in going back to the one-package system."

Dennis Chavez, a Senator from New Mexico, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency:

"From my experience I would say that more thought can be given to appropriation bills when they are considered by the individual departments. That has been the procedure with the exception of 1 year when we handled it all in one package. Subcommittees of the different departments would hold their hearings, but eventually had to wait until the House finally acted on the one-package bill. "In my opinion, the one-package bill makes for delay, indifference, lack of thought and attention."

Burnet R. Maybank, a Senator from South Carolina, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Independent Offices:

"I feel as Senator Byrd that we should reduce expenditures to the minimum, but we had the single appropriation bill some years ago. I voted for it, but it proved to be totally useless from a practical standpoint because only the old-line Government agencies were included in the bill. Foreign aid and ECA were exempted and, of course, all deficiency bills. More than 80 percent of the Government spending goes for past wars and future wars
and the Appropriations Committee has cut to the bone the old-line departments.

"You cannot reduce the interest on the debt, and unless you repeal the law passed by the Congress you cannot materially curtail the Veterans' Administration. The Atomic Energy Commission and the stockpiling program, together with the Veterans, take up as much money as all of the other bills. Then when you add to this the appropriations for the armed services, everyone on the Appropriations Committee realizes that this is where the real money goes. The single appropriation bill saved no money but created greater debt with the supplements that followed."

ALLEN J. ELLENDER, a Senator from Louisiana, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of the Government:

"The plan is impractical. I don't see how it would be possible for each Senator on the Appropriations Committee to study in detail the appropriations for the various departments of Government. The subcommittee procedure places the responsibility for studying and reporting appropriations for a particular department in the hands of a few Senators who make a study of all the details of the appropriations under their jurisdiction. You will recall that the omnibus appropriation bill we experimented with during the last session of Congress could not be handled as a whole, but we had to resort to the subcommittee method previously in effect. As a matter of fact, the work grew cumbersome, particularly when it became necessary to have conferences to iron out differences between the two Houses. Many Senators served as conferees on titles of the omnibus bill with which they were not acquainted, and those who actually made the study were oftentimes left off.

"It is certainly not a time-saver. I believe rather that it is time consuming. All bills do not require the same length of time for hearings. The ones entailing the longest hearings will retard the passage of those that are ready for action by the Senate."

LISTER HILL, a Senator from Alabama, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia:

"I have served on the Senate Appropriations Committee when the committee has had the single-package bill and when the committee has had the separate bills. My experience on the committee convinces me that the committee can function more intelligently and more effectively in behalf of economy and wise expenditures with the separate bills.

"From the standpoint of our Government, its efficiency and economic operation, I hope there will be no return to the single-package bill."

HARLEY M. KILGORE, a Senator from West Virginia, and chairman of the Subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office Departments:

"The consolidation of all appropriations into one appropriations act, whatever the theoretical arguments in favor of it, is in actual operation a wholly impractical, unwieldy, cumbersome, inefficient, and unbusinesslike method of handling appropriations.
"As a member of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman this year of the subcommittee handling the appropriations for the Treasury Department and the Post Office, I have had an opportunity to compare at first hand the two methods. The inadequacies of the so-called one-package appropriation became glaringly obvious last year.

"The one-package approach provides a far less adequate way of determining the real needs of the departments and agencies of the Government, and makes the achievement of proper economies in governmental operations correspondingly difficult.

"I hope that the lessons which were painfully learned with the one-package approach last year will not be ignored."

The following report on Senate Concurrent Resolution 27 was submitted by the Director of the Budget which suggests that prior to the adoption of the resolution the President should be authorized to veto items in any consolidated appropriation bill:

**EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,**
**BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,**
**Washington 25, D. C., July 12, 1951.**

HON. CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HAYDEN: This is in reply to your letter of June 1, 1951, in which you request an expression of our views on Senate Concurrent Resolution 27. This resolution would amend the joint rules of the Congress to provide for a consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, to require that appropriation bills contain certain provisions to limit obligations, to require that committee reports accompanying appropriation bills contain certain tabulations of expenditure estimates, and to make certain other changes in the rules.

I see no particular technical problems involved in the draft resolution. The basic question, however, is one difficulty which I have pointed out to the committee earlier on similar resolutions; namely, the fact that a single appropriation bill magnifies the problem of legislative riders on appropriation acts. In the report of the committee on a prior resolution dealing with the consolidated appropriation bill, this problem apparently was recognized; as was the obvious solution; that is, the granting of an item veto to the President. The experience with the consolidated appropriation bill last year strengthens my belief that a single appropriation bill is fertile ground for the inclusion of legislative riders despite provision in the current Senate and House rules relating to legislation in appropriation bills.

It seems to me, therefore, that from the Executive point of view it would be better to first provide for the item veto before action is taken to consolidate appropriations into one bill.

Sincerely yours,

F. J. LAWTON, Director.

The Senator from Wyoming, Mr. HUNT, on July 7, 1949, in reporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 18 of the Eighty-first Congress, which is identical with Senate Concurrent Resolution 27, indicated the need for an item veto, but the bill which he and the Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Lodge, then joined in introducing (S. 2161), merely authorized the President to impound sums of appropriated money, the expenditure of which he determines is not in the public interest, but granted to the President no authority to disapprove legislation attached to an appropriation bill.

In his report the Senator from Wyoming stated:

During the course of the hearings, the committee had before it for consideration a draft of proposed legislation which would permit the President, upon his finding and determination that the expenditure of any single item of appropriation, or
any portion of an item, in a consolidated general appropriation bill is not in the public interest, so to notify the official of the Government in whom the authority to make such expenditure is vested. Upon receipt of such notification, the amount specified in such finding and determination immediately would be covered into the Treasury and would be unavailable for expenditure or obligation unless subsequently reappropriated by the Congress, in which event the President would be without authority to find and determine that this reappropriated money is not in the public interest. Legislation of this type would avoid the constitutional question which is an inevitable part of any discussion on the granting of the item veto power to the President.

CARL HAYDEN.