Richard Briggs Haskell
Wallace Howard Hastings, Jr.
Robert Everett Hatton
Warren Joseph Hayford IV
Donald Edwin Hegberg
Lewis Joshua Henderson
Joe Don Hendrickson
John Richard Hermann, Jr.
John Adams Hettinger, Jr.
John George Hill
Thomas Robert Hill
Howell Linson Hodgskin, Jr.
Charles Arthur Hoenstine, Jr.
Daniel Howe Hoge, Jr.
William Bamford Holden
Herbert Charles Hollander
Owen Cobb Holleran, Jr.
Robert Sylvester Holmes
Winfield Andrew Holt
Edwin Patrick Horan, Jr.
William Lawton Horn
Max L. Howard
Samuel John Hubbard
Robert Neal Hulley
Graham Lacy Humble
Richard George Inman
Orville Friend Ireland, Jr.
Arthur Gerard Jackson
Carroll Valentine Jackson
Joseph Newton Jaggers, Jr.
Edward Joseph Jelen II
Howard Charles Jelinek
Raymond Carl Jess
Wesley Gale Jones
Joseph Leonard Jordan
Michael Pettiss Juvenal
John Bernard Keeley
John Francis Carley Kenney, Jr.
Birtrun Singleton Kidwell, Jr.
Homer Watson Kiefer, Jr.
Thomas Aquinas Kiernan
Robert Gene Kimmel
Ivan Ward King
Peter Cotterill King
Jack Carl Kleberg
Daniel Burnett Knight, Jr.
O'Ferrall Knight, Jr.
Kent Goodwin Knutson
Karl George Koenig, Jr.
Robert Louis Korchek
Stanley J. Kuick
Richard Francis Lamb
Harold Raymond Lamp
Edward Eugene Lane
Richard Neil Lang
Richard Xavier Larkin
Raymond Ellwood Lash
Donald Rex Lasher
Alfred Francis Lawrence, Jr.
Robert Wesley Leach
James Bracken Lee
William Thomas Leggett, Jr.
James Francis Lehan, Jr.
Albert Carter Lehman
Leo Hugh Lennon
John Joseph Lentz
Neal Anthony Lespasio
John Hiram Lewis III
Leon Eugene Lichtenwalter, Jr.
Kennis Earl Lockard, Jr.
Albert Ingwer Lorenzen, Jr.
Henry Ingold Lowder
Jay Earl Luther
James McGehee Lynch
David Kenneth Lyon
George Lindsay MacGarrigle, Jr.
Paul Bernard Malone III
James Watt Maloney
David Henry Martin, Jr.
John Craig Mauer
James Laurence McAndie
Edgar Byrd McClung
Robert McCrindle
James Edward McDonnell
Robert Samuel McGarry
Robert Silber McGowan
Clarence Edward McKnight, Jr.
Daniel Peter McMahon
Ivan R. Mechtly, Jr.
Charles Evans Meikle
Henry Richard Meyer
James Arthur Michel
Larry Scott Mickel
George William Miller
Richard Joseph Miller
John Michael Misch
Corwin Anderson Mitchell
William Lemuel Mitchell, Jr.
Richard Davis Moore
William Charles Moore
Otis Augustus Moran, Jr.
Robert Lincoln Morgan
Louis Francis Morin
Henry Goldsborough Mosely
James Walter Mueller
Denis Francis Mullane
William Albert Myers
Thomas Walker Nelson
Stephen Edward Nichols
Donald Arthur Nixon
Ronald Marvin Obach
Warren Stark O'Sullivan
Thomas Daniel Pace
Donald Vance Pafford
Glenn Hunter Palmer, Jr.
Joseph Richard Paluh
Walter Gray Parks
Stewart Paterson, Jr.
John DeWitt Pelton
Freeman Luke Pendleton
Harvey Herbert Perritt, Jr.
Harold Kingston Peters
James Mitchell Peterson
James Stratton Pettit II
Robert Peter Pfeil
Martin Darrow Phillips
Phillip Bruce Pickering
Dayton Stanley Pickett
Jack Richard Pilk
David Frederick Piske
Lawrence Haynes Putnam
John Thomas Quinn
William Russell Raiford
Charles Norman Rainey
Louis Joseph Rajchel, Jr.
Richard Byrd Ray
James Benny Reaves
Franklin Lawrence Reeder
Thomas Arthur Rehm
William Francis Reilly
Edmund Joseph Reinhalter
George Robert Relyea
Loyd Perkins Rhiddlehoover, Jr.
Everett Dalton Richards
Robert Shean Riley
James Henry Rink
William Howard Ritter
Frank Eugene Robinson
James Abel Rodrigues
Richard Joseph Rogers
Harry McKenzie Roper, Jr.
Donald Hilton Ross
Wilbur Allen Ross
Clarence Gerald Ruff
Lawrence Russell III
Robert Lewis Russell
Richard James Russomano
John William Sadler
Joseph Francis Santilli, Jr.
Herbert Yale Schandler
William Samuel Schroeder
Gilbert Theodore Scott
Robert Louis Sears
William Joseph Seaver, Jr.
Timothy Metz Seebach
Charles Elmer Sell, Jr.
Clyde Andrew Selleck, Jr.
Donald Eugene Sells
Richard Thomas Shea, Jr.
Scott Hugh Shipe, Jr.
John Willard Shy
Douglas Alan Slingerland
Leonard Andrew Sluga
Frank Barry Smith
John Dexter Smith
William Paul Snyder
Warren A. Spaulding
Ashley Cobb Speir, Jr.
James Monroe Spell, Jr.
William Hartwell Spencer, Jr.
Richard Elmer Stanier
Arthur Rowland Stebbins
Charles Sanford Steen, Jr.
Frederick Atherton Stevens, Jr.
Eugene James Stokes, Jr.
Albert Newton Stubblebine III
John Joseph Sullivan
Milton Dorhan Sullivan
Thoralf Mauritz Sundt, Jr.
Kermit Dale Swanson
Donald Richard Swygert
Cecil Ray Sykes
Norbert Joseph Szymczyk
Arthur Eugene Taylor, Jr.
Raymond Joseph Tensfeldt
Alfred Lawrence Thieme
Reynold Thomas, J .
Edmund Albin Thompson
Edmund Randall Thompson
Robert Simpson Tickle
John Harding Tipton, Jr.
Adalbert Edward Toepel, Jr.
Louis Vincent Tomasetti
James Lyons Tow
George Marion Tronsrue, Jr.
Robert Harold Truax
James Justice Turner
Robert Clayton Turner
Walter Francis Ulmer, Jr.
George Robert Underhill
Edwin Joseph Upton
Harry Leslie Van Trees, Jr.
Herbert Davis Vogel, Jr.
Harry Dwight Wagner
William Alexander Walker, Jr.
Raymond Emmett Wallace
Charles Ross Wallis
James Harold Wallwork, Jr.
James Northcutt Walter
Joseph Edward Wasiak
Charles Edward Watkins
Mahlon Garland Weed
Donald Gregory Weinert
Deane Elliott Welch
Robert Nicholson Wells, Jr.
James William Wensyel
Robert Lewis Wetzel
Richard John Weyhrich
Robert Joseph Wheeler
Deryle Taylor Whipple
Wayne Neville White
Richard Isaiah Wiles
Lewis Allen Williams
Drake Wilson
Harry Stephen Wilson, Jr.
John Royal Witherell
Peter Craig Withers
Karl Augustus Woltersdorf, Jr.
Robert Earl Wright
Edward Emil Wuthrich
Charles Van der Veer Yarbrough
Charles William Yocum
Melvin Asher Young
Steven Zellem

The following-named cadets, United States Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, effective June 3, 1952, upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

Robert Preston Hand
Graham Hildebrand
Kenneth John Keating

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, April 14, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, amid all the turmoil of life's busy ways we thank Thee for

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

moments of quietness and of insight. We would be still and know that Thou art God, and in that steadying consciousness may our inner eyes behold new vistas and new perspectives.

We praise Thee, O God, for all who create beauty in the world. We acknowledge our debt of gratitude to musicians, whose harmonies refresh the heart, to artists and sculptors who give enduring expression to fair visions of loveliness; we pay our tribute to those who create better social attitudes and whose passion is to lift the levels of human living above woe and misery. May we be numbered among those who help bridge the gaps made by prejudice and suspicion, who heal the wounds of man's inhumanity to man, who, by the contagion of our own spirits, draw men together in the fair realm of good will and mutual helpfulness. Open our ears and eyes that we may hear voices in bushes that burn with Thee, find sermons in stones and good in everything. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, April 16, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, April 17, 1952, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 2447) to amend the Federal Credit Union Act.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. IVES was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate tomorrow and next Monday.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. O'CONOR, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Rules and Administration was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MORSE, and by unanimous consent, a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to hold hearings this afternoon on FEPC, beginning at 2 o'clock.

TOM CONNALLY, SENATOR FROM TEXAS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I regret that I was not on the floor of the Senate yesterday when the fine and richly deserved tributes were being paid by other Senators to our very dear personal friend, Senator TOM CONNALLY. I would have wanted to be among the first to pay a tribute to him.

For 35 years Senator CONNALLY has rendered distinguished and outstanding service in the House and in the Senate. His record speaks for itself. To all Americans he has long been one of the most colorful and articulate personalities on the Washington scene. He is a rugged individualist. He always has been willing to fight for what he thought was right, regardless of consequences. He certainly will be missed on the floor of the Senate. He has been an able leader at the helm of one of the most powerful and important committees in Government, the Committee on Foreign Relations.

To me, he has been a teacher. When I was a freshman Senator, I turned to Senator CONNALLY for advice, which was always willingly given.

In paying tribute to the very distinguished senior Senator from Texas, I feel that I speak not only for myself, but also for the Southwest, particularly for my own State of Arizona. Senator CONNALLY and I were associated in a very difficult fight on the issue of the Mexican Water Treaty, in connection with which he performed outstanding service for his State.

He has made a great record in the development of irrigation and reclamation for the West, and his own State of Texas certainly has prospered by his efforts. His record on other subjects of interest to his State is equally as good.

Senator CONNALLY, during his 12 years in the House and his 24 years in the Senate, has become an institution on Capitol Hill.

At the very beginning of the First World War, as a Member of Congress, he voted to declare war on Germany, and later left Congress to fight in the war he had helped to declare. He was that kind of man throughout his public life—a man of convictions, and always willing to fight for his convictions. Through other wars, hot and cold, he has been a bold and resourceful leader of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

These have been trying times for America all over the world. History will reward Senator CONNALLY for his leadership in the broad and difficult responsibilities of the post he held as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, I have observed Senator CONNALLY's work in the field of foreign relations. His record is long and distinguished. He has represented the United States in many capacities. He served as delegate to the Interparliamentary Union, Geneva, 1924; London, 1930; Constantinople, 1934; Rome, 1948; and Empire Parliamentary Association, Ottawa, Canada, 1943; special congressional adviser to the United States delegation to the Inter-American Conference on Problems of War and Peace, Mexico City, 1945; vice chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on International Organization, San Francisco, 1945; Representative of the United States to the first session of the General Assembly of the United Nations at London, 1946; adviser to the Secretary of State at the meetings of the Council of Foreign Ministers at Paris and New York and at the Paris Peace Conference, 1946; Representative of the United States to the second session of the General Assembly of the United Nations at New York, 1946; served as a delegate to the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Continental Peace and Security at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 1947.

He helped inaugurate the bipartisan foreign policy, which in my opinion has been of as much benefit to our Government in recent years as any other single factor. He has played an important part in helping formulate our good neighbor policies.

I have observed the Senator from Texas when he returned from foreign conferences unselfishly yield to others to make the first report, though he was chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, in order to demonstrate that a bipartisan policy was being carried out.

It was with deep regret that I read in the newspapers, while I was in Arizona that Senator CONNALLY had decided not to seek reelection this year. The splendid record he has made in the Senate, speaks for itself. It is a record of which not only the citizens of the State of Texas, but also the people of the entire Nation, may well be proud.

Future Congresses will never be the same without him—as someone said "a certain spark will be gone—a special dash of color will be lacking." In his earned leisure he can look back and be proud of his record for America and for his fellow man. Few have ever withdrawn and left behind more admirers, more well wishers. I am proud today, Mr. President, to enroll myself in that legion.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was on Tuesday last, when I was in the Middle West, that I read in the press that my dear friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas, had decided not to engage in another contest for his seat in this body. I feel that when he leaves the Senate something substantial, something clean, something constructive, will go out from among us.

For many years it has been my pleasure to be associated with Senator CONNALLY on the Committee on Foreign Relations. No one can work with TOM CONNALLY without feeling, first, that he is a patriot—a real American. One may differ with him, but one senses, first and last, that he is a lover of the Republic, and believes in the principles which have made the Republic great and strong.

No one can serve with him very long without learning to love him. He has faults, but they are human. I do not think there is a hateful streak in his system. I learned to have a deep affection for him. I first served with him when he was chairman of the committee, and afterward, when Senator Vandenberg was chairman. Now TOM CONNALLY is again chairman. During my service with him I have profited by sitting literally at his feet throughout those years. While I am now ranking minority member, I still look to him for counsel and advice.

I have always wondered at his versatility at repartee. Sometimes his comments are a little strenuous, but they never have in them a barb which is meant to sting. When it was called to his attention that he had said things which might be misunderstood, he was

always the kind southern gentleman. He would say, "I am sorry; I did not mean it that way."

Yes, TOM CONNALLY will be missed. This morning I read briefly the fine encomiums which were paid him yesterday by his colleagues. They are all true. They give the picture of men's reactions to a life which has been well spent. He has lived half his life in the service of his country. He may have grown old in body, but in spirit he is still young. Like so many of the southern gentlemen who serve in this body, he has a fine sense of humor. He is quick on the retort; but over and above it all, he is a gentleman.

Everything that has been said about his being a statesman is correct. I believe that when the history of the country is written, showing the part which he played in formulating our present foreign policy and in seeing that the various organs which supplement that foreign policy came into being, he will stand among the great.

To all who know him and his State, it is clear that Texas and TOM CONNALLY have become synonymous. But not only has he faithfully represented that great Free State since he became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1917, but he has represented the larger interests of the United States as a whole.

As I have said, I have had the pleasure of working particularly closely with him for approximately one-half dozen years on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I know of his conscientiousness, his industry, his common sense, his humor, and his good judgment. He has been a beacon for American foreign policy during the many years of his service on that committee.

He has been a statesman. He has been a brilliant parliamentarian.

He has not hesitated to meet issues head on; and any man who has opposed him in Senate or committee debate knew that he faced in TOM CONNALLY a worthy opponent indeed—a man who would fight, and fight hard, but fight cleanly, for objectives which he held dear.

America has embarked on a great many new adventures in international relations during the years that TOM CONNALLY has been chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. During the Republican Eightieth Congress, when the late Senator Vandenberg of Michigan became chairman, there was an unbroken continuity of cooperation between both parties.

Yesterday, when the well-deserved tributes were paid, they were made by the representatives of his own party, the Democratic majority. But I know that we on this side of the aisle share their esteem for TOM CONNALLY. I want the people of Texas to know that we feel that they may indeed say, as we know they will: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

But no man who has served his State and Nation so long and so well can entirely close the book on so active a career. Great, new service still looms ahead for TOM CONNALLY, and we know that he will open up new vistas. Why? Because with his energy, courage, and ability, he believes that life is action, and that the best action is service. He well merits a bit of relaxation after the long years of stress and strain, but we shall look to him for continued guidance and direction.

I join with his countless friends in the Senate and in the city of Washington and the multitudes from Texas and elsewhere who say, "Well done, Tom. You have done a grand job. We know that you will keep buy doing a good work. We know that your active brain will continue to function in doing the things which are necessary. We want you to enjoy the remainder of life in an atmosphere where, perhaps, a little less strenuous action will be required and a little more ease assured."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I entered the Chamber just in time to hear the kindly encomiums uttered so eloquently by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] relative to our good friend the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], who has announced that he is retiring and will not seek reelection to the Senate.

Yesterday I was flying up from Miami, and arrived here too late to participate in the remarks made early in the day about our distinguished friend. Later in the afternoon, when the senior Senator from Connecticut was speaking in that connection, I was in the chair, so that I could not then make the brief remarks which I wanted to add to that discussion.

The night before I had been in a meeting of young people in the city of Miami, Fla., a rather large meeting of the junior chamber of commerce. I am sure that Senators would like to know, and that the Senator from Texas would appreciate the fact that those young people in Florida were exceedingly solicitous over the news of the approaching retirement of the Senator from Texas, and were exceedingly appreciative in all they had to say concerning their high estimate of his very fine work, both in the Senate and in various international conferences in which he has participated on behalf of our Nation as a whole.

I believe that I am disclosing a little-known chapter in the life of the distinguished Texan when I say that the people of Miami have a peculiar affection for him because of the fact that he soldiered there as a young man in the blue uniform of the United States Army during the Spanish-American War. They have never forgotten that. The young people whom I mentioned a while ago, who participated in the meeting of the junior chamber of commerce, found many ways to indicate their appreciation of the Senator, his sterling patriotism, and his fine service to our Nation. I thought that both he and the Senate would be glad to know that in the State of Florida, where he is still remembered as a gallant young American soldier, the people are indeed deeply regretful about his decision to leave the Senate.

Speaking for myself, let me say that no one has ever received kinder treatment from another than I have received from the distinguished Senator from Texas ever since I have been privileged to be a Member of this body. Sometimes his remarks are salty. Sometimes he throws a few barbs. The Senator from Florida has received them from time to time, but they never pierced deep, and they were always followed by ample treatment with the soothing balm of Gilead, which the distinguished Senator also knows how to skillfully apply.

Every memory which I have of the distinguished Senator from Texas and his work in the Senate is a pleasant one. I shall always treasure those memories. I join other Senators in wishing for him a long and happy life after his retirement from this particular field of activity. We know that his will always be a patriotic life, in which he will find renewed occasion to register his abiding faith in the Nation which he has served so well—his belief that it will continue to exist as the greatest democratic power on earth, and will continue to live up to its high responsibilities, which he and the late Senator Vandenberg have shaped and voiced to a greater extent than have any other Members of the Senate. We wish him well. Our affectionate regards will always go with him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to add a word to the tributes which have been paid to our esteemed friend, the chairman of the committee.

During 6 of the 8 years I have had the privilege of being a Member of the Senate I have served on the Foreign Relations Committee. During that time the late Senator Vandenberg served as chairman for 2 years, and during the remaining years the Senator from Texas was chairman.

I am one of those who have thoroughly enjoyed the evidences of his wit, and even the barbs which sometimes came hurtling at some of us. They were all a part of the pleasantries of committee meetings and a part of the pleasantries of our exchanges on the floor. I have always felt that the senior Senator from Texas was not only a most able chairman who measured up fully to the responsibilities of the committee in meeting the succession of international programs with which it was confronted from time to time, but also he manifested qualities of mind and heart which made us proud to call him friend. While the distinguished chairman sometimes seemed to be necessarily a disciplinarian with his committee, I always found in him particularly the sentiments of affection and friendship which have meant so much to me in association with my colleagues in the Senate.

So I want to say, Senator CONNALLY, that my affection and my very best wishes go with you wherever you may be. I know that you will continue to render great service to your country. You will always be a great American citizen and patriot. I thank you for the association I have been privileged to enjoy with you during the years I have been a Member of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair asks the indulgence of the Senate for a moment. Senators know how reluctant the Chair is to speak from the rostrum. However, if he does not speak from the rostrum, he cannot speak at all.

I do not want the opportunity to pass without joining other Senators as a friend in expressing a word of appreciation and regret on the retirement of the senior Senator from Texas.

I preceded the senior Senator from Texas in the House of Representatives by 4 years. I preceded him in this body by 2 years. During all the years we served in the House together and served in the Senate together, not only have he and I enjoyed the closest and warmest and most affectionate friendship, but during all those years our families have also been very close, warm, and affectionate friends.

I appreciate the opportunity of saying just a word in voicing my deep regret at his voluntary departure from this body, and to express my gratitude and pride at the opportunity that has been mine to serve with the senior Senator from Texas during a whole generation, during two World Wars, in the interim between the wars, and in the aftermath of the Second World War, in which he played so prominent a part.

As Shakespeare has said:

Lowliness is young ambition's ladder,
Whereto the climber-upward turns his face;
But when he once attains the upmost round,
He then unto the ladder turns his back,
Looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees
By which he did ascend.

The Senator from Texas has reached in his long career the pinnacle of fame and service. Yet he has never lost the common touch. He has never scorned any low degree by which he did ascend. He enjoys the confidence and affection of his friends in the Senate to a remarkable degree, and he enjoys the respect of the whole country. I am sure that he enjoys the respect and affection of the people of the State of Texas.

I join with others in wishing him many and useful years in the future, and I hope that he may now and then come to see us in this Chamber or anywhere else he may find us. We all wish for him a long continuation of the happy, wholesome, and useful life he has lived up to this time and which we know he cannot fail to live as long as he breathes the breath of life.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the words of the Vice President and the other Members of the Senate with respect to the senior Senator from Texas.

While I have not been aquainted with the Senator from Texas as long as the Vice President, I have been a Member, for 4 years, of the Committee on Foreign Relations. As to personal association, I can only reiterate what has already been said. The senior Senator from Texas is a very charming, interesting, and colorful character.

I wish to refer to one thing which I do not think has been emphasized. Because of the highly controversial nature of the issues he has dealt with in recent months he has been at times criticized. Yet I believe that history will clearly prove that on the major and important issues which the Senator from Texas has supported and guided through the Senate, he was correct, and that his judgment, certainly his instinct, for the right course for the Nation to follow during this highly difficult time will be proved to have been sound and for the best interests of the Republic.

I certainly wish to join in the expression of regret at the retirement of the senior Senator from Texas. I know that he has the good will of all the Members of this body.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I should like to express my great appreciation of the association with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] I have had the good fortune to enjoy since I have been a Member of this body. I was chairman of a committee of the Senate in recognition of the fiftieth anniversary of the signing of the peace treaty with Spain which liberated Cuba. The distinguished Senator from Texas was a member of that committee. We have been very close because both of us served in the Spanish-American War.

Mr. President, I regret very much that the senior Senator from Texas has decided that he will not be a candidate for reelection. We shall miss him greatly. He is a great American and a real patriot.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have been a Member of the Senate since 1935. I have known of the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] for many, many years. I have always respected him. When he determined in his own conscience and mind not to continue in this body, my respect for him increased—not because I wanted him to leave the Senate, but because I knew that TOM CONNALLY of Texas was deciding for himself what he believed to be best.

He is my neighbor; he comes from an adjoining State. Once in a while, despite the fact that we have common interests, we disagree regarding matters which affect what we believe to be the interests of the individual States of Texas and New Mexico.

I, for one, without in any way trying to interfere with what are the wishes of the citizens of Texas, regret the decision of the Senator from Texas to leave the Senate.

I know we shall miss him. We shall miss his sound advice and even his mannerisms. He will be greatly missed by all of us.

I wish the senior Senator from Texas and his family nothing but the best in the future.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the Senators and the Vice President who have spoken about the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

When I first learned, early in the morning, when the newspaper was delivered to my house, of the intention of the senior Senator from Texas not to be a candidate for reelection to membership in the Senate, I telephoned him, and later I wrote him a letter to express to him my deep regret at his decision.

I had the pleasure of knowing the senior Senator from Texas long before I came to the Senate. Later, when I became a Member of the Senate, nearly 12 years ago, I had the pleasure of attending the breakfasts which he used to give in those days for some of the younger and newer Senators. Not only was it a pleasure to be with him, but his long experience, knowledge, and wisdom on legislative and other matters that came before this body were a source of inspiration and enlightenment and have served me well during my service in the Senate.

Although, of course, I cannot speak so fluently as did the distinguished Vice President, I wish to concur in what has been said regarding the distinguished senior Senator from Texas. I would have expressed my sentiments earlier, only I, too, was absent yesterday, being in attendance upon the State convention in South Carolina.

I also heartily endorse the remarks of the Senator from Arizona about the senior Senator from Texas. When the Senator from Arizona and I rode to the Senate on the subway this morning, we recalled the breakfasts we used to have with the senior Senator from Texas and agreed on how much joy and enlightenment they gave us.

The Senator from Texas and I have many mutual friends in the cotton business and in the cotton ginning and other cotton activities in Texas. We have many things in common and we worked on many things that have brought great benefit to our States and our Nation. I regret exceedingly therefore that he will not be a candidate for reelection to the Senate as I shall miss him as a trusted friend, a brilliant adviser, and a valiant cohort in our fight to make this Nation and the world a better and happier place in which to live.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senators will be permitted to make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business, without speeches and without debate.

SERVICE IN THE ARMED FORCES—LETTER FROM DEAN V. THOMPSON

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a letter which I have received from Dean V. Thompson, of Boise, Idaho. He writes to me, as one of his representatives in Congress, about the situation of himself and his sons. Three of his sons are serving in the armed services at the present time, and Mr. Thompson lost one son in World War II. My friend asks that I bring this letter to the attention of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Armed Services Committee. It seems to me that the best way to have that done is to have the letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and also to have it referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of March 29, 1952, addressed to me by Dean V. Thompson, of Boise, Idaho, be referred to the Committee on Armed Services and be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOISE, IDAHO, *March 29, 1952.*

Mr. HERMAN WELKER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am again writing you regarding my boys who are in the service, one in Alaska and one in Japan, another one in the Air Force in California. Myself a veteran of the First World War. And as I stated to you in my previous letter I lost my oldest boy in the Second World War out in the Pacific. I told you how they lied to my boys to get them to enlist. Promised them they could finish their high school while in the services. These promises were never kept. My boy in Alaska has been worked like a bound slave ever since he enlisted and never has been given any schooling. My boy in Japan just turned 18 and left high school to enlist was promised that they would see that he got to finish his schooling while in the service. He has never received a day's schooling. This boy was home on furlough. And reported back to Camp Stoneman on the 11th of this month.

I wrote the commandant, a Col. T. G. Jenkins. Sending my letter airmail special-delivery so he would be sure and get it asking him that if it was possible to secure a placement for my boy somewhere here in the States or Alaska I would appreciate anything he could do. My letter was completely ignored. Until my boy had been gone a full week. Then this so-called officer wrote stating that he never received the letter. I know he did for it was marked addressee only, personal, and had my returns on the envelope. And I personally mailed the letter. Personally, I think that Colonel Jenkins is just a plain prevaricator.

I understood that when Mr. CARL VINSON was out for the 18-year-old school boys that they were not to be sent out of the continental United States. This in itself is double-crossing the people of the country.

I want you to pass this letter on to Mr. VINSON. And also see if you can possibly get my boys and other 18-year-olds brought back to this country and trained long enough that they will know what it is to be a soldier. I, myself, got only 1 month's training before I was sent across to France. And up on the lines. I don't want this to happen to my boys.

Also if you can find the time to confer with Mr. VINSON personally and see just what can be done about this matter. In the first place we have no business in Korea at all. If we are at war let Congress declare war and then have the country come out for an all-out war using everything we have to win it and get it over with. Not let it drag along like it has for the past year killing our young manhood off a few thousands at a time if they must be killed at all let it be for a just cause and with the knowledge that we are all-out for war and putting everything we have behind our young men who are doing the dirty work.

If Congress had had any backbone at all they would have done something about the slaughter of our boys a long time ago. Either bring them home or send such numbers over there that we can get the job done in a hurry. Use the atomic bomb all along the line and over in Manchuria on the enemy's bases.

But get it done now, not next year. I may be wrong in my beliefs on this matter but remember that I, too, have faced the enemies of our country.

Anything you might be able to do for me will be greatly appreciated and wishing you happiness and success, I beg to remain,

Sincerely yours,

DEAN V. THOMPSON.

CONTROL OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE—RESOLUTIONS AND LETTER FROM WISCONSIN ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have previously commented in the Senate on the importance of accelerating research into the dread hoof-and-mouth disease which, if it once got a foothold in the United States, could cause havoc beyond almost any man's comprehension.

At this time, as a further indication of grass-roots sentiments on this issue I send to the desk several resolutions which I have received from farm organizations in my State of Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions and letter be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions and letter were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACINE COUNTY FARM BUREAU,
Union Grove, Wis., April 5, 1952.

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The board of directors of the Racine County Farm Bureau has instructed me to write you in their behalf, as pertaining to a resolution which they had proposed and accepted.

This resolution pertains to hoof-and-mouth disease, and reads thus: "We, the members of the board of directors of the Racine County Farm Bureau, are in favor of the Federal Government making an appropriation to finance research and develop facilities to control and eradicate hoof-and-mouth disease."

The farmers of our county are rather concerned over the recent outbreaks of this dread disease in Canada, and our organization likewise which represents a cross-section of agriculture, but predominantly livestock farmers, is interested in a program which would not only benefit agriculture but safeguard the meat supply of the Nation.

Very truly yours,

JOHN GRUBIM, *Secretary.*

RESOLUTION ON HOOF-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

Whereas hoof-and-mouth disease now has spread over 75 percent of the earth, and infection has been found in both Mexico and Canada; and

Whereas we have already spent $125,000,000 in Mexico, and we still have not wiped out the threat to our own stock; an outbreak in this country could cripple the entire livestock industry; and

Whereas a law was passed in 1948 which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to build laboratories to find methods, other than slaughter, to stop the disease: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Aurora-Homestead Local No. 283 of the Wisconsin Farmers Union, at a regular meeting held on April 3, 1952, go on record as urging Congress to appropriate funds to build and operate the laboratories as provided for in Public Law 496.

Mrs. IDA RINGBLOM,
Secretary, Aurora-Homestead Local No. 283.
IRON MOUNTAIN, MICH.

LAKE TO LAKE DAIRY CO-OP,
Manitowoc, Wis., April 8, 1952.

Senator ALEX WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: At the Lake to Lake annual meeting on March 29, 1952, at Denmark, Wis., the following resolutions were unanimously adopted by over 600 assembled members, and we have been directed to mail them to you:

"RESOLUTION 3

"Whereas the outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in Mexico in the past year and the more recent outbreak in Canada presents a most serious threat not only to the dairy farmer but to the entire livestock industry: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we commend our Department of Agriculture for the speedy placing of embargoes on importations of livestock and meat and we recommend that these embargoes continue in force for such extended periods as is necessary to completely insure against any possibility of the disease being brought into this country; be it further

"*Resolved,* That we recommend that the Congress pass such legislation as is necessary to set aside a research grant to study immunization, control and other curative measures."

Sincerely,

TRUMAN TORGERSON,
General Manager.

MOQUAH, WIS., *April 9, 1952.*

United States Senator ALEXANDER WILEY.

DEAR SENATOR: No doubt but what you have heard by now, that parts of Canada have an outbreak of foot and mouth diseases—their cattle are not very far from our northern border and opening up the gates to ship cattle from Mexico, which has been bothered year after year with such outbreaks in livestock, giving us no protection against this horrible plague whatever.

Can you not do something in lobbying some of that foreign-aid money and get a laboratory in this country to try and figure out some protection for our United States farmers?

Once this malady gets across our border, our American farmers are going to find themselves in a deplorable condition. Once warm weather sets in, 50 miles or so from our North Dakota is not far to get us. Please do something before it's too late.

Thanking you very kindly in advance.

Yours very truly,

AUGUST JOHANIK,
Secretary-Treasurer, Bayfield County Guernsey Breeders' Association.

P. S.—Just think how disastrous this would be if some of the deer got a touch of it.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1258. A bill to authorize and direct the conveyance of a certain tract of land in the State of Mississippi to Louie H. Emfinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1461);

H. R. 586. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell certain land on the Chena River to the Tanana Valley Sportsmen's Association of Fairbanks, Alaska; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1462); and

H. R. 4199. A bill to authorize the transfer of lands from the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463).

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 1084) to amend section 2 of the Natural Gas Act, and I

submit a report (No. 1460) thereon. The report is based on a thorough study made jointly by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] and other members of the committee.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3024. A bill for the relief of Gunhard Oravas and Virve Oravas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3025. A bill to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail equipment shops in Washington, District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOEY:

S. 3026. A bill for the relief of Grace L. Patton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEELY (for himself and Mr. DUFF):

S. 3027. A bill to regulate the election of delegates representing the District of Columbia to national political conventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 3028. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to the heirs of Lizzie Bull Horse; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 3029. A bill for the relief of Stefan Virgilius Issarescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 3030. A bill for the relief of Spiridon Platis; and

S. 3031. A bill for the relief of Mariko Kuniyuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of certain discriminatory practices of foreign nations against American-flag vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ENLARGEMENT OF MAIL EQUIPMENT SHOPS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail-equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a brief statement in connection with the bill, prepared by me, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The bill (S. 3025) to authorize the modernization and enlargement of the mail-equipment shops in Washington, D. C., and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The statement by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

This legislation is requested by the Postmaster General to meet an imperative need for enlarged plant facilities for an important manufacturing unit of one of the largest business enterprises of the world—the postal system. Perhaps many Senators do not realize that this mail-equipment shop, located in sight of the Capitol, is among the most important industries of the District of Columbia with a considerable payroll.

When the present plant was built in 1918 annual postal receipts were $389,000,000; today such receipts are in excess of $2,000,000,000.

In 1946 the pressure of the mounting mail equipment repair load made it necessary to put on a night shift and the crowded condition of this plant at this time makes it imperative that something be done promptly.

The Postmaster General estimates that it would cost at least $6,000,000 to build a new plant that would be adequate. He feels that the present plant, with the acquisition at a rather nominal cost of contiguous strips of land, can be modernized and enlarged for half a million dollars and do the job as well as a new plant. It is also felt that improved working conditions and general rehabilitation will result in defraying the costs of this modernization in less than 4 years of operation of the renovated plant.

Because of the present conditions in the mail-equipment shops it is desirable to commence the work necessary to the remodeling, modernization, and enlargment of the shops as soon as possible. This legislation, if enacted, will provide the necessary authority for this project.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

STUDY OF FEDERAL SEIZURE OF STEEL MILLS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF SENATE RESOLUTION 306

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] be added as a cosponsor on the resolution (S. Res. 306) providing for a study of the legal authority of the President to seize and operate certain steel plants and facilities.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

Remarks by him introducing Senator NIXON at the forty-third annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association, held in Philadelphia on February 26, 1952, and address delivered by Senator NIXON on that occasion.

Editorial entitled "Senator for Americans," published in the Pittsburgh Press on April 15, 1952.

Article entitled "The Cameron Dynasty," published in the Sunbury (Pa.) Daily Item on April 8, 1952.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Two articles dealing with global uniform television, published in the April 15, 1952, issue of Television Opportunities.

By Mr. WILEY:

Statement on a recent trip made by him to the northern New York-Ontario area with respect to the proposed Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

Address on United States foreign policy, delivered by the Honorable Hugh G. Grant, former United States Minister to Albania and Thailand, at the nineteenth annual convention of the Southern Cemetery Association, at Augusta, Ga.

Article entitled "All Business Needs Small Business," by Telford Taylor, Administrator of the Small Defense Plants Administration, published in the March 1952 issue of the magazine Purchasing.

Article entitled "SDPA and Its Loan Program for Small Business," written by Joseph R. Slevin, and published in the March 15, 1952, issue of the magazine, Finance.

By Mr. BRICKER:

Address entitled "Edison, Servant of Mankind," delivered by George E. Stringfellow at the February 11, 1952, meeting of the Ohio Society of New York.

Report of the Federal budget subcommittee of the national affairs committee, Toledo Chamber of Commerce, Toledo, Ohio.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Southern Progress in Negro Education," written by Benjamin Fine, originally published in the New York Times and reprinted in the Arkansas Gazette of April 13, 1952.

By Mr. IVES:

Editorial dealing with the results of the New Jersey primary, published in the New York Times of April 17, 1952.

Editorial discussing the threats to the rights of labor and management, resulting from Government seizure of the steel plants, published in the New York Times of April 17, 1952.

ADDRESS BY GOV. JAMES F. BYRNES AT SOUTH CAROLINA DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, yesterday I attended the South Carolina Democratic Convention at which the keynote address was delivered by the Honorable James F. Byrnes. The State's delegates to the national convention were duly elected and pledged to the nomination of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

As one of the elected delegates and also as national committeeman, it will be my pleasure to continue my active support for the nomination of the Senator from Georgia. Because of my close association over a long period of years with him, I am confident of his qualifications to serve during these precarious times as the Chief Executive of this Nation.

I have known him as a lawyer, a governor, a legislator—both State and National—and as a statesman. I know of the monumental services he has rendered to farmers and laborers. His honest record of service to all men and all groups speaks for itself.

Because of the importance of the remarks made yesterday by Governor Byrnes and because they represent so well the feelings and the thinking of so many people in this land, I ask to have the Governor's speech inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I am not sure I shall object, I respectfully say that I hope that a speech of this character will be accorded the same treatment in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as certain of the speeches of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. I think they were placed in the Appendix of the RECORD. That is my only reason for rising. It seemed to me that all political statements should be put in the same category, in order to be fair.

Mr. MAYBANK. I would not want to take advantage of any other Senator. If such speeches have been placed in the Appendix of the RECORD, of course, I shall follow the same procedure.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If it is a proper parliamentary inquiry I should like to ask the Chair if it is not a fact that speeches of this character within the past few weeks have been placed in the Appendix of the RECORD rather than in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has been rather lenient in regard to the printing of any documents in the RECORD. Under the procedure of the Joint Committee on Printing, an effort has been made to prevent the printing of certain documents in the body of the RECORD and to have them printed in the Appendix. But Senators rise daily and ask unanimous consent that matters be printed in the body of the RECORD, or in the Appendix, and there is no objection. There is no rule as to what should go into the body of the RECORD and what should be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, by unanimous consent.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is quite agreeable, I am sure, that the speech be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I simply rose because I have high regard for the Governor of South Carolina. I think a speech delivered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was recently printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It seems to me such speeches should all have the same place in the RECORD. That is why I rose.

Mr. MAYBANK. We certainly believe in fair play and justice. The only request I would make is that the speech be printed first in the Appendix of the RECORD, because I gave way to eulogies of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]. The request now is that the speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All extraneous matters are supposed to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, but, as we all know, Senators frequently rise and ask unanimous consent that such matters be printed in the body of the RECORD. If no objection is made, the matter goes into the body of the RECORD. As a matter of fact, it is more easily read in the Appendix than it is in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

THE FLOODS ALONG THE MISSOURI AND MISSISSIPPI RIVERS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the tremendous floods which we are now experiencing in some of the important valleys of our Nation reemphasize the importance and necessity of our carrying forward as expeditiously and as practically as possible a sound program for the control of the floods and the prevention of these recurring disasters.

Mr. President, In this situation I believe that a great responsibility rests upon the Congress. We are practicing false economy when we unduly delay or defer making necessary appropriations to construct needed improvements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks two editorials dealing with this subject, one entitled "A Kick at Flooded People," published in the Kansas City Star of March 28, 1952, and the other entitled "To Mr. CANNON," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 5, 1952.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star of March 28, 1952]

A KICK AT FLOODED PEOPLE

NOW CLARENCE CANNON'S House Appropriations Committee has given its answer to the terrible flood of 1951. It has knocked out the Tuttle Creek Dam, key project of the Kaw Valley, and slashed appropriations for all dams under construction. It has reacted to demonstrated danger by doing as little as possible.

This is no move to save tax money. The money needed to start Tuttle Creek is relatively small. The Cannon committee action is an irritated kick at the people who are down, the scores of thousands who lost their homes, farms, and businesses in the deluge.

Through years of seniority Cannon has become almost a czar of the Appropriations Committee and he has been rated among the bitterest foes of large-scale flood-control action. To many persons it is surprising to see such opposition from a State that caught part of the ravages of the 1951 flood. But it must be remembered that the years that have given Cannon his seniority have been years of residence in Washington, far away from the people in this part of the country and far away from Missouri Valley floods.

The House committee action doesn't end the fight for Tuttle Creek but it is a very serious blow.

The President's survey committee for the Missouri Basin might be able to help the situation if it should give quick approval to the key project. CANNON has given the pending survey as his reason for opposing all new construction starts at this time—just a case of holding back for the completion of the survey. If he means what he has said, a strong recommendation by the survey commission should carry weight.

There is little chance of overriding the Appropriations Committee on the House floor but the issue still goes to the Senate. Given the support of the survey commission the Senate might make a real fight.

As matters stand now the United States Congress has denied flooded people even their right to hope for the future.

This House committee is the same that has voted billions for foreign aid. Through counterpart funds it has supported hundreds of millions for dams in the Rhone Valley. And now it refuses to approve even a small amount to start urgent flood control in the heart of America.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of April 5, 1952]

TO MR. CANNON

No Member of Congress should be more keenly aware of the importance of flood control to this State than Congressman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. In the last decade, his own district has suffered severely from at least three major floods. In St. Charles County alone last summer's floods caused property damage in excess of $3,000,000. Across the State last summer thousands were driven from their homes, industry and transportation in the flood areas were crippled and the property damage mounted into millions of dollars.

Yet under Congressman CANNON's leadership, the Appropriations Committee slashed all appropriations for flood control projects in the Missouri Basin. The committee eliminated entirely from the flood-control bill the funds to begin construction of the Tuttle Creek Reservoir in Kansas, which is a key project in the control of floods in the lower Missouri Basin. Last Wednesday the House passed without a single change the bill as reported out by the committee.

In a letter to the Globe-Democrat this week Congressman CANNON defends the committee's action, and disclaims his own influence in denying the money for Tuttle Creek. Mr. CANNON is too modest. As chairman of the committee and as its senior member, he has dominated the committee for several sessions. As chairman it is his duty to appoint the various subcommittees, including the subcommittee on the civil functions appropriations of the Army Engineers. In naming this subcommittee he took the unusual course of appointing himself as a member, the only regular subcommittee on which he serves. He appointed four members, not one of whom represents a Missouri Basin State or can be said to be familiar with the problems of this area. They are Congressman JOHN H. KERR, or North Carolina; LOUIS C. RABAUT and GERALD R. FORD, JR., of Michigan; and GLENN R. DAVIS, of Wisconsin. Not one comes from a State in which flood control is a serious problem.

It is a fair criticism to point out that this subcommittee was stacked against the Missouri Valley, just as is the Missouri Basin Survey Commission recently named by President Truman.

Congressman CANNON's explanation for killing the Tuttle Creek appropriation of

$13,500,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget is that "the engineers have not yet completed their report on the dam." By engineers we assume he means the survey commission, for Mr. CANNON cannot be unaware that the Army Engineers' reports and plans are complete and have been for some time. The Tuttle Creek Reservoir was authorized by Congress after lengthy hearings in 1938. The project has been studied and restudied and reviewed by engineering boards, both locally and in Washington.

Despite these facts, Congressman CANNON would defer construction of Tuttle Creek until the survey commission makes its report, which is not due until next January. That means that he would postpone a start on its construction until the next Congress.

The Globe-Democrat pointed out when the members of the survey commission were named that it appears to be a stalking horse for a Missouri Valley Authority, a charge which has been made openly by members of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. Congressman CANNON denies the charge, but the action of his committee does little to substantiate his denial.

He cannot claim that the elimination of the initial funds to begin the construction of Tuttle Creek is a tax-saving move. The amount involved is minute in comparison with the huge sums voted for waterways projects in Europe as a part of the foreign-aid program. These appropriations, totaling millions of dollars, have been approved by Congressman CANNON's committee. In the Rhone Valley in France, for example, Missouri Basin taxpayers are helping finance two vast navigation and hydroelectric projects, which were approved by Congress without even the formality of holding a hearing. There are 22 dams and 46 power stations, of which 3 are now under construction, or completed. The cost of just these three projects is $685,500,000. No estimate has been made public of the total cost of the Rhone Valley development, of which 90 percent is to be financed by the United States.

Yet the same committee has now said that the Missouri Valley must wait indefinitely for the flood protection it so urgently needs. Whether it is so intended or not, the committee's action under Mr. CANNON's leadership is a direct slap at the people of the Missouri Valley, who have not yet recovered from the disaster which struck last summer, and who live under the threat of future major floods.

GRAIN ELEVATORS OPERATED BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, on previous occasions I have called the attention of the Senate to certain instances in which the Department of Agriculture was utilizing Government facilities which had previously been leased to outside interests. The excuse was advanced in support of this practice that the Department of Agriculture had not known about the availability of such Government-owned facilities until after private interests had first obtained possession of them.

Today I call attention to a situation in which that excuse will not apply. At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of a letter which I have received from the Comptroller General, pointing out five instances in which grain elevators owned by the Farm Credit Administration, a division of the Department of Agriculture, are being leased to third parties, and at the same time showing how the same facilities are being partially utilized by the Commodity Credit Corporation, another division of the Department of Agriculture.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1952.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Please refer to your letters of February 5 and 6, 1952, requesting certain information with respect to the operation of particular elevators owned by the Farm Credit Administration.

Rental payments to Farm Credit Administration by the designated companies, under leases effective during the years indicated, are as follows:

Lessee and location of elevator	Year ended Dec. 31—		
	1949	1950	1951
Producers Grain Corp., Amarillo, Tex	$24,000	$24,000	$27,500
The Ohio Farmers Grain Corp., Fostoria, Ohio	17,500	17,500	21,250
West Central Cooperative Grain Co.:			
Fremont, Nebr	16,000	16,000	17,000
Kearney, Nebr	1,800	1,800	2,100
Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association:			
Spokane, Wash	10,250	10,250	10,250
Williston, N. Dak	4,800	4,800	4,800

Amounts paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation to the warehousemen for handling and storage of grain under its programs have been obtained by the Corporation from its various field offices and are reported to us as follows:

Warehouseman and location of elevator	Payments made during year ended Dec. 31—		
	1949	1950	1951
Producers Grain Corp., Amarillo, Tex	$135,981	[1] $216,100	[1] $66,656
Percent of capacity utilized [2]	36.5	56.5	16.5
The Ohio Farmers Grain Corp., Fostoria, Ohio	$26,439	$95,049	$12,065
Percent of capacity utilized [2]	14.0	49.0	4.0
West Central Cooperative Grain Co.:			
Fremont, Nebr	$11,582	$139,640	$121,780
Percent of capacity utilized [2]	22.0	70.0	54.0
Kearney, Nebr	$4,073	$4,234	$3,420
Percent of capacity utilized [2]	30.0	30.5	14.75
Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association:			
Spokane, Wash	$6,480	$56,182	$22,168
Percent of capacity utilized [2]	30.0	31.0	9.0
Williston, N. Dak	$5,396	$13,259	$5,385
Percent of capacity utilized [2]	12.0	7.0	2.0

[1] Distribution between 1950 and 1951 is approximate.
[2] Percentage figures obtained from the Department of Agriculture and are not a part of the Comptroller General's letter.

I trust the above information will serve the purpose of your inquiry.

Sincerely yours,
LINDSAY C. WARREN,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The rentals collected and the storage fees paid, along with the percentage of facilities utilized each year, are shown. These figures do not reflect profits accruing, nor is there any claim being made that the rentals are out of line. What I am criticizing is the policy under which Government-owned facilities, paid for by the taxpayers and apparently needed by the Government, are first leased to outside interests and then leased back to the same Government agency. This policy is wrong and should be stopped.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF THE CONTROLS BILL BY THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I desire to speak for a few minutes regarding the controls bill. It seems to me that almost everyone is investigating almost everyone else and almost everything these days. No doubt it is proper for the various investigating committees to be active in their work. However, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is not interested in investigating individuals; the business of our committee is to consider and report proposed legislation relating to those fields which come within the jurisdiction of the committee.

I desire to state that it is extremely difficult for our committee to prepare and bring to the floor of the Senate proposed legislation regarding controls if every morning the newspapers are full of headlines and articles regarding charges, countercharges, and proposed investigations with respect to various aspects of the problems we have under consideration.

This morning, at its meeting at 10:30, our committee decided to meet tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, at which time we shall ask to be present before the committee Mr. Steelman, Mr. Feinsinger, Mr. Putnam, and Mr. Arnall, in the hope that the committee, which is responsible for reporting to the Senate proposed legislation regarding the extension of the present controls law, and can ascertain what these four gentlemen jointly think on where we go from here.

That meeting will be in executive session, for we are not looking for publicity or for a series of newspaper articles regarding our activities. We intend to be faithful in the performance of our duty and to report to the Senate such proposed legislation in the field of production and price control as we may regard desirable of enactment, or not to report any legislation at all on these subjects. Every member of the committee hates and fears inflation; all members of the committee have been faithful and loyal since 1950 in their endeavor to stop inflation.

Since our committee closed its public hearings on the controls bill some 2 weeks ago, the unfortunate steel controversy has developed. All railroad freight rates have been raised. Many other economic developments will in all probability follow as a consequence of what happens in the steel industry.

The Banking and Currency Committee should and I believe does know more about legislating on price controls than do other committees. I recall that when I first served on the Banking and Currency Committee, in 1941, the present distinguished Vice President, then the senior Senator from Kentucky, was a very valuable member of the committee and did some excellent work on the control legislation then before the committee.

Reports have gone forth to the effect that some members of the Banking and Currency Committee are attempting to advocate an increase in steel prices. My name was mentioned in that connection. Mr. President, never have I undertaken to interfere with the procedure of an administrative agency, though I have expressed my views on the floor of the Senate from time to time. Naturally, of course, as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee considering an important piece of legislation I have had conferences with representatives from all sides—labor, industry, and Government. That is as it should be. It is my duty as chairman of the committee to keep myself as fully informed as possible on all the facts and factors connected with any problem which affects the work of our committee. I have had numerous talks and conferences with those administering the Control Act, but never did I attempt to direct them or suggest to them to take any action, or to make any decision one way or the other on any matter that might come before them. Anybody who knows any of the men concerned would know they make their own decisions.

I have received letters from various groups—unions, industry, and individuals. I received a letter only yesterday from Mr. Arnall, thanking me and complementing me for my cooperation and for my sincere efforts in attempting to stem the tide of inflation. But it is far beyond me to try to administer a law. All we can do is to enact legislation. All we want to do, Mr. President, is to report a bill to extend the Control Act properly, taking into consideration whatever effect the Capehart amendment may have on the steelworkers, and also on the workers in aluminum and copper, and workers in the telephone and telegraph communications systems. I do not know the answers. I am merely suggesting that those things may be matters of inquiry when Mr. Feinsinger, Mr. Steelman, Mr. Arnall, and Mr. Putnam appear before the committee.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina upon what he has said. So many investigations are being conducted that it is no wonder that some people become confused, or that we ourselves become confused. I repeat, I wish to commend the Senator upon the position he has taken, which is, that the Congress has a duty to perform.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Congress has a duty to legislate.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct. We had better see to it that we perform our duties. When we have done that, we shall then have done a pretty good job. Let us leave the administration of the laws to those who are charged with their administration by the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may add to what the Senator from Arizona has said that a resolution was submitted yesterday to refer to the Judiciary Committee the question of the legality of the steel strike. That is a proper reference. That is the committee to which the question should have been referred, for there is involved a question of constitutional law. I personally do not believe that the executive branch of the Government had a right to seize the steel mills. I have said so on this floor. I may be in error, but I think it is the duty of the Judiciary Committee to settle judicial matters, and not the business of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is our business to consider matters pertaining to prices and wages—not disputes. When we wrote the law we tried to tie prices and wages together, and, so to speak, to freeze them, so that we might avoid their continual spiraling.

I have never said that the workers did not deserve increases in wages commensurate with rising costs of living. But in 1950 I said, and I raised the question again when Mr. Arnall was before the committee, and after others had testified before the committee, that wages and prices should have been frozen when we passed the law in September of 1950. Had that been done, the workers today would have been better off. But that is water over the dam. All that I have said has also been said on this floor. Never have I called anyone on the telephone for the purpose of influencing a decision, as has been intimated recently in the press. Never have I asked that there be an increase in the price of steel.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I have listened to the Senator from South Carolina. I hope that his committee, after careful consideration, will take such action as may be necessary to prevent a skyrocketing inflation, and at the same time preserve to our people the American way of life. I am confident the Senator has those objectives in mind, as I have.

I also agree with the Senator that the resolution submitted yesterday which he mentioned was properly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MAYBANK. The resolution had to do with a legal question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I personally believed that it was first of all a question to be decided by the Congress. If the Congress should decide that the President has the constitutional power to take the action he has taken—which I very much doubt—then I certainly hope we shall enact legislation limiting its exercise to the gravest possible emergencies.

Mr. President, my reason for rising was to ask the Senator from South Carolina whether, in his committee's consideration of these subjects which he plans to take up tomorrow, and after the list of witnesses which he has mentioned has been exhausted, any new and additional amendments are to be tacked onto the bill extending the defense production law, and whether there will be afforded to Members of Congress and to witnesses who may be interested opportunities to appear before the committee. I ask and I hope that such opportunity will be given.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate what the Senator from Massachusetts has said, but the committee officially closed the hearings, after scheduling them about 2 months ago, and after hearings had been conducted for three solid weeks.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, I hope the committee will not consider reporting in the bill providing for the extension of the Defense Production Act amendments covering new subject matters on which hearings have not but should be held.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may say to the Senator that the committee feels that new subject matters have been placed in the Defense Production Act by the Wage Stabilization Board, and so the committee is helpless in that respect. The committee may not refuse to consider legislation on subjects which we believe were not within the proper purview of the Wage Stabilization Board. That is my opinion, and I think I speak for the majority of the committee. I may be in error. But I do not see what the Wage Stabilization Board in connection with disputes regarding prices and wages had to do with the closed shop. That is a matter for the National Labor Relations Board.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I may say I wrote a letter to the Senator from South Carolina, and also conferred with him.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator wrote a letter regarding certain amendments which the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] intended to propose to the bill. Am I not correct?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am interested in the amendments of the Senator from Arkansas. Those amendments, which are new, are proposed to apply to the Walsh-Healey Act.

Mr. MAYBANK. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is a completely new subject.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is a matter which very materially affects my section of the country.

Mr. MAYBANK. I may only say to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that, before the bill is reported by the committee, we shall certainly be glad to have him appear before the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is, if such amendments are to be seriously considered.

Mr. MAYBANK. Whether the amendments are reported or not, if the Senator desires to appear before the committee, the committee will be very glad to have him do so.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would only be interested in appearing when the chairman of the committee indicates to me, at any time in the future, that he believes that his committee is going to give serious consideration to that matter.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I have directed the clerk of the committee to notify the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, in the event the committee determines to report the amendment to which he refers, in order that the Senator from Massachusetts may first be heard.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am confident that every New England Representative and Senator is vitally interested in those amendments.

Mr. MAYBANK. I appreciate the Senator's statement with reference to New England Members of Congress. Certainly the southern Senators and Representatives, the western Senators and Representatives, and the northern Senators and Representatives are also interested. I may assure the Senator that those who are interested will certainly have an opportunity to be heard. I have had similar requests from Senators from those sections of the country.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should simply like to say to the Senator from South Carolina that I believe in his fairness. I believe as a Senator, of course, he is interested in protecting the section of the country from which he comes; and he, in turn, gives me similar credit. All I ask of him, as a fair-minded Senator, is to work out these problems in a careful manner.

Mr. MAYBANK. I assure the Senator, with whom I have been associated previously on the Governors' Board, together with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], seated beside the Senator, that I would never take action that might affect, in any way, their section without first giving them an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. President, I wish to remind the Senate that unless we get down to business and report a bill, there will not be any price-control bill at all, and so long as fantastic statements appear in the press, not by Senators, but statements appearing in various newspaper articles, such as the one recently attributed to me, we are not going to get very far. So, at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, we shall have before the committee the so-called big four, who are supposed to administer the law and handle it properly. We shall learn from each of them what he thinks about the matter. We will get them all together, so that the responsibility may not be shifted from one to the other. There must be unity among them.

Mr. MAYBANK subsequently said:

Mr. President, earlier today I said the Committee on Banking and Currency would meet tomorrow with Mr. Feinsinger, Mr. Arnall, Mr. Putnam, and Mr. Steelman, the four so-called directors or administrative officials in charge of the Defense Production Act.

It happened that tomorrow two of those gentlemen had engagements of long standing and of great importance to the Government, one in New York and one in Virginia. We are therefore postponing the meeting until Tuesday morning at 10 a. m.

My reason for making the announcement at this time is so that newspaper, radio, and other reporters may be aware of the exact situation.

Thus, the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet with the four directors so that we might get a clear understanding of the responsibilities and jurisdictions of the various agencies. In this way we shall be better able to legislate on the control bill.

CERTIFICATES OF NECESSITY FOR ACCELERATED TAX AMORTIZATION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a release of the Defense Production Administration, under date of April 16, 1952, listing certificates of necessity for accelerated tax amortization of 154 new or expanded defense facilities, which were granted between March 20 and March 27 of this year. I notice that the first and largest item listed is a grant for accelerated tax amortization to the Erie Mining Co., of Aurora, Minn., for work which will amount to $298,070,000. The purpose of the grant is to enable the company to develop taconite ore. I presume the grant is made in anticipation of exhaustion of high grade iron-ore deposits in the Great Lakes area and the necessity for developing more of the high-cost low-grade iron ore in order to keep the steel mills in the Midwest in operation.

I also note that most of the other large grants which were made were for the purpose of generating electric power, and I would list these certificates for accelerated tax amortization as follows: Consumers Power Co., Bay County, Mich., $27,838,559; Philadelphia Electric Co., Cromby, Pa., $27,000,000; South Carolina Generating Co., Beech Island, S. C., $24,048,500; Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co., Cincinnati, Ohio, $20,384,600; Connecticut Light & Power Co., Unncasville, Conn., $17,300,000; Boston Edison Co., North Weymouth, Mass., $16,613,400; Dow Chemical Co., Freeport, Tex., $15,833,300; Monongahela Power Co., Albright, W. Va., $14,022,497.

I presume, Mr. President, that these grants are made in order to help to overcome the acute deficiency in electrical energy which exists in this country today, and also to provide a source of iron ore for our steel mills, even though it may involve high-cost ore.

I invite attention, Mr. President, to the fact that grants for the production of electrical energy vary in percentage allowed from 35 to 65 percent, amounting in all to $163,075,856, which, added to the $298,070,000 for the development of taconite ore, brings the total to $461,145,836, or within $14,000,000 or $15,000,000 of the amount which it would cost to construct the United States share of the St. Lawrence seaway and power project. If that project were authorized by the Congress and developed by private capital, as we propose, we would be assured that the Midwest steel mills would have an adequate supply of high-grade iron ore from proven Labrador fields, and would not be required to depend exclusively upon the high-cost taconite ore which they would otherwise have to utilize.

With the development of St. Lawrence power we could be assured that there would be approximately 1,150,000 horsepower of electrical energy made available which we so badly need.

So, Mr. President, I hope Congress will consider the urgency of developing both the navigation and the power possibilities of the St. Lawrence seaway at the earliest possible moment. Under the proposals which I have made, the entire project would be financed through the sale of bonds to the public, and not by the use of taxpayers' money.

Last night at a dinner I sat beside a man who thought that the construction work should be delayed because it would be inflationary in its nature. As a matter of fact, if we construct the project and develop it through the use of private funds, it will be deflationary, and not inflationary in any sense of the word.

I wish also to call attention to the fact that while people criticize Congress for approving subsidies for one thing or another, Congress has, since the start of the accelerated tax amortization plan, and until March 30, granted to industry and utilities certificates of necessity for quick tax write-off amounting to $16,701,156,000 in new construction. Of this amount, there is allowed an average percentage write-off of 64 percent, which amounts to $10,717,732,000, according to this release which was issued yesterday by the Defense Production Administration.

I think we should keep this in mind when we are prone to criticize appropriations of relatively small amounts for agriculture, education, health, or other purposes, which Congress is called upon to make from time to time.

I wish to point out also that Congress is assisting in spending several hundred million dollars for the development of low-grade iron ore, and is assisting in the construction of electro-energy plants which will cost probably on an average of twice as much per kilowatt-hour generated as would the development of St. Lawrence power. Since the beginning of the tax write-off plan, certificates of necessity have been granted to railroads of this country amounting to more than $2,000,000,000, and according to the list issued yesterday, certificates of necessity amounting to about $1,250,000,000 have been granted to power companies.

In view of the enormous benefits being granted to the utilities these days, it ill behooves the friends of either the rail-

roads or the power companies to obstruct the efforts which some of us are making to develop low-cost transportation and power, which could be provided by the St. Lawrence development, and which are so critically needed in both this country and in Canada.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the first amendment of the committee.

THE SEIZURE OF THE STEEL PLANTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on April 8, 1952, the President of the United States issued an Executive order directing the Secretary of Commerce to take over and operate virtually the entire steel industry of the United States. The implications of this arbitrary and unwarranted act are far reaching and profoundly disturbing. This seizure of private industry is an expansion of executive power of the most dangerous character. It is an encroachment by the executive departments upon the inalienable rights of the people and upon the law-making authority of the Congress of the United States.

When the Executive seizes the steel industry of our Nation, he affects the lives of all our people. All segments of our population depend upon the products of our industrial society for their well-being. The American farmer is a heavy user of steel. His agricultural implements, his farm supplies, and his home equipment require thousands of tons. He bears a portion of the cost of steel used in the railroads, trucks, and ships that transport his products. He pays for the steel in the plants which process his crops and produce his supplies. In a thousand ways, from his tractor to his community school, the cost and availability of steel influence the farmer's life. All mechanics, merchants, professional men, and white-collar workers share in the cost and the social benefits of our steel industry. The people of America have an economic stake in the steel dispute.

But this action of the President, which amounts to virtual confiscation of the steel industry, involves a basic principle far more important than the mere keeping of our steel mills in operation. If the Executive, in time of peace, and without any specific constitutional authority, may seize the property of any individual or corporation which refused to accept his recommendation in an industrial dispute, our system of government is threatened. If the lawful procedures established by the Congress of the United States can be willfully ignored by the President, our system of government by checks and balances is seriously menaced.

Are we to adhere to the type of government established by our forefathers, with the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, each granted certain powers and each checking and restraining the other branches, or shall we abandon that system and allow the President of the United States to usurp the powers of Congress and rule by executive decree? The very form of government we can expect to live under in the future is now at stake.

It is my considered opinion that the time has come to put a stop to the assumption of the powers of Congress by the Executive before our entire constitutional system is destroyed.

I do not maintain that the President of the United States lacks the inherent powers under our system to protect the health and safety of the people during a national emergency until Congress has an opportunity to act. I can envision situations which would demand the exercise of emergency powers by the Executive when Congress could not perform its normal functions. Sudden disasters necessitating immediate action, acts of war committed against us by a foreign power, a crisis developing while Congress was not in session might justify such Executive action.

The basic elements of these situations are not contained in the present steel dispute. The Congress of the United States was in session; there was legislation in existence to deal with the situation; and additional legislation could have been requested if it had been deemed necessary by the Executive.

It is therefore my contention that the President was bound to obey the laws of the land, just as any other citizen, and to enforce those laws so long as they remain on the statute books, irrespective of his personal likes or dislikes. I further maintain that the President was bound by his oath of office to respect the views of Congress, once they had been expressed. It is my opinion that our Executive has failed to obey the law, enforce the law, or to respect the views of Congress, and I believe he has, accordingly, brought discredit to our constitutional system and to the high and honored office which he is privileged to occupy.

Let us examine the important facts in connection with the seizure of the steel industry.

In June of 1951, when the Senate of the United States was debating the Defense Production Act, an amendment was submitted which would have given the President the authority to seize plants. That amendment was defeated by a vote of 57 to 28. This was a clear-cut expression of the will of the Congress of the United States with respect to the granting of seizure powers to the President of the United States in time of peace.

On December 31, 1951, it was apparent that a strike threatened in our steel industry. Through the Taft-Hartley Act, the Congress of the United States had set up machinery to cope with strikes and threatened strikes or lock-outs which affected an entire industry and which imperiled the national health and safety. That law established the procedures for handling strikes and lock-outs of this nature. That act provides that as a last resort the "President shall submit to the Congress a full and comprehensive report of the proceedings, together with such recommendations as he may see fit to make for consideration and appropriate action." Appropriate action by whom? By the Congress of the United States.

From December 31, 1951, until April 8, 1952, there was ample opportunity for the President of the United States to invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, and thereby to utilize the legal procedures which had been established by act of Congress.

On March 20, 1952, the Wage Stabilization Board recommended certain wage increases and certain changes in working conditions which were obviously unsatisfactory to the steel operators. Without discussing the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board, it is significant to note that as a result of its recommendations, Defense Mobilizer Charles E. Wilson resigned, protesting that the recommendations were inflationary and disregard the principles of equity on which our whole control program was based.

There can be no denying the fact, therefore, that the stalemate in the steel industry on April 8 did not arise in 24 hours, or 48 hours, or even 24 days. It is apparent that the emergency was created by the failure of the President to invoke the law. A crisis was produced just 90 minutes before the deadline set to paralyze the Nation's industry and the defense efforts of the country. This crisis was allowed to develop, and then was utilized by the President as an excuse for ignoring the Taft-Hartley law, and as an opportunity to take over the steel mills. By this means the President succeeded in doing by indirection, that which he could not do by direction.

It is significant to note that the seizure order was issued by the President just before the Congress sent to the Executive an act which specifically denied the President the authority to seize any privately owned plant or facility which was not a public utility. It is, therefore, apparent that the President took this drastic step with full cognizance that he was flouting the will of the representatives of the American people.

A calm appraisal of the political significance of the President's action in this situation should give every American cause for grave concern.

In the last 20 years we have gone a long way down the road toward socialism in this country. The profit incentive so necessary to our capitalistic system has been unmercifully taxed. Wages and prices are controlled by bureaucratic officials; in many areas rents are still controlled by the Government. The seizure of industry and the resultant nationalization of that industry is a final step toward state socialism and possible dictatorship. If the steel industry, the backbone of our industrial system, can be removed from private ownership by a capricious Executive who creates a phony emergency and acts without any specific constitutional authority, what is to protect any other industry?

The seizure of the steel industry is but the culmination of a series of encroachments of the Government upon private enterprise. The people should know that the use of the seizure power by the President of the United States has been more frequent than is generally realized. Since June 1941 there have been 69 cases of Government seizure of industry. Mr. Truman has ordered 28 seizures of private industry since he became our Chief Executive.

In trying to justify his action in the present situation, the President has stated that a strike would "immediately jeopardize and imperil our national defense." This may well be true, but that statement alone does not automatically transfer constitutional power from the legislative to the executive branch. If in the opinion of the President it was imperative to stop the impending steel strike, two courses of action were available to him. First, he could have invoked the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, as he had done on nine previous occasions when faced with similar situations; or, second, he could have appeared before the Congress of the United States and requested immediate suitable legislation. His failure to follow either of these courses is regrettable.

The people of America must realize that merely because the Executive claims certain authority, his claim does not entitle him to that authority. The Executive, like the legislative branch, derives its power from the Constitution of the United States. In this instance the power to legislate clearly belongs to the Congress and the Executive has usurped that prerogative.

It will be interesting to observe what course of action is adopted by the President when John L. Lewis and the United Mine Workers become involved in their annual strike threat. Will the Taft-Hartley law be invoked, as it was before, or will the mines of the Nation be nationalized?

The people of America should be further aware that only a microscopic part of the steel industry's output of 2,000,000 tons a week is sold directly to the Government of the United States. It is fantastic for the Government to operate mills which manufacture steel for the production of end products such as hairpins, toys, household appliances, and other consumer items.

It had been publicly stated and universally accepted that the recommendations of the Government Wage Stabilization Board were not binding, but merely served as a frame of reference for arbitration. The American people must now realize that the President's act has shown this to be false. The recommendations of this bureaucratic agency have been made compulsory by the seizure of the industry involved, and thus we have now, in effect, compulsory arbitration. In accordance with this principle the Secretary of Commerce has announced that since the steel industry will not accept the recommendations of the Wage Stabilization Board, he, under the Executive order, will deal directly with the unions involved and will grant such increases of pay to labor as he deems desirable.

For the reasons which I have enumerated above, I have concluded, after careful reflection, that the action of the President in seizing the steel industry of our country was a high-handed, arbitrary, unwarranted act. It is my opinion that the President has usurped the legislative authority of the Congress of the United States. Instead of executing the laws as he was, by his oath, bound to do, the President chose to make law by Executive decree in direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. This action is only another demonstration of his utter disregard for the laws passed by Congress which are not to his personal liking. I therefore believe that the Executive action in this instance should be made the subject of a penetrating inquiry by the Congress. I have joined with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and others of my colleagues in sponsoring Senate Resolution 306, which has been submitted for that purpose.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who suggested the absence of a quorum, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, which will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative branch," on page 1, after line 8, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Marjorie C. Wherry, widow of Kenneth S. Wherry, late a Senator from the State of Nebraska, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 2, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Senate restaurants: For an additional amount for Senate kitchens and restaurants, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "House of Representatives," on page 2, after line 12, to insert:

For payment to Barbara Y. Schwabe, widow of George B. Schwabe, late a Representative from the State of Oklahoma, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Salaries, officers and employees," on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

For an additional amount, salaries and expenses, studies and examinations of executive agencies, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses of the House," on page 3, after line 6, to insert:

For payment to W. Kingsland Macy, contestant, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Macy against Greenwood as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 10, to insert:

For payment to Ernest Greenwood, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested-election case of Macy against Greenwood as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 14, to insert:

For payment to Maurice S. Osser, contestant for expenses incurred in the contested election case of Osser versus Scott as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 18, to insert:

For payment to HARDIE SCOTT, contestee, for expenses incurred in the contested election case of Osser versus Scott as audited and recommended by the Committee on House Administration, $2,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 5, to insert:

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Subway transportation, Capitol and Senate Office Buildings: For an additional amount, not to exceed $300, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Capitol Buildings."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 10, to insert:

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WORKING CAPITAL AND CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING AND BINDING

The limitation under this head in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for printing, binding, and distributing the Federal Register, is increased from "$480,000" to "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter II—Department of Justice—Legal activities and general administration," at the top of page 5, to strike out:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

For an additional amount for "salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry," $14,800,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington is interested in this amendment. He is not in the Chamber at the moment. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may be passed over, without prejudice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over, without prejudice.

The next amendment of the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Immigration and Naturalization Service—Salaries and expenses," on page 5, line 8, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$2,610,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I am informed that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] is interested in this amendment. He is not in the Chamber at the moment, but we are sending for him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily.

The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter IV—Department of Labor—Bureau of Employment Security—Salaries and expenses", on page 8, line 18, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$892,000" and insert "$917,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this amendment was adopted in the committee. Subsequently we obtained some additional information regarding it. I have talked to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and other Senators who are interested in this matter.

Senators will understand that in connection with the bill on the subject of importation of Mexican agricultural labor, there are two features: One is the enforcement of the immigration law, by deporting from the United States aliens who are illegally in the United States. That function is performed by the Immigration Service of the Department of Justice. Funds for that purpose are provided in the item which has just been passed over. The Senator from Michigan knows about it.

Let me say to the senior Senator from Michigan who now has come to the floor, that I was directing attention to the fact that two provisions of this appropriation bill affect the importation of agricultural labor. One is the item on page 5, in line 8, where it is proposed to increase the amount from $2,610,000 to $4,000,000. That increase is proposed for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and is desired for the purpose, among others, of seeing to it that wetbacks, or those who are illegally in the United States, are deported.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then we come to the pending amendment, on page 8. An additional amount is proposed for the Bureau of Employment Security. The Appropriations Committee voted to increase that amount by $25,000, based upon a supplemental estimate which provided $25,000 for printing the new agreements with Mexico, which are soon to be made, relating to the importation of agricultural labor.

It has been brought to our attention, and I have called it to the attention of the Senator from Michigan and other Senators who are interested, that if the amount is not increased by an additional $142,000, the effect will be that the employment of 41 of a total of 49 persons now employed in handling the compliance function will be terminated; and two migration centers in Mexico, involving a cost of $16,000, will be closed. There is some question whether Mexico will allow us to recruit laborers who otherwise would have been processed at those migration centers, for the Mexican Government has insisted that the recruitment take place in the interior of Mexico, and that is why those stations have been established.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. THYE. The matter pointed out by the able and distinguished Senator from Arizona is most important. Never before have the agricultural producers in the United States been faced with such a shortage of workers—not necessarily skilled workers, but ordinary workers, including those imported from Mexico.

Unless this appropriation is made, we shall find that the number of Mexican agricultural workers will be decreased, and that will have a definite effect on the production of food and fiber in the United States, because at this time we are in the planting season, as well as in the harvesting season in the deep South in the case of some of the vegetable crops; and the potato crop will soon be ready for harvest.

Therefore, Mr. President, the items the distinguished Senator from Arizona has mentioned are absolutely essential in behalf of the farmers who may be affected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are two phases to this matter: One is that we are trying to have Mexican labor brought into the United States only for such periods of time as its services are needed, and then returned to Mexico.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the lawful way to proceed under the international agreement.

Mr. THYE. Definitely.

Mr. HAYDEN. The other phase is that in the case of those who are illegally in the United States, we are endeavoring to see that they shall be deported to Mexico.

This item of the bill relates to carrying into effect the legislation which was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of which the Senator from Minnesota is a member.

I have discussed the matter with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], who was the author of Public Law 78. He entirely agrees that the appropriation of the additional $142,000, for which I shall offer an amendment in a moment, is necessary if that law is to be administered properly, because otherwise there will be no personnel either to recruit the labor in Mexico or to screen the laborers when they are about to enter the United States or to see that they are properly allocated to the farmers.

Mr. THYE. The law itself will be ineffective unless we appropriate sufficient funds for its administration, is that not correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. And the workers will not be in the United States unless we provide for the manning of the recruitment stations in Mexico, in order to recruit the workers and to screen them properly. If the immigration authorities are properly to administer the law, they must have adequate appropriations, in order to have sufficient personnel to check on the wetbacks and on those who may be in the United States illegally or who may have overstayed their entrance permits.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. I think this appropriation is absolutely necessary in order to provide an adequate force of men to do the work which must be done if we are to have the food and fiber which are necessary in the present crop season.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, of course, in connection with this item, we face the same problem we usually face in connection with any appropriation bill, namely, if we attempt to decrease the requested appropriation by any amount the officials of the agency for which the appropriation is requested immediately attempt to demonstrate that if the requested appropriation is not made in full, they will not possibly be able to carry out the provisions of law which they are charged with enforcing.

I wish to ask what they plan to do with the $917,000 we are giving them for the next 2½ months in connection with enforcement of that law. We must not permit the wetback-labor problem to be confused with the legal-entrant problem. One problem is entirely separate from the other.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that perfectly, and that is what I have tried to make clear.

Mr. FERGUSON. I cannot understand why this agency cannot use for this purpose some of the $917,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Four hundred and forty-two thousand dollars of the $917,000 is for pay increases. The House of Representatives has allowed that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well; that is $442,000. What about the other $500,000; what is it for?

Mr. HAYDEN. The remainder is to carry into effect the Mexican-labor agreement which was entered into recently this year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Very well. How many employees can be obtained for $500,000 for 2½ months? Certainly this agency should be able to obtain a sufficient number of employees for that period of time with that amount of money.

Mr. HAYDEN. These are the figures which have been given to me: If this amount is not increased by $142,000, 41 employees out of a total of 49 in the compliance function will have to be discharged, and only 8 will be left. That is point No. 1.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is to be done with the remainder of the money? It certainly cannot be said that the Department proposes to spend $500,000 for nine employees over a period of 2½ months. But that is the figure. They say they have 49 employees. If we do not give them this money it will be necessary for them to lay off 40 of them, which will leave 9. But they will have

$500,000. What are they going to do with it?

Mr. HAYDEN. As the Senator knows, the Department has been paying transportation costs in order to bring the laborers into this country. It has expenses in the way of travel, communications, rents, utilities, supplies, public health, and so forth. All I can tell the Senator is that if we do not provide sufficient money, it will be impossible to have the necessary personnel to administer the act. The crops are in the ground, they are to be harvested, and either labor must be obtained in this way, or there will not be the necessary labor.

Mr. FERGUSON. I again ask, what is going to be done with the $500,000, if it is not to be used for the purpose of hiring help?

Mr. THYE. I think I can answer the distinguished Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish the Senator would do so.

Mr. THYE. It is not to be used solely for the purpose of hiring help.

Mr. FERGUSON. For what is it to be used?

Mr. THYE. It will be necessary to pay transportation in order to bring in the Mexican laborers.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not every man who contracts for Mexican labor pay a certain sum for every contract?

Mr. THYE. That is true. But there is the expense of bringing the laborer from the concentration center in Mexico to the border. From there on, the employer in the State will assume the expense. Board-and-room costs as well as transportation are involved.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not a fact that if all the money now requested is provided, the Department will have not only 49 employees, but 36 additional employees? I am opposed to having so many additional employees.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I may say in reply that events during the months which have passed since legislation on the subject was first given consideration have made it necessary that the entire recruitment program be stepped up and consolidated. There is a present need for the labor and the need will increase between now and midsummer. It will either be necessary to step up the program of recruitment, including the transportation of the laborers and their dispersal to areas of employment, where employers are waiting, or there will be crops which will not be put into the ground, and certain of the early crops will not be harvested. As the result of all my study of this subject and my contacts with the men who are seeking to employ Mexican laborers, I believe that we had better make the appropriation available; otherwise we may find that some food and fiber will not be planted, and some will not be harvested.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if I may, I desire to get to the matter before the Senate in concrete form, because we have merely been talking generally. I move to amend the committee amendment on page 8, line 18, by striking out the numerals "$917,000" and inserting "$1,159,000." That represents an increase of $142,000. And since there is, directly below that, a limitation of $5,675,000, I move to strike that amount from line 21, and to insert "$5,517,000."

That brings the issue squarely before the Senate.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I desire to make a few remarks on this question, because it is one which arises continually. We are concerned with what are known as organization charts. Let us see what is planned for the 36 new employees. The Department asks for $4,000,000, to prevent illegal entries across the border. Then it wants $1,000,000 plus a few thousand dollars in order to bring legal workers across the border and place them in employment. If we appropriate the amount which the Senator from Arizona has asked, there will be 36 new employees. What does the breakdown show? There will be six agricultural employment specialists. Then there will be a reception center, with a manager at $7,000, and an assistant manager at $5,940. In addition, there will be a chief of the reception service, a chief of the contract service, and an administrative assistant. What for? There will also be a supervisor of transportation, a supervisor of maintenance, housing and protection, and a supervisor of subsistence. It all reminds me of what the Indian said when he came to Washington: "There are too many chiefs and not enough Indians." The trouble in this instance is that there are so many supervisors, chiefs, and assistants that the work itself will not get done. Also on the list are an operating engineer, two checkers, and one stenographer for all the supervisory officers. Then there are three expediters, one head clerk and one file clerk. There are also a guard, two janitors, and two night watchmen. For the migration centers there are four interviewers and four more expediters.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has been discussing personnel included in a supplemental estimate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is what the Senator is asking for.

Mr. HAYDEN. No, I am not. I am not at all asking for personnel to perform the functions contemplated in the supplemental estimate. I am only seeking to retain in the service the employees the Department now has. The Senate committee very properly disagreed to the supplemental estimate, which was for $110,000, and allowed only the $25,000. We are going to adhere to our position.

Mr. FERGUSON. The item on page 8, line 18, in the House bill, was $892,000, was it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. And the amendment is going to restore the original amount in the House bill, which would bring the appropriation up to $1,144,200, which would include the 36 employees.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes, but we are only providing $1,000,000. The Senator from Michigan is talking about $100,000 which is not in the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Department asked for it, but it is not in the bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. But the Senator from Arizona wants to put it in the bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not want to put it in for the item in the supplemental estimate, at all. I see no necessity for it. I see no necessity for building any new reception centers.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator is also asking, on page 5, to increase the amount to $4,000,000; is he not?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is for another service entirely.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, it is for another service, but it is for the purpose of keeping out illegal entries; is it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The committee voted to restore the amount of money which the House committee recommended. The cut was made on the floor of the House. The original estimate, if I remember correctly, was about $4,500,000, or $4,610,000. The House committee cut off $610,000, and the reduction was then made on the floor; which would have made it impossible to enforce the wetback law at all.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan will say to the Senator from Arizona that he thinks the House did a good job on this item. It involves the question of labor in Michigan, as well as in Arizona. If the increase in this item is taken to conference and I am one of the conferees, I should be compelled to oppose it, and would go along with the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to submit it to conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. I would be perfectly willing to discuss it with the House conferees, because I think the House was right. If the Senator can convince me in the conference, I would naturally go along with him, but my present thinking is that the House is correct, and I want the Senator to know that before the item is taken to the conference.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let my amendments be adopted, and we will take them to conference on that basis.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the fact that I agree that nothing should be included that is not needed, but I do not think the chairman of the committee should be blamed for something which was asked for but was not given.

Mr. FERGUSON. I am not blaming the Senator from Arizona. He and I understand each other. We are trying to debate this question. I do not like what is known as organization charts that end up with too many chiefs and no workers, or, as the Indian said, too many chiefs and no Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the two amendments will be agreed to, and the committee amendment as amended is agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not want to take the item of $4,000,000 to conference. I think we should have a vote on it.

Mr. HAYDEN. We shall have to come back to that later.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the tabulation from which I have quoted,

and also a statement which I have prepared in which I have cited what the House committee report stated with respect to the share of the cost of importation of labor which should be borne by the farmers and the share which should be borne by the Government.

The House committee, I am sure, was mistaken in its statement, and I think I have proved it by statements taken from the record.

There being no objection, the tabulation and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Effect of reducing request of $611,000 to $468,800

Reduction in nonlabor costs	$34,200
Reduction in costs for salaries	108,000
Total reduction	142,200
Effect of reduction in salary items:	
1. Eliminate 41 employees of 49 performing compliance function	37,700
2. Close 2 migration centers in Mexico (there is some question as to whether Mexico will allow us to recruit the men who would have been processed here from another center)	16,000
3. Close 2 reception centers (May and June)	33,800
4. Release 17 regional office employees which is almost the entire staff working on Public Law 78, May 15, 1952	10,400
5. Release 24 of 33 headquarters staff employees working on Public Law 78, May 15, 1952	10,100
Total reduction, personal services	108,000
Reduction in nonlabor costs (includes travel, communications, rents and utilities, supplies and services of Public Health Service)	34,200
Total reduction	142,200

Restoration of the $142,000 will not permit any expansion of the existing program.

STATEMENT WITH RESPECT TO SALARIES AND EXPENSES OF REGULAR DEPARTMENT OR AGENCY PERSONNEL IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

House Report No. 1503 on the third supplemental appropriation to accompany H. R. 6947 states, in part:

"It was the understanding of each of the members of the committee, when this legislation was under consideration, that it would be in most part self-supporting. However, this has proven to be far from true. In fact, Federal appropriations are bearing over half of the cost of the program. Based on testimony of officials of the Department of Labor, the committee believes that this reduction is the greatest that can be made and still provide for adequate administration of the program as it is now constituted. The committee is unanimous in its belief that such steps that are necessary should be taken to remove the obstacles in the way of making the program more nearly self-supporting to the end that those who benefit should bear a greater portion of the cost."

We believe the committee has a misunderstanding with respect to the administrative financing of this program. Public Law 78, in section 502 (2), says:

"No workers shall be made available under this title to any employer unless such employer enters into an agreement with the United States— * * * "(2) to reimburse the United States for essential expenses, *not including salaries or expenses of regular department or agency personnel,* incurred by it for the transportation and subsistence of workers under this title in amounts not to exceed $15 per worker." (Italics supplied.)

When Public Law 78 was originally introduced in the House (H. R. 3048) and in the Senate (S. 984) the bills did not contain the provision italicized above. When Senate bill 984, however, was reported out by the Senate Committee on Agriculture it contained the italicized language. The report accompanying Senate bill 984 (S. 214) says in this respect:

"The bill as introduced provided that the employer pay for all expenses up to $20 incurred by the Government in recruitment and transportation of workers. The committee believes normal salary and other expenses of Government officials administering the program should not be charged to the individual employers of the workers recruited by such Government employees and recommends amending the bill accordingly."

After the House Committee on Agriculture had concluded its hearings on H. R. 3048 a clean bill was introduced (H. R. 3283) containing the italicized language.

The report of the committee accompanying H. R. 3283 (H. Rept. 326) states with respect to this matter:

"The only unrecoverable expense which the Government will be called upon to bear under the proposed program will be *the payment of salaries of regular departmental agency personnel,* the cost of establishing and maintaining reception centers in the United States, and the cost of apprehending and deporting contract violators which is in excess of the normal cost which the employer would have been required to bear had the worker returned in accordance with the provisions of the contract of employment." [Italics supplied.]

The above-quoted excerpts from the legislative history of Public Law 78 indicates very clearly that it was the intent of at least the committees which had considered the bills not to require the employers to reimburse the Government for the administrative expenses of the program. As a matter of fact, during the debate on the floor of the House doubt was expressed by various Members that the rate provided in the House bill of $10 per worker would be adequate to cover even the costs of recruitment and transportation. Several amendments were introduced to increase this amount; one amendment would have increased it to $20 per worker, another amendment would have increased it to $35 per worker.

The Committee on Appropriations recognized that the administrative costs of the program would be borne by the Federal Government when the first regular appropriation was made for the program. This is evident from House Report 890 on the 1952 supplemental appropriation bill to accompany H. R. 5215, which states in part:

"The law provides that the Government shall be reimbursed in the amount of $15 per worker by the contracting employers, such charge to cover costs of transporting, feeding, and housing workers from point of recruitment to border reception centers and return. The committee is of the opinion that the full costs of this temporary program should be recouped to the Treasury and regrets to note that the basic law made no provision for recapturing general administrative costs of handling the program."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency—Office of the Administrator," on page 9, after line 14, to strike out:

SURPLUS PROPERTY DISPOSAL

For an additional amount for "Surplus property disposal," $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter V—Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Salaries and expenses" on page 10, line 22, after the word "fires", to strike out "$3,000,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, with reference to this item, I hope the Senate will not vote the increase proposed in this amendment. This is only an amount to cover an estimate. The Department admits that $3,000,000 will be adequate for fighting forest fires if it is permitted to draw on 1953 funds. I feel that it would be wiser to appropriate the $3,000,000 rather than the sum of $3,500,000 and then wait until the cost of fighting spring fires are actually determined, however, allowing the Department to draw the necessary amount from the 1953 funds. When they know the cost they can tell us definitely what is needed and we can consider it in another supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to say so, he is assuming that we will know between now and the next appropriation bill what fires will take place. The way the committee handled the matter was proper. The committee recommends an appropriation of $3,500,000, an increase of $500,000 over the House allowance. The committee takes the view that the 1953 funds may be drawn upon to whatever extent may be required. The records show that there never has been a time when in fighting forest fires the Government was able to get off as cheaply as $500,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. I should like to read the Department's own justification. The committee went over it and determined that $3,000,000 was sufficient——

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the committee agreed to make it $3,500,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. I stand corrected.

Mr. HAYDEN. In addition to that, the Department can use next year's money if necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. I was looking at my own vote on this particular point.

I want to invite attention to the justification, which says:

While fire-fighting costs are largely influenced by weather, experience of the last several years indicates that the regular appropriation of $6,000,000 for 1953 will probably be inadequate. Therefore, it is likely that funds therefor in 1953 will be inadequate and another supplemental appropriation will be required at some future date.

I am asking that we keep the amount at $3,000,000, allow the Department to draw on the 1953 funds, and then, when they have determined what the cost is up to the time the 1953 funds are available, we shall be able to put that correct amount into the 1953 funds instead of guessing now by adding another half a million dollars.

I hope the Senate will vote against the committee amendment.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As one of those who agree with the Senator from Michigan, I should like to point out this statement which appears in the justification:

Inasmuch as spring fire-fighting obligations have been as high as $1,970,000, at the

present value of the dollar, it will obviously be necessary to draw on the 1953 appropriation in such an amount as may be required in the event of serious fire emergencies, even though in excess of the $500,000 reduction by the House.

To supplement what the Senator from Michigan has said, we are just guessing at $500,000. There may be needed three times that amount, or none of it may be needed. We are going to have another supplemental appropriation bill anyway.

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as the American taxpayer is concerned, he is going to pay for the cost of preserving one of the Nation's greatest natural assets, which is timber.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We all agree on that.

Mr. HAYDEN. If there are no forest fires, $500,000 is more than sufficient. What is the difference? If more is needed, we say that they may use the funds for next year. By acceding to the views of the Senator from Michigan; we may save a few dollars on the face of the bill, but the taxpayers are not saved a cent.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator asks, "What is the difference?" In my estimation, the difference is that if a department has money in its "treasury" which it is allowed to use, it will use it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Will it deliberately start forest fires?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; I am not indicating that it will set any fires. I may say however about the military, that the first of the year they had $80,100,000,000 available for expenditure. On July 1 of this year, 6 months later, they will have more than $100,000,000,000 unexpended. Such a situation breeds extravagance. If we appropriate the amount of money proposed to be provided for this item we will find that it is going to breed extravagance. I think it would be a mistake.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan has elaborated the point very fully, but I would reply to the Senator from Arizona by saying that I would rather have Congress hold control of the funds than for the department to have control, particularly in this instance.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question, in order to have the matter more thoroughly clarified. Assume there is a fire and that it must be controlled, or at least must be fought, but the funds for fire fighting have been exhausted. The Forest Service cannot cease its fire-fighting operations. They must try to obtain funds from the Department or from Congress in order to continue the fire fighting. How much money have they with which to meet an emergency if one should occur between now and June 30?

Mr. HAYDEN. None.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is not quite the fact. They have 1953 funds.

Mr. THYE. Let us get the answer. I think the clerk of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Smith, can enlighten us on this specific question.

Mr. FERGUSON. Emergency fire-fighting costs can be met with the amount provided by the House. That is admitted by the Forest Service. Funds will be available to put out any fire which might occur.

Mr. THYE. That is the only question with which I am concerning myself.

Mr. FERGUSON. The representatives of the Forest Service say so themselves.

Mr. THYE. The Forest Service could not mark time while waiting for Congress to act, in the event funds were exhausted and a fire was raging.

Mr. FERGUSON. No one is asking them to wait.

Mr. THYE. That is the question I want to have clear before I consent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Suppose Congress makes $3,500,000 available, and the Forest Service runs over that amount, and there is a fire; they would have to meet the deficiency in some way.

Mr. THYE. They recognize, however, that they can look back into past years and govern their anticipated expenditures by the sums heretofore provided.

Mr. HAYDEN. What happened was that last year Congress appropriated $6,000,000 for this purpose. Up to January, in fighting fires, $8,000,000 was spent. A budget estimate was submitted to increase the money available by $3,500,000, $2,000,000 of which had already been spent.

Mr. THYE. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The House committee said:

> The committee recommends an appropriation of $3,000,000, a reduction in the estimate of $500,000, with the understanding that funds for 1953 may be drawn upon to the extent of the reduction if necessary.

That meant that $500,000 could be used out of 1953 funds. Our committee thought that was wrong, and that money should not be taken from 1953 funds with which to fight fires.

Mr. THYE. That means solely to fight fires. Not one cent may be spent unless a fire is raging in our national forests, and there must be a staff to put the fire out.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. THYE. If proper steps are not taken, fire will destroy some of the vital materials which are necessary to increase the economy of the country.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In order to help answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota, I agree entirely with what the Senator from Arizona has said. I remember very well the discussion. We decided the House report did limit to $500,000 the amount which could be drawn ahead. We distinctly changed that language.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We made the change in order that the Forest Service could draw indefinitely from the 1953 amount. Therefore, ample funds are available.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan is not objecting to that change.

Mr. THYE. That was my understanding of the situation. One reason why the committee saw fit to increase the amount of the House appropriation by $500,000 was in order to leave a little more in reserve, in the event there should be serious forest fires between now and June 30. That was my understanding of the increase of $500,000, and that is the only reason why I state that there will probably not be a sufficient amount in reserve to meet an emergency, if an emergency shall occur, and that if the money is not expended, it will be carried over into 1953, and will be available.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I understand, under the language of the bill the full amount of the 1953 appropriation is available to fight fire in May 1952, if that is necessary.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The amount is available at this time. That is what the Forest Service says. They have sufficient to draw on.

Mr. HAYDEN. Actually the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill has not been passed.

Mr. THYE. That is my understanding. We have not enacted the agricultural appropriation bill for 1953, and we are only projecting ourselves into what may be done by Congress insofar as the matter relates to the 1953 budget.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wish to read into the RECORD a statement by Mr. Gustafson which appears at page 99 of the hearings on the third supplemental appropriation bill, 1952. Mr. Gustafson said:

> As stated, the obligation of $2,442,354 was met by drawing on the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation. Funds are required to reimburse the "Salaries and expenses" appropriation if the Forest Service is to continue its operations. This is the financial picture for the fire-fighting item as of January 1, 1952.

That indicates that whenever they need money for fire fighting, it is an unestimated amount, and they can always find in the appropriation a sufficient amount of money. That is why they say they have sufficient money. Of course, it has to be reimbursed.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be taken from funds to be used for paying fire rangers, or some other activity. They can use the money temporarily, but it must be returned to pay salaries during the remainder of the year.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. I only want to wait until we know what the exact amount will be, and then we will provide for it.

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator from Michigan could show me that we would save the taxpayer 1 cent, by cutting the fund by $500,000, I would be glad to go along with his proposal, but actually we are going to pay for fighting the fires if they occur, and if they do not occur we

will not have to pay anything. If they do occur, we will pay for fighting them out of next year's fund.

Mr. FERGUSON. My answer to that is that I am a believer in the Congress retaining control of the purse strings. If we require the Forest Service to give us the exact figures, we shall be better off than by merely filling the bank account and allowing them to write a blank check as they might desire to draw against the account. I think that under my proposal there would be a saving.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan might be correct in one particular instance. It is all very well to protect the taxpayers' dollars, and it is the duty of Members of Congress to watch appropriations from year to year. But we also have the responsibility of protecting the property of the taxpayers. Many millions of dollars are lost yearly to the taxpayers because Congress is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

In order to save now, supposedly, $500,000, we shall be running the risk of losing a million dollars. Only a year ago, in my own State, more than 45,000 acres of the finest timber land were lost.

Of this $500,000, the taxpayers are not going to lose one penny, if the money is not needed to protect some of the taxpayers' property.

I have been in the forests of the State of the Senator from Michigan. The American people possess some of the finest timber land throughout the country. There are millions of acres of fine timber land in my State, in Arizona, California, Oregon, Washington—yes; and in Michigan and Wisconsin.

Is it our duty, in order to save a few dollars, to cause a hazard that may result in the loss of that property?

I may say to the Senator from Michigan that he could save the money he would have to pay for insurance on his home, his business, or anything else, by not taking out a policy.

Do Senators realize the amount that is involved in this amendment? It is $500,000. Compare that with the billions of dollars which are spent for things we do not know about. Yet the sum of $500,000 is sought to protect property that belongs to all the people of the United States, including Senators. That is all it means. If it is not needed, it will not be spent. Would the Senator from Michigan rather save $500,000 and take a chance that $100,000,000 might be lost?

Let me make a further statement along that line. I may be considered a little fanatical about protecting the people's property. I have traveled from Tillamook, Oreg., to Portland. I have seen the area which is called the graveyard. It is called the graveyard because for 27 miles on both sides of the road one can see nothing but dead trees, which were once worth millions of dollars. They were the property of the taxpayers; but someone, in order to save a few dollars, decided that they need not be protected. Therefore we now have this area which is known as the graveyard.

All this item means is a little insurance, if it should become necessary. If it is not necessary, the money will not be spent. I hope the amendment of the committee will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 22.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan has not been arguing that he does not want to protect the forests. That is what this item is for. The item has nothing to do with private land. It has nothing to do with lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

It is said that $500,000 is only a drop in the bucket so far as the money of the taxpayers is concerned. I say, in view of the manner in which we are now spending billions of dollars, that it is not even a drop. This is a matter of principle.

This amount is only an estimate. If the Department takes the money from the other fund, as it has done for years, we can then determine, when the Department is through fighting the fires, how much is needed. The Department is authorized to use any amount of money necessary to protect forest lands and it can draw money from the 1953 funds.

I hope the Senate will reject this amendment and retain control of the purse strings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 10, line 22. [Putting the question.]

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that he voted "aye."

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Smoke jumper facilities," on page 11, line 2, after the word "expended", to insert *"Provided,* That the amount made available herein shall be the full cost of the acquisition of land and construction of facilities: *Provided further."*

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter VII—Independent offices," on page 14, after line 2, to insert:

AMERICAN BATTLE MONUMENTS COMMISSION

DEDICATION OF WORLD WAR II MEMORIALS

For expenses necessary for an appropriate dedication of World War II memorials, erected under authority of the act of June 26, 1946 (36 U. S. C. 123), to be available for such purposes as the Commission may deem necessary and proper and without regard to the provisions of other laws or regulations relating to the expenditure of public funds (except that this exemption shall not be construed as waiving the requirement for the submission of accounts and vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit), $30,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until June 30, 1953: *Provided,* That, when in the discretion of the American Battle Monuments Commission it would be in the public interest, personnel and transportation facilities of any other Government agency may be furnished by such agency, without reimbursement, to the Commission for the purposes of this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is in charge of the bill. I presume it is understood that as we go along and vote on the committee amendments, the entire bill, outside the committee amendments, will be open for amendment later.

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. I make that inquiry in order that there may be no misunderstanding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is correct in his statement. In order to be absolutely certain, let the Chair ask the Senator from Michigan if he correctly understands the statement which the Senator from Michigan made, namely, that the bill as a whole, aside from the committee amendments, will be open to amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. However, that does not apply to the committee amendments already passed upon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the point which the Chair wishes to make clear.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 14, after line 20, to insert:

COMMISSION ON RENOVATION OF THE EXECUTIVE MANSION

For an additional amount for "Commission on Renovation of the Executive Mansion," $20,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 14, line 24, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this item relates to the renovation of the Executive Mansion. There is a request in this bill for $20,000. Of that, $6,500 is needed for the Commission's staff, services, and expenses until June 30, in order to close out the accounts, dispose of the records, and complete other actions necessary to the termination of the business of the Commission. The remainder of the request, or $13,500, is for printing and binding the final report to Congress by the Commission. Think of it. The Commission wants $13,500 for printing and binding its final report. This brings me back to one of the requests in connection with a supplemental bill last year.

In connection with this same item, the Commission wanted $40,000 to file in the Archives the plans for this renovation. It wanted $20,000 to file in the Archives the plans of the hidden work for the renovation of the White House. In other words, the Commission wanted $60,000 of the taxpayers' money to file plans which were already in existence in the Archives.

The Senator from Michigan brought the situation to the attention of the Commission. Representatives of the Commission stated that it was necessary to draw new plans, because the plans belonged to the architect. When the representatives of the Commission came before the committee we discovered that the architect at the White House was on a yearly salary. How could the plans belong to the architect? If they belonged to the architect, they belonged to the United States Government.

Think of it. There was a request for $60,000 merely to file plans. That was boondoggling. What the Commission wanted to do was to redraft the plans and maintain a staff.

What do we find now? The Commission wants $13,500 for printing and binding a report. How is it to be bound? Is it to be bound in gold or silver? Originally the Commission wanted only $1,000 for the printing and binding of this report, but now it has ideas of grandeur.

If we do not cut appropriations, we shall eventually spend $85,000,000,000. This item will not be a drop in the bucket, or half a drop, or any appreciable percentage of a drop; but I say that the time has come when we must save on all these items. The Commission itself says—and I quote from its previous request:

> An item of $1,000 for printing, and sufficient merely for printing the report of a routine type, was included in the 1952 request for the Commission's expenses.

In other words, they wanted an appropriation for a routine report. Now they want an appropriation for a deluxe report. Instead of a thousand dollars, they want 13½ times that amount. It seems to me that if $1,000 was adequate for the job a year ago, it should be sufficient today. The Commission plans an elaborate project in connection with the final report, which the Government Printing Office estimates will cost $13,500, as against $1,000 for an adequate, but not deluxe, report.

I submit that this is not the time for indulgence in this type of luxury. Therefore I offer an amendment which reduces the amount of the funds for printing and binding by $12,500, and reduces the amount of the funds available for other expenses in connection with the writing of the report by $2,500. Certainly those amounts should be adequate.

Mr. President, if the Committee on Appropriations had not discovered last year the existence of the items of $40,000 and $20,000 this body would have appropriated $60,000 to file in the Archives the plans and specifications for the renovation of the White House. I hope the Senate will adopt my amendment.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, very seldom do I ever rise on the floor of the Senate except for the purpose of endeavoring to keep down appropriations. However, I am familiar with this item. The Commission on the Renovation of the White House has given very serious thought to it. We felt that there should be a report made on the renovation which would be a complete history of the White House. As Senators know, the White House was renovated the first time in 1817, after the British had burned it in 1814. The next time it was renovated was in 1901, under President Theodore Roosevelt. Then it was renovated again by President Coolidge in 1926 or 1927. The records of those renovations were not complete.

When a few years ago Congress appointed a commission to renovate the White House it was necessary to go back over all the history of the White House that could possibly be gathered in order that the Commission could make sure that the renovation would be done properly. We wanted the work to be permanent and to provide a report which would be available in the future.

Moreover, we wanted the White House to look as it looked when it was rebuilt in 1817 after it had been burned by the British in 1814. We hope that in subsequent years Americans will have available to them a full report on the renovation of the White House.

I admit that it will be a de luxe addition. The plan is to include pages of colored pictures of the various rooms in which the American people are particularly interested. It will cost about a thousand dollars a page to do so. I believe that we have kept the cost down to the smallest possible amount.

I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], the Chairman of the Renovation Commission and chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, could not be on the floor today, because he is very much more familiar with the whole subject than am I.

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

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

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon did not have an opportunity to hear any of the testimony given before the committee on this subject, and, indeed, very little testimony regarding it was given before the committee. So the Senator from Oregon is without what he believes to be essential information in order to make up his mind as to what should be done in connection with this particuular item. Therefore he would like to ask this question: Is this report to be a bound book, to be printed in volume, for sale by the Superintendent of Documents?

Mr. MARTIN. I am sorry that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, is not on the floor. The work of the Commission was divided, and I am not so familiar with that aspect of it as I am with the actual construction involved.

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

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon has found the answer in the hearings on the bill. It is found at page 430. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will permit me to do so, I should like to invite his attention to the testimony which appears at page 430. The question was asked: "How many reports would there be?"

I quote from the testimony:

> General EDGERTON. There will be one final report.
>
> Senator YOUNG. How many copies will be issued?
>
> General EDGERTON. There will be 5,000 copies.
>
> Senator YOUNG. Will these be sent to the Members of Congress?
>
> General EDGERTON. Yes, sir; and then of course, in addition, the Public Printer would print a quantity to be distributed through the channels which he uses for sale to the public.
>
> Senator HAYDEN. That is for sale?
>
> General EDGERTON. Yes, sir.
>
> It is probably not essential to the issue but there is a great likelihood that the sales he would make would reimburse the Government for the total cost entailed. We anticipate that every library, almost all architects, and many others will want a copy of the report.
>
> The reason we selected 5,000 is that that is the minimum edition on which they normally quote. A few hundred dollars would be saved by reducing that quantity, but there are a great many offices and persons who should be given at least one copy of the report.
>
> It might be well to put in the record also that the Commission will turn into the Treasury about $27,500 as the net proceeds of the souvenir program, which of course would not be applicable without legislation for this purpose. The souvenir program was entirely self-sustaining.

I invite attention to the fact that the souvenir program refers to the action taken by the Commission in selling souvenirs made from some of the material taken from the White House during the renovation.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, with relation to the souvenirs, I know that Members of the Senate are interested in that subject. Under a law which Congress passed, material taken from the White House could be used for the purpose of making souvenirs, provided that the program was not commercialized.

Therefore the gavels, canes, boxes, and other objects which were made from such material were sold. We did not, however, expect such a large demand for the souvenirs. Consequently we had a surplus on hand at the end of the work of $27,000.

Mr. President, I have served in various capacities on many commissions in my lifetime. I feel that this Commission has worked as diligently as it possibly could work to give the people of America a fine home for their President and at as economical a cost as was possible under the circumstances.

I do not want to take too much time, but I should like to say that the first thing that had to be determined by the Commission was whether the old walls of the White House could be left standing. We had to employ the best engineers and experts in the country to determine whether the walls could be underpinned and left standing with safety. It was finally decided that it could be done if the foundations were extended into the ground a depth of 24 feet. That was done. The walls were underpinned to a depth of 24 feet. Consequently there are now two stories underground which were

not there when the work was started. That additional space was very badly needed. The report will show all that engineering and architectural work, as well as how the Commission reached its conclusions. I think the expense is very well worth while.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I am sorry that I must differ with my colleague from Pennsylvania because he usually is on the side of economy. I realize that when we try to cut an item of expense, whether it be an item such as this one or an item for the judicial or legislative branch of the Government, we are bound to step on someone's toes in trying to apply economy.

All I am asking is whether the Senate feels that when we are in a period of deficit spending we can print 5,000 copies of a de luxe edition of a report. The White House is finished. Printing of the report will not add one thing to the White House. The report, if not in the form of a de luxe report could be printed for $1,000, and the same result would be obtained. The question is whether we should pay $1,000 for the report or $13,500. If I do not miss my guess, General Edgerton was right when he said that 5,000 copies of the de luxe report would go to Representatives and Senators. Mention has been made of the fact that copies would be made available to the public by the Government Printing Office. I should like to say that the Government Printing Office merely adds a 10-percent profit on the overrun.

Mr. President, I want the report printed. We are told that it can be printed for $5,000. If the smaller amount is appropriated, the only difference will be in the binding and in the cover. I suppose the report will contain colored pictures. A souvenir program has been issued.

The first time the Appropriations Committee went there, it was shown pictures of how the various rooms would look.

So, Mr. President, I ask whether we should cause deficit spending for a program of this kind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan to the committee amendment on page 14, in line 24. [Putting the question.]

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 14, beginning in line 21.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, to this committee amendment, I offer the following amendment: Strike out the figure "$20,000", and in lieu thereof insert the figure "$15,000."

In order to make perfectly clear what this amendment to the committee amendment will do, let me say that I believe that if the proposed reduction of $5,000 in the entire item is made, the Commission will still be able to print a sufficient number of copies of a proper report and will be able to assure that copies will be available to those who desire to purchase them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 14, in line 24, it is proposed to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$15,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon to the committee amendment on page 14, in line 24, which has just been stated. [Putting the question.]

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on this question I call for a division.

On a division, the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 14, in lines 21 to 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to submit an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless the amendment is to a committee amendment, it is not now in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there are two more committee amendments. One of them relates to the legislative branch. After those amendments are disposed of, we can consider what the Senator from Washington has in mind.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter XI—Increased pay costs—legislative branch," on page 22, after line 1, to insert:

Senate:

"Salaries, officers and employees," $782,896;

Contingent expenses of the Senate:

"Senate policy committee," $9,910;

"Joint Committee on the Economic Report," $7,690.

"Joint Committee on Atomic Energy," $12,925;

"Joint Committee on Printing," $2,792;

"Vice President's automobile," $355;

"Automobile for the President pro tempore," $355;

"Automobile for majority and minority leaders," $710;

"Reporting Senate proceedings," $10,253;

"Furniture," cleaning, etc., $290;

"Inquiries and investigations," $92,120;

"Folding documents," $2,890;

"Miscellaneous items," $15,060;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 47, after line 13, to insert:

CHAPTER XII

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES, AUDITED CLAIMS, AND JUDGMENTS

For payment of claims for damages as settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law, audited claims certified to be due by the General Accounting Office, and judgments rendered against the United States by United States district courts and the United States Court of Claims, as set forth in Senate Document Numbered 108, Eighty-second Congress, $4,357,649, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall have become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That, unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than 30 days after the date of approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be authorized to make the necessary changes in section numbers in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we have temporarily passed over two amendments. The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is interested in one of them, and the other amendment was passed over at the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], in behalf of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Let me inquire whether the Senator from Washington wishes to address himself to one of the amendments at this time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I should like to revert to page 5 of the bill and the committee amendment on that page striking out the item for "Salaries and expenses" in connection with the claims of persons of Japanese ancestry. The item appearing in lines 3 and 4, on page 5, would be stricken out by means of the committee amendment.

I desire to move that the committee amendment be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, in lines 1 to 4, it is proposed to strike out:

SALARIES AND EXPENSES, CLAIMS OF PERSONS OF JAPANESE ANCESTRY

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry," $14,800,000.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the committee amendment be rejected, so that this item will remain in the bill. I take this position after a great deal of discussion in regard to this matter with members of the subcommittee.

Following the inclusion of this item in the bill as passed by the House, there was some discussion in the committee, but no detailed discussion. Apparently the committee decided to strike out the item, not on the basis that the committee was opposed to the amount of the item on its merits, but on the ground that this matter might better be included in the regular appropriation bill.

I believe this item should be retained in this supplemental appropriation bill at this time because it relates to claims which have been made and adjudicated pursuant to laws passed by Congress, and because all the claims covered by this item have been or will be reviewed and passed upon by the Department of Justice, and those which it approves will have to be paid.

The claims which already have been adjudicated by the Department of Justice will have to be paid. They now represent both a moral and a legal obligation on the part of the United States Government. Therefore, absolutely no economy will be involved by eliminating the item of $14,800,000.

Let me say that there is no difference of opinion regarding this item. All the committee members are agreed regarding the justice of the item. I am informed that all the claims involved have been adjudicated by the Department of Justice and have been compromised. Most of the persons involved in this item are elderly, and can use the money. Furthermore, none of the claims involved in this item is for more than $2,500 or for more than three-fourths of the compensable item of the total amount claimed, whichever is less.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I wished to inquire whether this item constitutes complete settlement, or whether other claims remain to be settled.

Mr. MAGNUSON. So far as the Department is concerned, there are no other claims. Twenty-four thousand claims were filed under the original Evacuation Claims Act. However, all the claims covered by this item have been adjudicated, and they are the ones that the Department has determined it will allow.

Mr. HAYDEN. My point is that if a settlement in the nature of a compromise is made, with the agreement of the Department—and I understand that is the present situation—if other claims are subsequently to be compromised and if these claims are not paid the parties to the other claims would not be inclined to enter into a compromise.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I can read to the Senator a statement which I believe covers this matter:

On April 10 the Senate Appropriations Committee, in reporting the third supplemental appropriation bill for 1952, eliminated all of the $14,800,000 item which was requested by the Department of Justice for the payment of claims settled under the compromise settlement amendment to Public Law 886, the Evacuation Claims Act of 1948. This act authorizes the Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims for losses suffered by persons of Japanese ancestry, resulting from their compliance with the Government's evacuation orders, which removed them from the west coast in 1942.

The compromise settlement, which was enacted August 17, 1951, was devised to expedite the settlement of smaller claims, bringing substantial savings in administrative costs to the Government and speedier payment to the claimants. The compromise settlement amendment allows the claimants to compromise their claims for three-fourths of the compensable items of the total claimed or $2,500, whichever is less. In short, for the claimant who wishes to settle his claim under the compromise formula, there is first an automatic 25 percent cut of his possible award, no matter how justified his claim may be.

There were 24,000 claims filed under the original Evacuation Claims Act. The Department of Justice hopes to settle 17,000 of these smaller claims by the end of June of this year. Already the Department of Justice has awarded $9,000,000 under the compromise-settlement amendment, but these awards have not yet been paid because of lack of funds.

One of the most urgent factors arguing for a quick settlement of the claims is the advanced age of most of the claimants who suffered these losses 10 long years ago. It would seem cruel justice to these people, who have agreed to take a 25-percent reduction of their claims, to withhold any longer the money already awarded them by the Government.

I have recently checked with the Department of Justice, and am informed that insofar as it is concerned, this item covers all the claims that have been adjudicated, so far as the Department knows, although more claims than those which have been settled have been filed by various applicants. However, the adjudicated claims covered by this item of the bill are the ones the Department will consider. I offer that explanation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield for a question?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee decided against including this item for the reason—and I think the committee's reasoning was sound—that this item amounts to $14,800,000, and it will be only 2½ months until the regular appropriation bill will go into effect, and the subcommittee which handles the regular appropriation bill would like to go further into the entire matter.

I appreciate that the claims covered by this item are in the same position as judgments, for the claims have been adjudicated and the amounts are due.

However, it will be only 2½ months until this matter can be handled by means of the regular appropriation bill, instead of handling it now in the supplemental appropriation bill. That is the only consideration that is involved.

I think there is no question that the payments are due. However, the committee took the position that it preferred to have this item included in the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is correct, but many of these claims were adjudicated at some time in the past, and no funds are available with which to pay them. It would be desirable if the items could be separated, and if the exact amounts could be stated. I do not know whether $14,800,000 is the exact amount, or whether it is closer to $10,000,000.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As I read the side slips on the evidence presented, I come to the last paragraph, as follows:

The affidavit forms necessary to be executed by claimants in order to invoke the compromise provisions of the net law have been distributed and it is estimated that 17,824 claimants having claims of $5,000 or less will elect to compromise their claims. It is anticipated that this number of claims will be disposed of during the fiscal year 1952 since the vast majority of those desiring to compromise will undoubtedly submit the compromise forms prior to June 1952. The aggregate amount involved in these claims is $33,326,767.47.

I agree with what the Senator from Michigan has said. A question of principle is involved. This is a proper item for the 1953 budget. There are 23,725 claims pending, and 17,824 of these will probably be compromised. That is not definitely known yet. It seems to me, as the Senator from Michigan has said, that, with 2½ months remaining, opportunity would be afforded to obtain more definite knowledge. No one would be hurt. This is no proper item to be placed in a supplemental bill. The entire committee, I think, felt and realized that this amount will have to be paid. This is not a question of a saving, it is rather a question of principle.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. In a moment. I do not disagree with the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts, but, since that testimony was taken, I have discussed this matter with the Department of Justice. Their position is that, so far as the Department of Justice is concerned, they have now adjudicated all the claims they feel will be adjudicated. Although there are other applicants I think money ought to be made available as quickly as possible, so that those whose claims have been completely adjudicated may be paid. It is known that in many cases the claimants have been waiting months because no funds were available. The House figure was $14,800,000. I do not know whether that is the exact amount.

Mr. FERGUSON. No, the compromise figure was $8,957,000, which is the amount of adjudicated claims actually ready for payment at the time of the hearings.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to make a suggestion which may solve the matter and which would do no injustice to some who may be interested. Let us insert the figure of $9,000,000 in lieu of the House figure of $14,800,000. It will then go to conference the amount can there be adjusted and some of the claims can be paid. It would do no injustice to others who could be taken care of through the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The committee could consider that question in the regular appropriation bill. Does the Senator from Washington favor the inclusion of $9,000,000 in this bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The compromise figure for the adjudicated claims is nearly $9,000,000, to be exact it is $8,957,000. A few other claims may be allowed by the time this bill becomes a law.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I withdraw my amendment, and move that the figure $14,800,000 be changed to $9,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the Senator from Washington.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the numeral "$14,800,000", and insert "$9,000,000."

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, while I am on my feet and the matter is before the Senate I should like to say that I think the people interested in these claims are to be complimented on the fact that they in every case—and they are all good, loyal American citizens—that have sustained much greater damage than the amount of the compromises made in connection with

their claims. They are to be complimented upon their cooperation in trying to get this matter settled.

In 1942 we made a great mistake when, at the request of the military, we bundled up these loyal American Japanese and placed them in internment camps. It cost us millions of dollars to take care of them. Hearings were held, and practically nothing at all wrong was found with the internees. We dislocated their lives. Many of them were even unable to return to the places from which they came. In their enforced absence, there was vandalism and the destruction of their property, including their gardens and lands and farm machinery. In this case, although we are not doing full justice, I think they are at least more than entitled to what they are to receive under this bill. I think they are to be commended.

I shall never forget that, in 1941, following the Pearl Harbor incident, I saw certain Japanese friends and neighbors of mine being bundled up and taken to jail, later to be placed in internment camps. They were loyal Japanese. Then, a few weeks later, upon my arrival at a place 3,000 miles nearer the enemy, the Japanese Imperial Government, I found Japanese in Hawaii doing guard work, free to carry on as they had done before. It seemed a little bit incongruous and somewhat paradoxical to see loyal Japanese on the west coast being removed from their homes and placed in internment camps, and then to find them allowed to do anything they wished in Hawaii. They did a good job in Hawaii during the war. The National Guard, which was mainly composed of Japanese, guarded the water works, the light installations, and things of that sort. So, although this is not full compensation to these people for what they suffered then, and what they have suffered since their internment, I think we are at least doing something for them. I wish to commend them publicly for their cooperation throughout this entire matter. I think a grave mistake was made at the time action was taken against them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Washington to the House provision.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now, on the committee amendment, on page 5, line 3, striking out the provision for salaries and expenses, claims of persons of Japanese ancestry.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the only other committee item which remains is on the same page, namely, page 5, line 8, where the committee proposes to strike out the numeral "$2,610,000" and insert "$4,000,000," which is the amount allowed by the House committee. The budget estimate was $4,600,000. The House committee cut off $600,000, but determined that $4,000,000 was required in order to carry out the duties imposed upon the Immigration and Naturalization Service, particularly with respect to the deportation of the so-called wetbacks. I think the action of the committee was sound and that it ought to be sustained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, line 8, it is proposed by the committee to strike out "$2,610,000" and insert "$4,000,000."

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this is a matter which has been before the House. The House placed the figure at $2,610,000, which would pay the costs of the increase in pay. This is a large item. It is only supplemental to the larger item of $30,159,900. A problem exists between Mexico and the United States which is difficult of solution.

Estimates are made from time to time, and reliable figures seem to indicate that 750,000 persons a year are illegally crossing the border from Mexico into the United States. The Immigration Service has been stumped as to what to do. It is a difficult problem to solve. They try to use the idea we used to employ when we desired to get rid of a cat. We would take the cat in a bag, in the buggy or the automobile, as the case might be, and drive as far as we could and then let the cat out of the bag. We then drove home, and a few hours after we arrived home the cat would be back. What we are trying to do in Mexico is to load illegal entrants into airplanes, fly them as far as we can into Mexico and then let them out, thinking they will not come back. As soon as they can walk back, or as soon as they can get enough money to get transportation back to the border, they come back again and cross the border.

What are we going to do? We are told by the Immigration Service that the problem cannot be solved by putting up prisons, because so many people would be in prison that we would not be able to feed them.

I am wondering whether more of those living south of the border could not be induced to make legal entry. We shall be using more than a million dollars in the next 2½ months to get Mexican laborers into our country legally, and at the same time the Department is asking for $4,000,000 for the next 2½ months to keep illegal entrants out.

I think the question requires very deep study. We have got to find an answer to the problem. The subcommittee charged with solving this problem should look into it well. It is a congressional problem. We must establish a policy. If the only solution is to fly illegal entrants back into Mexico so far as to make it difficult for them to walk back to the border again, that is the way it will have to be done. But I think the committee ought to give the matter further study. The House reduced the item to $2,610,000. They said, "We will increase the pay of the employees we have on the particular job." It is a job on which we have spent $30,159,900 so far this year. The item of $2,610,000 is for pay increases only.

I think the Senate should do exactly what the House did, increase the pay, because it is a statutory increase, and allow the item to wait until we discover what should be done. I hope the committee amendment increasing the appropriation to $4,000,000 will be rejected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, my primary concern is this: If we are to have legal immigration from Mexico, it must be by agreement with the Mexican Government. The Mexican Government has insisted that it will not make arrangements whereby agricultural labor can be recruited inside the Republic of Mexico unless we adequately enforce the law when Mexicans leave their own country and come illegally into the United States.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is Mexico doing to keep the wetbacks out? As I understand, they are called wetbacks because they swim across the river and when they land in the United States they have wet backs. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the origin of the expression.

Mr. FERGUSON. What are we doing to prevent them from swimming across the river?

Mr. HAYDEN. There is no duty on the part of Mexico to enforce the immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. But Mexico has a duty to object to persons illegally leaving that country. The wetbacks do not have passports from Mexico. Mexico owes a duty to keep its citizens from leaving Mexico.

Mr. HAYDEN. We do not require passports from Mexico any more than we require them from Canada. A Canadian citizen can cross the border when he pleases and return when he pleases. The crime to which we object is that of seeking employment in the United States at wage rates which are below the American standard of living, competing not only in agriculture but in the industrial field in Michigan and other States, where the illegal entrants are willing to work for less money because they know that if the employer reports them they can be deported.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is not the principal difficulty that American farmers want to hire many of them at a lower wage than the average wage, and Mexicans find an incentive to come across the border and be employed, not through regular channels but through illegal channels? Is not that the problem?

Mr. HAYDEN. That may be the problem, but if we properly enforce the law there will be less difficulty. Congress enacted the Ellender bill which covers the question both ways. When the House Committee on Appropriations looked into the matter and decided that the sum of $4,000,000 was necessary, the action taken on the floor of the House was along the line of that taken theretofore, without reflection on the part of the membership of the House. The general impression is that it was those who did not want the Ellender Act to succeed, but wanted to have wetbacks come into this country illegally, who urged the amendment in the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. The so-called Ellender Act expires on December 31 of next year, and unless funds are provided to carry out the law, it is possible that no Mexican labor, which is so much needed now, will be imported into this country.

Mr. FERGUSON. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. Certainly.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that Mexico says, "If you allow these people to come to the United States illegally we shall not make a contract with you in relation to those who desire to come legally?" Is not that the problem?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is partly the reason why Congress had to amend the so-called Ellender Act this year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why does not Mexico cooperate with us?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mexico has actually failed to carry out her part of the agreement. Under Mexican law, as I understand, if a wetback is returned from this country to Mexico he can be punished. But, so far, the Mexican Government has taken no steps to enforce its own law. I will say to my distinguished friend from Michigan that we are in this situation: Unless we are willing to carry out the law which was recently enacted, the probabilities are that a contract which now exists between the United States and Mexico will expire on the 30th of this month. After that, the Mexican Government will absolutely refuse to enter into an agreement. If that shall occur, there will be a shortage of labor which is so necessary to handle the cotton crop and other crops which are being planted or are in the process of growing.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the appropriation contemplate flying wetbacks into Mexico?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. That is what a part of this money is for.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe that flying is a most expensive form of transportation, and that it is the very height of folly to pick up wetbacks on the American side of the border and return them to Mexico by airplane?

Mr. FERGUSON. From the knowledge I now have, I do not believe it is a practice that should be followed. As the Senator from Louisiana has said, we are using a most expensive method of returning illegal entrant people, when we ought to have the cooperation of the Mexican Government. It is a crime for them to leave Mexico illegally, and when they are taken back across the border they are supposed to be punished.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does not the Senator believe wetbacks could be transported to Mexico by rail much cheaper than by airplane?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, I think much cheaper.

Mr. EASTLAND. Does the Senator from Michigan know that a great many Mexicans who are in this country illegally show themselves around immigration offices, so that they can be flown back to Mexico on personal business? They spend their week ends in Mexico at the expense of the United States Government, then they wade the river and are back at work in the United States on Monday morning.

Mr. FERGUSON. I did not know that, but when we consider that about 750,000 a year are coming into the United States illegally, the Senator could be right in his facts, and I take it for granted he is, and knows what he is talking about.

Mr. EASTLAND. I may say to the Senator that I have spent a good deal of time on the border, and it is considered a joke there that wetbacks show themselves around immigration offices and deliberately permit themselves to be picked up and returned to Mexico, frequently by plane.

I know of the instance of a Mexican who desired to take money to his parents in old Mexico. He walked around in front of an immigration office in the town of Del Rio, Tex., was picked up and flown into Mexico to the town where his parents lived. He delivered the money, and was back at work on the American side on Monday, 2 days later. That is an illustration of what is happening under the foolish plan of transporting wetbacks into Mexico by plane.

Mr. FERGUSON. I assume that is what the House had in mind when they said, "We will grant an increase in the amount, but will cut out certain items, and will have to make a further study of this matter, because it is a problem that must be solved." However, I do not think it will be solved by flying wetbacks into Mexico.

Mr. EASTLAND. Is it not a waste of money to fly them back when they can be transported by railroad or motor truck? Would we not fulfill all our obligations under the agreement with Mexico by using rail or truck?

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from Mississippi feel we have fulfilled our obligation when we have returned them across the river and delivered them to Mexican authorities?

Mr. EASTLAND. Certainly.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Michigan. Is it not a fact that at the time the bill was passed permitting Mexican nationals to enter this country a majority of this body voted for the bill which would permit them to come in legally?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but we are not debating that. The question of the legal entry is contained in another item of the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; but there has been talk about the Mexican wetbacks coming into the United States. At the time we were debating the bill which would permit them to come in legally, it was proposed by me that the way in which this question could be solved would be to employ American nationals instead of Mexican nationals.

Mr. FERGUSON. I remember that debate by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish to assure the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Mississippi that this question can be solved completely without the expenditure of one cent of American money either on Mexican wetbacks or Mexican nationals, by employing only American citizens, such as boys who might have brothers in service in Korea or elsewhere, and by paying them American wages.

There are plenty of people out of work, but the Congress of the United States, in its wisdom or foolishness, is now permitting aliens to enter this country, possibly because aliens can be paid a few cents less in wages.

There are thousands of Indians——

Mr. FERGUSON. Who should be employed on these projects.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Who could be employed, and who I insist should be employed. I agree with the Senator. American boys are now dying for their country to try to sell that idea in some instances. But the preference seems to be for Mexican wetbacks or Mexican legal entrants, because they are treated differently, and then there is a complaint about sending them back to Mexico.

I wish to assure the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Mississippi that the way to solve the problem is not by complaining about legal expenses which have to be met after a law is passed. The way to solve the problem is by employing American citizens.

Puerto Rico has a population of 2,500,000. Many Puerto Ricans are dying in Korea. A Puerto Rican triple amputee is now at Walter Reed Hospital. Why not use Puerto Ricans? They need the work. Why not employ our own citizens?

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator believe the solution is to fly the wetbacks into Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No. The solution is to make it impossible to fly them back. Let us employ Americans in place of the Mexicans. If Mexicans come in illegally, let them be turned over to the Immigration Service. Let them be put on the border, and have the Mexican Government, or any other foreign government, take care of them. That is the solution. But if they are employed legally, or if some are employed illegally, the solution is not to pay their expenses to the interior of Mexico.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is there not now a law to cope with the situation of a person who enters the country illegally, whether he be a Mexican, a European, or any other foreigner?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. We take such people before a court, if they are not citizens, and the United States court makes a decision that they be deported.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The law is complied with when the alien is placed on the border. That is as much as we can do, under the law now on the statute books.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know of any law that permits an alien to be flown hundreds of miles into Mexico?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; I do not know of a single law to that effect.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the purpose for which it is intended we should appropriate this money.

Mr. CHAVEZ. There is a law, the last law on the subject which we passed, the one we are now appropriating a little money to implement, to put into execu-

tion, the law to which the Senator from Louisiana referred.

It is true that there was a shortage of labor, as a result of which Congress enacted a law making it possible for Mexican nationals to come into this country legally. An understanding, or contract, or agreement was made between the United States Government and the Mexican Government as to how those Mexicans were to enter this country, where they were to be picked up, how they were to be treated while they were here, and how they were to be returned. That is the legal phase of it. What I understand the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Mississippi are talking about is illegal entry of the so-called wetbacks.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; the reference is to the wetbacks.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The poor pauper, who knows he can get 25 cents an hour in this country, which is big money to him, is taking a chance by walking across the river, or coming in in any way he can, in order to get here illegally, not by means of a passport, or through any legal authority. He comes into the United States and when he is picked up in the interior of the country, he is flown back to Mexico. I do not think there is any authority at all for that.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is exactly what is being done. They are not given a trial; they are merely flown back to Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not know about that, but if they are being flown beyond the border of the United States, I do not think there is any authority for that.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I indicated a moment ago, if the provisions of the law which was passed last year, and amended this year, are to be carried out, in order to make available to the farmers of the United States sufficient labor to cultivate and harvest their crops, it is necessary to provide funds to enforce the law.

It will be recalled that the Mexican Government was unwilling to enter into an agreement with the United States for a longer period than 6 months, because it felt that the United States Government should lend further aid in trying to fight the so-called wetback problem.

This year the Congress passed an amendment to the act. The agreement which was entered into last year, and which expired in February, has been extended, as I understand, until May 31. Unless we provide the funds to assist in trying to solve the wetback problem, the chances are that the agreement now in existence between the United States and Mexico will not be renewed.

If that agreement is not renewed, I fear that there will be a shortage of labor, to such an extent that much of the cotton, much of the beets which are grown in the Northwest, and, in fact, many other crops throughout the United States, will not be harvested.

I am hopeful that the Senate will at least stand by the figures which were agreed upon by the House Committee on Appropriations. The amount of $4,000,000 was recommended by the House committee, and it was on the floor of the House that the reduction was made. When the subject came before the full Senate Committee on Appropriations the amount which was originally reported by the House committee was restored. I am hopeful that the Senate will stand by the figures recommended by the Senate committee, and thereby make it possible for our Government to enter into negotiations with the Mexican Government so that we can contract for labor at least during the existence of the present law.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I want to go along with the Committee on Appropriations in connection with this item. There has been some confusion this afternoon as to what was in mind. Whether we like the law which is now in existence or not, it is law. I argued against the passage of that law, but in accordance with the processes which prevail in this country the Congress enacted that law, which permits a Mexican alien to come into this country legally and work in the farm industry.

There is no question that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is correct. There is a shortage of labor in carrying on agricultural activities. I am not one of those who believe that the provisions of the law afford a solution for labor shortages in that industry. Nevertheless, that is the way which Congress has provided, for the moment, at least, and so long as it is the law it certainly behooves the Congress to see that it is enforced.

All that the item does is to make available to the Department sufficient money so that it can perform the duty which the Congress imposed upon it, that is, the duty of bringing Mexican nationals into this country so that they may work on the farms. The confusion has arisen because the wetback element has been brought in, which is an entirely different question and has no connection whatsoever with the discussion of this item. However, inasmuch as it has been discussed, I thought I would clarify the situation so that we might at least know for what we are voting.

The wetback problem is no different from the problem in connection with the illegal entry of any person from any other country. The wetback problem concerns those who would come into the country illegally. Entry into the country by illegal processes can apply to any nation in the world, including Mexico. That is a question which must be handled separately by the Congress if we want to control that problem. We all have our ideas as to how it should be controlled. In my opinion, so far as the wetback problem is concerned, I thought it could be controlled if we employed Americans instead of wetbacks. I am still of that opinion. But that is another question.

The question involved in this particular item, which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has placed before the Senate, and for which the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] has argued, is a question which must be considered if we believe in the laws which we pass. Congress enacted the law referred to, and it should be executed. I hope we can at least keep the House figures in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 49, after line 19, it is proposed to strike out through line 20, on page 50, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 1302. Section 1310 of Public Law 253 of the Eighty-second Congress is hereby repealed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, the effect of the amendment just offered would be to repeal the so-called Whitten rider.

The Whitten rider has been in effect for approximately 19 months and in that relatively short time has had a devastating effect on the administrative operations of the executive branch of the Government.

Well over 300,000 of our career employees have lost their civil-service status due to this rider.

The rate of turn-over in Federal employment is at its highest.

Federal employee morale is at its lowest ebb since the inception of the civil-service merit system.

The provisions of the rider are subject to many interpretations and have seriously hampered administrative operation.

The complexity of the separation process has been similarly increased. In operation, the Whitten rider has caused long-time career employees to be displaced by new employees with relatively little service.

The rider has greatly increased the amount of red tape and paper work necessary to administer a personnel program.

In operation, the Whitten rider has actually caused the unnecessary expenditure of many millions of dollars.

I fail to understand how Congress can continue to enact such legislation of a permanent nature on appropriation bills, when the committees of Congress, under whose jurisdiction matters of this nature come, having spent thousands of dollars analyzing their effectiveness, recommend so strongly against their enactment.

This recommendation has the unqualified endorsement of almost every official of the executive branch of the Government having anything to do with the operation of that branch. It has also been requested by every organized group representing Federal employees and through thousands of letters to every Member of Congress.

I agree with most of the objectives of the members of the House Appropriations Committee, which caused the enactment of the Whitten rider. But I am firmly of the opinion that the language in it or any of its amendments will do the job at the least cost to the Government.

The chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission in an attempt to determine what the policy of the Commission would be in the event the Congress adopts the amendment that I now propose.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point this exchange of correspondence.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1952.

Hon. ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman, United States Civil Service Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAMSPECK: The committee would like to know, in general, what procedures would be followed and what rules and regulations would be established by the Civil Service Commission with respect to appointments, transfers, promotions, and reinstatements during the continuation of this emergency period in the event section 1310 of the Appropriations Act of 1952 (the Whitten rider) is repealed during this session of the Congress.

The committee would appreciate your furnishing this information by Tuesday, April 1, if possible.

With kindest regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 31, 1952.

Hon. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: I have your letter of March 25, asking for a general report as to what procedures would be followed and what rules and regulations would be established by the Civil Service Commission with respect to appointments, transfers, promotions, and reinstatements during the continuation of this emergency period in the event section 1310 of the Appropriations Act, 1952 (the Whitten rider), is repealed during this session of the Congress.

Before replying to your specific question, it might be well to review briefly here the nature and purpose of the major provisions of the Whitten rider. These are, as we see them:

1. A requirement that initial appointments to positions in the Federal service shall be made on a temporary or indefinite basis in order to prevent increases in the number of permanent personnel above the total number of permanent employees existing on September 1, 1950. The purpose of this is to simplify the readjustment downward of the Federal force at the end of the emergency.

2. A requirement that all promotions be made on a temporary basis. This provision is intended to prevent the upgrading of the Federal force during the emergency and to facilitate the readjustment of the grades of employees following the termination of the emergency.

3. A requirement that all reinstatements be made on a temporary basis. This requirement, like that in (1) above, is aimed at keeping the permanent force at the pre-emergency level.

4. A provision for encouraging the transfer of employees from nondefense to defense activities, principally through the grant of reemployment rights. This is aimed at assisting defense activities to meet their recruitments needs.

5. Specific time and grade restrictions on promotions. These requirements are designed to prevent excessively rapid promotions.

6. A provision for survey of the grades and basic-pay levels of Federal positions on an annual basis. This survey is designed to bring about the elimination or readjustment of the grade or basic salary of the positions as changes in, or elimination of, emergency functions make such actions appropriate.

I wish to point out that in presenting the program outlined later in this report we have been unable, within the time allotted, to have the program as a whole given the very careful and deliberate review by the Federal Personnel Council, the Defense Department, and other agencies concerned, and the Commission itself, that would normally be required for a program of this magnitude. Our planning and discussions with interested groups until now have been based on the assumption that a modified form of the Whitten rider would be enacted. Many of the points in the program outlined herein have been developed from our earlier planning and consultation with those groups. I believe that it should be made clear that if the Commission is free to adopt a program without the restrictions of the Whitten rider it would take further steps to consult with interested organizations and agencies concerning the program as a whole and might revise the program to some degree in the light of the representations made by those organizations and agencies. Also, it would in the future review and change or revise its program as changing circumstances warrant in accordance with our best judgment of the kind of personnel program required by the Federal Government. For that reason, I request that the committee, while considering this report as reflecting the current thinking of the Commission, nevertheless, consider it as a report of a tentative program.

We have been influenced in preparing this report by a number of assumptions as to the nature of the current emergency as it reflects on personnel administration in the Federal Government. It may be of interest to the committee to outline these assumptions:

1. The current emergency is a limited one in contrast to the all-out emergency we had during World War II. (We have kept in mind the possibility that it may turn into an all-out emergency.) We will have a military force of approximately 3,700,000 and a defense production capacity to maintain that military force and to furnish certain military equipment to other countries. In World War II there was an all-out effort, and after the war was over there was an equally short and rapid reduction in the size of our Armed Forces, our Federal civil service, and our Nation's defense production.

2. The current emergency is indefinite in duration whereas the emergency in World War II was definitely limited in duration. We cannot foresee a specific point in time when the current emergency will end. It may continue for 10, 15, or 20 years.

3. During this emergency there will be a continuous flow of persons away from the national labor supply into the military service as well as return to the national labor supply from the military service. The return of veterans to the civilian labor supply will take place continuously during the emergency; we do not foresee total demobilization at one time as occurred immediately following World War II. Likewise, we do not foresee a sudden sharp decline in the size of the Federal civilian force; rather, that decline will be gradual over a relatively long period of time.

With the above qualifications and based on the indicated assumptions it would be the Commission's intent to adopt the following type of program with respect to appointments, promotions, reinstatements, and transfers in the event the Whitten rider is repealed during this session of Congress:

A. APPOINTMENTS

Following the passage of the first Whitten rider and acting under the authority of Executive Order 10180 the Commission adopted on December 1, 1950, a program for making initial appointments to the competitive civil service on a nonpermanent basis with very few exceptions. While it would have been legally permissible to make a larger number of permanent appointments the Commission believed that it was necessary in order to meet the recruiting needs of the defense agencies to limit sharply the number of permanent appointments. The defense agencies had to build their forces far above the September 1, 1950, level whereas the nondefense agencies did not generally do so. Without the general limitation on permanent appointments the nondefense agencies would have had an advantage in recruitment over defense agencies in view of their ability to offer permanent appointments.

On the whole this program worked well under the circumstances at the beginning of the emergency. Lately, however, the Commission has been increasingly concerned with the fact that the size of the permanent force is declining sharply. With the prospect of a long-term emergency continuation of the present program would eventually create a need for a costly reconversion program at the end of the emergency.

It would be our intent, should the Whitten rider be repealed, to adopt the appointment program below. In planning this program we have given careful consideration to other alternatives and to the views of interested Members of Congress. At the same time we have been concerned that, insofar as possible, the program be such as not to place the defense agencies at the disadvantage in recruiting. The Commission believes it would be well to continue a limitation on the total number of permanent employees in the Federal Government, such as that contained in the Whitten rider. It plans to maintain that or a comparable limitation. Our appointment program would be:

1. Permanent type appointments would be authorized in the postal field service. The recruitment for this service can be undertaken under a permanent appointment program without disadvantage to the defense agencies.

2. Generally, a new type of competitive appointment would be authorized in the rest of the service. These would be called civil service reserve appointments. They would grant the appointees civil service status but only indefinite tenure. In this way the permanent force (comprising those employees having permanent tenure) could be kept below the September 1, 1950, or comparable level, while at the same time maintaining a uniform appointment system which would not place the defense agencies at a disadvantage.

3. Appointees serving under civil service reserve appointments could be converted to permanent tenure without further examination. This could be done periodically or at the termination of the emergency. Any conversions during the emergency would be limited by the limitation on the total number of permanent employees.

B. PROMOTIONS

1. Permanent promotions

The objective of the Whitten rider requirement that all promotions shall be made on a temporary basis is sound. However, this requirement has proved extremely cumbersome in operation and inequitable in its

treatment of career employees as against new appointees.

The objective of the requirement is to prevent the permanent up-grading of the force and to simplify readjustments at the end of the emergency. The Commission believes that this objective can be achieved in a more equitable and orderly manner through over-all control of the number of permanent employees in the service and through the review and readjustment of grades of positions under authority of the Classification Act of 1949. As long as the requirement for temporary promotions is continued, the Commission sees no equitable and feasible method of permitting on a large scale permanent appointments up to the September 1, 1950, or comparable level. Such a program would give new appointees superior rights in reductions in force over career employees temporarily promoted.

Accordingly, the Commission would, if permitted by law, make provision for permanent employees to be promoted on a permanent basis.

2. Control of rapidity of promotions

The Commission is in thorough agreement with the policy expressed in the Whitten rider that excessively rapid promotions should be prevented. The specific time and grade requirements have, however, proved inequitable in many situations.

The Commission's program would be to continue effective control so that there would not be excessively rapid promotions. Our basic check on the rapidity of promotions of Government employees would be adherence to sound qualifications standards. During World War II there was some justifiable criticism in this respect since the Commission had not at that time published qualifications standards governing a great many of the wartime positions. Since the war, however, the Commission has prepared and published qualifications standards covering practically every occupational field found in the competitive service, and agencies are required to adhere to these standards when making promotions. I would also like to point out that our qualifications standards generally require that an employee serve a specified period of time in a lower grade before he is eligible for promotion to a higher grade.

It would also be the program of the Commission to continue through its authority under the Classification Act of 1949 the requirements for review and readjustment of the grades of positions under the Classification Act to approximately the same extent as now required by the Whitten rider.

C. REINSTATEMENTS

It is the opinion of the Commission that career employees returning to the service during this emergency should be permitted to do so on a permanent basis. The number of these cases is so small in comparison with the total recruitment picture that there would be little effect on the size of the permanent force. It would, therefore, be our program to permit reinstatements on a permanent basis.

D. TRANSFERS

The Commission would continue the present policy set forth in the Whitten rider of encouraging the transfers of employees from nondefense to defense activities, principally through the grant of reemployment rights. However, it would be our intent to periodically review the reemployment rights program as recruitment needs of defense activities increase or diminish.

Thank you for this opportunity to submit our views on the question you have presented. I shall be very happy to give you further information if you desire.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT RAMSPECK,
Chairman.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to bring to the attention of the Members of the Senate the fact that in the event the proposed amendment is accepted by the Senate it would not mean the wiping out of the intent of the Whitten rider. We have certain assurances from the Civil Service Commission which I believe constitute the intent of Congress with respect to the subject, namely, that the Commission is making certain recommendations which, for the purpose of emphasis, I shall now read from the Commission's letter at page 4. This is what the Civil Service Commission would do in the event the Whitten rider were repealed:

1. Permanent-type appointments would be authorized in the postal field service. The recruitment for this service can be undertaken under a permanent appointment program without disadvantage to the defense agencies.

2. Generally, a new type of competitive appointment would be authorized in the rest of the service. These would be called civil service reserve appointments. They would grant the appointees civil-service status but only indefinite tenure. In this way the permanent force (comprising those employees having permanent tenure) could be kept below the September 1, 1950, or comparable level while at the same time maintaining a uniform appointment system which would not place the defense agencies at a disadvantage.

3. Appointees serving under civil service reserve appointments could be converted to permanent tenure without further examination. This could be done periodically or at the termination of the emergency. Any conversions during the emergency would be limited by the limitation on the total number of permanent employees.

With reference to promotions:

1. Permanent promotions: The objective of the Whitten rider requirement that all promotions shall be made on a temporary basis is sound. However, this requirement has proved extremely cumbersome in operation and inequitable in its treatment of career employees as against new appointees.

The objective of the requirement is to prevent the permanent upgrading of the force and to simplify readjustments at the end of the emergency. The Commission believes that this objective can be achieved in a more equitable and orderly manner through over-all control of the number of permanent employees in the service and through the review and readjustment of grades of positions under authority of the Classification Act of 1949. As long as the requirement for temporary promotions is continued, the Commission sees no equitable and feasible method of permitting on a large scale permanent appointments up to the September 1, 1950, or comparable level. Such a program would give new appointees superior rights in reductions in force over career employees temporarily promoted.

Accordingly, the Commission would, if permitted by law, make provisions for permanent employees to be promoted on a permanent basis.

Mr. President, in our opinion the provision outlined in the Ramspeck letter will accomplish in full the intentions of Congress which caused the enactment of the Whitten rider. Above all, it will give to the Civil Service Commission sufficient flexibility which is essential in adjusting to unusual or changing conditions.

In the interest of economy in operations, lifting morale of Federal employees, and restoring good, sound business principles to the operation of the executive branch, I ask the Senate to go on record in sufficient numbers this afternoon to insure the repeal of this rider and to make certain that our action prevails in conference on H. R. 6947. I fully intend to raise objection to any conference report which does not retain the Senate amendment in the report.

Mr. President, our committee had eliminated the Whitten rider when it was originally suggested in 1950—I believe that was the year—but it was restored in conference.

I wish to leave this final thought. While there has been a certain relaxation of the original Whitten rider in the bill reported by the Senate committee, the fact remains that it does not do an adequate or a full and complete job. We know what the original objective and purpose of the Whitten rider was. The objective and purpose would be preserved by the Civil Service Commission if the rider were repealed. We have the assurance that the Commission would carry out the intention of the Whitten rider. Yet the Commission would have the flexibility which is absolutely necessary for it to have in order to carry out, in an intelligent and orderly fashion, the objective and purpose which were originally intended.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assuming that the Post Office Department is in a different category from other departments and agencies which have been established to meet emergency conditions, because as the country has grown the business of the Post Office Department has increased, would the Senator from Rhode Island feel, as a thoughtful citizen and efficient member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, that an amendment should be adopted which would exempt the Post Office Department from the provision of the Whitten rider?

Mr. PASTORE. I would accept it as an alternative. However, we have an expression by the Civil Service Commission to the effect that if the Whitten rider is repealed they will hold the permanent structure within the figure of September 1, 1950. Therefore, with that assurance, in a sense of fairness and uniformity and equity I feel that we ought to repeal the Whitten rider completely. If that cannot be done—and I certainly hope that it can be done—I would be more than happy to accept the alternative suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield further?

Mr. PASTORE. I am glad to yield further to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Assuming that some injustices exist in some of the other departments, which no doubt will be eliminated by the Commission, the situation in the Post Office Department

forms the main objection to the Whitten rider, as I understand. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. I cannot go along with the statement that it is the main objection. The Post Office Department has made the representation that the Whitten rider hampers it in recruitment. Although it has been stated that the same situation does not exist insofar as the Post Office Department is concerned, nevertheless it should be noted, to the credit of the Post Office Department, that in the case of employment it is not in competition with the defense agencies, although some of the other Government agencies may be.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. So from the point of view of the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, it would help if we were to remove the Post Office Department from the application of this provision, although the Senator from Rhode Island would like, as I understand him, to have us go the whole way. Is that correct?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes, I should like to have us go the whole way.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to clarify one point. In Chairman Ramspeck's letter to me, Senators will find that he states that if the Whitten rider is repealed, he will do certain things. We wanted to know that they would be done, in order to protect the Government. We think the Whitten rider and other provisions would have a good effect, but we think this matter could better be handled by the Civil Service Commission.

Chairman Ramspeck also states that if the Whitten rider is repealed, the Post Office Department will be entirely removed from its effect. Therefore, as I see it, that letter clarifies the entire matter.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me, to permit me to ask a further question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McCLELLAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we repeal entirely the Whitten rider, what will the situation be? I have great respect for Mr. Ramspeck, whom I know. However, if the Whitten rider is repealed, all pressure on the Civil Service Commission to accomplish these results will be removed, and, on the contrary, the Civil Service Commission will then be under great pressure not to accomplish these results.

Therefore will not the Civil Service Commission be left in a better position if we include this legislative provision, with the result that the Commission will be forced to handle these matters in the way in which we desire to have them handled?

Mr. PASTORE. If that is the best we can do, I suppose we shall have to be satisfied with it. However, the fact remains that the Whitten rider, which now is on the statute books, is hampering both recruitment and administration. For that reason practically every witness before our committee was critical of the Whitten rider.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield to me?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. How does the Whitten rider prevent recruitment insofar as promotions are concerned? The Whitten rider really does not interfere with them.

Mr. PASTORE. Yes; it does. Let me give this example: If a civil-service employee has a permanent status and if he applies for promotion to a higher grade, he cannot apply for promotion within a period of 12 months to a grade that is higher by one than the one he presently occupies. Yet a person recruited from the outside can take that grade without any handicap.

Mr. FERGUSON. A new employee simply could not do that. The purpose of the Whitten amendment is to prevent outside persons from entering the Government service in the upper grades as permanent employees.

Mr. PASTORE. No person enters the Government service as a permanent employee. However, if a man is in GS-7, and if he has been in that grade for 6 months, he cannot be promoted to GS-9; the only promotion he can receive is to GS-8, and he can be promoted to that grade only after a period of 12 months.

On the other hand, a person who has not previously been in the Government service can be recruited on the streets and can apply for the GS-9 position, and can occupy it.

Mr. FERGUSON. But he cannot obtain permanent employment.

Mr. PASTORE. No; but today all appointments are temporary.

Mr. FERGUSON. Has not provision already been made for striking out the part of the Whitten amendment the Senator from Rhode Island wishes to have stricken out?

Mr. PASTORE. No; for I want to have all of the Whitten amendment stricken out.

I have already said it is a step in the proper direction and it does remedy somewhat the situation, but it is not a complete answer to the problem. The problem can be met more sensibly and in a better and more businesslike fashion if it is handled by means of rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, when accompanied by a strong statement by the Congress that the permanent force must be kept within the figure of September 1, 1950.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. There can be no question that the Whitten amendment has made it impossible for the Post Office Department to function properly and to obtain qualified workers, in the sense that they are efficient workers, because the new employees know they are only temporarily employed. As a result, many persons will not seek opportunities to become employed in the Post Office Department, because they know they cannot obtain permanent employment status. Therefore, the Post Office Department is unable to attract the best class of workers. That is one objection which I have found to the Whitten amendment.

The other objections which I have recognized to the Whitten amendment are in respect to all the permanent agencies. In that case the Whitten amendment has created an administrative problem that is most difficult of solution, and it has the effect of not attracting the best type of workers. In the case of the war agencies or, as we might call them, the temporary crisis agencies, the Whitten amendment is serving a useful purpose, because in that respect neither the Civil Service Commission nor any other Government agency is permitted to establish permanent civil-service status for the employees of those agencies.

However, if the Whitten amendment could be amended so as to apply to the so-called emergency agencies of the Government, but not to be effective as against the permanent agencies, and if at the same time there was included in the report a strong statement to the effect that the Post Office Department is to function in accordance with the intent of the Whitten amendment, then we would have an administrative measure which would render a service to the country rather than a disservice.

Mr. PASTORE. That is exactly what we intend to do. In that connection, I should like to call the Senator's attention to page 4.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Rhode Island will permit me to do so, I should like to state further that the very ruling of the Civil Service Commission regarding the intent and effect of the original Whitten amendment makes us somewhat distrustful of what the Civil Service Commission is likely to do in the event we remove all the barriers and the Civil Service Commission is permitted to proceed in its own way. That is the question with which we are faced in this instance.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Let me say that is the reason why I wrote the letter to Chairman Ramspeck. In reply to my letter, I have received his letter in which he states what he would do. We are placing in the RECORD his letter in which he states what he will do and how he will proceed.

We should permit the Commission to proceed, in exactly the way stated a few minutes ago by the Senator from Rhode Island, to carry out the intent and purposes of the Whitten rider. That is what Chairman Ramspeck told us he will do; he has set that forth in his letter.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, if we knew that would be the administrative arrangement and procedure, we would have no fear. However, we are fearful that if we make such action permissive on the part of the various agencies, including the Civil Service Commission, they will follow the specific language of the Civil Service Act, to the effect that

when an employee is on the job and has served his probationary period, he will be eligible for employment in a permanent status, and, when qualified for promotion, will be eligible to be promoted to the upper grades. All those are matters of the civil-service law.

If no better law is provided, the question is whether the Civil Service Commission will disregard the intent of Congress in the case of the permanent agencies, and will proceed to bring in new employees and to put them through their probationary periods and then will proceed to qualify them for employment on a permanent basis. That is the question we must consider insofar as the temporary agencies of the Government are concerned. If employees of those agencies are frozen into the Government service, later they will be transferred to some of the permanent agencies, with the result of forcing out of Government employment persons who have just entered the permanent agencies on a probationary basis. In that way the present employees of the emergency agencies will be frozen into jobs in the permanent agencies and there they will do work which some of the qualified, deserving employees of the permanent agencies, who still are on what might be termed a probationary basis, are performing today.

Those are questions which we cannot and should not overlook.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I understand exactly what the Senator from Minnesota fears. That is why I wanted to add the letter of Chairman Ramspeck to this discussion today, in order that it might show what the intent of the Commission was, and how he intended to carry out the Whitten rider.

Mr. THYE. I still contend that, in case of an employee of OPS who has served for 2½ years, if the OPS should be entirely eliminated or disbanded, that employee, having a permanent status, would seek employment in another agency. Ordinarily he would bump an employee who is on probation. Those are questions with which we must concern ourselves.

That is the only reason for my having recognized that there was merit in the Whitten rider. But I also recognized what the Whitten rider was doing to the Post Office Department. I do not believe the Post Office Department is getting more than about 60 percent efficiency from the employees it is now able to employ, because no one is interested in taking a job with the Post Office Department, for the reason that it is known that it would be strictly a temporary job, and that the temporary employee would be subject to being bumped at any time that anyone having permanent status desired to bump him.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I should like to add a further observation to what the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said. On the present basis, when we are in a period of emergency, and when for that reason all appointments should be of a temporary nature, if we were to use it as a criterion, this emergency might continue for 15 or 20 years, and we would not have any permanent employees. That is what is making it doubly hard for the Federal Government to recruit persons of capacity and qualifications.

Mr. THYE. I have joined with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] in an amendment to the Whitten rider, in respect to postal employees, because we know there is a deficit in that Department. We know that we must obtain 100 percent efficiency from the worker, or there will be a greater deficit. Therefore, insofar as postal employees are concerned, if the Whitten rider remains in the act, we must in some manner correct the situation in which the Post Office Department finds itself. Therefore, I have joined with the Senator from Michigan in this amendment. At the same time I recognize the other problems which the Whitten amendment has created in the Post Office Department, in that the administration of the Whitten rider by the Civil Service Commission within the past year has made that rider absolutely a blockade in solving their personnel problem.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I had the same fear, and, under date of March 25, 1952, I addressed to the Honorable Robert Ramspeck, Chairman of the United States Civil Service Commission, the following letter:

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAMSPECK: The committee would like to know, in general, what procedures would be followed and what rules and regulations would be established by the Civil Service Commission with respect to appointments, transfers, promotions, and reinstatements during the continuation of this emergency period in the event section 1310 of the Appropriations Act of 1952 (the Whitten rider) is repealed during this session of the Congress.

The committee would appreciate your furnishing this information by Tuesday, April 1, if possible.

In reply to that letter, among other things, Mr. Ramspeck had this to say:

1. Permanent-type appointments would be authorized in the postal field service. The recruitment for this service can be undertaken under a permanent appointment program without disadvantage to the defense agencies.

2. Generally, a new type of competitive appointment would be authorized in the rest of the service. These would be called civil service reserve appointments. They would grant the appointees civil service status but only indefinite tenure. In this way the permanent force (comprising those employees having permanent tenure) could be kept below the September 1, 1950, or comparable level while at the same time maintaining a uniform appointment system which would not place the defense agencies at a disadvantage.

I think that answers the Senator's question. This goes into the RECORD. This is what he says he will do, in case the Whitten rider is repealed. That clarifies the point, so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PASTORE. I desire to make a further observation. In the event that the intent of the Whitten amendment were not carried out, it would not be very long until Congress would enact something similar to it. After all, this would be more or less a mandate or a declaration to the Commission as to the intent of Congress. I agree with the Senator from Minnesota.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I will yield in a moment. I agree with the Senator that we have no written, air-tight guaranty that the intent will be entirely followed. I realize that. But it strikes me that in view of the letter written by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], which asks a very specific, point-blank question, and the answer of the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission that this will be their policy and their procedure, it strikes me that we could not get a better assurance than that. I now yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, it has occurred to me that the point made by the Senator from Rhode Island is simply this, that we could correct the situation. Yes, we could. But we never could retrieve the excess of expenditure in which the United States Government would be involved, in the event the Civil Service Commission did not adhere to the provisions of the Whitten rider, and we would have many permanent employees, in the event the Civil Service Commission should not function as the Whitten rider intended it should.

Mr. PASTORE. That is perfectly true. I do not dispute that statement. But it strikes me that with the assurances we have received there would be very little fear of the situation which the Senator from Minnesota suggests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, Representative WHITTEN had a very fine idea in mind in proposing his original amendment, but he discovered that, as construed and interpreted by the Civil Service Commission, it was not working as he desired and as he originally proposed. That Commission, originally, before the adoption of the Whitten amendment, instead of doing what is indicated by their letter, did not do a thing about this matter. The Commission does not want on the statute book any law on the subject. Their position is that, if we were to wipe out all law in relation to the pyramided Government employees, they would take care of the situation themselves. But in my opinion, the time has come when we must act. I think Representative WHITTEN, when he offered his amendment, which is the one now in this particular supplemental bill, took care of the situation contemplated by him. It reads:

Provided further, That, notwithstanding the provisions hereof, and in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity, the Civil Service Commission, when requested by the head of the agency involved, may authorize promotions in individual cases of meritorious nature.

That would permit the Commission to take care of this situation. I also want

to read from the RECORD what Representative WHITTEN said:

Mr. Chairman, these amendments were worked out by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], chairman of the Committee on Civil Service—

That is, of the House of Representatives—

and myself, with the cooperation of representatives of the Civil Service Commission and the Comptroller General.

These amendments—

He is talking now about the amendment which is now sought to be stricken from the bill.

These amendments do not change the basic policy nor objectives of section 1310 of Public Law 253, the so-called Whitten rider.

These amendments, if adopted, will prevent certain interpretations placed on section 1310 of Public Law 253, which were not intended and which, in my judgment, in most cases were not required by that act, from bringing about results not intended.

Mr. PASTORE. I desire to make an observation at this point. If the result was so satisfactory, because it was worked out by Mr. MURRAY and the members of the Commission, why did it not exclude the postal field service?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall explain that. I am reading what Mr. WHITTEN said:

These amendments preserve the intent to hold the average grade and salary, and to limit the total number of employees to that of September 1, 1950.

As I say, it has been worked out with the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY], and others, and it has also been worked out with the Civil Service Commission representatives, and with the Comptroller General's office.

Mr. President, the Civil Service Commission is interested in wiping it off the statute books, so much so that it has a man now on the floor of the Senate.

I think the time has come when Congress should determine the policy of the United States, rather than that the Civil Service Commission should determine it. That Commission had an opportunity. Originally it could have done this thing, but it would not do it.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I make another observation?

Mr. FERGUSON. I decline to yield at the present moment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I have the floor. I yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not desire to take the floor from the Senator from Rhode Island. I will take it later in my own right, but I want to say that the Commission had the opportunity to put the policy into effect and did not do it. When Congress acted, the Commisson wanted it entirely wiped out.

Mr. President, I do not think we should wipe it from the statute books. I am going to propose a perfecting amendment on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], on page 50, after after line 20, to insert at the end of subsection (d) a new subsection (e) reading as follows:

This section shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, is the Senator amending my amendment or the committee amendment?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am perfecting the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the Senator from Michigan to send the amendment to the desk, and the clerk will state it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 50, after line 20, it is proposed to insert at the end of subsection (d) a new subsection (e) reading as follows:

This section shall not apply to the field service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it my amendment which is being perfected, or is it the committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is being offered by the distinguished Senator from Michigan to perfect the language of the bill.

Mr. PASTORE. The pending amendment is my amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is an amendment to perfect the language, and it takes precedence over the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the rider known as the Whitten amendment or the Whitten rider has been the subject of attack by many departments of the Government. There has been a barrage of propaganda against it. We have now to consider what should be done with the legislation. Three avenues are open. The first is to eliminate it, which would do what the Senator from Rhode Island desires to do. The next would be to retain it in full or to amend it. It would seem that any move that would prevent building up a vast army of permanent Government employees is most desirable. Any move which would force Government agencies to think once again about the all-too-often haphazard method which has characterized much of the hiring and many of the promotions should not be dismissed too lightly. We know what has happened in all departments.

I think there is an exception in the case of mail carriers. Their salaries had not been increased by the so-called emergency pay to any extent, as had salaries in other departments. An evidence that the shoe is pinching is the fairly well organized attempt which is being made to eliminate the rider from the statute books.

It is said that no one has appeared in behalf of the taxpayer. That is true. We do not find any appearances before the Appropriations Committees in behalf of the taxpayers. It is the tax consumer who appears before the Appropriations Committees. Tax consumers are the ones who are in the employ of the Government, and while they are drawing their salaries from the Government they are appearing before the Commission and before the Appropriations Committees. They are now on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Michigan attribute that statement to the junior Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no; the Senator from Michigan does not attribute it to the Senator from Rhode Island. I am talking about what has happened. We find only those who are interested in abolishing the law and further building up bureaucracy appearing before the committee. The person who has not yet obtained a Government job is not interested in paying his way to Washington to protest. Neither is the taxpayer willing to come here at his own expense, except in very rare cases. So I say, Mr. President, that we who represent our respective States have got to represent the taxpayers. We need not think we are going to get help from the bureaus in the pyramided program. They want their employees to become permanent.

I want to be fair in this matter. Personally I believe we should all try to play the game for the best interest of the Nation. For that reason I am suggesting to those who are trying to kill the Whitten rider to hold off, to give it a chance, to let it work and see just how much progress it makes toward its goal—a goal, incidentally, which we in the Senate must admit is earnestly supported by the taxpayers of the Nation.

Representative WHITTEN had the testimony of representatives of the Civil Service Commission and of the Comptroller General. The Commission said that it was in thorough agreement with the policy expressed in the Whitten amendment that excessively rapid promotions should be prevented. That is what Representative WHITTEN was trying to accomplish.

Incidentally, Mr. President, this entire body must watch the growth of bureaucracy and control it.

I said I wanted to be fair, and I hope that what we are trying to do by this perfecting amendment is fair and that the amendment can be worked out with the House. No one could hope that this rider, seeking, as it does, a widespread reform, would be entirely successful immediately. No one can suppose there would not be inequities. So the House and the Senate committees have advanced the proposed amendments to the Whitten rider seeking to eliminate the trouble spots. I hope the Senate will support the proposed changes, and that the perfecting amendment will be adopted, for I sincerely believe it makes an exception which in the provisions of the rider should be made, because without it, the rider is working a hardship not only on employees of the Post Office Department, but on citizens as a whole.

I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that this amendment applies only to the field service—that is, to employees who sort and deliver the mails.

Because of the operation of the Whitten rider, the right type of employee is not being attracted to the service. I believe most Senators have received complaints indicating that that is the fact, and that it is difficult to get men to enter the field service of the Post Office Department when no permanency of employment can be offered them. That has seriously impaired the efficiency of the Post Office Department. I believe

we are today receiving more complaints about the Postal Service than we have in many a year.

In post office work there is a period of long, intensive study required before any of the clerks, carriers, or other employees can acquire the intimate knowledge required to dispatch mail in the speediest manner. Testimony has shown that temporary employees will not take the trouble to learn the system which will send a letter along the speediest route to its receiver.

As a matter of fact, Department officials reported they have been forced to hire 28,000 temporary employees to supplant 12,000 permanent employees who have become separated from the service because of this attitude on the part of temporary personnel. Such an obvious inequity must be eliminated in order to preserve the efficiency of the Post Office Department.

That is the reason why we are proposing the perfecting amendment, and I certainly hope it will be adopted. I hope the Whitten rider will then stand as perfected and will remain the law of the land.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am in favor of the perfecting amendment suggested by the senior Senator from Michigan, but I wish to say that what can be said for exempting the field service of the Post Office Department can also be said for other agencies. I think it is abundantly clear in the minds of all exactly what the intent of Congress is.

I agree that the purposes of the original Whitten rider were honorable and in the proper direction. I believe it was intended to accomplish something good and wholesome, namely, to restrict bureaucracy. I am against bureaucracy as strongly as anyone else is. But after an experience of 19 months I believe the Whitten rider has not worked so well, and we are beginning to recognize that fully, insofar as the postal field service is concerned. With equal force I think the same thing can be said about other agencies of the Government.

I hope the perfecting amendment will be adopted, and I hope also that the entire Whitten amendment will be repudiated by the Senate, leaving the responsibility exactly where it belongs, in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, with all the flexibility needed to carry out the intent of Congress and to carry out the purposes of the Whitten rider.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in connection with this bill, there appears to be a question of appropriations for public libraries. No money has been earmarked for public libraries. In fact, no money has been earmarked for any of the items with respect to housing or under the heading "Defense community facilities and service."

Much to my regret, the House Appropriations Committee materially reduced the recommendations of the Budget Bureau with respect to defense areas, and also, in some instances, on the floor the House itself reduced the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations.

I am not suggesting that Congress should appropriate more money, but I am suggesting that in connection with appropriations we might make, public libraries, which are so essential in critical areas where defense housing facilities are being constructed, are very badly needed and would be a great attraction. When I use the word "attraction," I mean they would offer attractive benefits to the many people who have left their homes to toil in the installations erected to expedite the atomic energy and other defense programs.

My attention was called to this yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. I believe he conferred with certain officials in respect to the matter. He and I are members of the Committee on Appropriations. I desire to make this statement, and I am pleased the Senator called the matter to my attention, because the Federal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama. I suggest that perhaps the matter might be considered jointly by his subcommittee and the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of which the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is chairman.

Mr. HILL. I may say that the Senator from South Carolina is not only chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, but he is also chairman of a subcommittee of that committee which deals with appropriations for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HILL. It is my understanding that the authority to provide such community facilities as libraries is contained in Public Law 139, which was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill was passed unanimously by the Senate and by the House. It authorized the appropriation of about $65,000,000 for community facilities last year, but the money has not been appropriated.

Mr. HILL. That law includes authorization for library facilities.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. HILL. In other words, nothing in that law would prevent the use of some portion of these funds to relieve the library situation. On the other hand, it was contemplated that some of the funds might be used for that purpose. Is not that statement correct?

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct.

During hearings on the first supplemental appropriation bill, a witness appeared and testified, and he urged that something be done in this field. I might say that library executives from my own State realized the situation existing in the atomic area—that is, in the Savannah Valley—and they have sent me some information on that subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letters I have received may be included in the RECORD in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE LIBRARY BOARD,
Columbia, S. C., March 20, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senator from South Carolina,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I understand that the Senate Appropriations Committee will soon meet to consider the Supplemental Appropriations bill. I am particularly interested in the Housing and Home Finance Agency's supplementary appropriation because of the possibility of earmarking funds for library facilities within this appropriation which will implement Public Law 139, the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951.

Public Library needs in the Savannah River area have long since passed the point where they can be met by local appropriations. Public library service in Aiken, Barnwell, and Allendale Counties has been developed over a period of years by local effort, and though certainly not of the caliber of service available from large centers, was nevertheless quite adequate to meet the needs of the people in the three counties. Since the beginning of the Savannah River project the population in the three counties has increased by approximately 58 percent. The people coming into the area have few recreation facilities available and have made an immediate demand upon the library facilities. The libraries in the area have neither the books, the staff, or the equipment to meet this need. South Carolinians are without exception generous and hospitable and the local library boards have tried to stretch their meager book collections to meet the needs of the new people coming into the area. The result has been that local people whose efforts and money have gone into building up the service are being penalized by the unprecedented demand for service by the workers on the H-bomb project.

That the immigrants need public library service is incontestable. There is a dearth of adult education and recreation facilities in the Savannah River area. The new people crowd into the little towns in the area, which are completely unprepared to take care of their recreation and educational needs. They are coming to the libraries for books on technical subjects which the libraries are unprepared to supply and for books just to read for fun. With few recreation facilities and with little or no library service, these new people—the workers and the families of the workers on the H-bomb project—are forced to while away their leisure time in dull and profitless activities. The libraries in the area have the organizational framework to take care of the library needs of the new people, but they do not have the funds to supply the books and the equipment.

I know that you understand the value of good public library service in any community. I hope that in considering the Supplementary Appropriations bill, it will be possible to earmark some of the funds for libraries in the Savannah River project. All of the services in the area are important, but no other service reaches so many people with both education and recreation, as does public library service.

Sincerely yours,
ESTELLENE P. WALKER,
Executive Secretary.

SOUTH CAROLINA STATE LIBRARY BOARD,
Columbia, S. C., April 8, 1952.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Senator from South Carolina, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: All of us who are interested in the public libraries in the

Aiken area are much concerned that funds be earmarked for public libraries in the supplemental budget of the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Under the section called Facilities in Public Law 139 libraries are specifically mentioned. We are afraid that if funds are not definitely earmarked for libraries that they will receive no funds. We are dead sure of one thing—that unless some Federal assistance is forthcoming libraries in the Aiken area have not a chance of serving the in-migrants who continue to beg for service. We know that public library service should be given to the new people, but local and State funds are not sufficient to meet the emergency. Please keep us in mind when the bill comes up in the Senate and see if at least $950,000 can be earmarked for libraries in designated critical areas.

Sincerely yours,

ESTELLENE P. WALKER,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is perhaps no area more critical, from the standpoint of the impact of defense, than the area of the Senator's own State, to which he has just referred.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct, but I may say there are many other serious or critical areas, as the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. FREAR] knows from his experience when we wrote the so-called defense housing bill, particularly the community facilities section of the bill, toward which the Senator from Alabama so ably contributed during the floor debate on that bill. In fact, there are similar situations in Alabama and in the States producing aluminum. I am hopeful that the regular appropriations bill will specifically earmark funds for public libraries and other facilities.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is exactly correct in his statement, and I wish to thank the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which handled the legislation which became Public Law 139, for making it definite and clear that funds authorized in that law may be used for library facilities.

Not only is there nothing in that law which would prohibit their use for library facilities, but on the contrary, it was contemplated that some of those funds would be used for library facilities.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator is correct, as the distinguished Presiding Officer knows. He examined some of the sites. I have seen some of them in other sections of the country. As I understand, a bad situation exists in Mississippi, and in many other areas because of the impact caused by thousands of new workers coming in, without any advance provisions for any facilities whatsoever. I believe that it would be a good thing to provide some library facilities so that the workers may have books and magazines to read during their off-hours.

Mr. HILL. I join the Senator in the expression of the sentiment that the contemplation of the committee should be carried out, and that some of the funds should go to meet the need for library facilities.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator. I trust that in the independent offices appropriation bill, which is not now before the Senate, but which will come before it later, the Senate may restore some of the appropriations for defense housing and for so-called critical materials in critical areas throughout the country. There is not enough now to go around. Although the amount involved, $25,000,000, seems large, yet when we are spending billions of dollars for the Army and Navy, in comparison $25,000,000 is a rather small amount for community facilities such as playgrounds, schools, and libraries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] for himself, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], to perfect the language beginning on page 49, line 20.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. What has become of my amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I had intended to offer a new amendment. I understood that the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island had been disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. The amendment of the Senator from Mississippi would not be in order at the present time.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

Mr. FERGUSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE].

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out from page 17 the words beginning after the semicolon on line 4 to the colon on line 11, and to insert in lieu thereof the following: "And the limitations under this head in the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952, on the amount available for expenses of National Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Management, and on the amount available for expenses of State Administration, Planning, Training, and Records Servicing, are hereby repealed."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this amendment does not involve any additional funds. It merely repeals, for the last quarter of the current fiscal year, some limitations which were placed in the 1952 appropriation act with reference to the use of funds appropriated for the Selective Service System, in the operation of the national office, State offices, and local offices at the county level. The provision which this amendment would strike out for the last quarter of the current fiscal year has already been omitted by the House of Representatives in the passage of the appropriation bill for 1953.

I have conferred with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]. They agree that the amendment should be taken to conference and analyzed by the staff, where it may be ascertained whether it can withstand the close scrutiny to which it may be subjected.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that it is a matter that can be taken to conference, where it can be carefully analyzed. I understand that the Senator from Mississippi believes that it is a proper amendment, which would permit the switching of funds in order to take care of the program, that it would not add one dollar to the bill, and would merely provide a method of using the money. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. The facts have been examined by the Bureau of the Budget. They say it would take care of fluctuations and changes in conditions which are hard to anticipate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, there is only one question which I should like to ask in connection with this amendment. The matter involved was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations. At the time we had the bill under consideration a letter was received by the chairman of the committee from General Hershey, in which he made no mention of the matter, but in which he asked for an increase in funds. From a conversation which I had with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], who had conferred with General Hershey, I understand that General Hershey does not intend to ask for an increase in funds provided this amendment is adopted. Is that correct?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the way the Senator from Mississippi understands the situation, although he has not talked to General Hershey himself.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood that the Senator from Wyoming had talked with General Hershey and that the understanding was that if this amendment were adopted it would not be necessary to comply with the original request for an increase in the appropriation.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the way the Senator from Mississippi understands the situation, namely, that the removal of the limitation would provide legal authority to meet fluctuating conditions, and would dispense with the necessity for increasing the fund.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under those circumstances I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAGNUSON in the chair). Without ob-

jection, the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state it.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, after line 25, it is proposed to insert:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $300,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Renegotiation Board has been re-created. We had a Renegotiation Board during the war, which saved the Government many millions of dollars. Under the new law, contractors are required, beginning on the 1st of May, to submit their operations to the Board. There is no money available for the Board to carry on its work.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wish to state that the reason the proposed appropriation should be provided in the supplemental appropriation bill is that the Board was created after the regular appropriation bills were passed last year. They have many pending cases. The old Board was abolished and a new Board has been set up. My information is that approximately $10,000,000 has been collected by it and that there is a possibility that countless millions of dollars could be collected by the Renegotiation Board if more contracts could be studied by the Board.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is perfectly obvious that the Board must be provided with money in order to function.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this item would establish two field offices. I believe that the Board should function properly and renegotiate contracts as speedily as it is possible for the Board to do so. However, it seems to me that an appropriation of $300,000 for two field offices to function for the remainder of the fiscal year is a great deal of money.

I hope that the so-called plan, which is referred to as an organization plan, is not the type of plan which will cost us $150,000 a month for two offices. If it does cost that large amount of money there certainly should be a great number of contracts renegotiated. I am in favor of renegotiation and have always been in favor of a renegotiation law. However, while speed is essential I hope we will not find that in getting speed we will have set up another organization which is composed of chiefs and no one to do the work.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator from Michigan know how many cases will be before the Renegotiation Board?

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not know.

Mr. HAYDEN. The record shows that there is a backlog of 8,161 cases.

Mr. MAYBANK. One of the witnesses, who is a former Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and who was associated with the Renegotiation Board during the last war, told me—because I believe I presided at the hearing on that day, in the absence of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]—that there would be approximately 10,000 cases pending by the time legislation passed. I agree that we should vote for a $300,000 expenditure provided contracts can be promptly renegotiated.

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe, too, that the agency should report to Congress as soon as it has established the offices and show how much of the $300,000 it is using.

Mr. HAYDEN. That will be developed in the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. They will come before our subcommittee in connection with the independent offices appropriation bill. The Senator from Michigan is a member of that subcommittee. I understand the offices will be opened in San Francisco and Boston.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Arizona advise me—and I hope some of my colleagues are interested in the question also—why there is any necessity for making an appropriation of $300,000 in a supplemental appropriation bill when only 2 months, approximately, remain of the current fiscal year. We will have an opportunity to go thoroughly into this question in the regular appropriation bill and make the money available at least by the 1st of July this year in an amount which a careful consideration will show to be necessary. That amount may be shown to be $300,000 or perhaps $100,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. As the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] has stated, the Renegotiation Act was recently enacted by Congress. It provides that contractors must go before the Board with their contracts beginning May 1. There is now a backlog of approximately 8,000 cases, which have not been disposed of. The amount of money involved in the contracts will run into many millions of dollars. I have a letter written by the Board to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee in which he states that although the filing date is May 1 of this year, the sum of $2,400,000 has already been returned to the Treasury through the Board. That was done voluntarily by some of the contractors. On the other hand, other contractors are avoiding renegotiation. I believe the sum of money requested to be reasonable. Of course, the amount can always be reduced if it is necessary to do so. I believe that we should provide the amount of money which the Commission has stated it needs at this time.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I have no objection to establishing a renegotiation board and to giving it every dollar it needs to perform the work entrusted to it. On the other hand, we should not provide even $1 it does not need. I merely raise the point that we do not have what I think is a sound basic showing that $300,000 is needed at this time to operate the Board from today until the 1st day of July.

Mr. HAYDEN. All I know is that the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate in that amount of money. The Bureau of the Budget is supposed to do some checking.

Mr. CORDON. If that be the case, I am opposed to it, because if we follow that argument we shall have to appropriate $84,000,000,000; and I am not going to agree to that on the basis of any showing made by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. HAYDEN. I simply wished to indicate that I did not pull the figure out of the air.

Mr. CORDON. I understand.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. It is not indicated that for each of the offices to be established, $150,000 will be available for a period of 2 months? That seems to be an enormous amount. I wonder whether the Senator from Arizona will agree to take to conference an amendment calling for $100,000 for this purpose. Let me inquire whether this item has been before the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; this matter came up in the form of a supplemental estimate, sent to the Senate Appropriations Committee, in the amount of $300,000; and the estimate was accompanied by a letter.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is the Senator from Arizona able to state how many employees the agency would be able to hire in one of the offices for $150,000 for a period of 2 months? Does the record contain figures showing the number of employees? It simply would seem unreasonable for a newly created office to spend $150,000 for 2 months, inasmuch as a new office will not get started for a little while.

Mr. HAYDEN. This justification appears in the record:

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of a proposed supplement in the amount of $300,000 to the funds available to the Renegotiation Board for the fiscal year 1952 is to enable the Board to (1) further develop its field organization by establishing regional boards in Boston and Detroit and balancing the staffs of the newly established New York and Chicago regional boards; and (2) reduce the significance case inventory resulting from the transfer of cases under the Renegotiation Act of 1948 to the point where contractor filings under the 1951 act may be processed without undue delay.

* * * * *

The requested supplement provides for an additional 28 man-years of personal services which when added to the present staff will enable the Board to economically and efficiently administer the act during the balance of fiscal year 1952 and enter fiscal year 1953 with an adequate key staff.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator from Arizona tell us how much it will cost to have 28 new employees for the remainder of the present year?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am sorry that I can give nothing but the record which appears in the hearings. I do not have the information the Senator from Michigan requests.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a member of the Armed Services Committee and as

a member of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, I have a little general information on this subject. The Renegotiation Board is a most important agency. It has been set up with the idea of renegotiating contracts, and thus reducing their amount, so as to save as much money to the Government as possible.

I cannot go into the details of the cost of running the Renegotiation Board, but I think it would be helpful to make some of the requested appropriation, if not all of it.

I should be glad if the Senator from Arizona would agree to take to conference an amendment for this purpose in the amount of $150,000 or $200,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. I was going to ask the Senator from South Carolina about that. He handles the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I appreciate what the Senators have said about this matter. When the Renegotiation Board gets fully under way, it will renegotiate contracts in such a manner as to return to the Government millions of dollars. The law under which the Board will operate is the same as the law which Congress passed in 1941, under which great benefit accrued.

I would not request anything that was not essential. I have not requested additional funds for housing or other programs. However, this agency should be put to work. It has before it approximately 10,000 cases calling for renegotiation, so I have been informed. I believe the Administrator to be able and sincere. These offices will be expanded later on by the agency.

If the Senator in charge of this bill is willing to accept a modification of the amendment so as to provide $200,000 for this purpose, I hope that will be agreeable to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HAYDEN. The original request was dated in March. Therefore, at this time we can decrease by one-third the amount requested, and thus make the amount $200,000, which would be about right.

Mr. FERGUSON. On page 388 of the hearings there appears the following statement by the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR]:

> You have borrowed or obtained from the Department of Defense $549,339.

So it is obvious that we have not been skimping the appropriations for this Board.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I am not suggesting that that has been done.

The Board has been set up as an independent agency, and is not under the Army. Let us get the Board to work. If we appropriate $200,000 for it, with the consent of the acting minority leader, as well as the Senator in charge of the bill, then if later we find that the amount thus provided is excessive, we can reduce the amount for this purpose carried in the regular appropriation bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from South Carolina is willing, is he not, to have the modification made in the amendment, and that if thereafter it is found that the amount thus provided is greater than is needed, he will take action to reduce the amount carried for this purpose in the regular appropriation bill?

Mr. MAYBANK. Yes; I assure the Senator from Michigan that I will.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Arizona, on page 16, following line 25, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 16, following line 25, it is proposed to insert the following:

RENEGOTIATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $200,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, in line 16, before the period, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That (1), the position of Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury established by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950, the position of Administrative Assistant to the Attorney General established by Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1950, the position of Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Interior established by Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1950, the position of Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce established by Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1950, and the position of Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Labor established by Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1950, shall be filled without reference to section 1310 of Public Law 253 of the Eighty-second Congress, as amended, shall be subject to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be placed in the highest grade set forth in the general schedule of such act without regard to section 505 (b) of such act, as amended, and shall be in addition to the number of positions authorized to be placed in such grade under such section, and (2) in the case of any other position for which compensation is expressly established by law at a rate equal to the rate payable prior to the enactment of Public Law 201, Eighty-second Congress, under the highest grade of the Classification Act of 1949, the rate of compensation shall hereafter be equal to the rate payable for such grade under said Public Law 201."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I have spoken about the amendment to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who is handling the bill on the floor, and also to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

This amendment will give to 37 employees the pay increase which other Government employees received last year when Congress increased the pay of the various employees of the Federal Government. After that pay-increase bill was passed, it was found that there were 37 employees whose salaries were paid at the rate of $14,000, and therefore they could not receive any additional pay. After the increased pay went into effect, those 37 employees had working under them certain employees whose pay under the new schedules would amount to $14,800. Certainly such an arrangement does not have a good effect in any way.

In order that there shall be no mistake regarding the employees who will be affected by this amendment, let me state that on page 450 of the hearings the employees affected will be found stated by title.

I understand there is no objection to this amendment on the part of the Senator who is handling the bill.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does this amendment constitute only an arrangement for equalization of salary?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Yes, and it applies only to the employees to whom I have referred.

Mr. President, in order to clarify the matter, I ask unanimous consent that page 450 of the hearings be printed at this point in the RECORD, so there will be no mistake as to what this amendment proposes to do.

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

Number of positions at statutory $14,000 rate which would be increased to $14,800 by proposed amendment

Group I. Positions at $14,000 under sec. 6 (a) of Public Law 359, 81st Cong. (Executives' Pay Act): [1]

Director of the Bureau of Federal Supply	1
Director of Selective Service	1
Members of the Displaced Persons Commission	3
Members of the Indian Claims Commission	3
Members of the War Claims Commission	3
Associate Federal Mediation and Conciliation Director	1
Deputy Director of Central Intelligence	1
Director of the Bureau of Prisons	1
Commissioner of Public Buildings	1
Commissioner of Community Facilities	1
Commissioner for Social Security	1
Commissioner of Reclamation	1
Chief of the Soil Conservation Service	1
Commissioner of Customs	1
Commissioner of Narcotics	1
Governor of the Farm Credit Administration	1
Chief Forester of the Forest Service	1
Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration	1
Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	1
Assistant Architect of the Capitol	1
Chief Assistant Librarian of Congress	1
Deputy Public Printer	1
Subtotal, group I	28

Number of positions at statutory $14,000 rate which would be increased to $14,800 by proposed amendment—Continued

Group II. Positions at $14,000 under Reorganization Plans Nos. 2, 3, 5, 6, and 26, respectively, of 1950:	
The Administrative Assistant Attorney General (plan 2 of 1950)	1
Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior (plan 3 of 1950)	1
Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Commerce (plan 5 of 1950)	1
Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor (plan 6 of 1950)	1
Administrative Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury (plan 26 of 1950)	1
Subtotal, group II	5
Group III. Positions at $14,000 under sec. 2 (a) of Public Law 585, 79th Cong. (Atomic Energy Act of 1946):	
Director of the Division of—	
Research	1
Production	1
Engineering	1
Military Application	1
Subtotal, group III	4
Total	37

[1] 18 positions for which sec. 6 (a) of Public Law 359 fixed compensation at $14,000 will not be affected by the proposed language: (a) The Office of the Housing Expediter was abolished by Executive Order 10276 of July 31, 1951; (b) the Philippine War Damage Commission (3 members) ceased to exist on Mar. 31, 1951, pursuant to provisions of General Appropriation Act of 1951, Public Law 759, 81st Cong.; (c) the compensation of the Associate Director of the FBI has been fixed at $17,500 by sec. 606 of Public Law 188, 82d Cong.; (d) the compensation of the 13 commissioners, U. S. Court of Claims, was increased from $14,000 to $14,800 by Public Law 201, 82d Cong.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief statement regarding the amendment.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

The purpose of this amendment to H. R. 6947 is to make clear that the positions of Administrative Assistant Secretary in the Departments of Treasury, Interior, Commerce and Labor, and the position of the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, are under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and to place them in the highest grade of the schedule of that act.

The Reorganization Acts establishing these positions made it clear that the positions were created to fill a demonstrated need for a highly trained administrator to assist the head of each named Department in the administration and management of his programs and responsibilities. A properly qualified individual, acting in such a capacity, would free the Department head for the policy decisions necessary if he is to hold and exercise full responsibility for the conduct of his Department.

In order to accomplish specific improvement in management, the Reorganization Acts also made clear that continuous attention to effective performance of such aids to management as budgeting, financial review, personnel, and management analysis, was necessary. For this reason the acts provided for the appointment of career employees from the classified civil service. The adoption of this amendment will make it clear that such employees are, for all intents and purposes, under the regular civil service merit system and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

The original acts and this amendment will make it possible to achieve continuity without regard to changes in officials concerned mainly with direction of policy. The complexity of our Government demands the presence of men experienced in Government management and administration, to advise such officials with respect to the means and methods of accomplishment and to translate policies into action. It was intended to establish a career pattern for the positions extending across departmental lines with a Government-wide approach to management problems. The demands of these officers are so great that standards for performance must be of the highest order so that the officers must be outstanding and must remain so. The method of appointment of these officials would not be changed by the proposed amendment.

The salary for the holder of these offices was fixed at the time the offices were created. In October 1951 this Congress, by Public Law 201, recognized that, to attract and keep competent personnel in the Government, adjustments should be made to reflect increased living costs. Because these positions were not clearly subject to the Classification Act, the benefits of the adjustments were not available to the incumbents. This omission indicated a deviation from the basic purpose of maintaining these positions at the top of the career civil service, and providing for the necessary continuity in the positions. Acceptance of this amendment will correct this deviation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to have a vote taken on the amendment. It probably will take only a minute to vote on it.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon seek recognition on the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. CORDON. I intend to make a point of order against the amendment. At this moment I hope the Senator from South Carolina will agree to withhold action on the amendment until I can study it. I am frank to say that I intend to make a point of order on the amendment, but I shall appreciate it if the Senator from South Carolina will be willing to have action on the amendment withheld until we can determine whether the amendment calls for the addition of substantive legislation to an appropriation bill.

On the other hand, if the Senator from South Carolina will agree to withhold action on the amendment, it may be that I can join in the request to have the amendment taken to conference.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I should like to suggest that an amendment on the same subject was adopted in the House of Representatives. Therefore I think the only question is whether this particular amendment is germane to this bill. I believe it is germane in that it is dealing with the same subject matter.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the proposed amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina raises the point of germaneness in this matter. The Senator from Oregon has made a point of order. The Chair quotes from rule XVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, on page 21:

All questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I would ask that the Senator from South Dakota proceed. He wants to speak at this time, and we may be able to work this out without further action by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the point of order will be temporarily withdrawn, and the Chair recognizes the Senator from South Dakota.

MISSOURI RIVER FLOOD

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Tuesday morning, under the leadership of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the Public Works Committee of the Senate, a delegation from the United States Senate, from the House of Representatives, and from the Army Corps of Engineers, flew to the Midwest to make an inspection of the flooded areas of the Missouri River Valley. We returned from that trip late last night. I do not intend to detain the Senate at any length this afternoon in describing that tragedy, but I should like to read into the RECORD for the benefit of Senators who did not make the trip, and who have not had an opportunity to have a summation of the damage which has been done, some statistics which have just come to my attention in connection with that very serious flood.

For the area between Bismarck, N. Dak., and the present crest of the flood, which is at Omaha, Nebr., where the crest is presumed to reach its fullest height some time after dark tonight, the present statistics, up to now, have been made available and have been authenticated.

The flood has cut major line railroads in 27 different places in that farming area and in that region where transcontinental railroads and other rail services taking care of the rural and urban areas of that section operate.

The flood has now broken 83 main highways. That does not include county roads or township roads, but covers State roads and United States highways. At 83 different places they have been covered with water, so that they are no longer usable by motor vehicles.

As of today, more than 87,000 persons have had to be moved from their homes on the farms, or from their homes in the towns, to places of safety, as a consequence of this flood.

Fifty-one towns and cities have been inundated to the point where their public services are in jeopardy, and where people have had to be moved to higher ground. In most of those cities and towns, business has come to a stalemate, and the people are living under what would be martial law if martial law were necessary—which it is not, in that

area—in order to get them to conform with the mayors' proclamations to desist from their normal activities and to fight the floods and help maintain the levees.

The land flooded as of now comprises 2,073,000 acres of farm land which constitutes much of the richest farming land in the United States today. It is a part of the farm land to which our country and the world have been looking for food as we do battle against communism. It is a part of the farm land, the productivity of which is quite as essential to victory in the battle for freedom as is the productivity of an arsenal or the productivity of a plant producing atomic bombs.

Nobody at this stage can tell how long it will be before that land can be cultivated, or whether it can be cultivated at all during the current growing season.

In the river valley the floods have brought about a tragedy almost without parallel and completely without parallel or precedent in that sector of the river valley which is presently bearing the brunt of the flood and where 153 private levees have been breached up to now. Those are levees which communities and farmers have built out of their own finances, through their own efforts to help safeguard property from the floods of the river. Those are not levees which have been built by the Army engineers. They are not levees which have been built by Federal funds. Those are 153 private levees.

The damage up to this time can only be estimated, because nobody can tell definitely as of now. The river has not yet been whipped, it has not been contained; the danger is not over at Omaha and at points down the river where the larger populations live. But the best estimate available from the figures supplied by the Army engineers is $200,000,000 worth of damage to date.

I am happy to report one encouraging element in the picture in that area, Mr. President. There are 195,000 acres of farm land protected by Federal levees, and up to now those levees have held. Up to now, not one single acre of farm land, protected by a levee which is complete and which is maintained by the Army Engineers, has been flooded.

I call this to the attention of the Senate merely as a brief summary. Those of us who made the trip are going to make a much more complete report, when all the evidence is in. It certainly highlights for all of us the wisdom of the program for which the Senate year after year has been appropriating funds, the program which has come to be known as the Pick-Sloan plan, for the completion of the flood-control project in the Missouri River Valley.

The President's party, at Omaha, yesterday afternoon, was told by Gen. Lewis A. Pick, of the United States Corps of Army Engineers, that had the program which was started and which has been in operation since 1946, been completed, the present flood would have been impossible. They told the President that, had the plan moved forward as rapidly as the Army Engineers had been seeking funds with which to move it forward, they would have completed it to a sufficient extent that the floods from which the area is now suffering would have been impossible.

I salute the Senate on being far ahead of the other body in the matter of flood-control in the past few sessions of the Congress. The Senate has restored repeatedly the budget funds which had previously been deleted by the House of Representatives. The Senate Appropriations Committee, especially its Civil Functions subcommittee, at this time is confronted with exactly that same situation once again. The House, lacking, of course, the evidence which the current flood has provided, has slashed rather heavily and seriously the flood-control program recommended by the Army engineers, the President, and the Bureau of the Budget for the current building year in the Missouri River Valley. I certainly hope that the Senate will not only restore those funds, but that, in recognition of the fact that for a second consecutive year we have had these tremendously devastating floods in this very same area, the Senate will also move forward with this program on an emergency basis, and on a forced-feed basis, in recognition of the fact that in a war against floods, as in a war against Reds, we either have to win the war or lose it, and that a stalemate battle against floods is a battle which is tremendously costly to the people of the valley affected and to the country.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask whether the distinguished Senator from South Dakota flew over the Mississippi River or the Minnesota River?

Mr. MUNDT. We did not. The President's party did. We had a report at Omaha that conditions were very tragic and were very serious.

Mr. THYE. The Minnesota River has taken its toll in cities along its banks, but the Mississippi River has broken all records of high water. It is so high that it has covered some of the major streets in the loop of St. Paul. Never before has the water of the Mississippi River been that high.

I should like to commend the Senator from South Dakota for inviting the attention of the Senate to the need for an adequate appropriation to fight against a recurrence of floods in the same manner as we would fight against a human enemy. The flood is as devastating to the property owner as any war damage could be. We have seen property owners take a loss from which they will require a lifetime of effort to recover. Some of them will never regain what they have lost in the flood.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Minnesota is correct. Only this afternoon I read of a very tragic case of a lady in the Senator's State who was moving in a rowboat. The boat capsized and the lady drowned. That loss of life is just as serious as if the lady had lost her life by enemy bomb or by enemy gunfire. We must recognize that in this kind of war it is not enough to come within nine-tenths of winning, but we must appropriate funds to proceed with a program that can win against these disastrous floods.

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

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I was interested in what the distinguished Senator had to say about General Pick's statement in Omaha yesterday and in the Senator's reference to the 1946 recommendation on the part of the Army engineers. Can the Senator tell us whether the 1946 recommendation included the Fort Randall Dam?

Mr. MUNDT. Speaking from memory, in 1946 I believe the recommendation started with the Garrison Dam in North Dakota, because the program was to start with the one dam which is completed on the river at Fort Peck and to move down into North Dakota and then into South Dakota, harnessing the river as it moved on.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Was not a great deal of the work in 1946 for which appropriations were made suspended by Executive order?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is correct. Had that suspension not have occurred, probably Garrison and certainly Randall would now have been closed, which would have reduced tremendously the floodwaters now cascading down the valley.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to have that information in the RECORD.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I shall cease at this point by asking to have incorporated in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Aberdeen American News of April 16, 1952. It is entitled "Demand Speed-up in Flood Control."

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

DEMAND SPEED-UP IN FLOOD CONTROL

Nature has provided "exhibit A" in the case for generous appropriations for Oahe and Gavins Point Dam.

The spectacle in waste of resources, presented so dramatically these past few days by the uncontrolled floodwaters of the Missouri River and its tributaries, should convince Congress—if anything can—that large main-stem dams are needed without delay in the Missouri Valley development program.

It would have been helpful in getting the Missouri River flood story before the Nation if leaders in Congress could have accepted the invitation extended by Gov. Sigurd Anderson to fly to South Dakota and study the problem at close range.

Congressmen could have observed the loss of natural resources as fertile topsoil was being washed away.

They could have seen the material damage to homes, business places, and power plants.

They could have measured the human efforts expended in a losing battle aimed at protecting property from the irresistible force of the powerful water current.

An on-the-scene study would offer convincing proof that money appropriated for the South Dakota dams in question would be an investment in preserving resources sorely needed by the Nation.

Economy mindedness in an election year is good. Economy mindedness, in fact, is a virtue that has been too long hidden in Congress.

But in the instance of the Missouri River program it will be an economic benefit of long range to hasten the completion of the projected dams.

The natural wealth saved plus the new wealth created by the development program will more than offset the present cost, high as it may seem.

This graphic economic picture must be presented to Congress by Dakotans and others interested in preserving and developing the resources of this great area of present and potential productivity.

Dakotans will be aided in this endeavor by their representatives in Congress, some of whom are en route to this area now for the purpose of investigating and reporting their findings to colleagues in Washington.

The factual story that can now be presented to Congress should cause Members to reverse completely their stand on reducing Missouri River improvement appropriations.

Instead of considering cutting appropriations for Oahe Dam at Pierre, and Gavins Point and Randall Dams, near Yankton, Senators and Representatives should demand increased appropriations.

The present floods show the necessity for speeding up rather than retarding the entire Missouri River program.

THIRD SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6947) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for a vote on my amendment.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I desire at this time to withdraw the point of order I raised with reference to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I have three minor amendments which I should like to have acted upon.

I send to the desk an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Effective April 15, 1952, the appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1952 is made available for the compensation of one camera man, Joint Recording Facility, at the basic rate of $3,600 per annum.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amendment makes available money heretofore appropriated for a cameraman.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It establishes a television man in the rooms upstairs, but requires no additional money now, so that on an annual-salary basis there will be a new man for the purpose of operating television.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 1, it is proposed to insert:

Folding documents: For an additional amount for folding speeches and pamphlets at a gross rate not exceeding $2 per thousand, $10,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 20, it is proposed to strike out "$575,000" and insert "$750,000."

Mr. HAYDEN. This amendment relates to the support of United States prisoners who are in jails and whose subsistence is provided for by contract. The money has become exhausted.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand the report of the Prison Board shows that there are now more prisoners than there were heretofore.

Mr. HAYDEN. The number has increased.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are the terms getting longer as indicated by the report?

Mr. HAYDEN. I could not say as to that; but those in charge of Federal prisons are out of food-money at the present time.

Mr. FERGUSON. I think we can take congressional notice, Mr. President, of the fact that there are more prisoners going to Federal prisons for crimes in connection with conditions in Washington. I, for one, am all in favor of the amendment. I am for feeding them in prison rather than allowing them to pursue their criminal careers outside of prison.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator feel that the statistics may also be subject to the interpretation that there is a little better law enforcement?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think that is true. It has been brought about by congressional investigations. The law has to be enforced better than it was before the congressional investigations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in keeping with my promise, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, April 18, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate on April 17 (legislative day of April 14), 1952:

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Christian F. Schilt
Thomas J. Cushman

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Gregon A. Williams
Frank H. Lamson-Scribner

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Arthur H. Butler
Thomas A. Wornham

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 18, 1952

(Legislative day of Monday, April 14, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God our Father, we thank Thee for the unquenchable impulse toward Thee Thou hast planted within us. Open our eyes to see Thee, not just out on the far rim of the universe, but in human love which hallows our lives and which at best bears witness to Thee. Strengthen us with the assurance that, at last, love never faileth and alone can heal the hurt of the world. Conscious of Thy overshadowing presence, we pray for fidelity not to shirk the issues of these momentous days nor to be lured by appeasement or compromise. Committing our souls unto Thee, who knowest the way we take, bring us forth as gold tried in the fire. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1952.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN C. STENNIS, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
President pro tempore.

Mr. STENNIS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MCFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 17, 1952, was dispensed with.