

Commission Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 959; 25 U. S. C. 70); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

724. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to amend 18 United States Code 871 to provide penalties for threats against the President-elect and the Vice President"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

725. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of a bill entitled, "A bill to amend the act approved July 8, 1937, authorizing cash relief for certain employees of the Canal Zone government"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 248. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and \$350 funeral expenses to the estate of Charles R. Torbert, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 492). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LeCOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 247. Resolution providing for the payment of 6 months' salary and \$350 funeral expenses to Sarah Waldron, mother of Mary Waldron, late an employee of the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. WOLCOTT: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 5141. A bill to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small business institutions and free, competitive enterprise; with amendment (Rept. No. 494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOW:

H. R. 5447. A bill to provide that the Commissioner of Education shall compile and make available to schools in the United States a list of all foreign publications which are undesirable for school use because of their tendency to promote undemocratic forms of government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5448. A bill to amend chapter 83 of title 18, United States Code, so as to make certain foreign publications nonmailable unless they bear an appropriate label indicating the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRAZIER:

H. R. 5449. A bill to amend section 47c of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 5450. A bill to admit 100,000 immigrants who are natives and citizens of Italy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 5451. A bill to amend the wheat-marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code, act of February 10, 1939; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACK of Illinois:

H. R. 5453. A bill to amend section 22 (b) (13) of the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the exclusion from gross income in the case of members of the Armed Forces serving on active duty in a combat zone during any month shall not apply unless the individual serves for at least 6 days; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 5454. A bill to provide for the construction of a Veterans' Administration hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 5455. A bill for the relief of the Board of County Commissioners of Hamilton County, Ohio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H. R. 5456. A bill to extend to June 30, 1954, the direct home and farmhouse loan authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs under title III of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, to make additional funds available therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H. Res. 257. Resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the status of local service airlines under the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. Res. 258. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of how the annual budget may be balanced and deficit financing eliminated; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5457. A bill to authorize and direct the sale of certain land in Alaska to John Ekonomos, of the Fairbanks Precinct, Alaska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BRAMBLETT:

H. R. 5458. A bill for the relief of William Nasato, Josephine Nasato, and Carolyn M. Nasato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5459. A bill for the relief of Takeko Ishiki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 5460. A bill for the relief of Sgt. Chancy C. Newsom; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H. R. 5461. A bill for the relief of Wah Chang Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODWIN:

H. R. 5462. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Romana Michelina Serini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 5463. A bill for the relief of Pauline Ann Dufault and Michael Francis Dufault; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 5464. A bill for the relief of Nicola Scala di Antonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5465. A bill for the relief of Nicola Scala di Felice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 5466. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy Louise Cowan Tarrant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H. R. 5467. A bill for the relief of Francis A. Reilly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOLLEFSON:

H. R. 5468. A bill for the relief of Sidney Blechman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5469. A bill for the relief of Alton B. York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H. R. 5470. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Mario Veltri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1953

(Legislative day of Thursday,
May 28, 1953)

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, with our burdened lives tense and strained in a violent world, we seek the peace which is the gift of Thy grace to all those who yield their wills to Thy will, their minds to Thy truth, their hearts to Thy obedience. God of our fathers, save us from the supreme hypocrisy of decorating tombs and at the same time desecrating the heritage which graves guarantee. Make us clean in mind and imagination, upright in character and life. Help us to stand for the hard right against the easy wrong. Amid all the strife and confusion of our times preserve to us a vision of the world as Thou wouldst have it be, and grant us some part in molding it nearer to Thy purposes of love and grace. With our eyes always on that shining goal, as our Nation stands in the valley of decision, save us from any expedient compromise which would mean the crucifixion of moral principle and prove to be in the fateful tomorrow but part of a progressive surrender to the pagan forces which have vowed the destruction of the free world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 28, 1953, was dispensed with.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., June 1, 1953.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.
STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BENNETT thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

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 May 29, 1953, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 837) for the relief of Eugene Rivoche and Marie Barsky.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, and Mr. SMITH of North Carolina were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. STENNIS were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and tomorrow.

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HUNT and Mr. McCARRAN were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate during this week.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. BUSH was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from June 4 to June 8, inclusive.

On his own request, and by unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER was excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate from June 4 to June 8, inclusive, in order to conduct hearings for the Judiciary Committee in Florida.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to suggest the absence of a quorum. However, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call Senators may be permitted to introduce bills and joint resolutions, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business without debate, under the 2-minute time limitation that has been previously adhered to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Martin
Barrett	Goldwater	Maybank
Beall	Gore	McClellan
Bennett	Griswold	Millikin
Bricker	Hayden	Monroney
Bush	Hendrickson	Morse
Butler, Md.	Hill	Neely
Byrd	Hoey	Payne
Capehart	Holland	Potter
Carlson	Jackson	Purtell
Chavez	Jenner	Robertson
Clement	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cordon	Kefauver	Schoepel
Daniel	Kennedy	Smathers
Douglas	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dworshak	Knowland	Symington
Eastland	Kuchel	Tobey
Ellender	Langer	Watkins
Ferguson	Lehman	Williams
Flanders	Long	Young
Frear	Malone	
Fulbright	Mansfield	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREENE and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board for the year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF CIVIL AIR PATROL

A letter from the Chairman, National Board, Civil Air Patrol, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that patrol for the calendar year 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"Senate Joint Memorial 11

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has recently held that the activities of a private contractor performing services for the Atomic Energy Commission are to be treated as activities of the Atomic Energy Commission itself for the purpose of securing immunity from State and local taxes: Now, therefore,

"Your memorialists respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to amend the Atomic Energy Act so as to eliminate therefrom any language which may be interpreted as providing for the extension of tax exemption to private contractors with the Atomic Energy Commission or to the vendors of such contractors, contrary to the well-established principles of intergovernmental relations which have assured to the States and their political subdivisions full power to impose nondiscriminatory taxation upon private persons who deal with the Government; and be it

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Washington congressional delegation."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, protesting against a reduction of the appropriation for the national school-lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on May 27, 1953, p. 5630, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

Three resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relating to congratulating members of the Armed Forces, proposed curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard, and to urge that any steps aimed at curtailment of employment or curtailment of work at the Boston Naval Shipyard be reconsidered, in view of the value of this facility to the State and National defense and to the State and National economic security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See resolutions printed in full when laid before the Senate by the President pro tempore on May 27, 1953, p. 5630, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

COMMUNISM IN POLAND—RESOLUTION OF POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC UNION OF AMERICA, SALEM, MASS.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a

resolution unanimously adopted by the delegates of 52 societies and 7 circuits, numbering more than 15,000 members, of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, located in the First District of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire, convened at the united societies and circuit meeting held in the Martyr Dolorosa Hall in Holyoke, Mass., on April 26, 1953, relating to the treatment of Catholic priests by the Communist government of Poland.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF POLISH ROMAN CATHOLIC UNION OF AMERICA, UNITED SOCIETIES AND CIRCUITS, NEW ENGLAND BRANCH

The delegates of 52 societies and 7 circuits, numbering more than 15,000 members, of the Polish Roman Catholic Union of America, located in the First District of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire, convened at the united societies and circuit meeting held in the Martyr Dolorosa Hall in Holyoke, Mass., on April 26, 1953, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the Communist government of Poland is carrying on a campaign of persecution, jailing, and murder of Catholic priests, dictated by its Soviet masters; and
"Whereas this communistic regime is striving, through compulsory atheistic teaching in its schools, to annihilate the inherent religious spirit of the youth of Christian Poland; and

"Whereas the controlled press, radio, and Communist dictators of Poland persist in leveling baseless and unjust charges and attacks on His Holiness, Pope Pius XII; and

"Whereas the Polish nation is held in bondage and is being oppressed and tortured by the agents and puppets of Red Russia, masquerading as the Polish Government; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That, raising our voices to the civilized world, in protest of these vicious and inhuman activities of the Soviet tyrants, we importune the President and Congress of the United States to help Poland, the historic friend and ally of our country, in its difficult struggle against communism and all of its evil forces; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower; Vice President Richard Nixon, President of the Senate; Hon. Joseph Martin, Speaker of the House; United States Senators and to the Members of the United States House of Representatives from the State of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Vermont, and New Hampshire."

RESOLUTION COMMITTEE.
KASIMIR I. KOZAKIEWICZ.
SOPHIA C. ANDRUSZKIEWICZ.
EDWARD W. DOBEK.
JOHN A. BURZYNSKI.
WILLIAM J. SONDAJ.

DEVELOPMENT OF GREAT LAKES-ST. LAWRENCE WATERWAY—RESOLUTION

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I present a resolution, expressing the unanimous endorsement of the Republican delegation in Congress from the State of Michigan to the proposed plan of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada in the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr.

POTTER] joins me in presenting the resolution. I ask unanimous consent that it be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD, at this point, together with the signatures attached, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, with the signatures attached, as follows:

This resolution expresses the unanimous endorsement by the Republican delegation to the Congress from the State of Michigan of the proposed plan of cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada in the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project:

"Whereas President Eisenhower, his Cabinet, and the National Security Council have unanimously endorsed the participation by our Government in the proposed development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project; and

"Whereas the national security of the United States requires that the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project be constructed to transport raw materials and finished goods uninterruptedly, notwithstanding the disruption of internal transportation that would inevitably be caused by shortages in time of war; and

"Whereas the national security of the United States requires that raw materials be at all times readily accessible to industry in Michigan, the industrial heart of the Nation, which demonstrated its productive power in World War II by turning out more war goods than any other State in the Nation; and

"Whereas the maintenance and development of a sound, prosperous, and healthful national economy demands the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project in order that raw materials might always be readily accessible to the industrial heartland of the Nation; and

"Whereas the example of international trust, good will, and hemispheric solidarity which will be demonstrated to the world by our cooperation with our great neighbor and good friend Canada in the development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project will inspire the free world by demonstrating the benefits attainable by international trust, good will, and cooperation; Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the undersigned that the Government of the United States should join with the Government of Canada in the joint development of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Waterway project. We commend President Eisenhower for his farsighted stand on this matter, and we urge our colleagues in the Congress to join with us in our support of the policy urged by the President.

"HOMER FERGUSON, United States Senator; CHARLES E. POTTER, United States Senator; GEORGE MEADER, Member of Congress, 2d District; PAUL W. SHAFER, Member of Congress, 3d District; CLARE E. HOFFMAN, Member of Congress, 4th District (the advocates of St. Lawrence should be heard); GERALD R. FORD, Jr., Member of Congress, 5th District; KIT CLARDY, Member of Congress, 6th District; JESSE P. WOLCOTT, Member of Congress, 7th District; ALVIN M. BENTLEY, Member of Congress, 8th District; RUTH THOMPSON, Member of Congress, 9th District; ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, Member of Congress, 10th District; VICTOR A. KNOX, Member of Congress, 11th District; JOHN B. BENNETT, Member of Congress, 12th District; CHARLES G. OAKMAN, Member of Congress, 17th District; GEO. A. DONDERO, Member of Congress, 18th District."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 754. A bill for the relief of Ethel Hudson Morrison; without amendment (Rept. No. 314);

H. R. 1730. A bill to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 315); and

H. R. 4730. A bill to provide for the conveyance by the United States to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio, of certain lands formerly owned by that city; with amendments (Rept. No. 316).

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. 1461. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, concerning requests of common carriers for increased transportation rates; with amendments (Rept. No. 317).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 2021. A bill to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency. (See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 2022. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Navy to advance 1st Sgt. Charles H. Gray, United States Marine Corps (retired), to the grade of chief warrant officer on the retired list of the Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 2023. A bill to amend the Social Security Act so as to prescribe circumstances under which the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system may be extended to State and local employees who are covered by retirement systems; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 2024. A bill to withdraw the privilege of free transmission of official mail matter from certain Government corporations and agencies; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. BUSH (by request):

S. 2025. A bill to amend section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 relating to the exemption from taxation of certain activities of the Atomic Energy Commission; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2026. A bill for the relief of the Henly Construction Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 2027. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue quitclaim deeds to the States for certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2028. A bill to promote safe driving, to eliminate the reckless and financially irresponsible driver from the highways, and to provide for the giving of security and proof of financial responsibility by persons driving or owning vehicles of a type subject to registration under the laws of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 2029. A bill to provide for the disposal of property acquired by the United States in Fairfax County, Va., for the purpose of constructing a public airport in the vicinity of the District of Columbia under authority of the act of September 7, 1950; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 2030. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Interior to correct an incomplete and faulty survey in township 8 north, range 53 west, of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado, and to issue patents describing any new areas included in lots 1, 2, 3, and 4 in sections 1 through 6, township 8 north, range 53 west, of the sixth principal meridian in Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MILLIKIN (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado):

S. 2031. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Horrell; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEALL (for himself, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, and Mr. BYRD):

S. 2032. A bill to modernize the charter of Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 2033. A bill relating to the labeling of packages containing foreign-produced trout sold in the United States, and requiring certain information to appear on the menus of public eating places serving such trout; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2034. A bill for the relief of Hermine Lorenz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITION OF COSPONSOR OF SENATE BILL 671

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] be made a cosponsor of Senate bill 671, a bill to amend section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, relating to the exemption of activities of the Atomic Energy Commission from State and local taxation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT, RELATING TO GUARANTY FOR CERTAIN LOANS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last April I introduced the bill (S. 1559) to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act to authorize the Federal Reserve Board to guarantee the loans of chartered banks up to 90 percent. That authority was to be a substitute for long-term capital loans previously handled by the RFC, the activities of which many of us believe should now be discontinued.

Today, I introduce for appropriate reference a new bill for S. 1559, which changes my previous bill in the following respects:

First. The loans are to meet demonstrated military or defense requirements or essential civilian requirements for necessities.

Second. A limitation of \$100,000 is placed upon such loans.

Third. I provided for the termination of disaster loans by the RFC without affecting the disbursement of funds or the carrying out of any commitment or

other obligation entered into pursuant to section 4 (a) 4 of the RFC Act as amended and to loans upon the recommendation of the Small Defense Plants Administration under section 714 (b) (1) (A) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 as amended.

My bill makes no provision for disaster loans because they can be made under other statutes by the Farmers Home Administration, the Federal Housing Administration, the emergency fund for the President and an act of September 30, 1950 (64 Stat. 1109). Therefore, in my opinion, we do not need authority for the RFC to make disaster loans nor the existing authority under section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act under which the Federal Reserve banks in exceptional circumstances can make 5-year loans to industrial or commercial businesses.

But my bill makes credit available to small business up to \$100,000, in full keeping with our private-enterprise system and without expense to the taxpayers.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2021) to amend section 13b of the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

WITHDRAWAL OF FREE MAILING PRIVILEGE FROM CERTAIN GOV- ERNMENT CORPORATIONS AND AGENCIES

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to withdraw the privilege of free transmission of official mail matter by certain Government corporations and agencies, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2024) to withdraw the privilege of free transmission of official mail matter from certain Government corporations and agencies, introduced by Mr. FERGUSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That official matter which has heretofore been sent through the mails free of postage under the penalty privilege by (1) the Tennessee Valley Authority, (2) the Commodity Credit Corporation, (3) the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, (4) the Inland Waterways Corporation, (5) the Bonneville Power Administration, (6) the Southwestern Power Administration, (7) the Southeastern Power Administration, (8) the Alaska Railroad, (9) the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and (10) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall be subject to postage at the regular rates, including registry fees if registration is required.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect 30 days after the date of its enactment.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946, RELATING TO EX- EMPTION FROM TAXATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, at the request of the Legislature of the State of Connecticut, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 relating to the exemption from taxation of certain activities of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2025) to amend section 9 (b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 relating to the exemption from taxation of certain activities of the Atomic Energy Commission, introduced by Mr. BUSH (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. FERGUSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4974, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CARLSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4974, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON JOINT RESOLUTION EXTENDING TO CITIZENS 18 YEARS OF AGE THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I give notice that at 2 o'clock tomorrow, in room 424 of the Senate Office Building, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold a public hearing on the joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment to provide that citizens of 18 years of age may vote.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8, AND SIMILAR RESOLUTIONS, PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, June 11, 1953, at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office

Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 8, and similar resolutions, proposing amendments to the Constitution relative to the nomination and election of President and Vice President. Persons desiring to be heard should notify the committee so that a schedule can be prepared for those who wish to appear and testify. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

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. LANGER:

Memorial Day address delivered by Senator HENDRICKSON under the auspices of the William Stokes Bonsal Post, No. 133, American Legion, at Woodbury, N. J.

By Mr. POTTER:

Address on the St. Lawrence seaway and power project, delivered by Attorney General Brownell at Canton, Ohio, on May 19, 1953.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Article on the Eisenhower administration, written by Edward Lamb in his column, The Publisher's Notebook, and published in the Erie Dispatch of Sunday, May 16, 1953.

Article entitled "Flisk Gets Chapter of Phi Beta Kappa," published in the New York Times of April 4, 1953.

By Mr. JACKSON:

Article entitled "Fosdick at 75—Still a Rebel," written by Gertrude Samuels, and published in the New York Times magazine of May 24, 1953.

By Mr. JACKSON (for Mr. MAGNUSON):

Editorial entitled "Hells Canyon and the GOP Repudiation," written by Howard Ordway, and published in the Waterville Empire-Press.

Article entitled "Reclaimed Basin Land Produces Sugar Crop," written by Fred Nien-dorf, and published in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of May 25, 1953.

By Mr. MONRONEY:

Article entitled "A Sickness of Fear," dealing with the nomination of Mrs. Mildred McAfee Horton, written by Mrs. Dwight Davis, and published in the Washington Post of May 31, 1953.

By Mr. WATKINS:

Article entitled "New Refugee Influx Swamps West Berlin," published in the New York Times of May 28, 1953.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Letter addressed to him by Harry W. Colmery, of Topeka, Kans., in support of the so-called Bricker resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MORSE:

Editorial entitled "Tricky Grazing Bill," published in the Oregon Sunday Journal.

THE LIVING VETERANS OF THE CONFEDERATE ARMY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, Saturday was Memorial Day. On that day we honored the dead of all the wars in which this Nation has engaged, including that most tragic of all wars in which our Nation was divided within itself.

We have been for these many years a united country. The bitterness that lived after the end of the War Between the States has died away. Few, indeed, are the survivors of that conflict. Nearly all those brave men are gone from among us.

In tribute to them, I should like to name and pay honor to the still living veterans of the Confederate Army. To my knowledge, there are only four of them. They are Thomas E. Riddle, of the Confederate Soldiers' Home in Austin, Tex.; Walter Williams, of Franklin, Tex.; W. A. Lundy, of Laurel Hill, Fla.; and John Stallings, of Slant, Va.

I honor these men. They represent today the thousands of brave men who fought and died for a land they loved. They have lived through other wars. Our greatest glory is that they have lived to see this a truly united nation, undivided and indivisible. They deserve and have our respect and esteem.

REPORT TO CONGRESS BY THE CIVIL AIR PATROL

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. President, it has been customary for some years to print in the body of the RECORD the annual report of the Civil Air Patrol, auxiliary of the United States Air Force. I have before me the report of the Civil Air Patrol for the year 1952. In accordance with the custom, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 1953.

CIVIL AIR PATROL, AUXILIARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, REPORT TO CONGRESS FOR 1952

INTRODUCTION

The national headquarters, Civil Air Patrol, was established April 29, 1943, as an exempted activity under the commanding general, Army Air Force. Under Public Law 476, 79th Congress, approved July 1, 1946, Civil Air Patrol was incorporated and declared to be a body corporate by the name of "Civil Air Patrol." Under Public Law 557, 80th Congress, approved May 26, 1948, Civil Air Patrol was established as a civilian auxiliary of the Air Force. The Secretary of the Air Force was authorized to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives and to accept and to utilize the services of Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of the non-combatant mission of the United States Air Force Establishment.

Civil Air Patrol has an organizational structure consisting of a national headquarters, 8 regions, 52 wings located in each of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Each wing has groups and squadrons located throughout its area with a total of 211 groups and 1,756 squadrons. Air Force personnel are assigned to the national headquarters, regions, and wings to assist and to advise Civil Air Patrol personnel regarding operational, administrative, and logistical problems and to act as liaison between the Air Force and Civil Air Patrol.

The national commander, Civil Air Patrol, is a regular United States Air Force general officer designated by the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force. He discharges the responsibilities of the Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with respect to the inspection and supervision of the activities of Civil Air

Patrol. The national headquarters, Civil Air Patrol, is staffed with United States Air Force officers and airmen. The military headquarters is designated Headquarters Civil Air Patrol, United States Air Force.

The governing body of Civil Air Patrol is the National Board, which consists of 52 wing commanders, 11 members of the National Executive Board and 9 members-at-large. The business of the corporation, when the National Board is not in session, is carried on and conducted by the National Executive Board, which consists of the 8 regional directors, a chairman, a vice chairman, and the chief financial officer. The National Commander has been vested with all the powers, duties, and privileges enjoyed by the National Board and the National Executive Board when the above boards are not in session.

MISSION

The mission of Civil Air Patrol was established by Public Law 476, 79th Congress, July 1946. The objects and purposes of the corporation as stated in section 2, chapter 527, are:

"(a) To provide an organization to encourage and aid American citizens in the contribution of their efforts, services, and resources in the development of aviation and in the maintenance of air supremacy, and to encourage and develop by example the voluntary contribution of private citizens to the public welfare;

"(b) To provide aviation education and training especially to its senior and cadet members; to encourage and foster civil aviation in local communities, and to provide an organization of private citizens with adequate facilities to assist in meeting local and national emergencies."

In the accomplishment of these objectives, Civil Air Patrol is engaged in a nationwide program of public education on matters pertaining to the advancement of aeronautics and the maintenance of air supremacy, is developing a reserve pool of personnel trained in the fundamentals of aviation by conducting an aviation education program for a continuing group of 100,000 or more carefully selected Civil Air Patrol cadets between the ages of 15 and 18, has organized a nationwide radio network for training communications specialists and for emergency purposes, and is performing volunteer missing-aircraft search and rescue missions as an auxiliary of the Air Rescue Service, Military Air Transport Service, and other emergency operations. In addition to service rendered for the Air Force, Civil Air Patrol also performs emergency missions for other Federal agencies and State governments, patrolling forests, pipelines, public utilities, and flooded areas when ordered by the National Commander, Civil Air Patrol. Under mobilization conditions, the Civil Air Patrol will continue as a permanent auxiliary of the Air Force and will remain a volunteer civilian organization to assist the military and civil agencies during the war period.

PERSONNEL

Civil Air Patrol membership is separated into two categories—cadet and senior members. Any United States citizen 15 to 18 years of age can become a cadet member of Civil Air Patrol. At the end of 1952, 47,308 cadets were enrolled. This was a 9-percent increase over 1951 membership and was substantially higher than the goal of 46,000 cadets established for the year. The ultimate goal is 100,000 cadets, which has been programmed for 1955. Any United States citizen over 18 years of age may become a senior member of Civil Air Patrol. At the end of 1952, 29,196 senior members were enrolled.

OPERATIONS AND TRAINING

Operations and training were conducted on the basis of fulfilling the following objectives: (1) Increasing the interest of American

citizenry in aviation, (2) providing a pool of air-minded youth as a source of procurement for the Air Force, (3) providing an organization capable of alleviating the burden of the Air Force in fields of search, rescue, and disaster relief, (4) providing a semimilitary organization of aviation-minded civilians capable of taking an active part in civil defense and other flying aspects of national defense, (5) providing the Air Force with an organization that is making a concerted effort to contribute to better understanding of air power at the grassroots level.

OPERATIONS

Air Rescue Service-Civil Air Patrol actual search and rescue missions: During 1952, Civil Air Patrol flew a total of 111 actual search missions under the control of Air Rescue Service units. A total of 8,901 hours was amassed in actual search during this period, and 5,310 aircraft were utilized. Operating with minimum equipment and often at great personal risk, there can be no better test of the sincerity of these light-plane pilots than their readiness to fulfill a request for aid in search and rescue work.

Air Rescue Service-Civil Air Patrol aircraft wreckage marking missions: Air Rescue Service and Civil Air Patrol have an agreement whereby Civil Air Patrol will aid Air Rescue Service in the marking of aircraft wreckage sites. Marking of sites is under the direction and control of Air Rescue Service personnel. Equipment and supplies necessary for the actual marking of sites are furnished by that organization.

Civil Air Patrol-Civil Defense exercises: To carry out the joint Federal Civil Defense-Civil Air Patrol policy established in 1951, each Civil Air Patrol wing was authorized participation in one statewide Civil Defense exercise a year. The policy of one exercise a year in no way prohibits Civil Air Patrol units from engaging in other State or local exercises requested by Civil Defense personnel. Sixteen field exercises were conducted in 1952, with Civil Air Patrol air units flying 676 hours in direct support of ground mobile support teams. Four thousand nine-hundred and fifty-eight Civil Air Patrol personnel volunteered their services to conduct the joint exercises. There were 118 mobile support teams available for search and rescue work when requested by local and State Civil Defense authorities. Development of good mobile support units has been slow; lack of equipment for the ground teams is considered the primary limiting factor.

Civil Air Patrol-Air Defense Command Ground Observer Corps missions: Of interest to both civil and military defense is the increase of missions and hours flown in 1952, to aid Air Defense Command units in training filter center personnel and civilian ground observers. Missions and hours flown represented a 100-percent increase over 1951. There were 107 logged missions and 3,349 hours flown.

Miscellaneous missions: During 1952, 179 Civil Air Patrol aircraft flew a reported 531 hours on missions involving special flights for the American Red Cross, city, and State officials, and independent search and rescue missions. These missions represent only a few of the flights made, many unreported, which constituted a service to the Nation.

United States Air Force on-loan aircraft: Perhaps the greatest morale booster and aid to the Civil Air Patrol recruitment program has been the allocation of United States Air Force liaison-type on-loan aircraft to Civil Air Patrol units. During the period of this report, 63,463 hours, involving both corporate and on-loan aircraft, were flown for orientation and familiarization training. The availability of on-loan aircraft is largely responsible for this tremendous increase over last year. On-loan aircraft were flown a total of 35,816 hours, with an average of over 5,000 hours flown a month in the latter part of the year when more aircraft were made available.

CADET TRAINING

The Civil Air Patrol Cadet program is designed to develop in youth an awareness of the social, political, economic, international, and vocational aspects of aviation. This concept is interpreted and applied in the Aviation Education program and Special Activities related to air-age indoctrination. Aviation education is that branch of general education concerned with communicating knowledges, skills, and attitudes about aviation and its impact upon society. This training is accomplished by academic instruction in squadrons and high schools. Areas of instruction include: Our Air Age, Know Your Airplane, Why the Airplane Flies, Power of Flight, The Airplane and the Airman, Weather, The Path of Flight, Air Traffic Control, National and International Problems of Safety and Control, Airports, and Vocational Opportunities in Aviation. Aviation education does not stress the technical aspects of aeronautical instruction; hence, the course is not to be confused with the preflight courses taught in schools and colleges during the war. Aviation education is general education and is not based on a temporary need. Aviation education in high school is a 1-year program taught by regular members of the school faculty. Any interested student is eligible for enrollment on an elective-course basis; Civil Air Patrol membership, though desired, is not a prerequisite. Educational accrediting associations, in realizing the value of aviation education as a part of the school curriculum, have approved the granting of academic credit for the high-school course. Since its inception in 1949, the number of schools and students participating has increased steadily. Guidance in obtaining source and reference materials from governmental agencies, airline companies, and aviation industries has been rendered to Civil Air Patrol squadrons and high schools offering a course in aviation education. For its outstanding efforts in promoting and sponsoring air-youth education, Civil Air Patrol was awarded the Frank G. Brewer Trophy for 1952. To develop an air-minded citizenry is to insure the conservation and proper utilization of our human resources.

Flight orientation: To motivate the interest of cadets in actual flying activities and to afford application for his academic training in aviation education, flight orientation rides are provided. This opportunity engenders interest in aviation either professionally, vocationally, or avocationally. The extent of this activity in 1952, is reflected by 25,583 cadets flying 52,887.36 hours.

Civil Air Patrol cadet encampments: In order to acquaint cadets with the operational activities of the Air Force at its bases, encampments are scheduled for each wing during the summer months. Forty-two cadet encampments were conducted at 39 Air Force bases during the summer of 1952. All 52 wings, with the exception of Louisiana, stricken by a polio epidemic, engaged in encampment activities. The first all-girl national encampment, composed of wing representatives, was held at Lockland Air Force Base, Texas.

Special activities: These include the international cadet exchange program and international drill competition which are designed to provide the cadet with an opportunity to apply some of the knowledges and skills he has acquired in the Civil Air Patrol training program and to foster international good will and relationships.

The international cadet exchange was conducted in 1952, with the following countries: Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, England, France, Italy, Luxembourg, Mexico, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the Netherlands. Civil Air Patrol provided 111 cadets and 15 escorts; foreign countries sent to the United States 113 cadets and 26 escorts. This exchange of air-minded youth did much

to foster good will and understanding by the intermingling of groups of different nationalities and cultures.

Regional, national, and international drill competitions were held in the summer of 1952. The 52 wings were formed into 5 regional areas. The regional winners (New Jersey, Puerto Rico, Michigan, Colorado, and Utah) competed in the national exercise held at Mitchel Air Force Base, New York. Puerto Rico, the national winner, was awarded the Stone Trophy. The international drill team was composed of selected members from the five regional teams, with the exception of Colorado's all-girl unit. The international drill competition held at the Minnesota State Fair, Minneapolis, Minn., was between the United States and Canada. The General Beau Trophy was awarded to the United States team for the first time since the inception of the international meet in 1947.

National aviation education workshop: The success of the aviation education program is, to a large degree, measured by the support it receives from the public-school systems. They, in turn, need interested, enthusiastic, and qualified teachers to make the program meaningful and productive of its stated objectives. Realizing this need, Civil Air Patrol cosponsored and directed the first national aviation education workshop at the University of Colorado during the summer of 1952. Over 100 teachers and Civil Air Patrol senior members attended this workshop for which four semester hours of college credit were granted. Civil Air Patrol personnel at the community level obtained the cooperation and support of service, civic, and fraternal organizations in providing scholarships for a number of those attending; others paid their own expenses. This educational project provided an excellent opportunity for Civil Air Patrol to work with other related aviation agencies which provided materials, instructors, and guest speakers. These included: Civil Aeronautics Administration, United States Office of Education, National Aeronautics Association, and the Academy of Model Aeronautics. As a result of this successful endeavor, several colleges and universities have been encouraged to sponsor workshops.

SENIOR TRAINING

The senior training program is designed to orient members as to the purposes, scope, and functions of the organization. In order to accomplish this objective, senior training is divided into three phases: CAP-USAF orientation, which consists of the history, organization, and mission of Civil Air Patrol and its relation to the United States Air Force as an auxiliary service; military orientation, comprised of customs and courtesies of the service, leadership, wearing of the uniform, command and staff functions; and operational training which is accomplished primarily by a familiarization course and search and rescue practice missions (SARCAPS) under the direction and supervision of Air Rescue Service. Statutory provisions restrict the utilization of Civil Air Patrol to missions of a noncombatant nature. Other practice missions include Ground Observer Corps and civil defense exercises. Civil Air Patrol's operational effectiveness was greatly increased by these various field exercises.

Practice search and rescue training missions: To improve search and rescue technique of Civil Air Patrol units, at least one practice search and rescue mission, monitored and evaluated by Air Rescue Service personnel, was accomplished in each Civil Air Patrol wing. Additional independent search and rescue missions were authorized when considered justifiable. In 1952, 72 practice missions were flown utilizing 2,532 aircraft for a total of 8,925 training hours. Twelve thousand Civil Air Patrol members volunteered their services to gain the practical experience offered from the training mission.

Extension course institute enrollment: Senior members are urged to increase their individual effectiveness by taking courses from the Extension Course Institute, a United States Air Force sponsored correspondence school. Group study is also encouraged. Enrollments during the year 1952 increased substantially.

Cooperation between the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps and Civil Air Patrol: During 1952, closer cooperation between the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps and Civil Air Patrol was effected. Professors of air science and tactics were encouraged to lend assistance to Civil Air Patrol units (senior and cadet) in providing classroom instructors, guest lecturers, drill instructors, advisory personnel, classroom facilities, training aids, and such other assistance as would be practicable. One of the accomplishments of this program was the granting of priority considerations for Air Force Reserve officer training to cadet and senior members who have been recommended by commandant of cadets and squadron commanders, respectively.

Reserve participation in Civil Air Patrol: In order to afford additional training opportunities for certain categories of Air Force Reservists and at the same time, obtain greater efficiency in Civil Air Patrol, qualified Air Reserve officers are attached on an inactive voluntary basis to Civil Air Patrol units. Reservists are predominantly utilized as unit instructors; however, other duties may include assistance and advisory service to Civil Air Patrol commanders in the administration and operation of their organization. Point credits toward promotion, retention, and retirement are earned for this duty.

MANPOWER AND ORGANIZATION

With the expansion of Civil Air Patrol, there is a continuous need for analysis of manpower requirements and a study of the organizational structure, Civil Air Patrol Corporation. Civil Air Patrol was reorganized in January 1952, in order to authorize a larger number of staff positions and establish separate cadet squadrons. The purpose was to enable unit commanders to enlarge their staff for more efficient operation and activate cadet squadrons in areas where no senior squadrons were located. In addition, this reorganization established positions whereby professional and businessmen could be appointed as advisers to the national commander, regional directors and wing commanders. These advisers are particularly helpful in the legal, educational, communication, and religious fields.

COMMUNICATIONS

There were two main objectives of the communications program: (1) the organization and operation of a nationwide radio network to provide communications facilities for the operational facets of Civil Air Patrol and (2) the provision of communications training to Civil Air Patrol members. In accomplishing these objectives, the primary efforts were directed toward reorganizing the Civil Air Patrol radio network so that adequate coverage could be provided each wing. Other areas of activity included establishing mobile communication facilities, maintaining communications discipline, standardizing procedures, licensing radio stations, and implementing a standardized communications training program.

The organization of the Civil Air Patrol communications program has been based on the fundamental principle that "communications is a function of command." During 1952, action was taken to reorganize the Civil Air Patrol radio network so that definite command control could be exercised by each commander from the national headquarters level down to the lowest echelon in Civil Air Patrol. While lack of radio equipment has not permitted full radio coverage in all wings,

the foundation for a command communications system has been laid.

The missions of Civil Air Patrol call for extreme mobility and flexibility of communications. In 1952, great emphasis was placed on mobility of Civil Air Patrol radio stations. Wing commanders and communications officers were urged to decommission radio stations located in the cellars and attics in the homes of Civil Air Patrol members and to place this equipment in their private automobiles. The result of this concerted drive for mobility of communications is evident, as the ratio of mobile stations to fixed stations is now approximately 9 to 1 as compared to a ratio of approximately 5 to 1 in 1951. The lack of lightweight airborne VHF equipment for Civil Air Patrol aircraft has reduced the overall efficiency of the organization, particularly on practice and actual search and rescue missions. Less than 15 percent of the total number of aircraft assigned to Civil Air Patrol are VHF equipped. The total number of radio stations increased from 9,000 stations in 1951, to approximately 11,000 stations in 1952. Most of the equipment was purchased by the individual Civil Air Patrol communicator or from unit funds. Heretofore, very few Civil Air Patrol cadets have been exposed to any communications training due to the lack of a standardized program. A communications training program for cadets has been initiated.

The licensing of Civil Air Patrol radio stations has presented a problem in that Civil Air Patrol members have been forced to fill out two complicated Federal Communications Commission forms in order to obtain a station license. Through close cooperation with the Federal Communications Commission, a new form for licensing Civil Air Patrol radio stations was developed. This new form includes all the necessary licensing information on one page; radio station licenses are processed in a few days as opposed to the 6 to 8 weeks' delay previously encountered. Relationships between Civil Air Patrol and Federal Communications Commission during the past year have been harmonious and have resulted in expeditious action on all joint matters.

While Air Force support was limited because of the wording of Public Law 557, 80th Congress, that rendered to the Civil Air Patrol communications program greatly enhanced its overall efficiency. Although the assignment of two additional HF frequencies helped, the operation of a large number of Civil Air Patrol radio stations on assigned Air Force high frequencies has resulted in many interference reports from United States and Canadian agencies operating on adjacent channels; therefore, every effort is being made to shift to VHF. Lack of equipment and frequencies has seriously impeded this plan.

The assignment of nine Philco technical representatives to Civil Air Patrol facilitated the supervision of communications operations at the regional level and aided in the implementation of the cadet communications' training program.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Proposed legislation was caused to be introduced in the second session, 82d Congress, to bring Civil Air Patrol members, killed or injured while engaged in missions requested and directed by the Air Force, under the provisions of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, with an assumed monthly pay of \$300 on which to base computation of compensation. The legislation was introduced by Mr. POLK, of Ohio, on January 30, 1952, as H. R. 6331 and by Senator Cain on July 5, 1952, as S. 3489. Congress adjourned before hearings were held in the House Armed Services Committee. Necessary action was taken to ensure its reintroduction in the first session of the 83d Congress. The desirability of and need for this proposed legislation are manifest.

It was the intent of Congress, in enacting Public Law 557, 80th Congress, to permit the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol by making available obsolete or surplus aircraft, materiel, and equipment of the Air Force. Passage of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152, 81st Congress, largely nullified the benefits to Civil Air Patrol of Public Law 557 by preventing the Secretary of the Air Force from making such property available. To effectuate the intent of the 80th Congress and to increase and to utilize fully the Civil Air Patrol potential, H. R. 8525 was caused to be introduced by Mr. VINSON on July 4, 1952, and by Senator CAIN on July 4, 1952, as S. 3483 before the second session of the 82d Congress. Necessary action was taken to ensure its reintroduction in the first session of the 83d Congress. The bill will again enable the Secretary of the Air Force to provide Civil Air Patrol with necessary property no longer required by the Air Force and will also permit the Air Force to budget for limited amounts of certain equipment. It is imperative that this bill be enacted into law if Civil Air Patrol operations are to continue effectively.

SUPPLY AND MAINTENANCE

Headquarters, Civil Air Patrol-United States Air Force, with the concurrence of all agencies concerned, formulated an administrative procedure which permitted the Department of Defense to donate certain supplies and equipment to Civil Air Patrol; however, this method of procuring equipment cannot be used as a sole means of supporting Civil Air Patrol. Only a limited amount has been obtained although the procedure has been in effect 1 year in May. This procedure will be continued as a means of supplementing equipment to be procured under the revised Public Law 557.

The assignment of on-loan aircraft to Civil Air Patrol has substantially increased its operational capabilities; however, no priority is assigned to maintenance support of these on-loan aircraft by Air Force installations. Due to this fact, aircraft are retained by the supporting installations for extensive periods resulting in a low-utilization rate.

Supply support in other categories has been received by Civil Air Patrol from the Air Force. Authorization was granted Civil Air Patrol members to purchase uniforms from Air Force clothing sales stores, although in this particular instance, the purchase of uniforms for female members was precluded because of a shortage of stock.

PUBLIC INFORMATION

Utilizing all communications media, Civil Air Patrol has conducted a varied and inclusive program of information and publicity. The success of this program can be attributed to several factors among which are: (1) The public-service feature of the Civil Air Patrol, (2) local community support of Civil Air Patrol activities, and (3) human-interest element of Civil Air Patrol operations. Increased public recognition and public support have resulted.

A large number of radio programs and panels were aired during year; among them was the national commander's appearance on Time for Defense. In the field, Civil Air Patrol units have sponsored radio programs using the public-service time provided by the Federal Communications Commission. Fillers and shorts were used for the purpose of recruitment. Television time was also obtained for a number of short programs and panels. The national commander and the chairman of the national executive board appeared on television programs.

Guest speakers to tell the story of Civil Air Patrol are in great demand. The speakers' bureau method was utilized in furnishing representatives for specialized and important audiences.

In order to improve and to increase the information activities being done in the field, Civil Air Patrol supplies such tools as copies of national news releases, films, tapes, prepared radio scripts, magazine reprints, and brochures. Elaborate press packets are prepared for distribution prior to the beginning of summer encampments, the international cadet exchange, and anniversary celebrations. Other areas of information liaison are protocol, congressional dinner programing, and speech and media research for the headquarters staff.

Contact, a semimonthly publication, incorporates the Civil Air Patrol newspaper as a regular 4-page insert. This organ of Civil Air Patrol serves as a medium of expression for the national organization and as a means of recognizing singular activities of field units. Editorial content includes staff section coverage, supplemented by news and pictures from the field. Contact is mailed to each active senior member of Civil Air Patrol.

CHAPLAIN

Progress within the Civil Air Patrol chaplaincy is evidenced by such factors as: (1) the increase in number of Civil Air Patrol chaplains, (2) the authorization and assignment of a deputy air chaplain at national headquarters, (3) the organization and initial meeting of the national chaplain's committee, (4) the authorization of regional and deputy regional chaplains and the assignment of 6 of the 8 regional chaplains authorized, (5) the holding of training conferences at regional and wing levels, and (6) publication of the National Air Chaplain Monthly Bulletin forwarded to all Civil Air Patrol chaplains. The chaplaincy continues to impart to Civil Air Patrol a spiritual tone. It makes available to Civil Air Patrol the one profession best qualified to assume the leadership in connection with the moral and citizenship training of the Civil Air Patrol cadets; affords Civil Air Patrol a most convincing talking point for the recruiting of cadets, as it concerns the parents of cadets; and makes available a source of cadets which otherwise would not be available—Sunday schools, church, and youth societies. The chaplaincy associates Civil Air Patrol with the greatest obstacle standing in the path of communism today: religion.

CONCLUSIONS

Civil Air Patrol, in 1952, met to a markedly successful degree, each of its missions as set forth by the Air Force and as established by law. It accomplished this with relatively little expense to the taxpayers and to the Air Force. Civil Air Patrol renders a major contribution in meeting local and national emergencies. It also supports Civil Defense agencies throughout the country. Civil Air Patrol performed 77 percent of the air search and rescue missions within the continental United States, and thereby released United States Air Force Air Rescue Service personnel and planes for other commitments.

The Air Force benefits both directly and indirectly from the training received by members of Civil Air Patrol. This is particularly true in the fields of aviation education, communications, and search and rescue.

The capability of Civil Air Patrol to perform its mission is directly proportionate to the materiel support received from the Air Force and other services and from the contribution of its voluntary members.

Civil Air Patrol is composed of air-minded American citizens who believe in air power, work for air power, and conceive it as both military and civil aviation in all their relationships. Its members are determined to ensure an Air Force capable of guaranteeing our national security.

Civil Air Patrol annual financial statement as of December 31, 1952

RECEIPTS	
Balance Dec. 31, 1951.....	\$31,256.90
Receipts:	
Memberships.....	90,762.00
Prepaid memberships for 1953.....	8,610.00
Insurance refund from cancelled policy.....	1,472.87
Donations.....	3,355.00
Interest on savings accounts.....	400.25
Sale of aircraft.....	250.40
Miscellaneous refunds.....	650.00
Total receipts, 1952.....	136,757.42
DISBURSEMENTS	
Cadet drill competition.....	4,797.10
International Cadet Exchange.....	22,610.38
Official Civil Air Patrol News publication.....	11,945.59
Insurance and bonds.....	12,133.15
National Educational Advisory Committee meetings.....	835.73
Printing and photography.....	3,897.58
Rents.....	192.24
Legal.....	1,001.21
Wing commanders' conference (congressional dinner).....	5,027.33
Petty cash.....	670.80
Miscellaneous.....	2,364.02
Total disbursements, 1952.....	65,475.13
Total receipts.....	136,757.42
Less disbursements.....	65,475.13
	71,282.29
Savings funds on deposit.....	50,936.66
Balance, Dec. 31, 1952.....	122,218.95

HOMETOWN WELFARE?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, the newest member of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, the distinguished Mrs. Oveta Hobby, made a statement to the effect that more of our welfare work should be done by the people themselves at the local level of government. She stated: "A tax dollar that goes to Washington never comes back intact."

In this connection, the Pittsburgh Press of yesterday commented favorably on the statement of Mrs. Hobby, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks the editorial printed by the Pittsburgh Press entitled "Hometown Welfare?"

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

HOMETOWN WELFARE?

The interesting suggestion that welfare programs might cost less if they were financed locally is raised by Mrs. Oveta Hobby, the new Cabinet member who administers welfare activities.

Our welfare programs do cost a good deal, even though they are not as elaborate as those in some other countries where everyone is entitled to free medical care and where governments encourage overpopulation by monthly allowances for each child in a family.

But government programs have a tendency to grow and to cost more and more as the years go by.

In these times of full employment the people in the individual States and cities might well ask themselves whether they wouldn't be better off—financially as well as morally—to handle and pay for their welfare programs themselves and look to the Federal Government only in cases of grave emergency.

Despite the pleasant self-deception involved in accepting handouts from Washington, the taxpayers must pay for them anyway, and, as Mrs. Hobby so succinctly puts it, "a tax dollar that goes to Washington never comes back intact."

THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has been conducting hearings on Senate bill 1901, dealing with the outer Continental Shelf and its development.

Because I have pending before the mittee amendments pertaining to this subject and to the revenues to be derived, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], who is an outstanding authority on this subject, courteously invited me to submit a statement on this vital matter.

I fear that we have heard too little concerning the disposition of this great area, seaward of the States' historic boundaries, wherein is located the great bulk of our offshore oil resources.

Mr. President, I ask for unanimous consent that my statement, in the form of a letter to the senior Senator from Oregon be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAY 26, 1953.

Hon. GUY CORDON,

Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GUY: I want to tell you how very much I appreciate your kind suggestion that I submit a statement to your distinguished Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs relative to pending legislation dealing with development of the outer Continental Shelf. Perhaps you would offer this letter outlining my views for the record being built by your committee.

You will recall that my amendments, submitted to the committee some time ago, dealt with this very problem of the outer shelf. I recollect, with appreciation, your own kind remarks on the floor of the Senate wherein you pointed out that the essentials of my amendments, and Senator ANDERSON'S amendments as they pertained to the outer shelf, were the basis for Senate bill 1901, now pending before the committee.

As the Senator knows, I do not believe that big government—a big Federal Government—should come along after 160 years of legal lethargy and tell any State that it does not own its own property. For that reason, I supported Senate Joint Resolution 13, vesting State title to the submerged lands within the historic boundaries of those States.

However, when Senate Joint Resolution 13 merely confirmed jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries, it seemed to me that the resolution did not go far enough.

My amendments, you will recall, do two things: First, they give to the Federal Government exclusive development rights in this outer-shelf area beyond historic State boundaries.

I emphasize my belief that Federal law should pertain in this area. In my view, there are no valid State claims there, and that to extend State jurisdiction—be it through State conservation laws or taxation prerogatives or other forms of State control—is an inconsistent and unworkable approach.

If the outer shelf is to be confirmed for the Federal Government, it should be without attendant strings attached.

I saw no reason why the Federal Government should participate in the development of those offshore lands within historic State boundaries. I see no reason why the coastal States should have any jurisdiction within the federally controlled areas seaward of these boundaries.

My amendments would also disburse the revenues derived from the resources lying to the edge of the shelf, for educational purposes.

The aid-to-education proposal which I have suggested to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs varies from that offered in the past by my distinguished colleague from Alabama, Mr. HILL.

In my opinion, this step would both solve the controversial question of Federal aid to education, and also would bestow the fruits from an area of Federal resources upon the needy school systems of all our States and Territories. In the case of the amendments which I have proposed, the funds derived from the rich seabeds of the Continental Shelf are clearly Federal funds, unclouded by the proposition that it is State resources which we would be asked to disburse to the Nation as a whole.

My amendments go a step further by spelling out a simple formula for disbursement of these funds to primary, secondary, and higher educational facilities within the States. Under this simplified formula, the old bugaboo of Federal aid to education will not sully the purpose of assisting our sorely pressed school systems. My proposal would transfer the funds derived from these resources to the school systems on the basis of school population alone.

There is no issue of Federal control and dictation herein involved. There is no rigid formula of aid to education whereby the Government in Washington lays down the law in a province traditionally reserved to the States, and forces school systems to line up their budgets and their State constitutions as well in order to qualify for assistance.

In my own State of New Jersey, all moneys arising from the sale of riparian rights are dedicated to the school fund of the State and cannot be used for any other purpose. My suggestions represent what I deem to be a practical and sensible approach to the disbursement of Federal funds derived from our natural resources. Those funds would go where they would do a great good for a growing and deep-seated problem of our times, without stirring up the rancors consistent with heavy handed Federal control.

Estimates to date indicate that from 70 to 90 percent of offshore wealth are located in that area of the Continental Shelf which appertains along its seabed to the Federal Government.

I realize that claims are being made for State participation in this outer Shelf region. I must oppose these claims.

Again, I am most grateful for your consideration and kindness in soliciting my views for your record. Naturally, I hope that they will be incorporated in the measure reported to the Senate.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON.

DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATION IN CAPITALS OF UKRAINE AND BYELORUSSIA—LETTER OF UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, BISMARCK, N. DAK.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a letter from the North Dakota State Branch of Ukrainian Con-

gress Committee of America, Bismarck, N. Dak., signed by Dr. Anthony Zukowsky, president, concerning the establishment of American diplomatic representation in the capitals of Ukraine and Byelorussia. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD, including the names of the officers of the committee, a group of outstanding and distinguished citizens of our country.

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

UKRAINIAN CONGRESS
COMMITTEE OF AMERICA, INC.,
STATE BRANCH OF NORTH DAKOTA,
Bismarck, N. Dak., April 27, 1953.
HON. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The North Dakota State Branch of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is vitally interested in the adoption of House Concurrent Resolution No. 58 concerning the establishment of American diplomatic representation in the capitals of Ukraine and Byelorussia.

We believe this would be an excellent move on the part of the United States in its psychological strategy because it would (1) cause concern in the Kremlin over America's interest in these two vital areas of the Soviet Union; (2) enhance the meaning of our counter-Soviet propaganda; (3) expose the Soviet's fraudulent claims of the independence of the republics; (4) tighten the bonds of alliance which the Ukrainians and Byelorussians naturally feel with America and the West; (5) cause embarrassment to the puppet delegations now falsely representing the Ukrainian and Byelorussian people in the United Nations; (6) be a valid test of the Soviet Union's current manifestations of a desire for peace and friendly relations; (7) gain for the United States additional listening posts behind the Iron Curtain, and open possibilities for contact with active anti-Soviet national leaders.

We respectfully urge you to support this resolution in the interest of America's gaining the initiative in the crucial area of psychological strategy and exposing the camouflaged imperialistic acts of the Soviet Union toward the captive peoples and satellite nations.

Respectfully yours,

Dr. ANTHONY ZUKOWSKY,
President, UCCLA State Branch of
North Dakota.

Vice presidents: Steve Hlebichuck, Bismarck, N. Dak.; Irene Hordynsky, Drake, N. Dak.; Alex Chorny, Wilton, N. Dak.

Secretary: William Sawycky, Wilton, N. Dak.

Treasurer: William Melnik, Beach, N. Dak.
Board members: Nick Chernos, Wilton, N. Dak.; John Ktytor, Dickinson, N. Dak.; Peter Iwaniw, Riverdale, N. Dak.

Advisory board: Dr. Bohdan Hordynsky, Drake, N. Dak.; Irene Mychajluk, Enderlin, N. Dak.; Nick Prokop, Belfield, N. Dak.; Katherine Melnik, Beach, N. Dak.; Dmytro Sawycky, Wilton, N. Dak.; Nick Sologuk, Wilton, N. Dak.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Congress is being urged to act immediately on a request for the shipment of 37.5 million bushels of wheat to Pakistan.

Yesterday at a radio forum, Harold Stassen, Director of the Mutual Security Agency, stated that a committee from the State Department had made a thor-

ough study of this famine-stricken country and the need for this food.

Governor Stassen stated that it was his firm conviction that the shipment of this amount of food to Pakistan would not only stabilize the present Government, which is friendly to us, but would mean much to our future relations in that entire section of Asia.

We shall have, on July 1, a carryover of some 550 million bushels of wheat. Therefore, wheat is one commodity we can ship without in any way damaging our reserve.

Let me respectfully suggest that—
First. The Senate take early action on this request.

Second. Every effort be made to get some of this grain to Pakistan by August 1, for I am advised that arrival of the wheat at that time would be most helpful.

Third. A percentage of it be shipped in the form of flour, in order that this foodstuff may be ready for immediate use.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter I have written to Governor Stassen.

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

JUNE 1, 1953.

HON. HAROLD STASSEN,
Director, Mutual Security Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GOVERNOR STASSEN: After listening last Sunday to your splendid statement regarding your trip to the Far East, your statement in regard to the famine conditions in Pakistan, and the benefits to be derived from the shipment of foodstuffs, I am urging immediate action in the Senate in order that we may have the full benefit from the shipment of this grain.

As I understand it, the National Security Council is making a study of this request and I sincerely trust they will make their recommendations at an early date.

We have a surplus of wheat in this Nation and the shipment of wheat and flour from our reserves would not in any way endanger our own food supply.

I would recommend that a portion of this shipment be in the form of flour, in order that it would be ready for immediate use on arrival.

If I can be of further assistance in this matter, kindly let me know.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK CARLSON.

EXEMPTION FROM ANNUAL AND SICK LEAVE ACT OF CERTAIN OFFICERS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4654) to provide for the exemption from the Annual and Sick Leave Act of 1951 of certain officers in the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes, and asking a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the conference

asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Acting President pro tempore appointed Mr. CARLSON, Mr. DUFF, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, and Mr. NEELY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Mason Sears, of Massachusetts, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Adm. Arthur William Radford, United States Navy, for appointment as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense;

Gen. Matthew Bunker Ridgway, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Army;

Adm. Arthur William Radford, United States Navy, to have the grade and rank of an admiral while serving as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in the Department of Defense;

Gen. Nathan Farragut Twining 10A (major general, Regular Air Force), United States Air Force, for appointment as Chief of Staff, United States Air Force, with the rank of general; and

Adm. Robert Bostwick Carney, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there are no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I now ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Darrell O. Holmes to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President—

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, this nomination was passed over at a previous session of the Senate at the re-

quest of my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. At that time he pointed out that there was some question about obtaining an appointment for Mr. Wayne Bezona, the marshal who is still holding that position, in order that he might continue in the Government service until February 28, 1954, when he will have served his full 20 years.

This morning I was advised by Mr. William Rogers, Assistant Attorney General, that an arrangement has been worked out with the present marshal, Mr. Wayne Bezona, whereby he may be made an investigator for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, with classification GS-9, I believe, until February 28, 1954, by which time he will have served his full 20 years and will be able to obtain his retirement benefits.

I should like to say that my colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and I are both very appreciative of the courteous way in which the Attorney General has handled this matter and has made what appears to be a satisfactory arrangement with Mr. Wayne Bezona, the present marshal.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph E. Talbot, of Connecticut, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of collectors of customs.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified forthwith of nominations confirmed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

DESIGNATION OF SERVICE PERSONNEL AS CLERKS AND ASSISTANT CLERKS IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1643, Calendar No. 276.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1643) to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California that the Senate proceed to consider the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1643) to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, before discussion ensues on the Senate bill, I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed, and that in its place the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 2327, which is Calendar Order No. 300, an identical bill which has come from the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the House bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2357) to authorize the Post Office Department to designate enlisted personnel of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard as postal clerks and assistant postal clerks, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; the bill (S. 1643) was indefinitely postponed, and the Senate proceeded to consider House bill 2357.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, very briefly I shall explain the bill. At the present time the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard are not required to bond their servicemen who are handling mail. The Army and the Air Force are required to do so. The pending bill would simply make it possible for the Army and the Air Force to be given the same status as that of the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. There are times, at the front, at sea, or in other difficult places, where it is impossible to obtain bond. I am informed that this arrangement will be satisfactory to the Post Office Department. The bill would not relieve from combat duty any serviceman who may now be doing post-office work. The purpose is simply to continue the present procedure, except insofar it gives the Army and the Air Force an opportunity to waive a bond for the serviceman who may be handling post-office work.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. I do not intend to oppose the pending bill; in fact, I am in favor of it, but I believe I should mention for the RECORD the fact that the

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is somewhat jealous of its prerogatives, and there was some question as to why this bill was not referred to that committee. I think we would have approved it, and we do approve it. I assure the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts that my only reason for making this statement is that I feel it my duty to protect and preserve the prerogatives of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee would not have wanted to take jurisdiction of this bill had it known there was any question about it. The bill was referred to our committee. Representatives of the Post Office Department testified in favor of it. It was not our purpose in any way to take anything away from the distinguished Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee has been much concerned, as have other Members of the Senate, I believe, over the tendency to assign more and more servicemen to duties and functions which could properly be performed by civilians. I inquire of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee whether the passage of the pending bill would in any way increase the number of men drafted for necessary military service, but subsequently assigned only to postal functions which could be performed by civilians.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The answer is a clear and emphatic "No."

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator think the passage of the pending bill would tend in that direction?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is my understanding, and it was the information of the committee that it would not make any change whatever in the procedures which are now being followed, and that it would not in any way make draftees or other servicemen mail clerks, when they were drafted for military service.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield further to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. To what extent are servicemen assigned to postal duties within the United States?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am informed that a very limited number are so assigned within the United States. The pending bill would apply principally to units at the front, where servicemen in uniform are employed in post-office work.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, with the assurance of the distinguished chairman of the committee, I shall interpose no objection to passage of the pending bill. However, I respectfully wish to call to the attention of the chairman and the other members of the committee the glaring fact that hundreds of thousands of men drafted for military service are new performing functions which could

be performed quite as well, and in many cases perhaps better, by civilians.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That has been a constant question in the minds of members of the Senate Armed Services Committee. Last year we questioned at length some of the uses that were being made of Marines. I remember that, as one example. But the best information we have is that the pending bill is primarily aimed at conditions at the front, and that it will not mean taking men into the services and assigning them merely to post-office duties. It is a bill which, if passed, will give the Army and the Air Force a little greater opportunity and more ease in handling their mail.

Mr. GORE. Then, Mr. President, I shall join the Senator in supporting the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2357) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRINTING OF UNITED STATES WALL MAPS FOR USE OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 30, which is Calendar Order No. 315.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the concurrent resolution by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of United States wall maps for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment in line 3, after the word "of", to strike out "a United States wall map," and insert "the official United States wall map, published by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior", so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 30,015 copies of the official United States wall map, published by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, size 5 feet by 7 feet, of which 99 copies, mounted and backed, and 7,425 copies, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the Senate; and 441 copies, mounted and backed, and 22,050, not mounted or backed, shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from California?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by way of explanation of the concurrent resolution, I may say that, prior to World War II, it was customary every 4 or 5 years to print large wall maps of the United States, which Senators and Representa-

tives could distribute. That practice was discontinued during the war, because there were no new editions of the maps. The Department of the Interior is now preparing a new edition of the map of the United States.

The alert Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] heard about it and suggested that the Congress take advantage of this new printing. Therefore, the preparation of these maps is not an original job being done for the Congress, but it is proposed that when the maps are impressed, we take advantage of that fact and have additional copies printed. There would be made available one mounted wall map for each Senator and Representative. In addition, it would be possible for each Senator to have in the document room 50 of these maps, which could be distributed to schools or elsewhere in his State. Seventy-five copies would be made available for each Member of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF DISPLAY OF FLAGS OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS OR OTHER NATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 694, which is Calendar Order No. 256.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the bill by its title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 694) to prohibit the display of flags of international organizations or other nations in equal or superior prominence or honor to the flag of the United States except under specified circumstances, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 2, line 2, after "United States," to insert a period, and in line 11, after the word "prominence" to strike out "of" and insert "or," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the analysis of chapter 1 of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserted at the end thereof the following:

"4. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States."

(b) Such chapter is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 4. Display of other flags equal, above, or in place of the flag of the United States.

"(a) No person shall display the flag of the United Nations or any other national or international flag equal, above, or in a position of superior prominence or honor to, or in place of, the flag of the United States at any place within the United States or any Territory or possession thereof: *Provided, That*

nothing in this section shall make unlawful the continuance of the practice heretofore followed of displaying the flag of the United Nations in a position of superior prominence or honor, and other national flags in positions of equal prominence or honor, with that of the flag of the United States at the headquarters of the United Nations or at any place at which any official meeting or proceeding of the United Nations is in progress.

"(b) Whoever knowingly violates the provisions of this section shall be fined not more than \$250 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STUDY OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 89, calendar No. 314.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 89) to study juvenile delinquency in the United States, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, and subsequently from the Committee on Rules and Administration with additional amendments. The amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary were, on page 2, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee or subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

In line 25, to change the section number from "2" to "3", and on page 3, line 4, to change the section number from "3" to "4."

The amendments were agreed to.

The additional amendments of the Committee on Rules and Administration were, on page 2, line 3, after the word "violating", to insert "Federal"; on page 3, line 3, after the word "than", to strike out "March 1" and insert "January 31", and in line 9, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$44,000", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study of juvenile

delinquency in the United States. In the conduct of such investigation special attention shall be given to (1) determining the extent and character of juvenile delinquency in the United States and its causes and contributing factors, (2) the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including chapters 402 and 403 of title 18 of the United States Code, in dealing with youthful offenders of Federal laws, (3) sentences imposed on, or other correctional action taken with respect to, youthful offenders by Federal courts, and (4) the extent to which juveniles are violating Federal laws relating to the sale or use of narcotics.

SEC. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Senate, to hold such hearings, to require by subpoenas or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and, within the amount appropriated therefor, to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report hearings of the committee of subcommittee shall not be in excess of 40 cents per hundred words. Subpoenas shall be issued by the chairman of the committee or the subcommittee, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman.

A majority of the members of the committee, or duly authorized subcommittee thereof, shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that a lesser number to be fixed by the committee, or by such subcommittee, shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of administering oaths and taking sworn testimony.

SEC. 3. The Committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for such legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest date practicable but not later than January 31, 1954.

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$44,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

The additional amendments were agreed to.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the resolution?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I shall gladly explain this resolution. It authorizes a study of juvenile delinquency, its causes and contributing factors, throughout the country by a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary. The purpose of the study is to suggest in a report to be submitted to the Senate not later than January 31, 1954, such legislation as may be found to be appropriate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could the Senator inform us as to whether any such investigation has been conducted in the past?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. There is none pending at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. Was any such investigation ever made in the past by this body?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what will be the scope of the investigation?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It will be primarily to furnish leadership in this field

so as to stimulate some activity in the States. In my own State of New Jersey, for example, since the introduction of this resolution, the agency having jurisdiction of this subject has offered to the Senate the services of one of the best criminologists in the country to aid in the investigation. I think we can save a portion of the committee-approved appropriation because of the voluntary aid we shall receive from the States and from the Department of Justice and other agencies of the Federal Government. I look for cooperation all along the line.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the Senator's view that the appointing of a subcommittee to investigate the subject will cause the States to follow suit and to assist in the project?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I feel very definitely that that is the case, Mr. President. I also feel that we have the responsibility of taking some leadership in this field.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is it the purpose of the proposed subcommittee to hold hearings, or simply to gather statistics?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. To hold some hearings; a limited number of hearings. Of course, the subcommittee has not as yet been created. I cannot tell what the subcommittee may do; but, assuming that I may be honored with membership on the subcommittee, I certainly would want to hold hearings. The initial hearings would be attended by appropriate representatives of the Department of Justice and appropriate representatives of the States whose participation may be desired.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would the Senator not say that the investigation would deal primarily with the gathering of statistics?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No, Mr. President. Statistics will be an important factor, but I think we shall receive some very informative material which will enable us to develop a program at the national level which will aid the States in developing their own individual programs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I notice on page 4 of the report that a proposed budget was made up. Is that on a yearly basis?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. No. It runs from the time of the adoption of the resolution to January 31, 1954. The Committee on Rules and Administration amended the original resolution which provided for an appropriation of \$50,000. The amount was reduced to \$44,000.

Mr. President, it is my hope that if I may have the privilege of serving on the subcommittee, we shall not use all of the \$44,000, because I think we shall receive aid from agencies of the States and from agencies of the Federal Government, which will make unnecessary the employment of all the contemplated personnel.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished friend from New Jersey that I shall be the most surprised man in the United States if such

a thing shall occur, because, as a rule, every dollar appropriated is expended.

The Senator assures us that the amount of money being sought will be used for the employment of the persons indicated on page 4 of the report, up to January 31, 1954.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as amended.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield further?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I gladly yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator give us any assurance that the subcommittee will complete its work on or before January 31, 1954?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I can give assurance, with the understanding, of course, that I shall be a member of the subcommittee—if I have the good fortune to be a member of it—that I shall insist that we complete our work by the time mentioned.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the Senator will recall that some time ago, when we were considering resolutions providing money for the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, it was pointed out that that committee leads all other committees in the amount of money used for investigation purposes, and my recollection is that the amount was in excess of half a million dollars.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I am aware of that fact, and I share the feeling of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana with respect to such expenditures. If the Senator will look over my record while serving on the Committee on Rules and Administration, he will find that I insisted again and again on cuts in such appropriations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Since the Senator from New Jersey is the author of this resolution I have no doubt that he will be appointed a member of the subcommittee. I hope so; and I hope he will come to the Senate next year without a request for more funds.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I sincerely hope that I shall be able to come before the Senate and report exactly the result which the Senator from Louisiana wishes.

Mr. HENDRICKSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the session this afternoon the Senate adopted Senate Resolution 89. At the time of the adoption of the resolution I had intended to make a formal statement on that measure. However, the resolution was adopted as a result of colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and myself.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that my formal statement on the resolution be printed in the RECORD at an appropriate place, in connection with that colloquy.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENDRICKSON

I rise today in support of Senate Resolution 89, authorizing a full and complete study of juvenile delinquency.

It was back on March 4 when I first addressed the Senate concerning this study of

one of the grave problems facing this Nation of ours today.

On March 4, the same day upon which I made my brief remarks, I introduced Senate Resolution 89, directing the Committee on the Judiciary or a duly authorized subcommittee thereof, to make this inquiry to determine the nationwide extent and character of juvenile delinquency, its causes and contributing factors.

The resolution, in part, calls for a review of present Federal statutes dealing with youthful offenders, correctional action taken with respect to youthful delinquents by Federal courts, and a study of the extent to which juveniles are violating narcotics laws.

When I first discussed before this body the thoroughly disgraceful story of the rotten roots that are gradually tearing at the sturdy trunk of our most priceless heritage—our youth—I recall having referred to juvenile delinquency as the fifth horseman of doom.

Since that time, through the medium of our daily newspapers, which are depicting a true and ever more grisly tale of increasing incidence of child crime, we who are concerned with this momentous problem have heard the rising crescendo of hoofbeats from that self-same fifth horseman.

The Committee on the Judiciary, of which I am proud to be a member, has approved this resolution, as has the Committee on Rules and Administration.

I believe that the staggering figures, the latest available, as correlated by our Federal Bureau of Investigation, have in no small way pointed up to my responsive and responsible colleagues the need for such an inquiry.

The newspapers tell only the most sensational part of the story of child crime.

True enough, the accounts are startling to parents concerned with the spreading problem.

The recent police raid on a teen-age fraternity "smoker" here at which obscene motion pictures were displayed is sensational news.

The 15-year-old New Jersey boy whose father taught him to rob and to murder makes a stark story.

But I am convinced from a reading of the latest FBI figures that the headlines merely reflect a small part of what is happening to our society—to all levels of our society—which can countenance and enable such tragic events to transpire.

Please permit me to touch upon merely a part of what the FBI found to be the facts concerning the incidence of child crime in these United States of America.

Of the more than 1,110,000 arrests reported by 232 cities with populations exceeding 25,000, 147,632, or 13.3 percent, were boys and girls under 21 years of age.

These youths accounted for 37.2 percent of the robbery arrests, 46.9 percent of the larcenies, 61.7 percent of the burglaries, and 68.6 percent of the auto thefts in the cities.

More than 13 percent of all auto theft arrests were children who were less than 15 years of age, Mr. President.

In our very midst, here in the District of Columbia, the Washington Criminal Justice Association reported that in 1952 there was an increase of 60.5 percent in delinquent acts committed by juveniles.

The pattern is the same throughout the cities of our land. The results of an Associated Press survey made in 1952 showed that about a million children get into trouble each year, and if the total increases only in proportion to the child population, the police will have to handle 1,420,000 child cases in 1960. Heaven help us and our civilization, Mr. President, if the present trend continues.

That this trend is continuing is known to all too few people. Surely, some parents see the problem. Welfare agencies do. However, too few people are bothering to take a second look at this situation.

To root the problem out at its core; to alert local authorities to the methods of combating this evil, and where those methods might be falling short; to establish the menace firmly in the public mind for the problem it is—these worthy purposes, Mr. President, constitute part of the scope of this study we are proposing today.

Since the resolution was introduced, my office has received many expressions of support from agencies such as the American Public Welfare Association, from interested church groups, from State officials and criminologists, and from juvenile and domestic relations court judges.

These good proponents of my resolution have expressed a variety of reasons for their support. Witness what the Honorable Libby E. Sachar, judge of the juvenile and domestic relations court of Union County, N. J., had to say. Judge Sachar called it "a very important piece of legislation, since we have not had a nationwide estimate of the true picture of delinquency for many years. There is no accurate record of the number of delinquents in the United States.

"I should consider this a great service in terms of having authentic figures and a true estimate of the situation."

Commissioner Sanford Bates of our New Jersey Department of Institutions and Agencies, a top-ranking student of criminology, advises me of his belief in the need for stimulation of "real sacrifice and effort on the part of our parents, our social agencies, our politicians, and our local leaders."

I feel that the work of the subcommittee would provide just such stimulation by throwing an effective spotlight on the situation and alert presently disinterested parties right down to the family level of their responsibilities and what they can do in the way of correction.

The Honorable Harry W. Lindeman, judge of the juvenile and domestic relations court of Essex County, N. J., called the resolution proper and timely. Judge Lindeman wrote: "I have been greatly concerned during this past year with gangs of the older teen-age boys. When 14- to 17-year-old children take it upon themselves to settle fancied wrongs by use of guns, knives, brass knuckles, auto wrenches, and broken bottles, and when students are beaten and cowed into paying tribute as the price of being left alone, when groups of students of one school prey on students of another to preserve a superior social status or athletic prowess, and when constituted authority is pushed around by junior mobsters, and when citizens are mugged and robbed by gangs of boys seeking an easy dollar, then it is about time for the community and the Nation to map out an overall strategy of action to combat this unhealthy trend."

These are just a few of the expressions of support which have been forthcoming since the resolution was introduced. Those who deal with the problem have given of their assurances that this study is a necessary one. I now call on the Senate of the United States to agree to give such expert opinion a forum for their ideas, so that we may correlate what has been done; determine what remains to be done, and supply the responsible agencies throughout our country with an overall study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 89), as amended, was agreed to.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, House bill 4974.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, 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. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be vacated, and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks about the bill which is now before the Senate for consideration. As Senators know, this is one of the major appropriation bills, and concerns fund requirements for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year 1954.

For these three departments, the Committee on Appropriations recommends a total of \$1,104,379,882. This sounds like a tremendous sum, and it is. However, I should like to make some comparisons. This amount is a decrease of \$38,766,830, or 3.3 percent, from the House figure. Many times when the House sends appropriation bills to the Senate, the Senate increases the amounts provided by the House. In this instance, the amount recommended by the Senate Committee is lower than the House figure, and also it is 14.4 percent below the amount appropriated for the present fiscal year, which is very unusual. Furthermore, it is 24.8 percent—practically 25 percent—below the figure in the budget which former President Truman sent to Congress in January. So I believe the Committee on Appropriations has done excellent work on this bill providing funds for these three important departments.

At the same time, notwithstanding the reductions, I believe the committee has provided adequate funds for the departments. Without going into details at this time, I should like to give an overall picture of the amounts appropriated.

The committee felt that \$90,258,676 should be sufficient to carry on the activities of the Department of State. This amount is \$12,486,111, or 12.1 percent, under the House figure. It is \$42,776,203 or 32.1 percent, below the appropriation for the State Department for the present fiscal year. It is \$60,889,914, or 40.2 percent, below the amount requested by former President Truman in January of this year. None of these figures, either in estimates or recommended sums, include funds for the International Information and Educational Activities, as the estimates for such programs have been deferred for later consideration.

The allowance for the Department of Justice is \$177,975,000. This is \$1,290,000, or less than 1 percent, below the figure allowed by the House. Compared with the 1953 total, the allowance is a decrease of \$6,318,000, or 3.4 percent. It is \$9,175,000, or 4.9 percent, below the budget estimate for 1954.

For the Department of Commerce, the bill provides total appropriations of \$836,146,206. This sum includes \$3,750,000, the House allowance, for the Civil Aeronautics Board. The allowance recommended by the Committee on Appropriations for the Department is \$24,990,719, or 2.9 percent, below the total allowed by the House; it is \$137,583,930, or 14.1 percent, below the comparable figures for the 1953 appropriation; and \$295,049,719, or 26 percent, under the 1954 budget estimates proposed by former President Truman in January.

I believe this statement gives to the Senate, particularly to Senators who are especially concerned with the matter of appropriations, a general picture of the appropriations for the three departments covered by the bill. Certainly a real opportunity is offered to effect economy and get the fiscal affairs of the United States into better shape.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. In addition to the appropriation shown on page 38 of the bill, I notice there is a contract authorization for the Secretary of Commerce to grant subsidies for ship construction amounting to \$40,144,000. Can the Senator from New Hampshire state how this amount compares with the contract authorization for fiscal 1953?

Mr. BRIDGES. There were no contract authorizations in fiscal 1953.

As chairman of the committee, I will say to the Senator from Vermont that I opposed this item in the subcommittee and full committee, but the full committee, in its wisdom, decided to include it in the bill. It came down to the issue of whether or not we were to maintain a minimum of shipyard facilities in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Is this a make-work project?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The ships are certainly necessary. It is a question whether or not we wish to maintain certain minimum shipyard facilities so that they will be in operation for defense purposes.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, this authorization is to enable two companies to build ships, namely, the Moore-McCormack Lines and the Grace Line. I think those are the names.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know the names, but essentially the idea is to permit the continuation of certain shipyard facilities.

Mr. AIKEN. Did the committee look into the record of operating costs of certain very successful steamship lines, such as the United Fruit Lines and the Waterman Steamship Co., which do not express a desire for subsidies, but claim that they can operate efficiently without them? I was wondering if the committee looked into the question, to ascertain why certain lines feel that they must have Government contributions in order to remain in business, while others, which appear to be equally successful, apparently do not encourage the Government subsidy program.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the distinguished Senator from Vermont is referring to is undoubtedly the operating

subsidy rather than the construction subsidy.

Mr. AIKEN. I am referring to construction subsidies also.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee did not make a complete study of the question, because it did not have the time. It went into the subject generally. The opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire with respect to certain maritime activities is about like that of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I ask the question because there are many persons, particularly those living on farms, who are watching the appropriation for maritime subsidies, in order to decide whether there exists in the administration and in the Congress this year a real determination to accomplish economical government and to balance the budget.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that I think it is a policy decision which the Senate will have to make. The Senator from New Hampshire did not favor the proposal, but as chairman I now offer it as a part of the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator.

I also notice that the pressure for certain types of appropriations comes from districts which would get more work of a Government nature, supported by Government checks, if certain appropriations were made. I am not pointing out any particular areas, but the question arises whether, in the long run, we are doing our national economy any good by encouraging dependency on Federal appropriations in order to maintain operations in certain lines of industry, and whether, so long as Government checks are forthcoming, those industries will seriously return to the competitive civilian field. I have in mind particularly the suggested cut in the appropriation for the Air Force. I cannot help but notice that the pressure for maintaining a tremendous advance-log rather than a backlog of appropriations seems to stem from areas in the United States where certain industries apparently are dependent upon Government contracts for many years into the future.

Mr. BRIDGES. I will say to the Senator from Vermont that another program was proposed, which the committee did not approve, with respect to ship construction, involving tankers and certain other types of vessels. It was a conversion program. I think the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and other Senators intend to speak on that subject. We were told frankly that if we did not make an appropriation for this purpose under one of the sections of existing law, conversion of the ships would be done in Japan, at a low labor cost. We were told also that if this proposal were not accepted work of this type would move out of our shipyards to England, Japan, and other nations. So there is a policy decision for the Senate to make, as to whether or not we shall maintain in operation at a minimum level certain shipyard facilities, or whether we shall allow ship conversion—or force it, as the witnesses who testified expressed it—to go to Japan, England, or somewhere else. The Senator from

New Hampshire thinks the Senate ought to decide that question.

Mr. AIKEN. I presume that some of those who are so insistent on Federal appropriations for keeping industries in operation in this country are likewise talking about filling the dollar gap with respect to certain foreign countries. I think some of them are rather inconsistent in that regard. When these ships are constructed, some of them will be used for transporting to the United States goods made in foreign countries at labor costs of 30 or 40 cents a day, to compete with the high-priced labor of the United States.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Are those involved in either the recommended appropriation of \$3 million or the contract authorization in the amount of \$40 million-plus funds for the prototype tanker?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. GORE. Is the proposed program for passenger ships?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is a program involving combination passenger and cargo ships.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee is not so familiar with the parliamentary rules of the Senate as he may have been with the rules of the body in which he served last year. However, it seems to me that the contract authorization is clearly legislation on an appropriation bill. At least it will be the purpose of the junior Senator from Tennessee to make the point of order when that point in the bill is reached.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee takes the position that it is not legislation. It is true that for the past 2 or 3 years we have not provided for contract authorizations. We contend that the provision is not legislation. The Senator from Tennessee will be privileged to make the point of order at the proper time and the Chair will rule on it.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. In the event the contract authorization of \$40 million were granted, would it not be fair bookkeeping to deduct that amount from the savings or reductions reported by the chairman of the committee in connection with the pending bill?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; because that would be authorization over a period of years. The only appropriation in the coming year will be the amount of \$3 million plus to which the Senator has referred.

The Senator from New Hampshire is perhaps a poor advocate of this particular item because he is not enthusiastic about it. He is merely carrying out the mandate of the committee, where he happened to be in the minority. Nevertheless, to the best of his ability and conscience, he certainly will defend it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Tennessee understands and appreciates the position of the Senator from New Hamp-

shire and congratulates the Senator upon his lack of enthusiasm.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and the amendments of the committee be first considered.

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

The clerk will state the first committee amendment.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of State—Salaries and Expenses," on page 2, line 4, after the word "including", to insert "the cost of transporting to and from a place of storage and the cost of storing the furniture and household and personal effects of an employee of the Foreign Service who is assigned to a post at which he is unable to use his furniture and effects, under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, has the Senator from New Hampshire concluded his introductory statement?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a very strange appropriation bill which our friends on the other side of the aisle have submitted to the Senate. On the face of it, the appropriations of \$1,104 million are alleged to be a saving of \$32.8 million under the amount appropriated by the House, and are also alleged to be a saving of approximately \$187 million compared to the amount appropriated last year.

FICTITIOUS ECONOMIES, WASTEFUL INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES

I have great respect for the Senator from New Hampshire, but I think he and his associates have been working with mirrors on this budget. Houdini, in his palmist days, could not equal their record.

A most amazing financial sleight-of-hand has been performed on these figures, as I shall try now to show.

Mr. President, what is it that the committee has done with regard to this bill, as it came from the House?

I call attention to the additions which it has made.

If Senators will examine the report and also examine the bill they will find that it is proposed to spend \$4 million, which the House did not provide, for the acquisition of buildings abroad for the State Department.

That item, as I shall show, is tucked away. It is not listed as an appropriation, but as money credited to us as counterpart funds which will be used to cover the item.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield, but I was just starting my discussion. This is my opening popgun. However, I am very glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire has great respect for the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The feeling is mutual, I assure my distinguished friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. I would suggest, Mr. President, that we be accurate in our

statements. Of course, counterpart funds are funds available to us in foreign currency which have accrued to our credit through various programs. They are available to us abroad. Rather than see some of them dissipated on items which would not be of any benefit to the American taxpayers, the Appropriations Committee—and I believe the Senate, too—feels the funds should be used for the benefit of our taxpayers. For example, if we need a new office building for our representation in a foreign country, counterpart funds could be used for its construction. In that way the funds would be of benefit to the United States in years to come, and at the same time we would not use American dollars in their construction.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what was the question the Senator from New Hampshire desired to ask me? I yielded for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I understood the Senator to refer to popguns. I thought we should dispose of the first popgun.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I submit that the \$4 million in counterpart funds could be used by us for other purposes. For example the amount involved could be used for offshore procurement of military supplies, and therefore could be used to diminish by that amount our foreign aid contributions. Instead, we have taken it away from foreign aid, so that it does not show up in our accounts as a payment. But it is one just the same.

It is item No. 1—and it is a very small item—in the financial ledgerdomain which permeates this whole bill.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, we could use the sum for administrative expenses in mutual aid. Some of it will be used for mutual aid. But treaty agreements control the use of these funds. A capital asset would be made valuable to the Foreign Service of the United States in that the buildings would be useful for decades to come. I think it is a sound move.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to say to my good friend from New Hampshire that his eyesight on this item is not so sharp as it is customarily. Moreover, it is an item calling for expenditures which are not listed as an appropriation in the bill. On this point he has suffered a financial myopia, and he has been sucked in and seduced by the gentlemen in the State Department.

Among the other operations of the Appropriations Committee, it has also approved items which were turned down by the House for various censuses, namely, the censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, agriculture, and mineral industries. The item was disapproved by the House, but it has been placed in the bill by the committee.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, not for a statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois yields for a question.

Mr. BRIDGES. Does the Senator know that the statement he has made is not a factual nor an accurate statement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire mean that the census of mineral industries is not included?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well. We will strike out mineral industries.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that the censuses of business, transportation, manufactures, and agriculture are included?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is not correct. I want the Senator from Illinois to be accurate in his statement, and I believe he wants to be accurate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the item does refer to censuses of business, manufactures, and agriculture?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. The Senator from Illinois is correct for the first time today.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to point out that if I was inaccurate in my statement, I was inaccurate because I read from the report prepared by the very able Senator from New Hampshire. The report, at page 27, shows censuses of business, transportation, manufacturers, and mineral industries.

Now that the Senator from New Hampshire has corrected his own record, I am very glad to continue.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for one more question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois read the report at page 13, approximately 13 lines down, where the following statement appears:

The committee has refused funds for censuses of transportation and mineral industries.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. However, the table at the end of the report does not give that information. At any rate, I should like to point out that the committee has approved censuses of business, manufacturers, and agriculture. While the committee admits that the costs during the current year will be \$11.6 million, it does not attempt to take into account the fact that not all the work will be done during the current fiscal year, but will carry over into 1954 and 1955.

According to the estimates of the Secretary of Commerce, an additional \$8 or \$9 million will be required to complete the business and manufactures censuses and according to the House hearing, page 83, the total costs of the census of agriculture will be \$23 million, or another \$20.8 million in addition to the amount appropriated in this bill. By the inclusion of these items, the committee has added to the total expenses of the Government not \$11.6 million, but approximately \$40 million.

OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASED EXPENDITURES

Furthermore, the committee has added \$12,500,000 for a Federal-aid airport program, which was not recommended

by the Secretary of Commerce—in fact, the Secretary recommended the item be omitted. Nor was it recommended by the House committee, nor passed by the House. It has been added by the Senate committee.

Moreover, an item is included which was mentioned by the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; namely, the authorization and partial appropriation for subsidies on the construction of four passenger-cargo ships.

A little work has been done with mirrors on that item also. The ultimate cost will be \$43.2 million, or an average of a little more than \$10 million for each ship. However, the initial amount appropriate is only \$3.1 million, and \$40.1 million is to be pledged in the future as a contract authorization; and the taxpayers will have to pay the bill. Therefore, in reality, \$43.2 million have been added for this item.

In addition, \$2.3 million, which had been eliminated by the House with respect to the Weather Bureau, has been restored by the committee. The House eliminated that item. The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate has restored it.

OTHER INCREASES FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT

There are further increases which are concealed by bookkeeping entries in the salaries and expenses of the Department of State. The committee claims it has cut appropriations \$10 million under the amount voted by the House of Representatives and \$26 million under the amount voted last year. However, if we read the fine print—in short, if we use a magnifying glass and examine the footnotes; in fact, one almost needs a microscope to deal with this item—then, by examining footnote 4, after the item of \$50 million on page 25, and if we follow that footnote to the bottom of the page, we see that the appropriation is one of \$50 million plus \$15,600,000 of the unobligated balances of all appropriations available to the Department in the fiscal year 1953. So, in reality, the committee is recommending an appropriation, not of \$50 million, but of \$65,600,000, which is not a saving of \$10 million over the amount voted by the House of Representatives, but is an increase of \$15,600,000 over the amount voted by the House.

In addition, if we trace through the report, we find that the amount for salaries has actually been increased by another \$2,800,000 by transferring funds for the consular and diplomatic activities in Germany and Austria from the State Department appropriation bill to the foreign-aid bill. There has been a transfer of appropriations to the foreign-aid bill, thus permitting an extra \$2,800,000 for the purposes in this bill. But this is not a reduction in expenditures.

So, in all, the committee has increased expenditures, over the appropriations voted by the House, in this year and in the years to follow, by \$113 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD, a table showing the committee amendment which will add expenditures for the taxpayers to shoulder.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—Senate committee amendments to H. R. 4974 for substantial increases in expenditures

Item	Increase in expenditures, 1953-54	Increase in total expenditures
	Millions	Millions
1. Department of State, salaries and expenses (net effect of reducing 1954 appropriation by \$10 million but extending \$15.6 million in unobligated 1953 appropriation).....	15.6	5.6
2. Department of State, salaries and expenses (by permitting funds for consular and diplomatic activities with Germany and Austria to be appropriated in a separate bill rather than included in total provided in this bill).....	12.8	2.8
3. Acquisition of buildings abroad.....	4.0	4.0
4. Census of business, manufactures.....	9.4	120.0
5. Census of agriculture.....	2.2	123.0
6. Federal-aid airport program.....	12.5	12.5
7. Ship-construction subsidies (\$3.1 million cash and \$40.1 million in contract authority).....	3.1	43.2
8. Weather Bureau, salaries and expenses.....	2.3	2.3
Total substantial increases.....	41.9	113.4

¹ Not all indicated in committee tabulations as an increase.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is true that the committee has made some savings on certain specific items under the amounts voted by the House. My computation shows that the reductions on other items have amounted to approximately \$14 million. But if we subtract the \$14 million of savings from the \$113 million of increased expenditures, we arrive at a net increase of \$99 million in the recommended appropriations.

FINANCIAL LEGERDEMAIN

Here is where the financial legerdemain comes in. If we examine page 1 of the report and also page 30 of the report, we find that the committee claims it has cut the appropriations voted by the House of Representatives by \$38,800,000, although in reality the committee has voted to increase total expenditures by \$99 million.

This reminds one of the well-known description of the three kinds of lies: lies, bad lies, and statistics. I would say that our friends have used statistics in this case in a strange and wonderful way, so as to give the impression that savings have been made, when in reality no savings have been made, and, on the contrary, expenditures have been increased, and it is expenditures which count. I should like to indicate how that is done.

I have already called attention to one item which is covered in footnote 4, on page 25 of the report. In reality, the committee has voted an appropriation of \$65,600,000, because it is taking over \$15,600,000 of unexpended balances. Yet the committee says it is voting to appropriate only \$50 million; and therefore it conceals, in fine print, the \$15,600,000 which really constitutes an added expenditure.

I also invite attention to page 28 of the report, where at the bottom of the page we find the item "Liquidation of

Contract Authorization." The House voted \$64 million for this purpose. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommends an appropriation of \$59 million, and thus the committee claims to have voted a saving of \$5 million. However, that is purely a paper, fictitious, and spurious economy, because this item is to pay outstanding bills under the subsidy granted for ship construction, and those outstanding obligations are said to amount to \$140 million. Those are obligations made under past formulas, and we do not decrease the ultimate expenditures by \$1, simply by reducing the appropriations to meet those obligations. Such an operation merely means that at a later time we shall have to appropriate more funds in order to meet the obligations which are outstanding at the present time. So this is purely a bookkeeping, paper economy which in no sense reduces expenditures.

OPERATING DIFFERENTIAL SUBSIDIES

Then let us look at the next item, namely, that of the operating differential subsidies. In connection with this item there is a huge volume of outstanding claims, which according to the testimony also amounts to \$140 million. Those subsidies have piled up because in the past the firms have been allowed to draw up to 75 percent of the amounts due them under the temporary formula. However, the temporary formula has now been revised by a permanent formula, at a much higher subsidy level, so that the Nation became obligated to an additional sum of \$140 million, beyond and in excess of the amounts which already had been paid. These bills are now hanging over the head of the country. We notice that for this item the committee recommends an appropriation of \$20 million, which is approximately only one-seventh of the outstanding obligations. Yet a saving of \$5 million over the appropriations voted by the House is claimed by the committee. However, that is not a saving in expenditures at all. The committee merely has acted to pile up for the future another \$5 million, which will have to be paid later. That is not a reduction in expenditures.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY

Now let us consider the item under the Bureau of Public Roads. The committee recommends an appropriation of \$475 million, a reduction of \$35 million, allegedly, so far as the appropriation voted by the House of Representatives is concerned. We have been over this issue many, many times; and we know it has been established—improperly, I believe, but nevertheless established by precedent—that once the authorizations are made, once the pledges have been given to the States for the ensuing fiscal year, Congress has obligated itself to appropriate, and that therefore the amounts due the States will have to be met during the year. We are not diminishing the claims of the States upon the Federal Government by one dollar, by appropriating only \$475 million. We are not saving \$35 million at all. So, as a matter of fact, that also is a spurious and fictitious saving.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a table showing savings claimed by this committee which are fictitious.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—Outline of apparent reductions made in H. R. 4974 by Senate Appropriations Committee which are not real

Item:	Reduction shown (millions)
1. Salaries and expenses of State Department (report shows reduction of \$10 million for this item, but \$15.6 million of unobligated balances from prior years was extended; the net effect is actually an increase).....	\$10
2. Ship construction (liquidation of contract authorization) (report shows reduction of \$5 million for this item, but commitments are made by law and must ultimately be met).....	5
3. Operating-differential subsidies (total amounts owed total \$140 million; this must all be paid ultimately and reduction cannot stick).....	5
4. Federal-aid highways (expenditures for this item are committed in advance so that the cut will not stick; as was the case last year, a supplemental bill will be required to restore this cut).....	35
Total unreal reductions.....	55

Mr. DOUGLAS. So, \$55 million of claimed savings are not savings at all.

Now, Mr. President, let us see how the committee arrived at their claimed cut of nearly \$39 million below the House figures in this bill. As we have seen from table 1, they increased expenditures for 1953-54 by \$41.9 million. But they did not count the increases in the State Department, totaling \$12.4 million. This leaves their indicated increases at only \$29.5 million. These are offset by real reductions of \$14 million, or a net increase of \$15.5 million. Then this is offset by fictitious savings of \$55 million as shown in table 2 for a net fictitious saving of about \$39 million, or the amount the committee claims to have saved.

In reality, they have made net increases for 1953-54 of \$27.9 million, and ultimate increases, when subsequent fiscal years are considered, of \$99 million (that is, \$113 million in increases offset by \$14 million actual saving, on certain specific items already mentioned.

The result is that wastefulness is made to masquerade in the guise of economy. Vices are disguised as virtues.

Furthermore, if we make comparisons with the amounts for the past year, as included in the budget for 1952-53, we find that the committee claims, on paper, economies of \$186 million, although in reality there are no such economies. I have worked out the figures, and I shall submit a detailed table which indicates that, on the whole, in terms of expenditures, \$157 million of the cuts claimed by the committee as being below amounts appropriated last year are fictitious. When we add to these fictitious cuts of \$157 million the increase of \$40.1 million in contract authority for ship construction, we find that, instead of savings of \$186 million below amounts appropriated for 1952-53 claimed by the

committee, we actually have an increase of at least \$11 million. Indeed, when we consider added expenditures in future years for censuses, total increases will exceed \$43 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert a table at this point, which bears this out.

There being no objection, the table was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—Claimed reductions in H. R. 4974 below amounts appropriated last year which are fictitious

Item:	Fictitious saving (millions)
1. State Department, salaries and expenses (report shows savings of \$26 million; but this is offset by extending \$15.6 million in prior-year spending authority and transferring \$2.8 million for diplomatic and consular services—Germany and Austria—to foreign-aid appropriation bill).....	\$18.4
2. State Department, acquisition of buildings abroad (report shows a cut of \$6.5 million but this does not consider \$4 million given in foreign credits).....	2.5
3. Department of Justice; Federal Bureau of Investigation (a total of \$14.1 million of this item was transferred to other agencies; thus not only is there not a \$7.4 million saving—there is a \$6.7 million increase).....	7.4
4. Department of Commerce, 17th Decennial Census (work is completed for this item, so that it could hardly be claimed as a saving).....	1.7
5. Department of Commerce, air navigation facilities (liquidation of contract authority), not a real saving since unexpended balances of \$18.5 million are available anyway).....	3.6
6. Claims, Federal Airport Act (there was no request for this item).....	1.8
7. Export control (no request for this item).....	5.7
8. Ship construction, liquidation of contract authorization (the rate of liquidation of contract authority for this program is set by law).....	81.0
9. Federal-aid highways (rate of expenditure determined by law).....	35.0
Total fictitious savings below amounts appropriated for 1952-53.....	157.1

In addition, further future expenditures of \$40.1 million for ship construction for which no appropriations are made and the some thirty-two million dollars of future expenditures for census are included, we actually have a budget which is out of line with the facts by \$229 million. This more than swallows up the \$186 million of claimed economies as compared with 1952-53. Hence the committee has increased, not decreased, actual expenditures.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee has claimed \$186 million saving—by failing to take account of expenditures authorized in the present but which are not met by appropriations, by failing to take into account past commitments which are not met, and by an extraordinary item, a claimed economy of \$81 million, the liquidation of the contract authorization for the construction of ships which is found on page 28. Let us look at this item.

Congress last year appropriated \$140 million for this item. The committee recommends only \$59 million, and it then preens itself upon having saved \$81 million. But I emphasize the fact that the obligations of the Government continue. No saving of expenditures is accomplished by appropriating a smaller amount than last year to meet a huge volume of outstanding obligations, when apparently the committee is depending in large part upon unexpended balances of last year to help eke out its appropriations of this year.

Mr. President, I wish to say in all soberness, in spite of the great respect I have for the Senator from New Hampshire, that the pending bill proposes phony cuts. It is not an economy measure, it is a spending bill; it is a wasteful measure, and I think it about time some real economy was brought about.

The independent offices appropriation bill, supported by the majority, contained hundreds of millions of dollars of phony economies, through a failure to appropriate for retirement funds, although the obligations would obviously continue, whether or not the appropriations were made.

What the majority is doing is failing to take account of obligations piling up, appropriating, but not saying they are appropriating, letting the country in for expenditures, but not providing for them, and shifting to the future, to another Congress or possibly to another administration, the burden which they do not reduce in the present, and for which they will not appropriate. If what is proposed were acted on favorably, another administration might then properly claim that they had been let in for a financial mess bequeathed to them by their predecessors.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. What good purpose, what public purpose, is to be served by the kind of procedure which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has described?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not believe any good purpose is served by it. The only purpose which it has fulfilled has been to cover up and actually increase expenditures by financial legerdemain, which purports to show economies which are fictitious and not real.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Illinois contend that the United States Government has a contractual obligation with the States with respect to Federal-aid highway construction, which renders the so-called reductions claimed in the pending bill a nullity?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not so claim; and in previous sessions I have tried to cut appropriations for the ensuing year for highways, on the ground that the authorizations made by the Bureau of Public Roads were not binding upon the Congress when the proposals were made.

But the Senate has overruled the position which I have taken, and, by rather heavy majorities, has taken the position that, once the letters of authorization have gone out to the States from the Bureau of Public Roads for a highway program which has been authorized in the past, then Congress is obligated to appropriate money with which to meet the cost of the letters of authorization. So, while I think Congress is wrong in this matter, I am out of step with Congress, and I can only say that the will of Congress not only has prevailed, but will prevail, and that, therefore, we will not be able to reduce the expenditures during the current year merely because we reduce the present appropriations. The States have already been authorized to get their money, through the Bureau of Public Roads; they ask for it, and we will have to appropriate the necessary sums, either in supplemental appropriation bills or in subsequent appropriation bills.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the distinguished Senator from Illinois believe that a contract authorization of \$40 million for ship-construction subsidy is tantamount to the making of an appropriation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Of course, I do, and it will be binding.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator believe that the tabulated report of the committee should include that, as an item for which expenditure is authorized?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly do; and it should be included in large type, and not appear merely as a microscopic footnote, which I can barely read with my reading glass, which, if we follow down to the bottom of the page, says, "Plus not to exceed \$40,144,000 in contract authority." Instead of tucking away these items in fine print at the bottom of the page, they should be printed in large type in the appropriation bill itself.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator have to use his magnifying glass in order to find that in the report?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It may be that my eyes are a little weak, but if the Senator from Tennessee will observe, he will find it is pretty hard to read. It is not evident to the casual eye; and a reading glass comes in very handy. But the fact is, the taxpayers cannot afford microscopes. They pay the bills.

REAL REDUCTION OF \$250 MILLION POSSIBLE

Mr. President, I think we ought to bring about some real economy, and, if the occasion presents itself, as I hope it will, I am going to offer certain amendments which will in their total reduce the appropriation contained in this bill by \$250 million. That will be a real cut.

COMMITTEE INCREASES SHOULD BE STOPPED

In the first place, I think we should oppose the committee amendments on pages 5 and 6, which will authorize expenditures in the sum of \$4 million for State Department buildings abroad.

On page 30, I oppose the request for an appropriation of \$9,400,000 for a census of business by the Department of Commerce and, on the same page, the item of \$2.2 million for a census of agriculture.

Let me again remind the Members of the Senate that these two censuses will not only cost the \$11.6 million listed for the ensuing fiscal year, but the first one will cost 8 or 9 million dollars more in subsequent years, with a total cost of \$20 million, and that the agricultural census will later cost an additional \$20 million.

Mr. President, with reference to these proposed censuses, a tremendous amount of political heat has been generated in the effort to get money for them, and the heat has come primarily from those who proclaim from the housetops their zeal for economy. The number of "economy-but-ers" is really extraordinary. I understand that the Senate Appropriations Committee has received approximately 3,000 letters asking for the restoration of this item which was eliminated by the House. The interesting thing is that these letters do not come from Democrats and from alleged high spenders, but from those business groups in our population who scream loudly about the high level of Government spending and the high tax level, and, with certain individual exceptions, the people who are asking for the \$20 million are largely the same ones who have opposed expenditures for the relief of slum dwellers, the poor, and the sick. They are generally the same persons who damn the growth of big government and the welfare state. Apparently it is not the welfare state to which they object so long as it is their own welfare being furthered, and apparently they do not object to expenditures from which they benefit. They are, as I say, "economy but-ers"—economy for the poor, but not for me; economy for the other fellow, but not for me.

I agree with Members of the other House that we need to reduce expenditures, and I hope the Senate will heed the voluminous demands for economy by cutting off funds for the proposed censuses.

POLITICAL AIRPORTS

On page 33 of the bill there appears an item of \$12,500,000 added by the committee for the federally aided airport program. I shall speak at greater length upon this item when it is reached in regular order.

Mr. President, we already have a thousand federally aided airports, and approximately 4,000 private airports. The country is studded with airports. From the standpoint of military defense, I am sure we have a sufficient number of airports, but the committee now proposes to spend \$12,500,000 for more airports, and this at a time when we are reducing the amounts to be spent for military airplanes.

This appropriation was not recommended by the Secretary of Commerce. He asked that provision for additional airports be deferred until the matter could be further studied. It was not approved by the House, but the Senate

committee, this economy committee, comes forward and ups the appropriation to \$12,500,000.

I know that localities like to have airports constructed at bargain rates—with Federal help. But in most cases the money is to be used for passenger facilities and for administration buildings, which will really not add in the slightest degree to military effectiveness.

I thought I detected certain political overtones with reference to some of these items, the idea being that if certain cities could be taken care of they might help the Grand Old Party.

I may say that the political considerations are also not absent from the recommendations for \$40 million of censuses, because census takers or enumerators happen to be named by Senators and Representatives, so that it is a way to build up Republican patronage at public expense.

MORE PASSENGER SHIPS BUT FEWER MILITARY AIRPLANES

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has invited attention to the extraordinary ship-construction item. The committee recommends an appropriation of only \$3.1 million, but the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] have both pointed out that there are also added contract obligations for \$40,100,000 to finance the building of four new passenger and cargo ships. The Administrator was asked, as appears on page 407 of the House hearings, whether these ship appropriations were urgent, and he replied, "No; they are not urgent." Yet, Mr. President, the committee proposes this commitment of \$43 million. Why?

Is this being done to keep certain shipyards of the country busy so they may derive a large profit from the construction of ships? Is it to enable them to get a cut on the amounts appropriated? We have already spent in the past 5 or 6 years approximately \$200 million in financing the construction of ships, and I may say that many of those appropriations have been tainted with practices condemned by the Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Lindsay Warren, and condemned by the very able House Committee on Government Operations headed by Representative PORTER HARDY. The whole program has reeked with fraud, and several of us have risen in past years to denounce the practices which have prevailed. Yet the committee pours \$43 million more into the shipyards, subsidizing them at a time when we are cutting down on airplanes.

The shipyards have only approximately half of the so-called mariner vessel program completed. That is a \$350 million program. I looked over the tabulation of completions, and as I remember approximately only 7 of the 35 ships have been finally accepted. Another 9 have been launched, but have not been fully equipped. Keels have been laid, I believe, in the case of 13 ships, and on the residue of 6 ships the keels have not even been laid. So there is still a stockpile of ship construction available for the shipyards. But that

does not satisfy the committee. It pours in \$43 million more to keep the shipyards busy representing a subsidy for the shipbuilders on the Atlantic Coast, with a proviso that the shipbuilders on the Pacific Coast can also come in for their share of the pie.

I notice the program is popular with the large ship operators and the large shipbuilders, but I submit that in this period of financial urgency, when we are in trouble so far as money is concerned, we should not appropriate these sums.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. I should like to raise a question with reference to the use of contract authorizations instead of direct appropriations. As the Senator from Illinois knows, it was my privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives for several years, and it was the unanimous conclusion of that committee, in view of the extravagance and the loss of control by the Congress over expenditures resulting from contract authorizations, that we should abolish the practice of writing a blank check, which is what a contract authorization amounts to, and, instead, make direct appropriations for the purposes for which Congress wished to spend the people's money.

We are now faced with a return to the blank-check method of dispensing the people's money. I believe we should stop that practice. It will be my purpose to make a point of order against this contract authorization provision, which, in my opinion, clearly is affirmative legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I quite agree with the Senator from Tennessee that it is a very bad practice. Virtually every student of the budget has condemned it. It is a means of making appropriations without being honest enough to admit what is being done. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who has just left the Chamber, has attacked this method time and time again in the past. Senators on the other side of the aisle attacked it when they were in the minority. However, when they are in the majority, they come forward with a similar plan.

I think the Senate should oppose the committee amendments now under consideration, and should also oppose the increase of \$2.6 million for the Weather Bureau. Every locality wants a local weather bureau, and popular is the Senator or Representative who can get one and keep it in his State or district. The House had courage enough to eliminate the \$2.3 million, but the Senate Committee has restored the item. I think the Senate should emulate the stringency of the House on the question of saving \$2.3 million for the taxpayers. These are committee amendments which I think we should oppose.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a table showing savings in expenditures if we reject the committee amendments listed.

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

TABLE 4.—Committee amendment to H. R. 4974 which Douglas will oppose

Amendment	Increases opposed	
	1953-54	Total
Pp. 5-6. State Department acquisition of buildings abroad.....	\$4.0	\$4.0
P. 30. Department of Commerce, Census of Business.....	9.4	20.0
P. 30. Department of Commerce, Census of Agriculture.....	2.2	23.0
Pp. 33-34. Department of Commerce, Federal-aid airport program.....	12.5	12.5
Pp. 37-38. Department of Commerce, ship construction subsidies.....	3.1	43.2
P. 51. Department of Commerce, Weather Bureau.....	2.3	2.3
Total committee increases opposed.....	33.5	105.0

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thus, by rejecting these six committee amendments we can save \$33,500,000 next year and total savings including subsequent years would amount to \$105 million.

OTHER AMENDMENTS WOULD SAVE LARGE SUMS

I shall also submit three amendments of my own, which will make additional savings. The first amendment would not save much money, only an infinitesimal amount, but I think it would lay down a very valuable principle. I shall move to cut the representation allowance for the Department of State by \$100,000, with the proviso—and it seems to be popular to legislate on appropriation bills—that none of the money is to be spent for the serving of alcoholic beverages in countries where the Mohammedan faith is the predominant religion. As everyone knows, the Koran, the sacred book of Mohammedans, prohibits the drinking of strong liquor or alcoholic beverages. If our representatives give parties at Government expense and serve liquor in Mohammedan countries, they hurt the foreign relations of the United States of America. So while the saving would be infinitesimal, namely, \$100,000—and I would be willing to reduce the saving to \$50,000 or even less in order to establish the principle—I think it would have a very beneficial effect upon our foreign relations.

Now let us consider a real economy. I propose to reduce very greatly the differential subsidies for ship operation. I shall try to amend page 39 of the bill. According to the House committee report, page 15, the subsidies for operating ships have grown in the last 6 years like a Upas tree. In 1947 they amounted to less than \$200,000. For the current year, they amount to more than \$50 million.

What has happened has been that 1,600 trips have been subsidized, at an average cost of \$30,900, roughly \$31,000 a trip.

The committee has provided that there shall be 1,600 trips. Therefore, it obligates the Government for costs during the ensuing year of \$50 million, but the committee has appropriated only \$20

million to meet the costs. This means that there will be a \$30 million cost for which the committee has not appropriated funds, and for which the country later will have to pick up the check in a later appropriation bill.

I grant that there should be some subsidies for the operation of ships, but this amount has been growing at a tremendous rate, from \$200,000 6 years ago, to more than \$50 million now. The way to strike at the problem is to restrict the total number of trips per year for which subsidies will be paid. I shall offer an amendment to restrict the total number of trips to 500 a year, which will save \$34 million.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in understanding the Senator from Illinois to say there is in this appropriation bill an item which the committee knows is not sufficient in amount to cover the actual cost which is bound to be incurred during the period of time covered by the budget?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I never like to pass judgment on what other people know.

Mr. MORSE. I shall rephrase my question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The committee has authorized 1,600 trips. The average subsidy a trip during the last year was approximately \$31,000. Therefore, the committee has authorized total subsidies of approximately \$50 million, but it has proposed an appropriation of only \$20 million. If members of the committee can multiply and subtract, they ought to know that they have failed to appropriate for the added costs by \$30 million.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. In order to make the matter perfectly clear in the RECORD, and to overcome the Senator's sensitivity in regard to speaking about what other people may know, let me put the question this way: In the opinion of the Senator from Illinois, is it a fact that this particular item of ship subsidy in the bill is less in amount, in relation to the number of trips which will be made by the ships, than the amount needed to cover the subsidy for the total number of trips which will be made by the ships on the basis of schedules?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. As I have said, the liability which will have been incurred will be approximately \$50 million; namely, 1,600 trips at an average subsidy, last year, of approximately \$31,000 a trip.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Has the Senator from Illinois studied the record of the hearings sufficiently to be able to state whether or not the facts concerning the total number of trips to be made were brought out in the record?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; the figure of 1,600 trips was in the House bill.

Mr. MORSE. Then, for the purpose of emphasis, am I correct, in my interpretation of what the Senator has said, in assuming that the Committee on Appropriations has brought to the floor of the Senate an appropriation bill con-

taining for subsidy an amount which is less than the amount that will be needed in order to pay the total bill before the period covered by the appropriation bill has ended?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think I should say that there are approximately \$140 million of unpaid subsidies from past years, which have not yet been finally processed and paid. Therefore, unless further appropriations are made, the effect of the committee's failure fully to appropriate for current liabilities will be to increase this sum by \$30 million—\$20 million in appropriations offset by \$50 million in additional obligations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is this the only instance the Senator from Illinois has found in this appropriation bill in which the Committee on Appropriations is recommending to the Senate an amount less than the total amount needed to cover the known expenses which will have to be incurred during the period covered by the bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. By no means. For example, it is proposed to appropriate \$35 million less for highways than the States will claim. Furthermore, it is proposed to appropriate for several other items less than the actual expenditures during the coming year will be for the items which are authorized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an additional question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Am I to understand that I am being asked to vote for an appropriation bill which does not contain the total sums which the record itself shows will be needed in order to cover the expenses and costs to the Government of the items mentioned in the appropriation bill?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Speaking for myself, I wish to say that if that is true, the bill ought to be recommitted to the committee with instructions to the committee to report back a bill which coincides, in the amount asked for, with the total cost which the people of the country are to be asked to pay for the period covered by the appropriation. The idea of postponing to a deficiency bill what the committee—if the Senator from Illinois is correct—knows is to be the total cost, is not, in my judgment, a proper way to bring an appropriation bill before the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I welcome the statement by the Senator from Oregon, because it is a splendid contribution to sound finance and true economy.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. GORE. In order that the record may be entirely clear, will the Senator turn to page 38 of the bill and note that the appropriation therein contained is for obligations incurred prior to the present rather than to pay for obligations to be incurred by voyages in futurity.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Tennessee speaking of lines 5 to 10 on page 38?

Mr. GORE. I am speaking of lines 12 through 15. Let me read:

For the payment of obligations incurred for operating differential subsidies granted on or after January 1, 1947—

So the way to effect some real economy for the future is by way of a limitation on subsidized voyages.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GORE. The obligations to which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] referred are much larger than the \$20 million appropriation contained herein. To that extent the reduction from \$25 million to \$20 million is no saving at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. None at all.

Mr. GORE. Nor, indeed, are we empowered, without breaking a contract, to make any economy on obligations heretofore incurred.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. We are still paying subsidies on voyages made back in 1947. There is a backlog of many millions of dollars which must be met.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Approximately \$140 million. The Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct. The situation is about as follows: The unpaid past obligations, as of the most recent date for this item, were approximately \$140 million. The liabilities for the year 1953-54, which the committee is authorizing, will amount to approximately \$50 million, namely, 1,600 trips at approximately \$31,000 a trip.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I finish and then I will yield.

The House appropriated \$25 million, leaving a deficit of \$25 million on current liabilities. So while the \$25 million would be used to pay past bills, \$50 million more would accumulate during the current year. The Senate committee has done even worse. It proposes to appropriate only \$20 million. So as we pay \$20 million on past bills, \$50 million of obligations will accrue during the current year, and unless further appropriations are made we shall be \$30 million worse off at the end of the year than when we started.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Has the Senator from Illinois made any investigation to ascertain how the General Motors Corp. makes appropriations?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I have not.

Mr. LANGER. It certainly would not make appropriations piecemeal.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think it would appropriate piecemeal. I think such a course is very bad financial practice.

Mr. LANGER. General Motors would ascertain what the costs of operating the business were expected to be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it should do so, and I think it does. I think we should do so.

The final statement which I intend to offer would really bring about a reduction in the Federal aid highway program. In view of past votes in the Congress, I do not think we can effect economies in

the present appropriation bill. However, we have heard a great deal of comment on the backlog of spending authorizations left by the previous administration. I intend to propose an amendment by means of a limitation which would prevent States from spending more than 80 percent of the amounts the Congress authorizes for Federal aid to highways during the fiscal year 1954-55, thus helping the Eisenhower administration to balance its budget for the fiscal year 1954-55, to which period, apparently, the program of balancing the budget has now been postponed. I wish to make a contribution of \$115 million in this direction.

I may say that, although the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] may raise a point of order when I offer this amendment, I do not think it is subject to a point of order, since a similar amendment which I submitted on April 21, 1952, was declared by the Vice President to be in order. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3, page 4162.

These additional amendments would save \$149 million. If these can be passed, and if the six committee amendments I have listed are rejected, total savings for 1953-54 and for subsequent years would amount to \$254 million.

ECONOMY NOT A PARTISAN ISSUE

Mr. President, I do not believe I can be accused of partisan motives in proposing these reductions. In previous years, when my own party was in power, I have stood upon the floor of the Senate and proposed economy measures. Frequently such proposals were unpopular with 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and were also unpopular with certain of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. I proposed such economies when the Democrats were in power, when it was not to my political advantage to do so. Many of these economy proposals were hostile to the relationships which I had with the high command of the Democratic Party. Therefore, I do not think I can be accused of politics if I insist that the present majority party live up to its campaign pledges and really introduce economy, instead of spending in a wasteful, spendthrift fashion, and trying to delude the American people by false bookkeeping into the belief that they are really putting into effect economies when in reality they are spending and spending—for whom? Spending for the shipowners; spending for the ship contractors and shipbuilders; spending for favored cities which want airports; spending for businessmen and advertising agencies who wish to have the Government perform their research functions for them; spending for the favored few, even as they take out the pruning knife and make economies at the expense of the poor.

My own party has many faults. We used to appropriate for big business. We would appropriate more for big business than we would appropriate for the poor; but we would permit at least a little money to go to the poor—not too much, but a little.

What our friends on the other side of the aisle are proposing is to cut out virtually all money for the poor but to

give more subsidies, more money, to big business, and to favored groups which have been feeding on public subsidies. The hypocrisy of the claim that the opposing party stands for economy, in the face of the two budgets which they have submitted, should be by now transparent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator would not agree with me, in view of his very accurate appraisal of the appropriation record of the two major parties, that it is about time, now that the people's party is operating, for the Senator from Illinois to come into the Independent Party with me, and help to stop this practice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Democratic Party is largely the people's party, and with the help of the Senator from Oregon we can make it more so. I hope he will join us.

Mr. President, certain words are bandied about in the Chamber and throughout the country. They are words such as socialization. I should like to point out to my friends that subsidies are a form of socialization. What we have been doing is socializing the shipping operations and ship construction of our country, and thus feeding people at the public trough, and I may say they are people whose appetites increase as we feed them.

It is about time that we took the pruning knife and cut out these subsidies granted to people who do not need them.

It is extraordinary, Mr. President, at a time of national peril, with the administration proposing to reduce the number of airplanes which would be used in the defense of the Nation, that the majority party should come to Congress with a proposal to build four new passenger ships, which the Administrator himself admits are not urgent at this time.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from Illinois does not believe that the administration will get away with any reduction of the Air Force, does he?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I know that that is what they are trying to do. They are proposing to cut the Air Force from 143 wings to something less than 120 wings, which would certainly diminish the armed security of the Nation. If we do not have sufficient money to provide 143 air wings for the defense of our country, how can we afford to subsidize the construction of 4 passenger ships, which the Administrator of the program has stated are not urgently needed.

Two of the ships are to be replacements for vessels which are 6 months over 20 years of age. Apparently, when a passenger ship becomes 20 years of age it is considered by the subsidy boys to be senile and must be scrapped, and another ship must be constructed to take its place. Apparently a ship 1 year over age has such disability that it must be removed and replaced by another ship.

Mr. President, I submit we can get along with the 2 ships of the Grace Line which are 20 years and 6 months of age, and I believe we can also get along with the 2 ships of the Moore-McCormick Line also, even though the Administrator may admit they are not in first-class condition.

Why should we pour millions of dollars in subsidies into ship construction? This budget is growing like the upas tree. These subsidies are where the Government money goes. A great many people think we have a welfare state for the poor. Actually it is a welfare state for the wealthy.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the Navy has done considerable work on reconversion?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is the Senator aware that the Navy has transferred much of its construction work to private yards?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure that is true.

Mr. MAYBANK. It is true. Orders have gone out from the navy yards to that effect.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It shows the tender solicitude on the part of the committee for private shipyards on the Pacific, the Gulf, and the Atlantic, as well as similar solicitude on the part of the Defense Administration.

Mr. MAYBANK. The committee has not approved it. I was speaking of the transfer to private yards of construction and reconversion work, about which the Senator perhaps did not know. Workers are being transferred from navy yards to private shipyards so that the latter can have construction work. I may say I did not vote for what the Senator has been discussing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. I may say that we seem to be involved in an extraordinary piece of arithmetic. The administration says we will have to do with 120 air wings instead of 143, and that such a reduction represents strength. In other words, weakness is strength. By the same crazy arithmetical logic, I could say we would get a stronger merchant marine by having fewer vessels. I do not say that. But I do say that if I have to choose between planes and passenger-cargo ships, I shall choose planes every time. Perhaps we can save on both.

Mr. President, at an appropriate time I shall offer my amendments, and I hope that the Senate will reject the committee amendments. The result would be a saving in expenditures of \$231 million as compared with the committee figures, which increase expenditures over last year by about \$5 million, and which increase expenditures over the House figure by about \$72 million.

Mr. President, let us have real economy. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to practice, when they are in power, that which they advocated when they were out of power.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have listened to the tirade on the other side of the aisle and to the use of words like "phony," "hypocrisy," and similar words.

We have before us a very simple appropriation bill.

The Senator from Illinois has stated that there were hidden figures in the bill. Every bit of information which the Senator from Illinois has used is contained in the report or in the bill. All of it is written in the English language. The only reason the Senator from Illinois knows anything about it is because he has read it in the report or in the bill. I know he is a very learned and brilliant gentleman. I assume therefore that he can read the English language. Anyone can understand exactly what the bill proposes and what it appropriates.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. No; I will not yield at this point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yielded to the Senator for questions.

Mr. BRIDGES. I shall yield a little later. First I should like to give the Senator from Illinois a few facts. The amount of the bill as reported to the Senate is \$1,104,379,882. It is a decrease of \$38,766,830, or 3.3 percent below the House figure.

It is \$186,678,133 under the appropriations for 1953, or a decrease of 14.4 percent. It is \$365,114,633 under the Truman budget for 1954, or a reduction of 24.8 percent.

To start with, Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois said that he would shoot his first popgun. Well, it was a popgun. He started to talk about censuses. In the first place, he said, we are having censuses for business, manufactures, agriculture, mineral industries, and transportation. Of course transportation and mineral industries were denied by the committee and are excluded from the bill. All the Senator had to do was to read the report to know that to be a fact.

Secondly, the Senator from Illinois has indicated that we are inaugurating new census activities in the bill. The agricultural census was started in 1922. It has been conducted ever since. The business census was started in 1929. It has been conducted ever since. I cite those items as illustrations.

Let us consider the State Department representation allowances, to which the Senator from Illinois referred. He infers that all of it is for liquor. I do not believe that the State Department would spend all of its representation allowances for liquor.

The allowances are used, for example, on important occasions such as the death of a prime minister, to send flowers on behalf of our Government or for laying wreaths on the monuments of national heroes or former heads of governments. In Great Britain, for example, it is used on the Fourth of July, on the anniversary of our Declaration of Independence, to entertain in our embassy in London. I admit that all of that is not completely necessary, as the Senator from Illinois has indicated, but it is in conformity with the way governments do business. It was done year after year before the Senator from Illinois was in the Senate and before the Senator from New Hampshire was in the

Senate. It was done under Democrats, and under Republicans, and will probably continue under both in the future.

Let me mention the item of \$15,600,000 for the State Department, to which the Senator from Illinois referred. That is money which was previously appropriated. The committee has rescinded that amount of money which had been previously appropriated, and has applied it to the current year. It has been used for several purposes; for example, one of the things we did was to reduce the number of State Department employees by 2,566. Of the \$15,600,000 we have earmarked \$5,600,000 for terminal leave and the costs of bringing employees home from abroad. The balance of \$10 million is for regular salary items. I think it was sound to do so.

Now let me refer to another of the figures cited by the Senator from Illinois. In answer to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Illinois said the figure stated was not a correct one because we did not add the contract authorizations to the total appropriations provided by the bill. However, by the same token, if we do not add contract authorizations, then why do we add the amounts to pay for previous contract authorizations, as provided in the past by the Democratic administration? We cannot carry these items twice and maintain accurate bookkeeping. Substantial items in the bill are for the purpose of paying previous authorizations. For instance, I have before me one for \$59 million for ship construction, liquidation of contract authorization. According to the theory of the Senator from Illinois, that should not be included, but we should simply get the money out of the air. We have in the past not carried contract authority in the totals of the bill; we do include the appropriations for liquidating authority.

Mr. President, I wish to cooperate with the Senator from Illinois. Whenever he is in favor of real economy, I join him, as I have done in the past; and sometimes he has joined me. But I wish him to give the correct picture, and not to deal in generalities and statements which he cannot back up.

I remember—and I do not have a poor memory—that although the Senator from Illinois was very strongly in favor of economy in some cases, in other cases he took a different attitude. For example, I hold in my hand a vote taken on May 28, 1952, on the foreign-aid bill. An amendment was offered to reduce the amount of the foreign-aid appropriations by \$1 billion. I find among the Senators who voted against the proposed reduction the Senator from Illinois.

I also hold in my hand a vote on an amendment proposed by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] to cut appropriations. The Senator from Louisiana proposed a cut of \$500 million. I find among the Senators who opposed that amendment was the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

So he has not been entirely consistent in his economy voting record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield

for a question, in clarification of the RECORD?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the committee had previously acted to cut by \$1 billion the requested appropriations for foreign aid, and that then I voted for a further cut of \$500 million, but I balked at a still further cut of \$500 million more?

Mr. BRIDGES. Not according to the vote I have before me, which was taken on May 28, 1952. That vote was taken on a proposal to make a cut of \$500 million in the appropriations. The result of the vote was 34 yeas and 43 nays. I shall have the vote read at this time, if the Senator from Illinois wishes to have that done.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Since the issue has been raised, of course, the vote should be read.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well; I shall read the vote. On that vote, the Senators voting "yea" were the following: Senators Bennett, Bricker, Bridges, Butler of Maryland, Butler of Nebraska, Capehart, Carlson, Case, Cordon, Dirksen, Dworshak, Ellender, Ferguson, Hickenlooper, Jenner, Johnson of Colorado, Johnston of South Carolina, Kem, Long, Malone, Martin, McCarran, McKellar, Millikin, Mundt, Schoepfel, Smith of Maine, Smith of North Carolina, Taft, Thye, Watkins, Welker, Williams, and Young.

Senators voting "nay" were: Senators Aiken, Anderson, Benton, Brewster, Chavez, Clements, Connally, Douglas, Eastland, Frear, Fulbright—

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator is ready to stop at this point, I shall be glad to reply.

Mr. BRIDGES. Very well; but I wish to be fair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, that I did not come prepared with voting records on all past appropriation bills, as the Senator from New Hampshire evidently has done, with the obvious purpose of "putting me on the spot."

Mr. BRIDGES. No; it was not with that purpose but merely to illustrate that we do not always agree as to where we should effect economies.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think my memory is correct when I say I voted for another amendment calling for a further reduction of approximately \$500 million. Various amendments were offered at the time. I should like to look up this matter, and insert my reply at the proper place in the RECORD.

Mr. BRIDGES. I say to the Senator from Illinois that all I wanted to show is that sometimes he has varied a little in his consistency.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have never thought that one must vote for every proposed cut in order to be in favor of economy. I do not claim to have perfect judgment.

I can simply say that under Democratic administrations I have sought economy, at real personal cost; and I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will not accuse me of indulging in a tirade when I try to carry out the same

principles when the Republicans are in power.

I stand for economy at all times—not like some who propose economy when the other side is in power, but favor spending with both hands when their side is in power.

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know whether the Senator from Illinois is referring to me; but if he is, he is not stating the facts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New Hampshire should apply my statement to himself only if his own conscience tells him to do so.

Mr. BRIDGES. I suggest that the Senator from Illinois apply it according to his own conscience, too. I shall take care of both myself and the Senator from Illinois at any time and any place, on the question of economy.

Let me say that only twice last year did I vote for an increase of appropriations, and one of those items was in regard to Air Force research and the other was in regard to Air Force development. I am very proud of that record, and I stand on it.

Mr. President, I admire the Senator from Illinois when he votes for economy. However, there is no use in his shouting about these matters.

Why not proceed with the amendments to the bill, and in that way we see how the Senator from Illinois votes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall not say the Senator from New Hampshire has been indulging in a tirade; but will he yield for specific questions on the points he makes?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly I yield for a question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me correct the RECORD at one point by saying that I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] proposing a cut of \$500 million; but on the subsequent vote on an amendment calling for a cut of approximately \$500 million, the RECORD will show that I voted in favor of the amendment. In connection with that matter, I shall make the insertion in the RECORD at the proper point, for I have here the record of the votes. Vote 47, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 5, page 6107, shows that the Ellender amendment called for a cut of \$580 million, not \$500 million. I voted against that as I did against a motion by Senator WELKER for a cut of \$1 billion—vote 44, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 5, page 6012. But I voted for a later Welker cut of \$500 million and for a long cut of \$400 million. See votes 45 and 46, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 5, page 6095 and page 6098.

So, Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has referred to one amendment calling for an appropriation decrease of \$580 million, against which I voted; but he has omitted to refer to another amendment, calling for a decrease of \$500 million in appropriations, for which I voted.

Mr. BRIDGES. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I have the floor. I sent for the votes on foreign aid in which the Senator from Illinois participated; and some of the votes show

that he voted, not for economy, but for larger appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from New Hampshire will examine vote 45, taken on May 28, 1952, as it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 95, part 5, page 6095—and that vote occurred on the question of agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], proposing a reduction of \$500 million in the total authorized appropriations for foreign aid—or to reduce the appropriation of \$6,900,000,000 as recommended by the committee, to \$6,400,000,000—the Senator from New Hampshire will find that the Senators voting "yea" were:

Senators BENNETT, BRICKER, BRIDGES, BUTLER of Maryland, BYRD, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CASE, CORDON, DIRKSEN, DOUGLAS, DWORSHAK—

Mr. BRIDGES. Fine, I congratulate the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The full record should be given. Senators should not pick out ex parte a vote involving a somewhat higher amount, and refer to it.

Mr. BRIDGES. I congratulate the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator from New Hampshire now withdraw the aspersions he made?

Mr. BRIDGES. I have not made any aspersions against the Senator from Illinois. I simply quoted his official voting record.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to point out that on a substantially similar vote, I voted to cut foreign aid appropriations by \$500 million; and the Senator from New Hampshire now has that vote in his hand.

If I had made a similar statement about the Senator from New Hampshire, and if I had been caught in the act, I would have admitted it. So I hope the natural gentility of the Senator from New Hampshire will now assert itself.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, let me say in courtesy to the Senator from Illinois that I hold in my hand a record of the vote of May 28, 1952, which was the vote on an amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER]. This shows that the Senator from Illinois voted for the reduction, and I congratulate him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am delighted. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). The Chair finds it necessary to remind the occupants of the galleries that they are present as guests of the Senate. This is not an entertainment for their amusement. The occupants of the galleries will refrain from any demonstration of their feelings, and will maintain the decorum of the Chamber.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I also hold in my hand the other votes which I quoted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I may say to my good friend from New Hampshire that I hold in my hand the RECORD of May 28, 1952, showing the vote on another amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], propos-

ing a cut of \$500 million, on which I voted in the affirmative.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois get the record straight? I will agree that the Senator holds in his hand the RECORD, which he has quoted. But the Senator from New Hampshire holds in his hand the record of two other votes of the Senator from Illinois, and he would be very glad if the Senator from Illinois would examine them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I voted against the further cut of \$1 billion on top of a committee cut of \$1 billion; and hence I voted against the first Welker proposal but I voted for the second Welker proposal. I voted against a cut of \$580 million sponsored by Senator ELLENDER, not for cuts of \$400 million and \$500 million proposed by Senators LONG and WELKER respectively. I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire that when a witness takes the stand, he takes an oath to tell the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The Senator from New Hampshire told a part of the truth, but he did not tell the whole truth, he did not tell all the truth.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may we proceed with the amendments?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would be well if we did, but before we do so, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Does the Senator from New Hampshire contend that reducing the appropriation for Federal aid to highways from \$510 million, as recommended in the House bill, to \$475 million, will reduce actual expenditures by the Federal Government by \$1? Will it reduce actual expenditures? That is the test.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois knows that we are making appropriations. Perhaps he is not aware that the Appropriations Committee, on taking this matter up with the Bureau of Public Roads, found that the cash requirements necessary to pay the States for work performed were less than originally estimated. The amount provided will be sufficient to meet every need in the fiscal year. There is a reduction of appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But is it a reduction of expenditures?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is not a reduction of expenditures; it is a reduction of appropriations.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is all the Senator from Illinois has to say.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are recommending that appropriation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But it is very important that the country should recognize the difference between appropriations and expenditures. What the members of the committee on the other side of the aisle have been doing is to give the impression, in large type, that a reduction in appropriations means a reduction in expenditures; whereas, by failing to meet obligations incurred, there is simply no reduction at all in the outlay.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire, of course, knows, as every other Senator knows, that the problem of expenditures is a wholly different thing from the problem of appropriations. The committee reported an

appropriation bill. Let me remind the Senate and the country that we in the United States of America are now faced with more than \$81 billion of carry-overs from previous administrations for which the present administration must raise revenues next year, the year after, and the year after that.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say to my good friend from New Hampshire that the amendment I intend to propose with respect to the highways will reduce actual expenditures in 1954-55 by \$115 million; and I shall welcome the support of the Senator from New Hampshire when that amendment is reached.

Mr. BRIDGES. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the appropriation for roads represents the amount which is necessary to carry out authorizations already made and for commitments made to the States. It represents the cost of work completed or to be completed in the year. It is an appropriation. When the money is paid, it will be an expenditure. It will be an expenditure to meet the requirements of the States under a formula established by law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire contend that the \$20 million appropriated for operating differential subsidies for ships will be adequate to meet the added costs of the 1,600 authorized trips for which subsidies will be paid?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire points out that the appropriation referred to is for the payment of operating costs—subsidies for previous years, incurred during the Democratic administration.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New Hampshire, I may say, has not answered the question. Is it not true that the committee is authorizing costs during the current year of approximately \$50 million, namely, 1,600 trips at an average cost of about \$31,000 a trip, for which it proposes to appropriate only \$20 million; so that, at the end of the year, we will be \$30 million worse off than when we started?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the Senator is not correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In what particular am I not correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. Because we do not know what the figure will be this year. No one has any idea what it will be, and no one can forecast accurately what it will be.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Has not the committee authorized 1,600 trips?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the average cost in the past year was \$30,900 a trip?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is approximately correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not that indicate an approximate figure of \$49,600,000?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is not certain, by any means, nor are we certain as to the cost per trip in the coming years that all those trips will be made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not virtually true that in the past the number of trips authorized have been made?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the Senator is not correct in that respect. In some instances the number of trips authorized was made, but in others the number authorized was very far from being made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that within the past year 1,638 trips, approximately, were made?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is about correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator contend that, if 1,600 trips are authorized, the ship-operating companies will voluntarily forego the subsidy which would be theirs if they made the 1,600 trips?

Mr. BRIDGES. No. The entire subject of subsidies for ships being built, and for ship-operation subsidies, is a very troublesome one, calling for a policy decision, which the Congress of the United States will have to make. But we must recognize that the costs the Government pays are only arrived at after a careful study of operating costs, foreign competition costs, and similar factors. Some of these payment figures have been under question for 7 years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All I wish to point out is that the committee is apparently letting us in during 1953-54 for obligations which will amount to approximately \$50 million, and is appropriating only \$20 million with which to meet that and the \$140 million of past obligations. I repeat, at the end of the year, we will be \$30 million worse off than when we started.

Mr. BRIDGES. No; the Senator is merely guessing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I submit the Senator has virtually confirmed everything I have said, subject to a margin of a few hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. President, I would now like to point out that in the case of highways the committees seem to claim a saving of \$35 million in expenditures, which turns out to be a chimera, and in the case of operating differentials a saving of \$30 million in appropriations, which likewise turns out to be a chimera. So we have \$65 million of chimeras in 2 items, and there are numerous others.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have the floor, and all I wish to suggest is that I should think the Senator from Illinois would like to be informed, so that he could be a little more accurate and not state half-truths, as he has done. Why does he not state all the facts, rather than half-truths and only a part of the facts?

The appropriation for roads is to meet previous authorizations and contracts. It is made according to law on a formula basis. The \$35 million was eliminated because work progress was less than originally estimated. The \$475 million appropriated by this bill, will be sufficient to meet the entire requirements next year. I never figured that there would be a saving on expenditures. I am addressing myself to an appropriation bill, and I have been very frank in saying what the road program is.

Mr. President, may we proceed with the amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 12, after the word "seamen", to insert "from United States vessels"; on page 4, at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "\$60,000,000" and insert "\$50,000,000 and in addition \$15,600,000 of the unobligated balances of all appropriations available to the Department of State during fiscal year 1953 of which latter amount not to exceed \$5,600,000 may be used to cover the costs of reduction-in-force, including salaries, terminal leave, travel and transportation expenses of officers and employees whose services are terminated, and travel and transportation costs in connection with transfers necessary as a result of reduction-in-force"; in line 18, after the word "which", to strike out "not less than"; and in the same line, after the figures "\$8,000,000", to strike out "shall" and insert "may."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 5, after line 11, to insert:

ACQUISITION OF BUILDINGS ABROAD

For carrying into effect the Foreign Service Buildings Act, 1926, as amended (22 U. S. C. 292-300), foreign currencies and credits owed to or owned by the United States in an amount not to exceed the equivalent of \$4 million to be available through June 30, 1954: *Provided*, That when such foreign currencies and credits are made available for purposes of said act, as amended, the Department of State shall issue certificates in equivalent dollar terms, and credits shall be allowed in the proper accounts of Government departments and agencies concerned: *Provided further*, That section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953 (Public Law 547, 82d Congress, approved July 15, 1952), or provisions relating thereto providing for reimbursement therefor to the Treasury from applicable appropriations of the agency concerned shall not apply to foreign currencies or credits used for the purposes of this authorization.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope this amendment will not be agreed to. It increases the expenditures of the United States Government for the acquisition of buildings abroad, for which we have already appropriated very large sums. I believe we have appropriated approximately \$200 million for the acquisition of buildings abroad. As of March 1 of this year, there was an unobligated balance of \$9.3 million available for this purpose, which, according to the report of the House committee, should be sufficient to carry out the most necessary projects.

For this purpose the Senate committee proposes to spend \$4 million out of counterpart funds. The State Department advises that if we do not use those funds we shall lose them, and that here is a way to get something for nothing. This myopic position might be expected from the budget officers of the State Department, but Congress should not be sucked in by it. In the first place, the counterpart funds can be used for other expenses of our foreign-aid program,

and also for offshore procurement and payment for munitions produced in foreign countries. I repeat that these sums do not have to be spent for buildings. They can be spent for more vital purposes and to that extent relieve a burden upon the American taxpayer.

Since reductions are being made in the personnel of the State Department overseas, the need for quarters could also be expected to subside. It seems to me that this is an item upon which we can well save.

Is it not much more important to furnish munitions than to build more stately mansions for the members of the Foreign Service?

I hope this committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the issue is very clear. It has been, in part, stated by the Senator from Illinois. The United States Government owns certain counterpart and other foreign funds abroad, in foreign currency. Are we going to use those funds? Are they to be used for something which will be a capital asset to the United States? The question is, Do we want to use counterpart funds, which might otherwise go down the drain, for the purchase of buildings which will always be a capital asset to the United States? We feel we should convert these monetary assets into physical assets.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I should like to confirm the statement which has just been made by the distinguished chairman of the committee. Recently, I visited in Stockholm, Sweden, where we are renting office space in several buildings for embassy quarters and for personnel. We are now erecting there a new building with counterpart funds which is costing us no new money.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays. I hope Senators will give us the yeas and nays instead of sitting on their hands. I see no hands raised on the other side of the aisle. Now I see only two, namely those of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The demand for the yeas and nays is not sufficiently seconded.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Clements	Fulbright
Barrett	Cooper	Gillette
Beall	Cordon	Goldwater
Bennett	Daniel	Gore
Bricker	Douglas	Griswold
Bridges	Duff	Hayden
Bush	Dworshak	Hendrickson
Butler, Md.	Eastland	Hill
Byrd	Ellender	Hoey
Capehart	Ferguson	Holland
Carlson	Flanders	Humphrey
Chavez	Frear	Jackson

Jenner	Malone
Johnson, Colo.	Mansfield
Johnson, Tex.	Martin
Kefauver	Maybank
Kennedy	McClellan
Kerr	Millikin
Kilgore	Monroney
Knowland	Morse
Kuchel	Neely
Langer	Payne
Lehman	Purtell
Long	Robertson

Russell
Saltonstall
Schoeppel
Smathers
Smith, Maine
Sparkman
Symington
Thye
Tobey
Watkins
Williams
Young

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on this vote, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, on this particular item, I believe the Senate ought to realize what is contemplated, and to consider whether or not the item involves an appropriation of American taxpayers' dollars.

In foreign countries there are certain funds known as counterpart funds. When appropriations similar to the one now under consideration were made in the past, a certain percentage of the funds was made up by counterpart funds. In other words, if the United States provided France with a certain number of tractors, France would sell the tractors to French citizens and receive francs in payment and the proceeds went into what were called counterpart funds. A certain amount would be set aside in francs. Our agreements with foreign countries provided that counterpart funds should be spent in certain ways. It is the purpose of the Federal Government to use such counterpart funds for the buying of land and the construction of building in foreign countries. So American taxpayers not only are not appropriating this fund, but they are saving this amount of money, because they would not be able to use the counterpart funds, which are currency of a foreign country, except for the purpose here proposed, or some other purpose of a similar nature.

Therefore, we are merely asking that the United States Government be able to use, in a specific country, counterpart funds which are currency of that country, in order to buy land and construct buildings in which our embassies and various other governmental staffs may be housed.

The item appears as though it were an appropriation, but for bookkeeping purposes only. In this way, the Director of the Budget can keep track of the item. The funds will be placed in the Treasury, and Congress will appropriate the money. Thus, the money will be placed right back in the Treasury, and the counterpart funds will be taken out and used for the construction of buildings or the purchase of land. So, as far as American taxpayers are concerned, they will not have to pay anything.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Has the committee determined that the acquisitions and construction are necessary?

Mr. FERGUSON. They have, to an extent.

I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Is it not a fact that only about 15 percent of our overseas staff is housed in United States Government-owned buildings?

Mr. BRIDGES. That is correct. For about 85 percent of American personnel abroad, office space is now rented. So this item would eliminate a part of the rent, and would save us money.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. It would save us money.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not also true that if we do not construct these buildings out of counterpart funds we may at some later date, if the currencies are depreciated, find ourselves in a position where we may have to use United States dollars, as we formerly had to do, in constructing this type of building?

Mr. BRIDGES. I think that would be the probability.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not also true that counterpart funds can be used by the Battle Monuments Commission to maintain cemeteries and build monuments? This year alone we saved \$1 million of the taxpayers' money, as the Senator may recall, in connection with the independent offices bill, by using counterpart funds to start the last monument to be built in Luxembourg.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct. The Senator from Michigan and other members of the Appropriations Committee have been urging that United States dollars be not used for such purposes.

I think there are other purposes for which we can use counterpart funds in certain countries, and, therefore, save money for the taxpayers, as we did in connection with the construction of monuments and the maintenance of graves and cemeteries. It is a simple matter when we understand what the counterpart funds are. For example, in Italy many natives are employed in maintaining lawns and graves in cemeteries where American boys are buried. Those employees can be paid in the lira of Italy which are in the counterpart funds. That is why we believe it is the proper thing to use the counterpart funds, which are in the currencies of the particular countries.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Senator from Michigan referred to Italy. I am glad he did so. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], and several other Senators know from personal knowledge that if it had not been for counterpart funds we would still be paying rent in Rome, Italy, for some of the buildings which are now being used by the American Government.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will say to the Senator from Michigan that I wish we had this program all over the world. In Buenos Aires, for example, we are renting a building from a Boston bank, and

paying hundreds of thousands of dollars of the taxpayers' money, simply because we have no building. Whether the buildings be constructed with counterpart funds or by some other method, I think the dignity of the United States Government is such that we should own a little property all over the world for governmental purposes. I think this is an excellent program.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator has been making a very piteous plea for the use of counterpart funds in maintaining the graves of American soldiers who died abroad. I ask the Senator from Michigan whether this particular item involves the maintenance of the graves of American dead, or the construction of handsome buildings to house Foreign Service officers of the State Department?

Mr. FERGUSON. This particular fund is not for the maintenance of graves. That was covered in another item. It was referred to by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK].

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I mentioned the subject only to furnish another example of the use of such funds.

Mr. FERGUSON. I feel rather certain that the distinguished Senator from Illinois knew that we were talking about another appropriation of counterpart funds.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Michigan made such a strong argument that we really should properly maintain the graves of our soldiers abroad, an argument in which the Senator from Illinois joins, that I thought perhaps some might be deluded into believing that we are now about to vote to maintain graves instead of constructing abroad lavish, extravagant buildings for the benefit of Foreign Service officers of the State Department.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan realizes that some of these buildings are what he personally would consider expensive buildings. However, there is something in the idea that when we construct buildings in foreign nations they should be in keeping with the dignity of the United States of America. Therefore the Senator from Michigan feels that many of these expenditures do not represent extravagance.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to make a brief observation, with the permission of the Senator from Michigan. What the Senator said about the United States making proper provision for its officials, whether they be under Eisenhower, Truman, Roosevelt, or anyone else, is correct. On the Island of Trinidad, for example, the representative of the communistic government in China has a better home than has the Consul General of the United States. I do not wish to indulge in extravagance in the construction of

buildings, but I think we have reached a point in history where our officers who are sent to foreign countries should be invested with a little dignity and accorded the respect which is their due.

Mr. FERGUSON. I appreciate the Senator's remarks.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Government buy anything in Trinidad with this appropriation?

Mr. FERGUSON. No.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Can the Senator tell us where it is proposed to use this money to purchase or erect buildings.

Mr. FERGUSON. Wherever the credits are available. I shall be glad to supply the list. Trinidad would not be covered, because I think there is no counterpart fund there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; there is not.

Is it not a fact that if these credits were not used for the purpose suggested, they might be used for the payment of salaries of employees, or for other programs? In other words, the use which is suggested is not the only use to which these credits can be put.

Mr. FERGUSON. The proposed expenditures are, of course, for capital assets. It is true that such funds could be used for purposes other than the acquisition of capital assets. We could use them for the payment of salaries of employees in embassies; but, as I understand, there are sufficient funds in existence for the acquisition of capital assets. Such funds could also be used for the purposes which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas has in mind.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In most of the countries I have visited, where counterpart funds exist, we have bought extremely lavish buildings. For example, in Rome the Government bought one of the finest villas in the city, the Villa Taverna. I have no idea what was paid for it. Our officials would not tell me. However, it looks as though it had cost several million dollars. I do not believe that that is the best use to which counterpart funds could be put. There are alternative ways to use them, which would save our Government an equal amount of money, provided we do not really need these buildings. In the case of Buenos Aires, no counterpart funds exist.

Mr. FERGUSON. They do not apply to Buenos Aires.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Take Bonn, for example. There has been much in the press recently in criticism of the extravagant buildings we are erecting in Bonn. I did not criticize. In fact, the criticism as to the lavishness of the buildings in Bonn arose from the other side of the aisle. But they have already been erected.

Take the case of England. Many Members of the Senate have visited London. I do not think anyone could successfully allege that there is any shortage of building space in London. If the reorganization plan which has just been submitted goes into effect, there will be

many vacant buildings in Paris, because we have already bought a very great many very handsome residences and other buildings in Paris. I should like to know exactly what it is proposed to do with the money, and where it is to be spent. There are alternative ways of spending which might be just as beneficial as this, or more so.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Arkansas is talking about buildings purchased under a Democratic administration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is correct, but the buildings are still there.

Mr. FERGUSON. They are still there.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They can be used. I do not believe that Republicans would refuse to use them because they were purchased during a Democratic administration.

Mr. FERGUSON. Oh, no.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, may I reply to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FERGUSON. I am glad to yield the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Arkansas has raised the question with reference to where these funds would be used. The places where they could be used are limited to places where the funds are available, and places where capital improvements are needed. We are also restricted in our use of the counterpart funds by the executive agreements entered into by previous administrations.

One building is to be in Honduras.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Honduras?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes. One is to be in Mexico.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask whether counterpart funds are involved in the case of Mexico or Honduras?

Mr. BRIDGES. The one in Honduras involves United States currency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Are counterpart funds involved in the case of Mexico? I do not believe so.

Mr. BRIDGES. In Mexico, a counselor's office building is to be constructed. In Finland—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Do counterpart funds exist in Mexico? I never heard of any counterpart funds existing in Mexico.

Mr. BRIDGES. We are dealing not only with counterpart funds but foreign credits which have been built up under various programs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. From what source?

Mr. BRIDGES. From the sale of surplus property and from various other sources. They have been built up over the years. Foreign credits or counterpart funds, whichever happens to be available, can be used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Mexico, from what source did these foreign credits arise?

Mr. BRIDGES. So far as we know, they were from the sale of surplus commodities after World War II.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Surplus war property?

Mr. BRIDGES. Commodities sold after World War II.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In Mexico? The reason I am asking these questions of the Senator is—

Mr. BRIDGES. I have before me the situation as it exists. In Mexico at this time there are funds available to us in foreign credits, based upon lend-lease agreements, of \$5,250,000.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is lend-lease, which is a very different source.

Mr. BRIDGES. It is foreign credit.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, but it arises from an entirely different source than from the sale of surplus property, or counterpart funds.

Mr. BRIDGES. The funds come from various sources. I do not have the Mexican situation before me.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The point I am trying to make is that where it is possible to buy property with counterpart funds, it is also possible to use the money for many other purposes.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Which would be quite beneficial to our country. In Mexico, for example, we are appropriating great sums of money for the control of the hoof-and-mouth disease. Why could not the funds available there be used for that purpose, instead of purchasing palaces?

Mr. BRIDGES. As the distinguished Senator from Arkansas knows, the use of the funds is controlled by treaty or agreements with the countries involved, which specify how the funds may be used, and we must be somewhat guided by those restrictions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But those treaties or agreements do not specify that we must use the funds for the purchase of real estate.

Mr. BRIDGES. Oh, no.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We have a good deal to say as to what we will do with the money.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. When we have money available, it should be used to the best advantage. We should get the best value out of the expenditure of the money. It is more than a question of whether we want bigger and better palaces. Extravagant palaces arouse considerable resentment in the countries where we purchase them, if they are out of keeping with similar buildings in that country.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire does not feel too strongly about this matter, but he is aware that we are paying rent for a large number of buildings all over the world, and if we can acquire permanent structures through the use of foreign credits or counterpart funds, it is to our advantage to do so. In that way we would eliminate the yearly payment of rent. It is probably good business to do so. However, the Senator from New Hampshire does not feel too strongly about it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do feel strongly about it, particularly in some cases. In Turkey, for example, we spent a considerable amount of money in building an unusual palace in Ankara, which I do not think we should have built at all. The excuse given me when I inquired about it was, "Oh, well, we have counterpart funds available. What difference does it make?"

It does make a difference, Mr. President, because the counterpart funds could be used to pay the salaries of our employees in those countries.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I do not want to differentiate as between counterpart funds and credit money or any other kind of money. However, if we can obtain a building which will belong to us, I think it is very unsound to continue to pay rent for the space the Government needs.

In Mexico City, for example, where I visited less than 4 months ago, our Embassy is located on 2 or 3 different floors of one of the largest office buildings in Mexico City. We are paying rent for those floors.

I am not trying to defend the use of counterpart funds, or any other kind of funds. However, there should be a method developed by which we can acquire our own property overseas, so as to eliminate the necessity for paying rent. In Mexico City our Embassy is located in a great big office building where we are paying a rental every year—the State Department probably can tell us how much we are paying—of probably hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Mr. BRIDGES. On this particular item, may I say to the Senator from Arkansas, who has raised the question about it, the funds could be used, for instance, to buy marble in Italy, for erecting a marble building in Holland. They could be used to pay for the marble in Italy, which would in turn help the industry of Italy, and in a way would be economic aid to that country. The marble could be transported to Holland for the construction of an office building there, assuming that we would construct a marble building in Holland. I am citing that situation only as an example. I do not know whether we are building any structures of marble.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not correct to say that counterpart funds sums could also be used for the purchase of strategic materials? For example, is it not true that the pounds sterling, which we hold in counterpart funds and from the sale of surplus materials, could be used to buy rubber and tin in British Malaya, thus diminishing the amount which we must pay for these crucial items and stockpiling them? Is it not incorrect to say that these funds can be spent only for the construction of buildings? Is it not rather true that they can be spent also for strategic materials, and for paying employees of foreign nationality who work in our embassies, as well as for various other purposes, and hence serve pro tanto to reduce the burden on our taxpayers? Should not this program be called "a palace-purchase program?"

Mr. BRIDGES. In answer to the Senator's question, let me say to the Senator from Illinois that he must know, because the Senator from New Hampshire has stated it time after time, counterpart funds can be used for other purposes. They cannot always be used for the purchase of strategic materials. It would

depend on the terms of the treaty we have with a particular country, whether strategic materials could be purchased. It all depends on the situation involved in each individual case.

So far as its being a palace-purchasing program, if it were a palace-purchasing program it certainly has been carried out during the previous administration, of which the Senator from Illinois was a part. The Senator from New Hampshire believes this to be a sound program, but he has no strong feelings about it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would the Senator consent to the rejection of the committee amendment, with the understanding that the Committee on Appropriations will later study the matter in greater detail?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I notice that the Senator from New Hampshire is weakening in his advocacy.

Mr. BRIDGES. The committee went into the matter quite fully. We know which countries are involved, and in which we are paying excessive rent. We believe that the acquisition of buildings in those countries will mean definite economy to the United States over a period of years.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The junior Senator from Tennessee is trying to make up his mind how to vote on this amendment. I think it is clear that there is wide latitude as to the use of the counterpart funds. Therefore, the question really boils down in my mind to whether the buildings in the countries involved are needed. Will the Senator not proceed to inform the Senate where these buildings are to be constructed, and if in the opinion of the Committee on Appropriations the buildings are needed therein?

Mr. BRIDGES. One of the buildings is in New Delhi, India. It involves the construction of a building costing \$1 million for office purposes and staff housing. There the present office space facilities are limited. They are very inadequate for the office operations.

The chancery building is typical of many of the old, rambling buildings of Delhi, with unusually high maintenance and repair costs. Office space on the outside is at such a premium and at such a cost that it is impossible to secure. We are now using a former Army barracks for the accommodation of the staff. Security protection is absolutely jeopardized because of the Embassy's operations being spread over various buildings.

Housing for Embassy personnel is also at a premium, the demand for high rent, payments of rent 2 to 3 years in advance and key money, precludes lower paid staff employees from acquiring suitable housing. Lack of adequate housing plus tropical summer temperatures has a depressing effect on morale, which is reflected in a lowering of the efficiency of office work, and an unwillingness of most personnel to return for a second tour of duty.

The situation at New Delhi, India, is typical of the situation generally existing in similar locations.

For instance, I might refer to the situation existing at Dakar, in French West

Africa, where \$227,000 is recommended as an appropriation for the consul general's residence and staff housing. I read from the description of this project, as set forth in the hearings:

Housing in Dakar presents a serious problem. It is practically impossible to rent either an apartment or a house. At the present time all consular properties are leased. The consul general's residence is an old-colonial-type house and not considered suitable for occupancy by the principal officer, particularly from the viewpoint of representation. It has been necessary because of lack of available quarters to house one of the consular officers in a part of the consul general's residence which has been converted into an apartment. In addition, four other properties are leased for staff housing. Three of these units are leased from the French Government and are uniformly old and badly in need of overall maintenance repairs. Available facilities are inadequate by American standards. The remaining property is a small, modern, two-room apartment, rental on which is considered excessive. It is planned to buy a tentatively selected site and erect a nine-unit apartment building. This will provide adequate staff housing and effect savings over a period of time. The French Government has offered a site to the consulate upon which a representative residence for the consul general will be constructed.

Similarly, an appropriation of \$525,000 is recommended for a new Embassy office building at The Hague, Netherlands. In that connection, I read from the description of the item, as set forth in the hearings:

The Embassy offices at The Hague are now housed in an American Oil Co. building and in several scattered locations, entailing a serious security problem as well as loss of efficiency. Furthermore, the owners of the building have indicated a desire to terminate the current lease upon its expiration date in August 1953.

In order to provide consolidated office quarters which will eliminate the present serious security problem and provide for improved operating efficiency, it is proposed to construct an office building on a site already owned by the Government. The savings which will be effected will be especially important, as substantial increases in rental will have to be met this year, particularly in negotiating for new quarters.

Mr. President, I shall not take time to go through all the items, unless it is desired that I do so. All of them are explained in more or less the same manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the House report on this matter stated that—

The committee was advised that the unobligated balance for this item, as of March 1, 1953, was \$9,290,363, of which \$8,689,078 was in credits and the remainder in dollars. A sizable unobligated balance will be carried over into the fiscal year 1954, which should be sufficient to carry on the most necessary projects.

Mr. BRIDGES. That was the judgment of the House of Representatives; yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire feel that there

is involved the question of security, which from time to time has been brought up in connection with the advisability of renting buildings in some foreign countries, where there would be better security if we had a separate building belonging to the United States?

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly. Security is becoming a major problem in many of these critical-development centers.

Mr. FERGUSON. When we speak of security, we mean, do we not, protection from espionage on the part of the Communist countries?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; that is absolutely true.

Let me point out when Mr. Truman was President of the United States, in January he asked \$15 million for this item. The revised budget, as submitted by the Eisenhower administration, asked for \$5 million. The committee voted for \$4 million, which we thought was a conservative use of money.

Of course there is involved in this matter a question of principle. If Senators do not wish to vote for this item, they do not have to do so. However, I believe this to be a sound move which, over a period of years, will result in substantial savings.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is true, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I should like to say to my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire, that of course whenever an appropriation is made for any purpose it costs money. On the other hand, I think this proposal is one of the soundest that has ever been made to save money to the American taxpayers. Of course, \$4,000,000 will be spent; but, as a result of that expenditure, at the end of 15 years we probably shall have \$4,000,000 worth of property, whereas if we continue to pay rent in the amount of thousands of dollars so that embassy buildings may be available in various areas—for instance, in Buenos Aires, Rome, and The Hague—we shall not have anything to show for the large amounts of rent we shall have to pay over the years.

So I believe this proposal is a very sound one, and I hope the Senate will support the chairman and the other members of the committee on this item.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe I take as much pride in the manner in which our Government and our people are represented abroad as does any other Member of this body. Ordinarily I might wish to vote for the committee amendment.

However, we have heard that it is necessary, because of our financial situation, to reduce our defense appropriations probably to the extent of considerably more than \$5 billion and that reduction will largely affect the size of our air defense. We have heard that because of our financial situation it will probably be necessary to reduce—or at least it is proposed by the administration under Republican leadership to reduce—the appropriations for mutual security by approximately \$2,400,000,000.

We know there is a proposal to make a material reduction in the appropriations for the point 4 program.

Furthermore we know that very substantial cuts are proposed in the appro-

priations for health activities, for research, for education, and for welfare.

So long as there is need to make substantial reductions in the appropriations, in order to balance or to attempt to balance the budget, we certainly should not give consideration to proposed expenditures of funds for purely convenience or show purposes.

Like many of my colleagues, I have been abroad a great many times. I think the buildings representing the United States in the large capitals of Europe are not below the dignity of our country.

When the distinguished Senator from Michigan indicates that this money is to be used for the acquisition of buildings to house our diplomatic missions or for the secretarial staff—as the Senator did at the beginning of his remarks—of course he is completely inaccurate. The counterpart funds can be used in our defense; they can be used for the furtherance of the principles of mutual security; they can be used for the acquisition of munitions and strategic materials; they can be used for offshore procurement; they can be used to pay the expenses of all non-American personnel in every diplomatic mission and every consular mission we have abroad. The use to which these funds can be put is substantially endless.

In the face of that situation, I see no reason why we should commit ourselves to the expenditure at this time of \$4 million for the acquisition or erection of new buildings for diplomatic officers. The use of the counterpart funds, as I have pointed out, is the equivalent to using cash which we need for the many purposes I have enumerated, and otherwise.

Mr. President, I feel so strongly about the need of full defense for the United States, which will proceed *pari passu* with our efforts to secure peace, that I shall vote against every proposed cut in defense appropriations or in mutual security appropriations which I believe will endanger the security of the United States. By the same token I believe the health, education, and welfare needs of the American people are so great that I shall continue to vote for every reasonable appropriation proposed for those purposes.

But to me, Mr. President, when we are struggling to save money for defense, for education, for health, for welfare, and for the security and safety and happiness and welfare of our people, it simply does not make sense that we should today be willing to appropriate for what is purely a piece of showmanship.

I may say further that I do not think we ought to appropriate money for non-essential purposes, or for purposes other than those of national security and the national welfare.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 16, beginning in line 19. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. GRISWOLD. Mr. President, I spent a little more than a year in an organization which used counterpart funds for the United States of America. It is very easy to say this item will not

cost the taxpayer anything, but that the money will come from credits we already have. It has been offensive to me, as I have traveled in Europe, to observe the embassies of the United States, which I think should reflect the dignity of this Nation. In many foreign countries the embassy is not an adequate office building. At the same time in many foreign countries I have seen homes occupied by the second secretary of the embassy, the third secretary, or our consul, which are finer as my observation goes, than the home of any Senator of the United States of America. It brings discredit on the United States to have exhibited such a waste of public funds in foreign countries. It creates the impression that there is a great Santa Claus in the United States who can take care of all the needs of the people of those countries. I think it has brought discredit to us in foreign nations.

I also desire to point out that when a larger building is erected by our Government, whether it be a home or whether it be an office building, it actually creates a liability for the Government. It does not create an asset, since additional funds will be required to defray the normal expenses of the building in all the years to come; and we may not always have counterpart funds with which to pay such expenses. Our country needs to be suitably represented, and our representatives ought to have adequate facilities; but there is a dividing line. There has been so much waste, in years past, in the field to which I am referring, that I believe there is apprehension as to what is going to be done in the future.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I merely desire to say a word in explanation of why I am opposed to the committee amendment. There is no limitation provided. I am not referring to counterpart funds, but there is set forth in the amendment no limitation with respect to the credits or currencies owned by the United States which can be used for the purpose suggested, within the limits of the foreign-aid act. Neither is there any limit to the amount that can be spent at one place, or within one area or country. Reference is made to counterpart funds, but the amendment is so worded that as much as \$4 million in credits or currencies owned by the United States abroad, regardless of the source from which they may be derived, can be used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, beginning on line 12. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I correctly understand that a vote "yea" is a vote for the committee amendment and for the expenditure of \$4 million, and that a vote "nay" is a vote against the committee amendment and against the expenditure of \$4 million?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A vote "yea" is a vote for the committee amendment. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

I further announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN and Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official committee business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate, having been appointed a delegate to attend the forthcoming International Labor Organization Conference at Geneva, Switzerland.

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 38, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aiken	Dworshak	McClellan
Barrett	Ellender	Millikin
Beall	Ferguson	Purtell
Bennett	Flanders	Russell
Bridges	Gore	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hayden	Sparkman
Capehart	Hill	Symington
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Thye
Chavez	Kefauver	Watkins
Cooper	Knowland	Young
Cordon	Kuchel	
Daniel	Maybank	

NAYS—38

Bricker	Hoey	Mansfield
Bush	Holland	Martin
Byrd	Humphrey	Monroney
Clements	Jackson	Morse
Douglas	Jenner	Neely
Duff	Johnson, Colo.	Payne
Eastland	Kennedy	Robertson
Frear	Kerr	Schoepfel
Fulbright	Kilgore	Smathers
Gillette	Langer	Smith, Maine
Goldwater	Lehman	Tobey
Griswold	Long	Williams
Hendrickson	Malone	

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Hunt	Pastore
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	Potter
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Magnuson	Smith, N. C.
George	MCCarran	Stennis
Green	McCarthy	Taft
Hennings	Mundt	Welker
Hickenlooper	Murray	Wiley

So the committee amendment was rejected.

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

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contributions to international organizations," on page 6, line 17, after the word "organizations", to strike out "the Government of Panama"; and in line 19, after the word "Congress", to strike out "\$30,044,787" and insert "\$29,614,787 together with such additional amount as may be necessary to pay the United States assessment applicable to the first 6 months operating budget of the United Nations during the calendar year 1954: *Provided*, That the amount of this appropriation to meet obligations to the United Nations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, shall be available for payment only in equal monthly installments for each semiannual period of such year for which the total amount of such contributions shall have been fixed, such payments to be payable on the first day of each of the respective months; except that the payment of obligations accrued for the period January 1, 1953 to June 30, 1953, may be made in one lump-sum payment."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I suggest to my good friend from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] that this amendment go over, to be considered with the companion amendment which the Senator expects to offer to the bill at a later time?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am willing to do that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this committee amendment be considered with one with which I expect to offer later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 7, to insert:

PAYMENT TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA

The Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be paid annually out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$430,000 as a payment to the Republic of Panama in accordance with the treaty of 1936 (53 Stat. 1818).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 13, to insert:

Section 602 of the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary Appropriation Act, 1952, as amended (65 Stat. 599), is hereby amended as follows: At the end of the second proviso in the first paragraph and before the period, insert: "Caribbean Commission and the Joint Support program of the International Civil Aviation Organization."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Missions to international organizations," on page 8, line 10, after the word "chauffeurs", to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "International contingencies," on page 9, line 13, after "(44 U. S. C. 111)", to strike out "\$1,300,000" and insert "\$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Construction," on page 11, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "\$6,600,000" and insert "\$5,100,000"; and in line 17, after the word "State", to insert a colon and "Provided further, That \$1,500,000 of the amount previously appropriated for the Anzalduas diversion dam is hereby transferred, to be available until expended, to the construction account of the Falcon Dam project and related works."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] is interested in this amendment. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment on page 11, at the beginning of line 5, and the one in line 17, go over until the senior Senator from Texas returns to the Chamber.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, that is agreeable to me. I see the junior Senator from Texas is present, but the senior Senator from Texas is absent at this time.

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

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Operation and maintenance," on page 11, at the beginning of line 25, to strike out "\$1,000,000" and insert "\$900,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "American sections, international commissions," on page 12, line 23, after the word "Commissions", to strike out "\$500,000" and insert "\$543,889."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 14, to strike out:

Sec. 111. No part of any appropriation contained in this title shall be used to pay any expenses incident to or in connection with, participation in the International Materials Conference.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, after line 18, to insert:

Sec. 111. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee be kind enough to yield to me for a moment or two?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, if I correctly understand this amendment, it is similar to one which has been approved in previous sessions of Congress regarding the dismissal of employees of the State Department. Personally, I do not think this language is necessary at the present time, in view of Public Law 733 and the President's Executive Order No. 10450. More than that, it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that the same language appears in the bill with reference to the Department of Commerce and also with reference to the Department of Justice?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Kansas would ask unanimous consent that the similar amendments with reference to the State Department, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce, be treated together. We do not want to treat the State Department in one way, the Commerce Department in another way, and the Department of Justice in still another way.

Mr. CARLSON. I had hoped to make the same objection to all three amendments, Mr. President, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that we may consider the three amendments at the same time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. May I ask the Senator from Kansas if he does not intend to make a point of order against these three provisions, namely, the provisions relating to the State Department, the Department of Justice, and the Department of Commerce? If we pass them over, the point of order should be raised at the same time, should it not?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I do expect to make a point of order against section 111, on page 16, section 210, on page 28, and section 304, on page 52 of the bill.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield further?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Kansas for yielding to me. I understand he intends to make a point of order with reference to the sections which he has enumerated. I am very glad he proposes to follow that course.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Have provisions similar to these ever been incorporated in previous appropriation bills?

Mr. CARLSON. Yes, they have been. I believe this provision has been incorporated in appropriation bills for several years.

I wish to state to the Senator from Vermont that I do not believe we have needed this section since Congress passed Public Law 733. Certainly we do not need it now, under the President's Executive Order No. 10450. In that order, the President is authorized to remove personnel for several reasons. He is now authorized to remove an employee, first, for any behavior, activities, or associations which tend to show that he is not reliable or trustworthy.

Second, for any deliberate misrepresentations, falsifications, or omissions of material facts.

Third, for any criminal, infamous, dishonest, immoral, or notoriously disgraceful conduct, habitual use of intoxicants to excess, drug addiction, or sexual perversion.

Fourth, for an adjudication of insanity, or treatment for serious mental or neurological disorder without satisfactory evidence of cure.

Fifth, for any facts which furnish reason to believe that the individual may be subjected to coercion, influence, or pressure, which may cause him to act contrary to the best interests of the national security.

I contend that under that order, the President can take care of these situations.

I wish to be very frank with the Senate. We have some personnel problems in various Government departments. In my opinion, there are some individuals who should be removed. I do not know if the matter can be handled in this bill, but I think it might be done if the Senate authorized the heads of agencies to remove persons from excepted service.

Of two and one-half million employees, there are now 310,000 in the excepted service in various departments. We might just as well be frank about the matter. Those employees came into the service through political preference or political appointment. I contend that no one would wish to remove 310,000 employees at this time. But in all fairness to the heads of agencies, a number of them should be removed. That could be done if there were adopted in this appropriation bill an amendment which would permit the termination of employment of persons in various departments who are excepted from the competitive civil service.

To be very frank about the matter, there are 4,000 attorneys in the Office of the Attorney General who are in the excepted class. They do not come under the regular civil-merit system. Yet under the present situation, they cannot be removed. I do not say the Attorney General would wish to remove all 4,000, but I am sure he would feel much better if he had the power to remove certain individuals from the Department.

Personally, I am opposed to the method proposed in the bill, but I would urge that some consideration be given to the heads of the departments, so that they might control their personnel and secure employees who will cooperate with them.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Kansas believe that under the suggestion he has made, which would permit the removal of employees in excepted service, plus authority which has already been granted to the President to remove employees for certain reasons, there would be adequate power to permit the present administration to have a smooth-working organization, with authority at the same time to remove saboteurs? I do not refer to saboteurs in the sense of persons who might blow up the Capitol or the White House, but persons who perhaps might be called boobytrap specialists, a few of whom I could name who might come within that category?

The President or the departments heads should have power to remove from office persons who are working to give the President as bad an administration as possible, but who are at least partially protected at the present time.

Mr. CARLSON. I have every reason to believe that if the amendment with respect to excepted appointments were adopted, and applied in conjunction with the President's Executive order, we would not have the problem that seems to be facing us now. I make this statement to Senators interested in the proper operation of various departments of the Government.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that I believe policymaking officers of the Government should be subject to removal, but I do not believe the proper place to provide for the removal of such employees is in an appropriation bill. I have never favored legislation on appropriation bills without holding hearings. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations. That committee held no hearings on the subject of who should or who should not be removed. Therefore, I am delighted that the Senator from Kansas has made the point of order. Likewise, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has held no hearings on this subject.

There may be some employees who should be removed, but I do not believe this is the proper time or place to make the determination. I voted against this amendment in the committee, and I intend to vote against a motion to suspend the rule so as to make it in order.

Neither do I believe that Congress should give a blanket check to the Secretary of State, to the Attorney General, or to the Secretary of Commerce. We were not elected to Congress to do that.

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Does the Senator from South Carolina mean a "blanket" check or a "blank" check?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. MAYBANK. I meant exactly what I said—a blanket check.

Mr. TOBEY. How would the Senator define a "blanket check"?

Mr. MAYBANK. I should be glad to explain it, if the Senator from Kansas would yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I wish to make this comment with respect to the point the Senator from South Carolina has raised. I am as anxious as is the Senator from South Carolina to protect civil-service employees. That is the reason why I plan to make a point of order against the three sections. I am also concerned about a few thousand persons who are not under the regular civil-service merit system, and should be dismissed. Department heads should have the power to dismiss some of them. It is for that power that I am pleading this afternoon. If the Senate desires to consider an amendment which I have prepared as a substitute for the amendment of the committee, my amendment would be limited only to those persons in the civil service who have excepted status. They

are the only ones the amendment would deal with.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I am glad to yield to a member of my committee.

Mr. PURTELL. The Senator from Kansas in an earlier statement said that there were 310,000 employees, if I heard his words correctly, who should be removed. I am certain the Senator did not mean to say that. For the RECORD, I wonder if the Senator did not mean that there are 310,000 employees as to whom the heads of departments should be allowed to determine the question of removal.

Mr. CARLSON. If I said they should be removed. I did not mean to say so. What I meant to say was that they are eligible for removal. I feel certain that no one wishes to remove 310,000 employees, but I am sure that in the various agencies there are a limited number of persons who should be removed, and the present heads of departments cannot remove them. Therefore, we ought to give the department heads some leeway.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does the Senator from Kansas intend to offer an amendment to give the President the right to remove the 310,000 employees?

Mr. CARLSON. If the amendment now before the Senate is rejected, I propose to offer an amendment, which I shall read to the Senate in the hope that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will accept it.

Mr. CAPEHART. Are the 310,000 persons employees of the civil service who were frozen into their position under an Executive order of the outgoing President of the United States?

Mr. CARLSON. They do not have civil-service merit status as a result of examinations, as do regular classified civil-service employees.

Mr. CAPEHART. They were frozen into their positions by the outgoing President, were they not?

Mr. CARLSON. At various times.

Mr. CAPEHART. And have not had civil-service status?

Mr. CARLSON. That is correct.

Mr. CAPEHART. Why should they not be restored to the positions they held before the outgoing President issued his order?

Mr. CARLSON. I assume they accepted their appointments, having that in mind.

Mr. CAPEHART. I feel certain they did. I hope the Senator from Kansas will offer his amendment, and that the Senate will agree to it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am somewhat surprised to hear the distinguished chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee announce on the floor of the Senate that in connection with an appropriation bill he intends to make a proposal which would impinge upon and destroy the jurisdiction of

that committee. Certainly a matter affecting the job security of some 310,000 employees is entitled to a hearing. There have been no hearings whatsoever. With respect to such precipitate action as the distinguished chairman says he will propose in a substitute amendment, on behalf of the distinguished former chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and myself, let me say that we shall be forced to raise a point of order against such an amendment as also being legislation on an appropriation bill.

We shall be glad to join with the distinguished chairman of the committee in a proper study and consideration of whatever is necessary to accomplish the end which he seeks; but I certainly do not think today is the time to wipe out the civil-service protection of a large number of faithful, loyal Government employees.

Mr. MAYBANK. Veterans' preferences are also involved.

Mr. MONRONEY. Veterans' preferences are also involved.

Furthermore, in this same bill there is a committee amendment which would wipe out the entire civil-service system in connection with the Office of United States Marshal, clerks, and deputy marshals. Such a measure has been before the Senate countless times, and has been voted down without exception.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Kansas is not so naive as to believe that such a proposal as he suggests could be put through on the floor of the Senate this afternoon. He realizes full well that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, the subject should have the attention of the Senate, and should be well considered.

In making the point of order against the committee amendment, I wish to make this explanation, at least, of a problem which confronts the various agencies of Government. In all fairness, I believe every Senator realizes that some action should be taken about this matter. In my opinion, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is absolutely correct as to the course we should follow. I think it is the duty of the committee to hold hearings on the proposal. However, the question was before the Senate, and I could not let the opportunity pass without calling attention to what I consider to be a serious defect in the civil-service laws. If we do not correct it, it will be very damaging to the civil service in the future.

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

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wonder whether the Senator would consider offering his amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment, inasmuch as it is legislation on an appropriation bill and therefore notice must be given in order that it might be made a part of the bill. Would the Senator offer his amendment to cover only those whose positions are excepted from competitive civil service, which is what I understand he proposes to do by his amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, in order to get the question before the Senate, and make it a matter of record, I intend to offer the amendment which is written for the particular agency which we are now discussing, the Department of State. Of course, a similar amendment could be written to deal with various other department heads. The amendment reads:

Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Secretary of State may, in his discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas offer his amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. Who has the floor?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to be very careful not to get myself in a position where any legislation I approve today would throw wide open the civil-service status of employees of the Government. On the other hand, I think there are some who should be eligible for dismissal by the head of the particular agency involved. For that reason, I wish to be cautious about what I accept.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would the Senator offer his amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment, rather than as a new amendment, with respect to which notice would have to be given, and which would have to lie over for a day?

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CARLSON. If I should offer my amendment as an amendment to the committee amendment, would that in any way interfere with the rights of the civil-service employees of the United States, aside from those whom I wish to reach by my amendment?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a point of order—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will ask the Senator from Kansas to send his amendment to the desk in order that it may be read.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is trying to prepare himself to answer the inquiry of the Senator from Kansas, which has not yet been answered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to raise a point of order about the inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to offer his amendment as a substitute, or as an amendment to the pending committee amendment?

Mr. CARLSON. It is my intention to offer it as a substitute for section 111.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 19, it is proposed to strike out section 111, in the committee amendment, and insert the following:

Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Secretary of State may, in his discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I raise the point of order that the amendment constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill, and is therefore out of order.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the rule of the Senate require, if this amendment is offered as a substitute for the language now in the bill, that notice be given under the rule?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Notice having been given with respect to the original amendment, the Chair rules that no notice is necessary with respect to a substitute offered for the original amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the same rule apply to amendments—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The ruling of the Chair applies to amendments to the original amendment, with respect to which notice has been given.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the rule of the Senate does not apply to a substitute, I think the proper thing to do is to offer the amendment as a substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, may I have a ruling on my point of order?

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order of the Senator from Oregon is sustained.

The Senator from Oklahoma will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understood the parliamentary situation before the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] rose, he had asked unanimous consent that section 111 be passed over. He has now offered a substitute for section 111. May I ask what is the question before the Senate at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The committee amendment itself was the question pending before the Senate. The request of the Senator from Kansas for unanimous consent was not heard by the Chair, and therefore was not put. So there is no unanimous-consent agreement to pass over section 111.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then the question before the Senate is the consideration of the substitute for the committee amendment, to strike out section 111 and sub-

stitute certain other language. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Except that a point of order has been raised against the substitute, and the Chair ruled that the point of order was sustained. Therefore, unless an attempt is made to take an appeal from the ruling of the Chair, the substitute has been rejected on a point of order, and the question pending before the Senate is the committee amendment itself.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President—

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I make a point of order against the committee amendment, which is now pending, on the ground that it constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AIKEN. May not the Senator from Kansas offer his substitute, standing on its own feet, or, rather, may he not give notice that he intends to offer it? If there is a two-thirds vote in favor of suspending the rule, will he not be authorized to offer it and have it acted upon?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. He may give 24 hours' notice, and his amendment may be acted upon as an original amendment.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Kansas can give 24 hours' notice that he intends to offer his amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not hear the entire statement of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. As I understand, it is perfectly proper for the Senator from Kansas to give 24 hours' notice that he intends to propose this amendment, which would be challenged, of course, as legislation on an appropriation bill. However, he would have a right to offer it, would he not?

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President—

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such notice must be given in writing, and is valid only provided the bill has not been previously disposed of.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator must give notice to suspend the rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair on the Carlson amendment, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair must rule that other business having been transacted in the meantime, the appeal from the ruling of the Chair is not in order at this time. The ruling applies only to the Carlson amendment.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan thought he had propounded a parliamentary inquiry as to whether the substitute for the language in the bill would require notice. Notice has al-

ready been given on the amendment contained in the bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct. However, because the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE] made a point of order against the original amendment, the making of that point of order constituted transaction of business by the Senate after the point of order was made against the substitute. It is in order for the Senator from New Hampshire to move to suspend the rule, but with the understanding that the rule will apply to the committee amendment, not to the Carlson substitute.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the ruling of the Chair mean that no vote may be taken on the Carlson amendment?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It means no vote can be taken on the Carlson amendment, unless and until the Senator from Kansas offers it again, with 24-hour notice of his intention to ask for the suspension of the rule.

The Parliamentarian reminds the Chair that if the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to suspend the rule prevails, and the committee amendment remains in the bill, the Carlson amendment may be offered again as a substitute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with regard to the merits of the proposition which is now before the Senate. I quite agree that we should have a procedure to make it possible to eliminate from Government service employees who are not competent or qualified or safe for Government service.

However, I have confidence in the Committee on Civil Service. I do not think we ought to invade the jurisdiction of a standing committee of the Senate via the Appropriations Committee. I believe we should constantly be on guard to see to it that the Appropriations Committee confines itself to appropriations and does not seek to turn itself into a superlegislative committee of the Senate.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I am always disturbed, as the RECORD will show, when I read in any proposals such language as: "The Secretary of State may in his absolute discretion during the current fiscal year terminate the employment of any officer." I recognize in these days that anyone who says a word in support of Government employees is suspect.

I am very much concerned about the morale of the Government employees. As I have argued many times on the floor of the Senate, no citizen has the right to Government employment, but once a person has been employed he has the right to fair treatment, when it comes to discontinuance of his service. He has such right as a citizen and as an employee and we, as Senators, ought to be constantly on guard to see to it that we protect his right for the good of the Government service itself. If we do not do so we will wreck morale in Government service.

What we need in the United States is the building up of Government career work to a greater degree than has been done. We ought to be encouraging young men and young women to recognize the fact that Government service is a fine occupation and a great career; we ought to encourage people to go into Government service, rather than discourage them.

There are many objections which I have to the amendment, including one with respect to veterans' preference. My main objection goes to the procedure which is proposed for the dismissal of employees from Government service. I do not like absolute discretion. Whenever I see absolute discretion granted, I become very worried because absolute discretion is always pregnant with dangerous abuse. It always makes possible capricious, arbitrary action on the part of mere men.

If we mean it when we so often speak on the floor of the Senate in support of the principle of government by law, we ought to protect that great principle when it comes to the adoption of procedures for the administration of government.

When we give blanket and absolute discretion to mere men who are administering Government departments, we go a long way from government by law, and walk down the trail of government by men.

Although no one has the right to Government service, and no one has the right to be continued in a Government job, certainly every employee has the right to the fair procedures we have developed in civil service for the establishment of proof that a person's service ought to be discontinued.

The assumption has become more or less widespread that because a man is blanketed into civil service by Executive order therefore he does not have a civil-service rating. True it is that such employees did not obtain their employment through competitive examination, but, unless I am completely misinformed on this point, it is my understanding that the Civil Service Commission always treats those who have been blanketed into civil service as having gained civil-service rights.

I agree with my friend from Kansas that undoubtedly many employees have obtained appointment by political influence, and to that extent they are, in fact, political appointees.

I remember some years ago, when I was in the Department of Justice, the common attitude was that there were two classes of lawyers in the Department, namely, those who were there on the basis of merit, and those who were appointed as a result of political pressure, induced by a desire to pay off a political debt. I have no reason for believing that that situation in the Department does not exist today.

I am pleading for trust and confidence in the Carlson committee. I have confidence in that committee. I am satisfied it will go into the problem of employment in Government service on the part of persons who, in fact, are holding political-patronage jobs, but who, by way of political pressure, have become blanketed into what amounts to a civil-

service rating. If they are not competent, if they are not good security risks, or if there is any other good reason, on the merits, for getting rid of them, that fact can be established on the record. I do not think we ought to give someone absolute discretionary power to fire them at will. When that is done, it is very difficult to convince other employees that we are drawing a clear distinction between political appointees and persons who are entitled to Government employment on the basis of merit.

It is a widely known fact that within the Government service employees are fearful as to what will happen to them. If Senators will talk to any of them they will find that their attitude is stated in replies like: "I do not know how long my job will last, although I have civil-service rating. No one seems to be very secure any more."

I think that is bad for the Eisenhower administration, and I am sure it is bad for the Government service. That is why I argue again today, as I have in the past, for an end to an arbitrary, absolute discretion procedure for dismissal, and a following of the regular procedure.

After all, Mr. President, I would prefer to spend money in the interest of being fair to Government employees, rather than spend money in the name of economy, and at the same time do injustice to some of them.

If any Government's employees are suspect and are not competent, I do not say that the head of the department in which they work should keep them in positions in which they might do great harm, until he can establish that they are not qualified to perform their jobs. I would go along with the procedure recommended by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, which would favor the suspension of such employees, insofar as concerns the performance of particular jobs; but I favor being fair to the employees. Thus, I would not favor having them removed from the payroll before the facts were determined. I would favor giving them their day in court, through civil-service procedure.

If we do not do that, I think we shall destroy the morale of the Government service and shall do great harm to Government service as a career.

If the Republicans wish to get rid of political appointees, I think they should do so under the procedure the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service can establish, rather than attempt to make provision, in an appropriation bill, for the dismissal of what very well may be, in specific cases, good and faithful public servants.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, in accordance with rule XVI of the standing rules of the Senate, I send to the desk a notice of a motion to suspend the rule, and ask that it be read, printed, and lie on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The notice will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

In accordance with rule XL of the standing rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI, for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes, the following substitute amendment, namely, on page 16, after line 18, to insert the following:

"Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interest of the United States."

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the notice submitted by the Senator from Michigan constitute an effort to suspend the rule in the case of an amendment which already has been ruled out of order? The original committee amendment, incorporating section 111, has been ruled out of order; and the motion to suspend the rule would apply only to the original committee amendment which has recently been ruled out of order?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair rules that the point of order raised against the proposed substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Kansas applied to it only as it was offered today. But it may come up again tomorrow; and under the proper notice of suspension of the rule, it may be considered.

A point of order may be made against it tomorrow; but it may be then considered.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact, then, that this amendment is a substitute for an amendment which, under the rules of the Senate, has been ruled out of order? So the basic amendment which the Carlson amendment seeks to amend is out of order, so far as the Senate is concerned, at this time; and the only way the amendment can be in order is for two-thirds of the Senate to vote in favor of an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma, by making a point of order against the original committee amendment, has knocked it out of the bill; but it is possible to offer the Carlson amendment as a completely new amendment tomorrow, since there is no such committee amendment in the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the point I was trying to reach, namely, that the root amendment for which this amendment seeks to be a substitute is no longer before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct, but it may be offered as an original amendment in its own right tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Then is it not true that tomorrow rather than today, will be the time to give notice of intention to sus-

pend the rule, in the case of the proposed Carlson substitute, when the point of order is raised, if it is raised again tomorrow?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment has been proposed today, and 24 hours' notice must be given before a vote may be had on suspension of the rule. So it is proper that the notice be given today, at the time when the amendment is offered, and that it be acted upon tomorrow.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. FREAR. Is the present situation that the substitute originally offered by the Senator from Kansas has been offered again by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]? The original substitute, which was offered by the Senator from Kansas, was ruled out of order, was it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. FREAR. And the original committee amendment was ruled out of order, was it not?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the present parliamentary situation, namely, that the original committee amendment has been ruled out of order.

Mr. FREAR. The parliamentary inquiry is this: Has the original substitute, offered by the Senator from Kansas, been reoffered by either himself or the Senator from Michigan?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Notice has been given that when the amendment is again offered, a motion to suspend the rule will be made.

Mr. FREAR. The giving of notice of intention to move to suspend the rule does not require that the substitute be on the table, then?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Carolina will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understood that the Senator from Kansas would give notice of intention to move to suspend the rule.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Notice was given by the Senator from Michigan in the case of a proposed amendment identical with that offered by the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MAYBANK. Does that include a motion to suspend the rule?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan has given notice of his intention to move a suspension of the rule.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, was unanimous consent granted to have sections 111, 210, and 304 considered?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; the present debate is limited to section 111.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma will state it.

Mr. MONRONEY. The amendment for which notice has been given of intention to move to suspend the rule will be the Ferguson amendment, not the Carlson amendment, although the new Ferguson amendment embodies the language of the Carlson amendment; is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair thinks that is a distinction without a difference.

Mr. MONRONEY. I beg to disagree, for the Carlson amendment was a dead issue before the Senate. The amendment now before the Senate, as a substitute for section 111 was offered by the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON]; and the motion to suspend the rule will apply to the amendment of the senior Senator from Michigan, instead of to the amendment of the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] who, incidentally, is chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct as to the authorship of the amendment. The Chair was referring to the fact that the language of the amendments is identical.

The Senator from Michigan has given notice that when an amendment is offered, embodying the language of the Carlson amendment, he intends to move that the rule be suspended. In that manner, the amendment can be considered after 24 hours.

Mr. MONRONEY. It would then become the Ferguson amendment, not the Carlson amendment. Is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in connection with this matter, let me say that I listened to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, when he said we are now proposing to take action which would remove all protection of the civil service. I admire the Senator from Oklahoma, but I must point out that the statement he has made is not a correct one. I believe that when I explain the matter, the Senator from Oklahoma, able and distinguished as he is, will wish to correct the statement he has made.

This provision has been the law of the land for 7 years, Mr. President. It is the law this minute. So we do not propose that any protection be removed. This provision has been the law of the land for 7 long years.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is the Senator from New Hampshire acquainted with Public Law 733, which was passed by the 81st Congress, in substitution for the various limitations which have been written into the appropriation bills for the past several years?

Mr. BRIDGES. Yes; I am familiar with it.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, does not the Senator from New Hampshire feel that the proper approach to the security matter is by means of having the legislative committee which deals with the civil-service matters act to protect the secu-

ity of the United States in its defense agencies which are of a sensitive nature, but at the same time to give the right of appeal to civil-service employees who may be charged? The entire purpose of Public Law 733 was to protect the security of the United States in that way. On that law long hearings were held by the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. It was designed to provide a rule to take the place of such legislation as is now proposed on this appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIDGES. The point I wanted to make to the distinguished Senator was that this provision has been the law of the land for several years. It is on the statute books at this minute. So the statement which the Senator made, and which I do not think he would want to allow to stand, since it was inaccurate, was the provision that we would under this bill do away with all protection to civil-service employees.

The situation which now exists has prevailed in the State Department for 7 long years, and in the Commerce Department for 3 or 4 years. The provision which had been carried in the law was not changed by the Democratic Party, to which the distinguished Senator belongs, and which had a controlling majority. Not a voice was raised against it. Not one Senator from either party rose to speak against it, or voted against it. It was adopted by unanimous vote.

Mr. President, something strange has happened to make what now seems to be so offensive, when it was so acceptable last year. While the Senator from Oklahoma has indicated that, in the subsequent period, a new law was passed, both acts, nevertheless, are on the statute books today.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not a fact that Public Law 733 was approved on August 26, 1950, subsequent to the approval of the former act, and therefore was amendatory of that act, and that in the 1951, 1952, and 1953 appropriation bills the same provision came to this floor and was adopted year after year?

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Oregon is entirely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not believe my distinguished colleague and beloved friend would want to create the inference that the limitation provision applying to the State Department extends to the Commerce Department, as to which the provision was for 2 years only.

Mr. BRIDGES. It was for 3 years.

Mr. MONRONEY. The limitation was not in the Justice Department appropriation for a single year. The provisions of the bill now before the Senate, go far beyond the provisions which the Senator was discussing in connection with the State Department. I refer particularly to the limitations as to discharging an employee under civil service, without the possibility of appeal.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. CORDON. Is not the question now before the Senate the amendment to the State Department appropriation bill? Is not that the matter under discussion?

Mr. BRIDGES. It is.

Mr. CORDON. Is it not true that the Secretary of State was given this authority for 3 years, after Congress passed Public Law 733? Is it not also true that, while the provision of law is most drastic, and might well be criticized as being a case of "rule by men rather than rule by law," it was explained on the Senate floor time after time that it was necessary, in view of the conditions under which the Government was laboring? We then determined that there was no right to work for the Government, but only a privilege to work for the Government, and if there were a doubt in the mind of a department head, he should resolve the doubt in favor of the security of his country, not in favor of the employee?

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, this act was first approved, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon has indicated, in 1946. I hold in my hand the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, containing the proceedings of the Senate. I refer to volume 92, part 6, page 7295. I observe at that point in the RECORD the substance of the amendment as reported by the committee. It was a Democratic Senator, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who moved the adoption of the amendment. It was agreed to by unanimous vote of the Senate. Not one Senator, Republican or Democrat, raised his voice against it at the time; and I do not recall that in subsequent years, though I have not checked the RECORD, any objection was ever raised either by the Senator from Oklahoma or by any other Senator. There was agreement, even, on the part of the Independent Party, the Senator from Oregon, I may say. Even the Independent Party must have approved this provision since it was agreed to unanimously.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I am satisfied the RECORD will show that when this question came before the Senate the Independent Party, then a Republican, rose on this side of the aisle to speak against the principle involved in the original act, of which the Senator speaks.

Mr. BRIDGES. I have before me the RECORD for 1 day. Perhaps the Senator was not in the Senate at that time.

Mr. MORSE. We shall have the RECORD before us presently. I have called for it, and when I receive it, I shall be very glad to present it to the Senator.

Mr. BRIDGES. Certainly there was no vote against the amendment when it was adopted. No voice was raised against it.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire whether there has been a disposition on the part of departmental heads to discriminate, strictly on a political basis, against employees who were in the departments?

Mr. BRIDGES. No; there has not been. As a matter of fact, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Kansas that in my judgment this provision has not been used often enough. In fact, I do not know of a single instance in which it has been used in respect to one of the major political parties. It might have been used with respect to a party for which we do not care too much in this country.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Inasmuch as this provision of law was first passed in 1946, and has been on the statute books ever since, what material improvement has the Senator from New Hampshire observed in the State Department since the Secretary was given the authority?

Mr. BRIDGES. I do not know that I can state to the distinguished Senator from Vermont how much improvement there has been, though I know there was testimony about several hundred employees who had been removed on the ground of their being security risks, or who resigned while investigation was under way, and likewise many homosexuals who had resigned or were dismissed. I may say that indirectly the provision may have had some effect, though I do not have the facts with which to support the statement.

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

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire believe that the law, as it was on the statute books, placed a responsibility upon the Secretary of State to get rid of unfit employees in the State Department, and that it made it impossible for him to offer the alibi that he was handicapped by the civil-service rules? It at least accomplished that much.

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

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Before the Senator from New Hampshire became the senior member of the Subcommittee on State and Justice Departments, I was for 2 years the senior member of the minority of the subcommittee under the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. It is my distinct memory that the representative of the State Department, when this amendment came before the committee, at a time when there were but a few of us present, was in favor of the amendment and did not object to it, for the simple reason that he thought it would be of assistance to the State Department to have such a provision on the statute books; not that he expected that it would be used very much, but that it

would be helpful in connection with certain personnel problems, as they arose. So far as I know there has never been any objection to it in our committee, nor has there been any discussion of it until this year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has concluded, I desire to obtain the floor.

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the very courteous and kindly chastisements which the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee attempted to give me. I regret that I do not share the confidence and the great good will of the new members of the administration, or the love and affection and undying loyalty to the civil service the Senator from New Hampshire seems to have.

In some way or other the name of Dr. Astin seems to strike a familiar note in my memory, and from across the marshes of the duck pond comes the name of a Dr. Day, as we consider the civil service.

As I have talked to dozens of civil service employees, citizens of Washington, who have never voted the Democratic ticket or the Republican ticket, I see in them fear and trembling, and a feeling that disaster is about to strike this great career service. This service has been built up over the years—since McKinley's time, as I recall, in an effort to give the Nation the services of public servants beyond and above the exigencies of political patronage.

I rather assume that there are deserving Republicans who are anxious to take over the positions in the departments and fill them.

I cannot quite agree with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that the issue before the Senate is solely the limitation on the State Department which has been in the appropriation bills for some 7 years. As I read other pages of the bill, I find it extends to the Commerce Department, and that it has been stretched to include the Department of Justice. On another page of the bill it appears that clerks and deputy United States marshals are deliberately taken from under the protection of the civil service.

By all these committee amendments now included in the bill we are proposing to do what the Senate heretofore has consistently refused to do when the matter came before it, namely, withdraw civil service protection, wipe out the veterans' preference law, which has resulted in practically 100 percent employment of veterans, who have gone into the service as deputy United States marshals since those positions were placed under the civil-service law.

The fear the junior Senator from Oklahoma has of this provision is shared by the commander of the American Legion, who, in a telegram dated May 4, 1953, to Hon. JOHN J. ROONEY, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., said:

American Legion strongly protests provisions sections 103, 207, and 304 of H. R. 4974, appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce, granting Secretaries and Attorney General absolute discretion dismiss any offi-

cer or employee whenever deemed necessary. Such request cannot be justified on ground national security since this is already covered in President's Executive Order 10450, April 27.

As national commander, American Legion, respectfully request you vote to eliminate these sections because they destroy veterans preference laws. Thanks and regards.

LEWIS K. GOUGH,

National Commander, the American Legion.

Mr. President, I read a telegram from the national legislative director of Disabled American Veterans, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 4, 1953.

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

H. R. 4974 due for House consideration tomorrow. Disabled American Veterans worked since 1921 to place a veterans' preference act on the statute books and succeeded in 1944. H. R. 4974 contains provisions which will destroy the existing Veterans' Preference Act. Please use your influence to have this provision stricken from the bill.

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director,
Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. President, it is all very well to argue that the provision has been in the law for 7 years with reference to the State Department, and for 2 years with reference to the Department of Commerce. It has never been applicable to the Department of Justice. Only two appropriation bills containing this provision have been passed since Congress enacted Public Law 733 in the 82d Congress, which was approved August 26, 1950. That is, in a way, an illustration of the dangers of legislative riders on appropriation bills. Once a part of an appropriation bill they may continue for 20 years or more without being noticed. The question of whether the need for them has passed is not considered.

The law which makes these riders unnecessary provides that the head of the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Justice, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Navy, the Department of the Air Force, the Coast Guard, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Security Resources Board, or the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics may suspend any employee in the interest of national security. An employee can be suspended tomorrow afternoon. But—and this may be because we are still living in America, where individual rights are rather important to the people—Public Law 733 further provides that, within 30 days after suspension, the employee so discharged shall be given notice in writing of the charges against him, shall have 30 days in which to reply to the charges, and shall be entitled to a hearing.

Is it asking too much that employees who work for lower wages than the average person receives and who do not have a share in the profit system under free enterprise, shall be given merely a minute form of job protection? They can be suspended tomorrow afternoon, but they are entitled to know what the charges are, and they are entitled to have a hearing before the agency which makes charges against them.

This rider here may have been necessary before we passed Public Law 733. It may have been necessary before we had President Eisenhower's loyalty plan and program. Maybe it was still necessary even after passage of Public Law 733, but now—after this law and a new administration—do we want a no-confidence vote against President Eisenhower's own loyalty program? Public Law 733 has been applauded throughout the Nation by the press, by Republicans, and by many Democrats, as being a vast improvement over any loyalty program previously in force.

When we see the cornerstone of civil service chipped away we cannot help but wonder whether the Republican Party is up to some kind of monkey business to try to tear away some of the protection which has been afforded career civil servants throughout the years under our great system of government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma feel that this particular provision assumes a different complexion in the face of the unprecedented action taken against Dr. Astin, the forced resignation of other persons, and the printing of lists of available Government jobs? Does the Senator from Oklahoma see in it anything but an attempt to equip the executive departments of the Government with the absolute right of firing employees without any appeal whatsoever under any circumstances? Is not that what the Senator sees?

Mr. MONRONEY. I definitely see that there is a grave danger. I should dislike to give to a new administrator, without any pattern, without any restrictions or limitations or tests, the power contained in the three amendments to this bill. I am not talking about only 1 amendment, because the fight is on 3 amendments which affect the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. The language is as follows: "Whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

Do Senators think any new Republican administrator would not deem it advisable to replace some of the present employees with deserving Republicans? It is in the very nature of politics. If we are going to write limitations, if we are going to support this kind of rider on an appropriation bill, we should at least say: "Deems it advisable for the security of the United States."

We should provide some safeguard, so that we will not turn back to patronage politics and throw out many of the GI's who are rendering good service but under these riders are under a constant threat that at the whim of one man at the top they can be cut off the payroll tomorrow without any appeal whatsoever.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, does not the Senator believe that the case of Dr. Astin shows exactly what this is aimed at? I recall that the distinguished Secretary of Commerce said that he was going to appoint a committee of eminent

scientists to look into the case of Dr. Astin. I suggest that the majority tell us when this committee is to be appointed. I recall that the Secretary of Commerce said later that he was not going to do anything about it.

This is nothing but a patronage amendment, and it ought to be labeled as such. This is the first frontal attack on the bulwark of the civil-service system which a great Republican President authored and asked Congress to establish.

It appears to me that the hunger for jobs has overcome the understanding and judicious judgment on the part of the majority.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his comment.

I say if we lose the career protection in the civil service in the bill before the Senate today, it will be only a matter of months when job security for even the most faithful and efficient persons in the career service will be in grave jeopardy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, who is as well versed as is anyone else in the Senate, I believe, in regard to civil-service matters, if Congress from time to time has not given a degree of protection to veterans, and an even greater degree of protection to disabled veterans, and if this amendment is agreed to, will it not interfere with or destroy the preference we have given to veterans, and particularly to disabled veterans?

Mr. MONRONEY. I feel that if we consider the amendments in their entirety and adopt them, under the language which provides that any of the three Secretaries can discharge an employee "whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States," veterans' preference will amount to nothing.

We have the advantage of the opinions of no less authorities than National Commander Lewis K. Gough, of the American Legion, and Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans. The question is whether we are going to maintain a career civil service, or go back to the days when only political patronage controlled appointments.

Mr. SPARKMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day, while the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] had the floor, I asked him some questions concerning veterans' preference. I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there may be inserted a telegram from Mr. Lewis K. Gough, national commander of the American Legion; a letter from Mr. Miles D. Kennedy, together with a prepared statement giving the position of the American Legion on the proposed amendment; and also a letter from Mr. Francis M. Sullivan, national legislative director of the Disabled American Veterans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 29, 1953.
Senator JOHN SPARKMAN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Understand Senate begins consideration Monday H. R. 4974 appropriation bill for State, Justice, and Commerce. American Legion strongly opposed to sections 111, 210, and 304 giving Department heads absolute discretion dismiss any officer or employee whenever deemed necessary without hearing or appeal. Such requests cannot be justified for national security reasons as same fully provided in President's Executive order April 27. Earnestly urge you vote to strike said sections from bill. There is absolutely no question but what these riders would destroy veterans' preference laws in these three Departments. Thanks and regards.

LEWIS K. GOUGH,
National Commander, the American
Legion.

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C. May 29, 1953.
Re H. R. 4974, appropriation bill for State,
Commerce, and Justice Departments for
fiscal year 1954.

Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR SPARKMAN: We note that the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported out the above bill containing appropriations for the three Departments in question for the fiscal year 1954.

As reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee the bill contains three riders granting the Secretaries of State and Commerce and the Attorney General absolute discretion to dismiss any officer or employee without a hearing or appeal. The sections in question are Nos. 111, 210, and 304.

These same riders were contained in the bill as originally reported out by the House Appropriations Committee but all were stricken from the bill during debate and before it passed the House on May 5, 1953.

There is absolutely no question but what the three riders would destroy veterans' preference laws in these Departments.

Enclosed please find a memorandum setting forth the reasons why the American Legion opposes the three riders.

I respectfully submit that an appropriation bill is not the proper place to insert riders which would destroy veterans' preference laws. We feel it would be far more equitable to have hearings held by the congressional committees having jurisdiction over civil-service matters, where an opportunity to be heard on the merits of the proposed legislation could be granted all concerned. We like to feel our veterans have earned this right.

I earnestly request that you do everything possible to cause these riders to be stricken from the bill before it is approved by the Senate.

Thanking you kindly for your cooperation, and with warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,
MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

(Enclosure)

WHY THE AMERICAN LEGION OPPOSES SECTIONS 111, 210, AND 304 OF H. R. 4974, THE APPROPRIATION BILL FOR STATE, COMMERCE, AND JUSTICE DEPARTMENTS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1954

The bill H. R. 4974 as reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee on May 27 contains three riders giving the heads of the departments above-named blanket authority to dismiss any employee. Employees would not have recourse to the usual

civil-service protection. They are denied the right of hearing or appeal.

Similar provisions were contained in the bill as it was reported out by the House Appropriations Committee on April 30, but all were stricken from the bill during debate and before it passed the House on May 5, 1953. The Senate Appropriations Committee has restored the riders.

The language of the three riders is the same in each section, except for identification of the respective departments.

We feel certain we are in complete agreement that the American Legion is one of the greatest foes of communism and subversive elements and that our organization would not condone the hiring or continued employment of any Reds, pinks, or sex perverts. We believe the American Legion's support of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and its stand on the numerous fights against communism over the past 30 years support this statement.

For your information, we had the privilege of reviewing a preliminary draft of the President's Executive Order No. 10450 before it was issued on April 27, 1953. As first drawn, it was a most drastic order and we raised objections to the lack of appeal provisions and to separation from service without any stated reasons.

We understand that many of the executive agencies objected for similar reasons. As a result, the Executive order was amended to provide impartial and equitable treatment at the hands of the Government. It is further noted that the Executive order is applicable to each department and agency of the Government and provides a prompt and effective method of severing employees whose conduct is not in the interest of our country. The riders attached to the Appropriation bill H. R. 4974 carry the same provisions except they permit the discharge of Federal employees—including veterans—in the sole and absolute discretion of the department head without the right of an appeal or hearing. The President's Executive order contains appeal provisions for Federal civil-service employees, including veterans.

As we see it, the issue is whether or not we are going to continue to protect the veterans' preference laws now in effect, or are we to leave their observance solely to the discretion of the heads of the three departments concerned, without any right of appeal from their decisions.

Your attention is also invited to the fact that Congressman EDWARD H. REES, Republican, of Kansas, chairman of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and who, we think you will agree, is considered to be one of the greatest authorities in Congress on civil-service legislation, vigorously opposed these riders during the debate in the House on May 5, 1953.

If the three riders in question are approved we will have no end of confusion, because there will then be an Executive order and two public laws all running concurrently, on the same subject matter:

(a) President Eisenhower's Executive Order No. 10450 issued April 27, 1953, which contains appeal rights; and

(b) Public Law 733, approved August 26, 1950, which contains appeal rights; and

(c) The law which will follow enactment of H. R. 4974, the current bill. These riders will supersede all veterans' preference laws in the three departments. None of said riders contains any appeal rights.

It is our honest conviction that the Executive Order is sufficient to carry out the intent of the proposed riders in a more equitable and American manner. It is also the feeling of the American Legion that the three riders will be a duplication of the Executive Order and result in demoralizing the sincere and hard-working Federal employees because of the constant threat of dismissal handing over their heads without any appeal rights.

We submit that the incorporation of riders in an appropriation bill is not the proper way to enact legislation affecting Federal Civil Service, especially veterans preference laws. We would like to be permitted to suggest that the fair and equitable way to handle this proposed legislation would have been to introduce bills and cause hearings to be held thereon by the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, where the advocates and opponents would have been granted a chance to be heard. We were given no such opportunity by either the Senate or House Appropriations Committees on the riders in question.

Wherefore, the national organization of the American Legion respectfully requests that you vote to strike these three riders from the bill H. R. 4974 when same comes up on the floor of the Senate for consideration.

DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS,
NATIONAL SERVICE HEADQUARTERS,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1953.

DEAR SENATOR: On May 5, 1953, the House of Representatives passed the bill H. R. 4974, the appropriations bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954. This bill has now been reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

When the bill was reported by the House committee it contained three sections which gave the Secretaries of the State Department, Commerce Department, and the Attorney General the absolute discretion to discharge any officer or employee when it was necessary on the grounds of national security. The provisions in the law gave the head of the agency the right to discharge an officer or employee without furnishing the employee a right to appeal and in many cases the employee did not know the charge placed against him.

We, of the DAV, realize that such a right has been in the Secretaries of State and of Commerce for the past several years. H. R. 4974 extended the authority to the Attorney General. If H. R. 4974 passed the House with the aforementioned provisions the DAV was fearful that all Federal agencies would seek the same provisions of law in their appropriation bills. The DAV, as well as the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, requested the elimination of these provisions on the floor of the House and they were eliminated by a vote of 181 to 168.

Our concern with these provisions is that there is now on the statute books Public Law 733, 81st Congress, approved August 26, 1950. Under this law the President has issued an Executive Order No. 10,450. Under the act and under the Executive Order 10,450 the head of each department and agency of the Federal Government may discharge an officer or employee within the department or agency if the officer's or employee's employment is not consistent with the interests of the national security. We, of the DAV, believe the law and Executive order now cover the situation. The law and the Executive order set up procedure to give each one who may be affected by the law or the Executive order his or her day in court. Further, it prohibits the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944, in which the DAV is primarily interested.

If the proponents of this type of legislation believe Public Law 733, 81st Congress, is not sufficient, then they should go to the appropriate legislative committees and hearings will be held. We all know that a rider in an appropriation bill is not the proper way to legislate.

It is contended by the DAV that Public Law 733, 81st Congress, and Executive Order No. 10,450 are sufficient law to protect the Federal Government against officers and employees who may be suspected on the ground of national security. The DAV will appreciate anything you may be able to do to have

the three sections eliminated from H. R. 4974 on the Senate floor.

With best wishes, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

FRANCIS M. SULLIVAN,
National Legislative Director,
Disabled American Veterans.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Are we to understand that if these three amendments are agreed to, employees so discharged would have no right to appeal?

Mr. MONRONEY. They would have no right of appeal, even under Public Law 733, which did give the right of appeal. This provision negates and rules out the action of Congress in passing that law, because the language is, "Notwithstanding the provision of any other law." So there is absolutely no shred or whiff of any protection.

Perhaps the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has far more confidence in his new administration than I have with respect to resisting the pressure for jobs, which I understand rather reliably is welling up in all the offices of the Senate and the House of Representatives. If he has confidence that heads of the three Departments can withstand that pressure to open up the jobs, he has more confidence in them than I have.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Under this amendment, would it be possible for a war veteran who has been disabled while fighting for his country to be discharged without even the right to prove that he was not a security risk to his country?

Mr. MONRONEY. The matter of security risk has nothing to do with the language in the bill. It is merely brought in as a part of the discussion.

Mr. LONG. Is it not argued on behalf of the amendment that some veterans might not be good security risks?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly would suggest that if we are to consider adopting these amendments, we ought at least to give the veterans who are going to lose preferential rights a test, if they are to be discharged because they are disloyal or because they are bad security risks. But the language of these amendments affords no protection and provides no standards whatsoever regarding discharge. Employees could be fired for any reason. There is only the debate on the floor of the Senate to indicate that they are going to be fired if they are disloyal, or homosexuals, or have bad characters. These riders permit the veterans to be fired because their superiors did not like the color of their eyes, the way they parted their hair, or the kind of hats their wives wore.

Mr. LONG. Can the Senator give us assurance that the national security is already adequately protected?

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe that Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress, plus the loyalty program of President Eisenhower, which is an excellent loyalty program, according to all the experts I have heard, will afford complete protection

for the Nation. Certainly if we need to write riders into an appropriation bill, let us provide specifically that disloyalty, being a security risk, or abnormality constitute grounds for dismissal. Let us not grant the authority to make blanket firings without cause by three newly appointed Secretaries downtown, with pressure upon them to open up thousands and thousands of jobs.

Every road into Washington is filled with Republicans willing to serve their country. That we appreciate greatly, but we do not like to see veterans being discharged in order to make way for so many deserving Republicans. I think these riders are highly dangerous.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Oklahoma has referred to the President's Executive order and has also referred to Public Law 733, which provides the procedure under which security risks may be dismissed from the service of the Government. I do not believe he has gone so far back as to mention the La Follette Act of 1912, and also the Veterans' Preference Act. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, I should like to read the amendment which appears as section 111 of the pending bill. The amendment provides:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 555), or the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State or of the Foreign Service of the United States.

If that does not eliminate all personal rights of job security, I do not know how language could be written more particularly.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee has told only half the story. He is a clever, able Senator; but he ought to have gone on and read two more lines. Instead of ending with "Foreign Service of the United States," the Senator should have continued with the clause:

Whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States.

The phrase "in the interests of the United States" puts a different tone into the language. The United States is the Senator's own country.

I might point out that the law to which the Senator from Tennessee refers to is a law for which he voted. It is a Democratic law.

When the Senator from Louisiana asked a question of the Senator from Oklahoma, the heart of the Senator from Louisiana was bleeding, even though there was a smile on his face, as he thought of the Republicans coming to Washington from the South. He voted for the law, too. There was not a Democrat who raised his voice against this law for years. They put it on the statute books. It is their law.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire accuses me of dwelling upon a part of the language. The Senator, in turn, has dwelt upon the word "necessary." He passed over without comment the word "advisable."

When he refers to Republicans coming up from the South, he gives me the impression of trying to grab the jobs for Republicans.

Mr. MONRONEY. I do not doubt the patriotism and ability of many of the Government officials who have been given these nice administrative jobs. I am sure that they sincerely feel that the election of a Republican administration last November 5 was "necessary and advisable in the interests of the United States."

I am sure that as good, loyal Republicans they will not feel hemmed in by this provision for they know that the discharge of any employees whom they wanted to upload to make new jobs for more deserving Republicans could easily be termed necessary and advisable.

I should like to read briefly from a letter from Miles D. Kennedy, director of the national legislative commission of the American Legion, addressed to the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN. It is as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., May 29, 1953.

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LEHMAN: We note that the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported out the above bill containing appropriations for the three departments in question for the fiscal year 1954.

As reported by the Senate Appropriations Committee the bill contains three riders granting the Secretaries of State and Commerce and the Attorney General absolute discretion to dismiss any officer or employee without a hearing or appeal. The sections in question are numbers 111, 210, and 304.

These same riders were contained in the bill as originally reported out by the House Appropriations Committee but all were stricken from the bill during debate and before it passed the House on May 5, 1953.

There is absolutely no question but what the three riders would destroy veterans' preference laws in these departments.

Enclosed please find a memorandum setting forth the reasons why the American Legion opposes the three riders.

I respectfully submit that an appropriation bill is not the proper place to insert riders which would destroy veterans' preference laws. We feel it would be far more equitable to have hearings held by the congressional committees having jurisdiction over civil-service matters, where an opportunity to be heard on the merits of the proposed legislation could be granted all concerned. We like to feel our veterans have earned this right.

I earnestly request that you do everything possible to cause these riders to be stricken from the bill before it is approved by the Senate.

Thanking you kindly for your cooperation, and with warm personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

MILES D. KENNEDY,
Director.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know whether or not the veterans objected when this provision became law, back in 1946, and when it was placed in the bill relating to the State Department, as well as the Commerce Department appropriation bill, in the following year?

Mr. MONRONEY. I have tried to explain the reason. I do not have that information from the veterans. The reason was that there was no Public Law 733 during 5 of those years. We had a great deal of trouble with charges which were being made and determined to see whether or not there were loyalty risks in the State Department. So as a stopgap program, before the legislative committee could act, this rider was carried in appropriation bills to try to guarantee the security of the State Department. Since that time, as I have said, Public Law 733 has been enacted; and since that time the Eisenhower loyalty program has been added to the protection.

Mr. FERGUSON. When was Public Law 733 enacted?

Mr. MONRONEY. Public Law 733 was approved August 26, 1950. Congress has enacted two appropriation bills similar to the one now pending since that law was passed. What I said a moment ago was that that was the trouble with legislative riders. Once they are in, they are likely to remain in for 40 years, because they are not reviewed by the legislative committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator tell us why he did not raise his voice in 1950, 1951, and 1952 against such terrible legislation, which took away all these rights?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the Senator that the "pattern of expansion" which stretched the program into a patronage grab was not then present. The law applied only to the State Department. Then 4 years later it was applied to one other department. Now we find the Republicans adding the Justice Department, the United States Marshal's Office, and other positions. We find that there is a pattern in Washington of trying to open up jobs for deserving Republicans, regardless of civil-service status.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator from Oklahoma contend that the American Legion and the veterans who have given so freely of their time, and even their lives and their health, want to keep anyone on the payroll if it is against the interests of the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan that the American Legion, through its national commander, and the Disabled War Veterans, who represent the legless and the armless, are just as much interested in American security and in protecting loyalty in the various depart-

ments of the Government as is any Member of the United States Senate.

Mr. FERGUSON. I agree; and when they understand the situation I am sure they will go along, as they did in 1946, and every year following that, with respect to the Department of Commerce appropriation bill and other bills after that. They felt that it was in the interest of the United States.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will tell the Senator why the veterans are fearful today. The veterans comprise a large percentage of civil service workers. They enter the service under veterans' preference rights. They have been given opportunities under legislation enacted in the past 20 years, which almost makes it possible for a very large percentage of our governmental employees to be veterans.

Representatives of the veterans, conscious as they are of national security, know, I believe, a little better than some Senators, what is important in Public Law 733. Veterans do not mind being put under the security check. They do not mind being subjected to Public Law 733, which provides that they have the one right which every American ought to be entitled to—certainly a veteran of the United States—namely, the right of appeal and hearing before he is summarily discharged, even if such termination is considered necessary or desirable in the interests of the United States.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator know of any complaints from the veterans that under the law now on the books, which was enacted by a Democratic Congress, the administration of which has been in the hands of Republicans only since January 20 of this year, any veteran has been discharged in a case in which the discharge was not in the interest of the United States? If we should continue this provision for another year, what reason is there to expect that there would be discharges not in the interest of the United States? The present law with respect to both the Commerce Department and the State Department extends until June 30.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is using a very peculiar argument when he argues that, because the veterans have been safe for the past 7 years under a Democratic Secretary of State, it necessarily follows, with all the advertised changes which were the cornerstone of the Republican Party's campaign, that the same veterans would be safe under the new Secretary of State. Certainly what has happened during the first 100 days of the present administration is not of a character to inspire the enthusiasm and confidence of the veterans that they will be undisturbed if they simply do a good job.

Mr. LEHMAN rose.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I promised to yield first to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma for having read the letter from the American Legion, which was addressed to me.

I ask the Senator from Oklahoma whether or not I am correct in my interpretation of this section, that when one of the Secretaries, in his absolute discretion—and it would be absolute discretion—decides to discharge an employee from his department, the Secretary is not required to make any accounting or report, or to give any justification to anyone, including the President of the United States. He acts entirely within his own discretion. Is not that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. As I understand the proposed riders, if they were applied as I believe the power proposed to be granted would allow them to be applied, there would be no way to prevent any number of discharges being made, even running into the tens of thousands, without any public record being provided as to who was discharged, or for what cause, or in which one of the three departments. The door would be wide open to violation of the Veterans' Preference Act.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. As a veteran, I am deeply interested in the welfare of the veterans. I certainly have cooperated with them as fully as I could during the many years I have been in the public service.

However, I am also very deeply interested in civil servants generally, whether they be veterans or nonveterans. I know from my experience as governor of a great State for 10 years how important it is to safeguard the interests and protect the rights of the men and women in the civil service who have given loyally of their time and effort, usually at low pay, in the service of their State or country. So I have always felt that instead of weakening the civil service, whether it be in the Federal Government, the State government, or the municipal government, those at the head of government in the executive departments should use every possible means to strengthen and safeguard the rights of civil servants.

Mr. MONRONEY. Insurance of tenure is one of the reasons why Government positions may be low paid. There are compensating factors, one of which is the assurance that a civil servant will not be subject to discharge at the whim of some department head.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very much interested in this discussion, and particularly in the question of the discretionary power proposed to be conferred.

I am just as much in sympathy with and I have just as deep interest in the veterans and all employees of the Government as any other Senator, but some of the arguments I have heard made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon sound rather strange to me. It is pro-

posed to give power to the head of a department to dismiss one or more employees if he chooses to do so. I have heard many arguments made on that point. Yet, last week we gave power to the Secretary of another department to reorganize completely his Department, in his discretion, and not even give notice of the reorganization, unless he deems it practical to do so. We gave him power to reorganize and disorganize the lives of hundreds of people, and to dismiss them. Now, we are talking about a little power to discharge someone that does not suit the top man. I want to see an amendment offered to protect the veterans.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that I may make a brief statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma intends to yield the floor.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is my intention to move to recess the Senate until tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, while I was out of the Chamber this afternoon two committee amendments were passed over. They are on page 11. If I may have the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, I should like to ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of the amendments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas? The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "\$6,600,000" and to insert in lieu thereof "\$5,100,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am also interested in the amendment at line 17. I ask that it too be stated and that the two amendments be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 11, at the end of line 17, it is proposed to insert "Provided further, That \$1,500,000 of the amount previously appropriated for the Anzalduas Diversion Dam is hereby transferred, to be available until expended, to the construction account of the Falcon Dam project and related works."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I see no reason why these amendments should not go over until tomorrow. Many of our colleagues have absented themselves from the Chamber. I do not know whether they are opposed to the amendments, but I believe the amendments should go over until tomorrow, and I respectfully make that request.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the Senator from Oregon has objection to their present consideration, of course, I shall not press my request. However, the committee was laboring under a misapprehension which has been cleared up

since the committee took action on these amendments.

When the amendments were passed over the Senator from Texas was not available on the floor. If any Member of the Senate has an interest in the amendments and feels he would like to take a contrary position, very well. However, as I understand, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is now of the opinion that the committee amendments referred to should be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have no objection, but I do not know whether any of the Senators who are not now present on the floor have any objection to the procedure requested by the Senator from Texas. Many of our colleagues have left the floor with the understanding that the Senate was about to recess, and to them it is only fair that consideration of the amendments go over until tomorrow, or that we have a quorum call, so they will know that business is to be transacted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I have no objection to a quorum call. Other speeches will be made this evening anyway. However, the leadership has given no assurance that no votes will be had today. There are many Senators on the floor at the present time. If I could do so I should like to explain how the situation in connection with these amendments arose.

The sum of \$1,500,000 was appropriated by Congress last year for the Construction of the Anzalduas Dam on the Rio Grande. That dam is to be built jointly by the United States and Mexico. A condition in making the appropriation was that the local interests would provide the right-of-way. Three counties are involved. The first county had an election on the question of voting the bonds to provide the right-of-way. That election carried about 10 to 1. The second county failed to secure the necessary two-thirds vote authorizing the issuance of the necessary bonds. The third county has an election scheduled for the 10th of June. The county that failed to vote by a two-thirds majority has applied to the commissioners court, and the commissioners court is authorizing an election to be held during the month of June.

The Committee on Appropriations, by its amendment, would divert to another project the money which has been appropriated for this project, of which Mexico would pay half, because it thought the local interests had refused to provide the right-of-way.

We have asked the committee to leave the measure as it came from the House, because during the month of June it will be determined whether the conditions attached to the appropriation will be met. If they are met, the money will be available, and the State Department and the Government of Mexico can proceed. If they are not met, we will have the entire month of July, and whatever other time we are here, to divert the funds to another project.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Texas has stated essentially the facts involved in the case. At the time the committee acted, it appeared, so far as the committee knew,

that nothing would be done. No movement was made by one of the participating counties to go forward. Therefore, we felt the money should revert to the use of the Government. However, since the committee has acted, this particular county has provided for a new election to pass on the question. Should it pass favorably on the question, the funds should be available with which to keep the Federal part of the agreement. If the county should reject the proposal, I would like to see it in a supplemental appropriation bill, if we have one, or put in another appropriation bill, provision made to rescind the money.

I feel that what the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] has stated is a correct statement of the facts. The money should remain available to keep our part of the agreement, the county having decided to have a new election.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. If the bonds are voted and the local interests provide the right of way, and if we adopt the committee amendment, we would have to proceed de novo. Since the elections are scheduled for June, if we do not adopt the amendment, we will have ample opportunity to pass on the question. I hope the amendments will be rejected en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the desire of the committee?

Mr. BRIDGES. Of course, I have no authorization to speak for the committee, but I should think that the members of the committee, as reasonable men and able Senators, having a new set of facts presented to them, would probably concur in the withdrawal of the amendments. Therefore I have no objection to their being withdrawn, and to our meeting the issue at another time, if the county involved fails to act.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc. A negative vote would eliminate the committee amendments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the explanation of the Senator from Texas is satisfactory. I wish to say to my friend from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, that I will now count on him to follow through on this particular provision, and should the Texas officials fail to pass the bond issue the Senator from New Hampshire will see to it that a rescission is presented to the Senate for action.

Mr. BRIDGES. I assure the Senator from Oregon that that will be done.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The amendments were rejected.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it take a recess until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I will state that no further votes will be taken

this evening. I assume that some insertions will be made in the RECORD, and other routine business will be transacted.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries.

ADDITIONAL EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate additional messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

USE OF INSCRIPTION "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON POSTAGE STAMPS—RESOLUTION OF HALLOCK AERIE, 2617, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, HALLOCK, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution which I have received from the Hallock Aerie, No. 2617, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Hallock, Minn., adopted at their regular meeting on May 12, 1953, relating to the use of the inscription "In God We Trust" on postage stamps.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HALLOCK AERIE, No. 2617,
FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES,
Hallock, Minn., May 16, 1953.

HON. HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Members of Hallock Aerie, No. 2617, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, adopted the following resolution at their regular meeting on May 12. We would appreciate any support that you may be able to give to bill S. 1482. The resolution is self-explanatory:

"Whereas our postage stamps do not bear the inscription 'In God We Trust,' while our coinage does; and

"Whereas our postage stamps reach into millions of foreign homes and offices in which our coinage is never seen; and

"Whereas postage stamps, on which the inscription 'In God We Trust' will be printed, can be an effective means of describing the fundamentally spiritual nature of this country to all nations of the world; and

"Whereas in our current struggle against the irreligious philosophy of communism, it is important that we pray to God for help; and

"Whereas many foreign nations do not consider Americans basically religious; and

"Whereas such postage stamps would serve to remind our own people of their debt to God; and

"Whereas Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senator from Montana, who is a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, has introduced a bill into the Senate instructing the Post Office Department to place the inscription 'In God We Trust' on all of our postage stamps: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the officers and members of Hallock Aerie No. 2617 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in Hallock, Minn., hereby express their endorsement of this legislation with the recommendation that it be given speedy attention and prompt passage; and be it further

"Resolved, That the officers and members of Hallock Aerie No. 2617 of the Fraternal Order of Eagles invite other civic, religious, patriotic, and fraternal organizations to join with them in the support of this project."

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

WALTER PETERSON,
Worthy President.
LYNN H. LUCAS,
Secretary.

PROPOSED REDUCTIONS IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION—RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a number of resolutions adopted by various posts and auxiliaries of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, protesting proposed reductions in appropriations for the Veterans' Administration.

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

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY MESABA RANGE POST, No. 1172, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, OF EVELETH, MINN., AT ITS REGULAR MEETING, MAY 18, 1953

"Whereas great hosts of veterans suffering from tuberculosis, mental disturbances, and chronic diseases yet unable to secure treatment because of lack of beds; and

"Whereas a new economy drive is endangering our VA hospital and medical program for disabled veterans: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That this post protests the action led by Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, toward this new economy drive; and be it further

"Resolved, That efforts should be made by Congress to appropriate sufficient funds for VA to reopen all hospital beds closed in fiscal 1953 and to keep all available VA hospital beds in operation throughout fiscal 1954; and be it finally

"Resolved, That this resolution be sent to the honorable Senators HUBERT HUMPHREY and EDWARD J. THYE, and Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK."

Passed May 18, 1953.

The foregoing resolution was offered by Tony Malevich, and supported by Ray Bastianelli, and was carried unanimously.

ROY VITO, *Commander.*

Attested:

RONALD J. ANDERSON,
Adjutant.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
FRANK J. KALIS POST, No. 1778,
Wells, Minn., May 16, 1953.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has come to our attention that the present administration is considering a reduction in the funds allotted to the Veterans' Administration for the purpose of maintaining its hospitals.

Enclosed is a resolution, which expresses the feeling of this post on the matter. We would appreciate your doing your utmost to see that the reduction in funds is not made.

Yours very truly,

NICHOLAS STENZEL,
Commander.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has under consideration a bill calling for a reduction in funds to be appropriated for the Veterans' Administration for the operation of hospitals for the treatment of the veterans of the wars of the United States; and

"Whereas the reduction in the appropriation would make it impossible for many veterans in need of hospitalization to secure same; and

"Whereas Frank J. Kallis Post, No. 1778, Wells, Minn., considers this reduction to be in the nature of false economy and not in the best interests of the veterans of the wars of the United States or of the people of the United States in general: Be it

Resolved, That Frank J. Kallis Post, No. 1778, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Wells, Minn., calls upon the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds to enable the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds closed during the fiscal year of 1953 and to keep all available Veterans' Administration hospital beds in operation throughout the year 1954.

"Done this 18th day of May 1953.

"NICHOLAS STENZEL,
"Post Commander.
"ROBERT F. STENZEL,
"Post Adjutant."

RESOLUTION OF LADIES AUXILIARY TO CHARLES McLAUGHLIN POST, No. 906, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, HUTCHINSON, MINN., MAY 15, 1953

Whereas our Veterans' Administration hospital and medical program for disabled veterans is in serious danger due to the special slashing of VA appropriations for the fiscal year 1954, which starts July 1, 1953; and

Whereas this will force the closing of additional thousands of hospital beds and seriously aggravate a situation which even today finds great hosts of veterans suffering from tuberculosis, mental disturbances, and chronic diseases, and unable to secure treatment because of lack of beds; and

Whereas we wish to join our national organization in a determination to fight this false economy; and

Whereas the new VA budget will be under consideration before May 25, we feel that it is necessary to act promptly and in this manner: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the members of the Ladies Auxiliary to Charles McLaughlin Post, No. 906, Veterans of Foreign Wars, convened in special meeting May 15, 1953, That our Congressmen be mailed this copy, asking them to call upon Congress, in their respective Houses, to appropriate sufficient funds for the VA to reopen all hospital beds closed in fiscal 1953 and to keep all available VA hospital beds in operation throughout 1954.

Approved by unanimous vote of membership assembled in special meeting May 15, 1953.

DOROTHY KLAWITTER, *President*.
HELGA R. NIELSEN, *Secretary*.

RESOLUTION OF ST. PAUL POST, No. 4160, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Whereas it has come to the attention of the officers and members of the St. Paul Post, No. 4160, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, that a bill is now pending before Congress to substantially reduce the VA appropriations for fiscal 1954, which will start July 1, 1953: Be it

Resolved, That the officers and members of St. Paul Post, No. 4160, VFW, at a regular meeting held May 12, 1953, unanimously went on record as opposing any decrease in appropriations that would decrease the number of beds available in our veterans' hospitals throughout the Nation. It has also come to our attention that many cases now

needing hospital care are unable to get it because of the hospitals not having ample facilities.

We hereby respectfully request that you do everything in your power to see that this bill does not pass.

Adopted May 12, 1953.

JAMES M. BARRETT,
"Post Commander.
ELMER E. CHESTER,
"Post Adjutant.

MAY 15, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.

Hon. Senator HUMPHREY: We are enclosing a resolution which we sincerely hope you will give your utmost consideration.

Our post has 72 members and our auxiliary has 26 members. They unanimously passed the attached resolution. If possible, we would like to hear from you on this subject.

If you are ever in Randall, we would like very much to have you stop at our club-rooms and pay us a visit.

Sincerely,

HUREL KAZEK,
NELLIE MUNSON.

"RESOLUTION OF CURTIS OLSON POST, No. 9073, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, RANDALL, MINN., MAY 15, 1953

"Whereas there are many veterans of World War I and World War II in need of hospitalization and medical care; and

"Whereas the Korean war has increased and aggravated the existing situation and shall continue to do so; and

"Whereas there is a false economy drive being led by Representative JOHN PHILLIPS of California that will force the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals and the urgently needed and necessary Veterans' Administration hospitalization facilities; and

"Whereas such expenditures are necessary to care for the men and women who served their country well and faithfully: Now, therefore let it be

Resolved, That Curtis Olson Post, No. 9073 of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Curtis Olson Post, No. 9073, Ladies Auxiliary, Randall, Minn., be on record as unanimously calling upon the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds closed in the fiscal year 1953 and to keep all available Veterans' Administration hospital beds in operation throughout the fiscal year 1954 and oppose the false economy drive led by the above-named Representative to hurt the cause of the American veteran.

"Passed in joint session of May 15, 1953, by unanimous vote of all members present.

"HUREL KAZEK,
"Commander.

"PAUL CHANDLER,
"Adjutant.

"NELLIE MUNSON,
"President, Ladies Auxiliary.

"FLORENCE SUTTON,
"Secretary, Ladies Auxiliary."

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, ARTHUR O. HAUKLAND POST, No. 1350, North St. Paul, Minn., May 16, 1953.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
"United States Senate,
"Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The members of Arthur O. Haukland Post, No. 1350, Veterans of Foreign Wars of North St. Paul, Minn., voted unanimously at our meeting of May 13 to present the attached resolution to our representatives in the Congress of the United States.

We urge you to do everything in your power to fight any cuts in Veteran's Administration funds which might result in cur-

tailing any services to which our wounded veterans are honestly entitled.

Very truly yours,

HENRY W. BERG, *Commander*.
EMIL J. LABORELLE, *Adjutant*.

"Whereas the number of disabled veterans is increasing, not decreasing, as a result of the Korean police action; and

"Whereas the Veteran's Administration hospital facilities are already overburdened as a result of previous budget cuts; and

"Whereas a shortage of Veteran's Administration hospital attendants is reducing the personal attention required by many of our hospitalized veterans; and

"Whereas it is the obligation of the Government to care for the wounded and disabled veterans of all wars: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of Arthur O. Haukland Post, No. 1350, Veterans of Foreign Wars of North St. Paul, Minn., strongly protest the economy drive led by Representative John Phillips of California insofar as it concerns cuts in the Veteran's Administration appropriations for the hospital and medical program for wounded and disabled veterans."

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A SPECIAL MEETING OF LYLE RUSSELL POST, No. 1210, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, HASTINGS, MINN., ON MAY 12, 1953

Whereas certain Members of the Congress of the United States have and are advocating drastic reductions in the amount of money to be appropriated to the Veterans' Administration for use in the operation of VA hospitals; and

Whereas many veterans are at the present time, though in dire need, unable to procure treatment through VA hospitals for chronic diseases, tuberculosis and mental disorders because of lack of beds; and

Whereas veterans who have given freely of their time, their personal liberty and in many cases their health and physical well-being in the military service of the United States of America are entitled to the above-mentioned medical care at the expense of the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Lyle Russell Post, No. 1210, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hastings, Minn., and its members, do everything possible to procure a careful appraisal of the needs of the VA hospital system when the matter is considered in connection with appropriations by the Congress of the United States; and be it further

Resolved by the members of Lyle Russell Post, No. 1210, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hastings, Minn., That the Congress of the United States be charged with the duty of appropriating sufficient funds to the Veterans' Administration to allow them to reopen all hospital beds closed in fiscal 1953 and to keep all available hospital facilities in operation during fiscal 1954.

WILLIAM M. NIEDERKORN,
"Post Commander.

VICTOR A. KIEFFER,
"Post Adjutant."

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, GEORGE R. WOLFF POST, No. 425, Hopkins, Minn., May 12, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
"Senate Office Building,
"Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At our last regular meeting May 7, we the members of George R. Wolff Post, No. 425, VFW, of Hopkins, Minn., adopted a resolution to oppose this new economy drive led by Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, to cut funds from the VA that are to be used to hospitalize our host of veterans suffering from tuberculosis, mental disturbances, and chronic diseases.

If this economy drive goes through it would be a big blow to our disabled veterans. United action is needed.

Your wholehearted support will be very much appreciated.

"RESOLUTION

"Whereas Congress appropriate sufficient funds for VA to reopen all hospital beds closed in fiscal 1953, and keep all available VA hospital beds in operation throughout fiscal 1954: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That George R. Wolff Post, No. 425, Veterans of Foreign Wars, of Hopkins, Minn., deplors the action of Congress to act on it, and that we give our wholehearted support to said Congressmen."

Sincerely,

MELVIN J. WERNESS,
Commander.
DONALD J. CONNER,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION OF OLAF B. DAMM AUXILIARY TO POST NO. 1216, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, AUSTIN, MINN., MAY 13, 1953

Whereas the Constitution of the United States guarantees certain freedom and protection to all citizens of the United States and those living under the protection of the Constitution, and in return for such guarantees requires all male citizens to bear arms in defense of the United States if need be; and

Whereas by reason of past congressional action or legislation of the Congress of the United States has admitted definite obligations to those bearing arms in defense of this country; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has decided that the safety of our country requires a continuation of calling of men to the colors, the great majority of whom are young men who have had no opportunity to secure any financial security; and

Whereas the present Veterans Administration statistics prove that 90 percent of patients in veterans' hospital are either veterans suffering from a service-connected disability or veterans suffering from long-term chronic ailments, far beyond the financial ability of such veterans to pay for such treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Ladies Auxiliary to Olaf B. Damm, Post No. 1216, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Austin, Minn., in regular meeting assembled this 13th day of May 1953, That we respectfully petition the Minnesota Senators and Representative of the First Minnesota Congressional District to use their utmost influence to curtail and vote against any attempted congressional action which would reduce Veterans' Administration appropriations and deprive any needy and deserving veterans of treatment and hospitalization at a Veterans' Administration hospital or facility; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and copies be forwarded to the Honorable EDWARD J. THYE, the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, and the Honorable AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.

IRENE PAULSON,
President.
LEONE COLE,
Secretary.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, ARTHUR BERNARD JOHNSON POST NO. 1112, Little Falls, Minn., May 12, 1953.
Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. Senator HUMPHREY: We are enclosing a resolution which we sincerely hope you will give your utmost consideration.

Our Post has 452 members and our auxiliary has 98 members. They unanimously passed the attached resolution. If possible, we would like to hear from you on this subject.

If you are ever in Little Falls, we would like very much to have you stop at our club-rooms and pay us a visit.

Sincerely,

STANLEY MROZIK,
Commander.
MADGE MCGUIRE,
President, Ladies Auxiliary.

"Whereas there are many veterans of World War I and World War II in need of hospitalization and medical care; and

"Whereas the Korean war has increased and aggravated the existing situation and shall continue to do so; and

"Whereas there is a false economy drive being led by Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California, that will force the closing of Veterans' Administration hospitals and the urgently needed and necessary Veterans' Administration hospitalization facilities; and

"Whereas such expenditures are necessary to care for the men and women who served their country well and faithfully: Now, therefore, let it be

"Resolved, That Arthur Bernard Johnson Post, No. 1112, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Arthur Bernard Johnson Post, No. 1112, Ladies' Auxiliary, Little Falls, Minn., be on record as unanimously calling upon the Congress of the United States to appropriate sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds closed in the fiscal year 1953 and to keep all available Veterans' Administration hospital beds in operation throughout the fiscal year 1954, and oppose the false-economy drive led by the above-named Representative to hurt the cause of the American veteran.

"Passed in joint session of May 12, 1953, by unanimous vote of all members present.

"STANLEY MROZIK,
"Commander.
"LAMBERT LARSON,
"Adjutant.
"MADGE MCGUIRE,
"President, Ladies' Auxiliary.
"DOROTHY LARSON,
"Secretary, Ladies' Auxiliary."

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, NEVILLE-LIEN POST, No. 1287, Winona, Minn., May 14, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Will you please find enclosed a resolution passed at our May 13, 1953, regular meeting unanimously to combat action of certain Congressmen to cut the VA appropriations in the fiscal year 1954.

Any action you can do for your veteran constituents will be greatly appreciated by Neville-Lien Post, No. 1287, and having heard your speech at the Winona Athletic Club on May 12, 1953, we know you won't let us down. Thanking you in advance for the interest we know you will give us on this matter, and for your many favors in the past, I remain,

Yours very respectfully,

LAURIS G. PETERSEN,
Adjutant.

"Whereas action is being taken by certain Members of the Congress of the United States to slice millions of dollars from Veterans' Administration appropriations for the fiscal year 1954; and

"Whereas a reduction of appropriations would force the closing of thousands of hospital beds and seriously aggravate a situation which even today finds great hosts of veterans suffering from tuberculosis, mental disturbances, and chronic diseases yet unable to secure treatment for lack of beds: Be it hereby

"Resolved, That the Neville-Lien Post, No. 1287, of Winona, Minn., demands the Congress of the United States appropriate sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds closed in the fiscal year 1953, and to keep all available Veterans'

Administration hospital beds in operation throughout the fiscal year 1954; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Hon. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, House of Representatives; Senator EDWARD J. THYE; and Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

"Dated at Winona, Minn., this 14th day of May 1953.

"GERALD F. VAN FELT,
"Commander."

RESOLUTION OF MONGEAU-THOLEN POST, No. 742, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, MARSHALL, MINN.

"Whereas it has come to the attention of this post that there is a movement on foot in the Congress of the United States whereby large sums of money would be cut from the appropriations to the Veterans' Administration; and

"Whereas curtailment of funds for use of the Veterans' Administration would deprive veterans of beds in hospitals and would deprive hospitalization to veterans suffering from chronic ailments of various kinds; and

"Whereas one of the chief objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars has always been the care of sick and disabled veterans, their dependents and widows: Be it

"Resolved, That this post go on record as being opposed to lowering the amount of appropriation for use of the Veterans' Administration during the coming fiscal year, and that all available hospital beds be kept for use of veterans; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to Senators THYE and HUMPHREY and to Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN."

I hereby certify that the above resolution was duly voted upon and passed at a special meeting of Mongeau-Tholen Post, No. 742, held at Marshall, Minn., on May 11, 1953.

A. S. LE BEAU,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION OF LADIES' AUXILIARY TO GRANT COUNTY POST, No. 1208, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, ELBOW LAKE, MINN., MAY 12, 1953

Whereas our VA hospital and medical program for disabled veterans is in danger if so-called economy drive succeeds; and

Whereas veterans in this area suffering from tuberculosis and mental diseases are now being taken care of by State hospitals due to lack of funds by VA; and

Whereas, due to lack of funds, veterans are put on long waiting lists for dental and outpatient treatment; and

Whereas area hospital located at Fargo, N. Dak., with a 400-bed capacity, is operating at about 25 percent due to lack of funds; and

Whereas 16,000 beds more are needed, and Congress refuses to appropriate funds for what we now have: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the Ladies' Auxiliary to Grant County Post, No. 1208, VFW, of Elbow Lake, Minn., in our regular meeting this Tuesday, May 12, 1953, unanimously call upon your office for your aid, as our representative, in support of additional funds for VA sufficient to meet the need at this time.

ROSE ANDERSON,
President.
RUBY GREELEY,
Secretary.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, RED RIVER VALLEY POST, No. 3817, East Grand Forks, Minn., May 15, 1953.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: At a regular meeting of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Red River Valley Post, No. 3817, held May 12, 1953 in their meeting rooms in East Grand

Forks, Minn., the following resolution was passed:

"Whereas many of our Veterans served their country at great cost to themselves mentally, physically, and financially; and

"Whereas many of these veterans are financially unable to pay for the medical attention they badly need at this time; and

"Whereas the present hospital and medical facilities available to them are definitely inadequate: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States should as soon as possible appropriate sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration to reopen all hospital beds closed in the fiscal year of 1953 and to keep all available Veterans' Administration hospital beds in operation through the fiscal year of 1954 and thereafter; and to appropriate funds for further treatment of dental care that is very inadequate at this time. There are waiting lists that are behind schedule as much as a year."

Respectfully submitted,

BALLARD FAHEY,

Commander.

NORMAN S. JOHNSON,

Adjutant.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Hinckley, Minn., May 14, 1953.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: We of the John and George Wallick Post, No. 4118, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Hinckley, Minn., adopt the following resolution:

"Be it resolved, That the Congress appropriate sufficient funds for the Veterans' Administration, reopen all hospital beds closed in fiscal 1953 and to keep all available VA hospital beds in operation throughout fiscal 1954."

We will appreciate your fullest cooperation in this matter.

Thanking you, we are,

Respectfully yours,

RALPH ROHWEDEN,

Commander.

RAY PROCHASKA,

Adjutant.

Whereas Public Law 242, 68th Congress, as amended by Public Law 448, 69th Congress and Public Law 427, 82d Congress, has established a minimal rating of \$67 per month for a veteran suffering from a service-connected tuberculous condition, which condition has, in the judgment of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, reached the state of complete arrest; and

Whereas R. and P. R. 1132 and 1135, as issued by the Veterans' Administration, makes allowance for the payment of not less than \$67 per month to a veteran with arrested tuberculosis; and

Whereas a great many veterans who have suffered from a pulmonary tubercular disease have had, through the action of the disease or by reason of surgical intervention, some portion of their anatomy removed or destroyed; and

Whereas the residual disability from such loss of anatomy is most frequently of such severity to be granted compensation; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration in drawing up its 1945 rating schedule, has indicated, on page 76 of such rating schedule, a directive that the 50 percent, 30 percent, and 20 percent ratings for arrested or inactive pulmonary tuberculosis are not to be combined with ratings of other respiratory disabilities; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has applied this criteria in the awarding of the \$67 per month statutory award so as to prevent a veteran, so entitled, from receiving his disability compensation in addition to the statutory award; and

Whereas statutory awards for other types of disability such as amputation, are added

to the percentage disability rating set out by the rating schedule; and

Whereas it is apparent that many veterans who have suffered losses of anatomy, particularly portions of or all of their lungs, due to either pulmonary tuberculosis or surgical intervention, are considerably more disabled than a veteran who has suffered from a minimal tuberculosis condition; and

Whereas under the present rating schedule and the directives of the Veterans' Administration, the minimum monthly compensation for a veteran who has lost a portion or all of his lungs is no greater than that paid a veteran who has suffered only a minimal tuberculosis attack; and

Whereas this is obviously a drastic case of discrepancy against the more seriously disabled veteran: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the 9th District, Department of Minnesota, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, in the annual department encampment at East Grand Forks, Minn., on May 3, 1953, do hereby request and solicit the National Rehabilitation Service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars to exert every influence in its power to correct the injustice being done to veterans suffering from an arrested tuberculosis and other respiratory conditions; and be it further

Resolved, That the National Rehabilitation Service be directed and authorized to work with the national legislative director in the drawing up of a bill to be presented to the Congress of the United States for passage to correct this discrepancy; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be presented to the Annual Encampment of Minnesota to be held in St. Cloud on June 11, 12, and 13, 1953, for its favorable consideration and that copies of this resolution also be forwarded to the Honorable HAROLD HAGEN, Member of the House, of the 9th Congressional District of Minnesota; the Honorable EDWARD THYE, and the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY, Members of the Senate of the State of Minnesota.

Yours in comradeship,

A. C. CARLSON,

Commander Ninth District of the
V. F. W., Department of Minnesota,
Hallowell, Minn.

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

OF THE UNITED STATES,

FREEMOND MADSON POST, No. 447,

Albert Lea, Minn., May 12, 1953.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It has become apparent that the present Congress is taking away some of our veterans' benefits.

We of Post No. 447, Albert Lea, Minn., have drawn up the following resolution which was adopted by our first district, and will be presented at the State VFW encampment.

"Whereas veterans of all wars have given unselfishly of their efforts on behalf of the United States in time of war; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration was enacted by the Congress of the United States to protect and administer the rights and privileges granted to veterans by laws of Congress; and

"Whereas the veterans' hospitals under the direction of the Veterans' Administration has rendered fair, efficient, and liberal hospital services to service-connected and non-service-connected cases alike, to the benefit of all veterans; and

"Whereas certain groups in Congress have expressed themselves as being in favor of greatly reducing the number of non-service-connected cases admitted to veterans' hospitals for medical attention; and

"Whereas more than half of non-service-connected cases admitted for medical care in vets' hospitals have incomes of less than \$1,000 per year: Therefore be it

Resolved by Freemond Madson Post, No. 447, in regular meeting assembled, That

we oppose any reduction in appropriations for veterans' hospitals below those made in the last Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That we desire to have the present liberal policy so far as non-service-connected cases are concerned to be continued as heretofore; and be it finally

Resolved, That we urge Congress to make such additional appropriations as are necessary to handle further needs, and that copies of this resolution be sent to Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State and the Committees on Veterans' Affairs in Congress."

RAYMOND SCHULTZ,

Post Commander.

HAROLD SCHREIBER,

Post Adjutant.

WACONIA POST, No. 5462,

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS,

Waconia, Minn., May 13, 1953.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned, being the duly elected commander and adjutant of the Waconia VFW Post, do hereby certify that the following resolution was adopted unanimously by our post at a special meeting held on May 13, 1953:

"Whereas there is currently being led an economy drive by a certain Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, of California; and

"Whereas this economy drive proposes the cutting of veterans' appropriations; and

"Whereas such a cut would force the closing of additional thousands of hospital beds; and

"Whereas many veterans even now are unable to secure treatment because of a lack of beds: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Waconia Post, No. 5462, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, That such legislation, which proposes economy at the expense of the veteran, is not worthy of support; and be it further

Resolved, That we call upon you, and all of our Representatives in Washington to, support the appropriation of sufficient funds to enable the VA to reopen all hospital beds closed in fiscal 1953 and to keep available VA hospital beds in operation throughout fiscal 1954.

WARREN GONGOLL,

Commander.

FRANK SCHELTZCKE,

Adjutant.

ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY—
STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I prepared for insertion in the RECORD on Armenian Independence Day, which fell on May 28, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
ON ARMENIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

In contrast to our joyous July 4, the celebration of Armenian Independence Day is an occasion for sober reflection and rededication to the goal of ultimate liberation of the Armenian people. Like for many other people in the Soviet sphere, freedom for the people of Armenia is a goal still to be attained.

History records that the sorrowful period of oppression of the Armenian people long preceded the advent of the Soviets. For centuries, their freedom to live as they please in their home country has been restricted

or even denied to them. Throughout this time, proudly withstanding the efforts of their persecutors, the Armenian people have clung to their Christian religion, their culture, and their traditions. But the price they paid was high. Because they wished to retain their religious and national identity many of them were brutally murdered. As a result of the cruel massacres in the Ottoman Empire, in which hundreds of thousands were slain, they became the first victims of genocide in modern times.

The first ray of hope in centuries came for the Armenian people shortly before the end of World War I when a free and independent Armenia became a reality. On May 28, 1918, Armenia proclaimed its independence. As Americans we can proudly say that our own President Wilson took an active interest in the strengthening of the new Armenian state.

Unfortunately Armenia's independence was short lived. Attacked by both Soviet Russia and the Ottoman Empire and without assistance from abroad, Armenia succumbed in 1920 to the international law of the jungle.

Throughout the long period of oppression, which continues to this very day, many Armenians have left their home country, and, through their ability and industriousness, have enriched many another nation. Our own country has been one of these beneficiaries and we count today many citizens of Armenian descent who have made fine contributions to our development.

As I greet these fellow citizens today, I want to assure you that the great ideals of Woodrow Wilson live on. Self-determination for all peoples, including the people of Armenia must still be our goal. Let us, therefore, rededicate ourselves to the principle of substituting international order for international lawlessness. International law and order will ultimately bring freedom to the long-suffering people of Armenia.

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 7, 8, 9, AND 10—MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate messages from the President of the United States transmitting Reorganization Plans Nos. 7, 8, 9, and 10. The messages and plans have been read in the House. If there is no objection, they will be entered on the record of the Senate without the necessity of reading them, and they will be referred to the appropriate committee, which is the Committee on Government Operations.

REORGANIZATION PLANS NOS. 7 AND 8 OF 1953, RELATING TO REALIGNMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED ECONOMIC OPERATIONS—UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Reorganization Plans Nos. 7 and 8 of 1953, regarding the realignment of foreign assistance and related economic operations, and the United States Information Agency, which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For text of message from the President, see pp. 5848-5850 of House proceedings of today.)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 7 OF 1953 RELATING TO FOREIGN AID FUNCTIONS AND AGENCIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1953, providing for reorganization of various foreign aid functions and agencies, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For text of message from the President, see pp. 5850-5851 of House proceedings of today.)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 8 OF 1953 RELATING TO FOREIGN INFORMATION FUNCTIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Reorganization Plan No. 8 of 1953, providing for the reorganization of foreign information functions, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For text of message from the President, see pp. 5851-5852 of House proceedings of today.)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 9 OF 1953 RELATING TO COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS IN EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Reorganization Plan No. 9 of 1953, providing reorganizations in the Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For text of message from the President, see pp. 5852-5853 of House proceedings of today.)

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 10 OF 1953 RELATING TO SEPARATE PAYMENT OF AIRLINE SUBSIDIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to Reorganization Plan No. 10 of 1953, providing for the separate payment of airline subsidies, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

(For text of message from the President, see pp. 5853-5854 of House proceedings of today.)

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of

State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I offered an amendment as a substitute for a committee amendment.

In order that the RECORD may be complete, and inasmuch as there are two similar amendments to sections 210 and 304, I now offer for the RECORD two amendments as substitutes for those sections.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendments will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I give notice in writing of intention to move to suspend the rule in relation to the last two amendments which have just been submitted by the distinguished Senator from Kansas; and I ask that this notice be applicable, as indicated therein, to all three of the amendments, first, as to the Department of State, second, as to the Department of Justice; third, as to the Department of Commerce, in the same way that the last amendment applied to those three Departments.

I also ask unanimous consent that the notice of intention to move to suspend the rule, in the form in which it is submitted, be considered in connection with all three amendments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask a question: Where the notice of intention to move to suspend the rule appears in the RECORD, will it show it is applicable to all three of the amendments, and not merely to one of them?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and the title reads as follows—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am speaking of the way the text of the notice will read, not the way the title of the notice will read.

Mr. FERGUSON. I ask unanimous consent that it so show.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It seems to me that should be done.

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

The notice is as follows:

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE

Mr. FERGUSON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4974) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, the following amendments, namely:

On page —, after line 18, insert the following:

"Sec. 14. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Secretary of State may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of State whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

On page 28, after line 15, insert the following:

"Sec. —. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Attorney General may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of

Justice whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

On page 52, after line 19, insert the following:

"SEC. —. Notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, the Secretary of Commerce may, in his absolute discretion, during the current fiscal year, terminate the employment of any officer or employee of the Department of Commerce whose position is excepted from the competitive civil service, whenever he shall deem such termination necessary or advisable in the interests of the United States."

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor. Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. My good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], has been very kind in remaining until I could state my record on the proposal to give the administrative officers absolute discretion to discharge employees at will.

First, Mr. President, I wish to say that on August 3, 1950, I moved to strike from an appropriation bill the very provision which, in principle, we are discussing this afternoon. At that time I made the arguments which in essence I made this afternoon in opposition to the same principle.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the speech I made in the Senate on August 3, 1950.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 96, pt. 9, pp. 11706 and 11709]

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 476, it is proposed to strike out the language in section 1113, beginning in line 5, through line 20.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am satisfied that if the Senate will hear me through on this amendment—and I expect to take less than 5 minutes—the Senate will agree with me that this section should be stricken from the bill.

My first point is that if this language had been proposed by the Senate committee as an amendment to the bill, it would have been subject to a point of order, because clearly it would have been legislation proposed under an appropriation bill. However, the Parliamentarian advises me that because the section was inserted by the House of Representatives, it is not subject to our Senate point of order rule.

My second point is that there is now pending a bill on security risks in Government employment known as the Tydings bill. Those of us who are members of the Armed Services Committee have been working hard on the Tydings bill in trying to iron out some differences in regard to appeal procedure. I say we should handle all measures on this subject of security risks in one bill, because if we proceed on that subject by piecemeal operations, we shall find that there will be considerable differences in procedures between the departments in respect to the handling of security risks.

My next point is that in its present form this section of the bill is highly arbitrary. It does not provide a check or any review or any appeal at all from the decisions of the dismissing officers. Of course, we wish to get the security risks out of Government em-

ployment, but we also wish to see that we are fair to the innocent. We owe it to our sense of fair play and justice to provide some appeals procedure and checks on the discretionary action of dismissing officers. However, on the basis of section 1113 of the bill which my motion seeks to strike, we might just as well repeal the entire civil-service appeal system now.

Mr. President, because I think this matter should be handled in a separate bill; because I think the procedure should be uniform; because section 1113 of the bill is legislation on an appropriation bill, although not subject to our Senate point of order, I say we should strike this section from the bill, and then should proceed to cover the same subject by means of the Tydings bill, which will be before the Senate in a very few days.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Nevada that there is no one in this body who wants to make more certain that subversives will be eliminated from Government than does the junior Senator from Oregon. Under the Tydings bill we are trying, however, to work out a procedure that will protect something which is pretty precious and fundamental in America. That is, that after a man has been dismissed from any of these so-called security-risk departments his case can be reviewed by an appeal officer. I want him to stay dismissed as far as the department that dismissed him is concerned. In other words, I do not want Louis Johnson in Defense, or McGrath in the Department of Justice, or anyone else at the head of any other department to be required to take back a man in whom he does not have confidence during the period of this great crisis with which we are confronted. But, Mr. President, mistakes in judgment can be made. People can and do dismiss loyal and fine employees because they have a grudge against them. Damage can be done and too frequently is done to innocent people. There is one principle in America that we must preserve: It is the principle that the exercise of discretion in determining the guilt of people shall be subject to review.

Let us not get to the point in this land of ours where people can be ruined for life by the exercise of judgment on the part of someone over them as to their guilt, when in fact a review of that decision would show them to be innocent.

The right of review from decisions as to one's guilt is basic to our American conception of fair play and fair trial. It is essential to just treatment. I cannot support the continuation of a procedure under which the Secretary of State can condemn a man as being subversive, if in fact the record will not support the judgment of the Secretary of State. I want his record cleared if he in fact is innocent. I do not want him sent back to the State Department if the Secretary of State does not have confidence in him. I think we should resolve doubts in favor of the public interest in these matters, and I do not think such a man should have a right to go back to the State Department and work. But I do think the judgment of the Secretary of State should be reviewed. That is basic to American justice as I know it, and that is all I am pleading for. I think that a check upon the decision of mere men in our Government as to the loyalty of employees of Government should be subject to review. The purpose of having section 1113 stricken out of this bill is so we can consider this subject in one bill applicable to all the departments. We should discuss the issue in a separate bill and fight it out here on the floor of the Senate in full debate as to the substance of the matter. We should not try to ram this section through here on the basis of House language that would be subject to a point of order if it were Senate language.

That is my position, and I shall stand on it no matter what misinterpretations are made as to the purposes of the junior Senator from Oregon in regard to this matter. The right to review the decisions of men in this country as to the guilt of people is pretty precious to all of us under the spirit and intent of the Bill of Rights.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I dealt then with the so-called Rooney amendment to an appropriation bill. That amendment was identical in principle with the amendment which is before the Senate this afternoon.

In the course of the debate which occurred on August 3, 1950, I said:

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to assure the Senator from Nevada that there is no one in this body who wants to make more certain that subversives will be eliminated from Government than does the junior Senator from Oregon. Under the Tydings bill we are trying, however, to work out a procedure that will protect something which is pretty precious and fundamental in America. That is, that after a man has been dismissed from any of these so-called security-risk departments his case can be reviewed by an appeal officer. I want him to stay dismissed as far as the department that dismissed him is concerned. In other words, I do not want Louis Johnson in Defense, or McGrath in the Department of Justice, or anyone else at the head of any other department to be required to take back a man in whom he does not have confidence during the period of this great crisis with which we are confronted. But, Mr. President, mistakes in judgment can be made. People can and do dismiss loyal and fine employees because they have a grudge against them. Damage can be done and too frequently is done to innocent people. There is one principle in America that we must preserve: It is the principle that the exercise of discretion in determining the guilt of people shall be subject to review.

I proceeded in the same vein to argue the question at some length.

Mr. President, I have not had time to check all my remarks on this subject, and I say quite facetiously and good naturedly that it is a considerable task even for me to check quickly the index of all the arguments I have made in the Senate during the past 8 years. But I state at this time, without fear of successful contradiction, that on at least four different occasions during my tenure in the Senate I have spoken on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the principle which is involved in the amendment now before the Senate, because I believe it is a dangerous principle.

I believe it is in the interest of government by law to see to it that some checks are provided, and absolute discretion is not granted to the Secretary of State or to any other Cabinet officer to dismiss employees at will.

I checked with the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service—I see he has now left the floor—on the argument I made earlier this afternoon. I thought I was correct, but I wished to be certain again as to the procedure.

The fact is that when persons are blanketed into the civil service, they have civil-service ratings. From that time on, insofar as the Civil Service Commission is concerned, they are civil-service employees.

If we do not like the blanketing-in process—and I do not like it, and I think

we should modify it—then let us amend the law which gives such authority.

But because we have granted an authority which in some instances we do not like in application, let us not adopt a principle which establishes or continues the exercise of arbitrary discretion on the part of a Government officer.

I agree with my colleague, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON]—and I said so earlier this afternoon, during my argument—that no person has a right to work for the Government; working for the Government is a privilege. But once a person gets on the Government payroll, he has a right to receive fair treatment, and he should not be subjected to arbitrary discretion which might ruin his life. Certainly he should have the right to make the record in his own case.

Mr. President, my last point is that I believe we heard a strange argument this afternoon, when various Senators were challenged to show that at any time heretofore they had risen in the Senate in objection to the adoption of such a rule. I have frequently heard that argument, and I believe it to be very unsound. In view of the volume of business which goes through the Senate, certainly it is not sound to take the position that a knockout rebuttal is made when Senator X says to Senator Y, "Did you say anything in 1946 or 1947 or 1948 in opposition to this proposal? Why do you object now if you did not object then?"

Of course, the answer to that argument is, "If I did not object then, so what? What do you have to say about the merits of the principle now? I am pointing out now what I think is wrong with the principle; and the fact that I may have missed it before or the fact that I even may have voted for it before because I did not fully appreciate the abuses which might develop under it, is no argument that I should remain silent today."

Mr. President, I hope Senators will always have the right to change their minds on issues, on the basis of the experience they have had since they have served in the Senate.

So I wish to say to my friends on this side of the aisle, and also to my friends on the other side of the aisle, that I do not believe it is sound to argue in favor of this principle on the ground that Senators may have remained silent about it in the past. If we now believe the principle is bad, we should speak against it; and our silence on it before is no reason for our silence on it today or for our acquiescence in it today.

Mr. President, I close by saying we should adopt a principle to govern the discharge of incompetents in the Government service. I encountered the principle involved in the problem of dismissal for incompetence when I was in the academic field, because there we constantly met the old argument of academic freedom. However, when a faculty member in fact was not competent and was not qualified to carry on the duties of his job, I have never known of a case when it was impossible to get rid of him on the basis of the record. He could be given a fair hearing; but if the evidence

was on the side of those who alleged his incompetence, it was possible to build up a case which would justify his dismissal.

I make that statement now regarding the blanketing in of civil-service employees. If there is a case against them, it can be proved by procedure under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and we should not allow the Appropriations Committee to become a super Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

We should fight to protect the jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and we should serve clear notice on the Appropriations Committee that, no matter how many times in the past it has gotten away with riders of this type, the time now has come to halt the Appropriations Committee from proceeding by way of riders on appropriation bills.

I am very glad my good friend, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who remained for at least a portion of my comments, has extended me the courtesy of giving me this opportunity to make the record straight and clear, so far as his comments about my past record are concerned.

I have a record of opposition to the principle embodied in this committee amendment. Even if I did not, even if I had never spoken against it heretofore since I have been a Member of the Senate, I certainly have a right to speak against it today. Once I am satisfied it is an evil principle, certainly I have a right to make my argument and to express by opposition. I do so now, and I say leave it to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, because that is their jurisdiction, and let us not try to do their job for them on an appropriation bill.

THE HARD-MONEY POLICY—DEPRECIATION OF VALUES

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in my judgment, this day, June 1, will go down in the economic history of our country as a very dark day. What happened today not only constitutes evidence of the fallacy of the hard-money policy of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States; it is also a day, Mr. President, the events of which prophesy darker days ahead.

The overall average of Government bonds was reduced in value today between one-half a point and five-eighths of a point, if I read the news tickers correctly. That means that the holders of Government bonds in our country have seen the value of their bonds reduced today in excess of \$1.5 billion. The Associated Press tells us that while that was happening, and in part as a result thereof, on the stock market in our country \$1.8 billion has been wiped off the quoted market value of stocks. The Associated and other press services tell us that at the same time the values of wheat and corn and other farm commodities have suffered an appreciable decline today. I am also advised, Mr. President, that across the length and breadth of the cattle country the value of cattle has suffered another decline today. I would say that over all, the value

of stocks and bonds and agricultural products and livestock has declined today approximately between four and five billion dollars.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I was at a dinner party Friday night, and a good many of the wives who were present were discussing this very problem. They raised the point about which I shall ask the Senator from Oklahoma. They asked, "Why is it that the retail meat prices in the meat shops of America still have not gone down with a decrease comparable to the decrease in the price the farmer receives for his beef on the hoof?"

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the question of the Senator from Oregon is very appropriate. Such a question would have been appropriate for the past several months. As I view the situation, the condition arises by reason of the fact first, that the farmer has no protection with reference to the value of his cattle at the market place. He is subject to the whim and desire of the representatives of the packers of the Nation. They have steadfastly pushed the price of cattle down, knowing that the producer had to sell.

For months past there have been more cattle in the feed pens than at any comparable time in our history. The feed which the feeders have been buying, bolstered as it is by the farm-products-support program, has been costing the feeders a good deal more than the increased weight any given amount of feed would put on the animal being fed. The result has been that each day the feeder kept the animal in the feed pen, and bought feed at the supported price, added to the loss the feeder was taking.

The cattle raisers have held on, Mr. President, in desperation, hoping that the Secretary of Agriculture would use his presently authorized power to come into the marketplace, under the authority he has, to support the price of meat. The Secretary of Agriculture, on March 8, within 30 days after assuming office, made the announcement that he had taken measures which had checked the decline in the price of cattle. Yet, Mr. President, since that time, since 30 days after he took office, the price of cattle has gone down to such an extent that the cattle owners have lost billions upon billions of dollars; and the end is not yet.

But the packers, as they have forced the price down to the producer, have not passed the reduction on to the consumer. The fact is that the packers are today making more money per head on first-class fed cattle than at any comparable time in our history, at the same moment when the producers of cattle are suffering economic losses which, if they are compelled to continue to sustain them, will bring bankruptcy to them by the hundreds of thousands.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Oklahoma is aware of the fact, I am sure, that there is now a growing move on the

part of some, such as packers and those who are in the business of processing cattle or meat, to bring about a lower price-support level under the farm-price-support program. The argument runs like this: That one cannot feed 90 percent price-supported corn into no-price-supported cattle. Therefore, the packers, the processors who have always been against a fair break for the farmer, say, "Reduce the price supports on corn, and then you will be able to meet the low costs of beef." The theory, of course, is, "Now we have got you—" indicating the producer of cattle—"in a position where you are going broke so get the corn farmer broke, too." The argument does not run, "Lift up the beef producer to the level of the corn producer," but "Push the corn producer down to the level of the beef producer."

I have just returned from my State, Mr. President, and I am prepared to testify to the fact that in the State of Minnesota 75 percent of the agricultural income accrues to cattle feeders. There is a tremendous amount of that kind of business. Thousands and thousands of dollars are being lost. I talked to farmers who have as many as 150 or 200 head of cattle, who are going to lose their cattle because they cannot pay their loans. I talked to farmers in the western part of my State who have already lost their farms because they could not pay the loans which were coming due on their cattle, loans they had to make in order to feed the cattle and to purchase food. That is the situation, all the headlines in the press to the contrary notwithstanding. Farmers do not feed cattle under the policies which are coming from the Department of Agriculture in the present administration; and we cannot raise prices by telling farmers that prices should be all right. I submit, Mr. President, that the Secretary of Agriculture in this administration should be thinking in terms not of lowering any price support of the producers of grain, but in terms of raising such prices.

Mr. KERR. I thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and invite attention to the fact that warnings have been issued on this side of the aisle for months that unless positive action is taken by the Secretary of Agriculture, the price of cattle will continue to decline until increasing bankruptcy is forced upon the cattle producers. That cannot continue without spreading to other segments of agriculture and to other segments of the Nation's economy.

Is it possible, Mr. President, that men in high positions want to see that situation become epidemic before they use the powers which they have?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. In a moment I shall be delighted to yield.

The Secretary of the Treasury today saw the 3½-percent bonds, which he so proudly announced but a few weeks ago had been oversubscribed, selling at less than 99 cents on the dollar. He saw them selling at approximately 98¾ or less, by reason of the fact that he has surrendered the prerogative of his office to fix the interest rate on Government

bonds and has abdicated that power to financial interests, that now have him in a squeeze from which they will not release him until they have forced him again to increase the interest rate on Government securities.

I say that unless dynamic, positive, definite action is taken, Mr. President, we shall see the next issue of long-term Government bonds sold on the basis of 3½-percent interest. When that happens, the long-term bonds now outstanding will continue their decline and each day the decline continues, it will mean the loss of additional billions of dollars to American citizens.

I now yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that in view of the nature of his remarks—and I think they are remarks which are long overdue in the Senate of the United States—I can well understand that there are only two Republicans on the Senate floor at this time, the acting majority leader and the Senator who is at the moment presiding over the Senate, because what the Senator from Oklahoma is saying is not very pleasing to Republican ears. But the people of the United States will be interested in what the Senator is saying, and the farmers are much concerned about what he is saying, because they know how true his statement is.

Mr. President, I rose to give a little testimony in support of what the Senator from Minnesota has said and what the Senator from Oklahoma has said.

Last week I bought some cattle, because my little farm in Oregon was showing an abundance of pasture which would soon develop into hay, and I figured that farm prices were so unstable that I did not want to take the chance of waiting to harvest the hay. I thought it better to get the hay into the bellies of some cattle. So I said to the man whom I hired to operate my farm in my absence, "Go on into the open market and buy the skinniest cattle, that can walk, you can find. Let them be healthy, but as skinny cattle as you can find. Buy them and turn them onto the farm and we will harvest our hay crop through the cattle, because we might, by fall, get enough meat on those cattle, even with the expectation of declining prices, to get at least an expense coverage on the hay crop."

That is the attitude of farmers generally. I should like to buy good feeders, but I will not run the risk of buying them. I would rather buy a number of thin cattle.

It is a rather sad state of affairs, Mr. President, that within a few months after the coming in of the Eisenhower administration we find ourselves in such a situation as that.

As I told the Senator from Oklahoma previously, I spend weekends with dirt farmers in Maryland. They will not even take a chance on buying skinny cattle, because they want to see some stability developed in the cattle market before they will run the risk and the gamble of the feed lot.

I think one reason why my Republican friends do not like the tune which the Senator from Oklahoma is playing

this afternoon is that it is not good music to their ears, but it at least is a warning to the farmers that if the Eisenhower farm program continues, the farmers are going to be tobogganed into a serious depression.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, who, I know, is aware of the fact that since the Secretary of Agriculture said the decline had been halted, the price of cattle has tobogganed until there has been a collapse.

Across the length and breadth of America, farmers will suffer, school districts will suffer, State and Federal tax income will suffer.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield at that point?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. A moment ago the Senator gave the price on today's market at which the 3¼ percent bonds were selling. Does the Senator happen to know about the price of the 2½ percent bonds?

Mr. KERR. For the first time in the history of those bonds, since they were issued, they sold today at less than 90 cents on the dollar.

Mr. FREAR. In the Senator's opinion, will that have any serious repercussions on the Federal tax income over the next fiscal year? Will the bankers who own the bonds take the opportunity of selling them at a loss to overcome some of the tax payments they have to make?

Mr. KERR. Very definitely, they will; because, first, they have already suffered an enormous loss in the value of the bonds in their portfolios; second, if they have profits from other phases of their business, they will sell those bonds as an offset against the profit they may have made in other lines of their business, which will mean not only a markdown of what they would have had as profit but also a reduction in what they will owe the Government in taxes.

They will also sell the bonds for a further reason. They know that we are not at the end of the present process, but are in the midst of it. They know that the Secretary of the Treasury has to refinance many billions of dollars of maturing bonds this year. In view of the fact that the 3¼s are now selling below par, he will be compelled to offer a higher rate of interest on the next issue, and that, in turn, will reduce the value of the 2½-percent bonds still further. So in the face of a continuing loss by retaining them, the holders of the bonds naturally are going to sell them. As a matter of course, their profits will be reduced. Naturally, that will decrease the amount of taxes they will be paying to our Government.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. FREAR. Last week the Senate failed to adopt a resolution offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], which would have denied the Secretary of Agriculture the privilege of putting into effect a reorganization plan proposed by the administration. As I understand, that reorganization plan

will go into effect in a very few days. Is that not true?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FREAR. With that reorganization plan in such shape that the Secretary of Agriculture could use it to any extent he might think best, would he not then be in a better position to stop the agricultural catastrophe which seems to confront the farmers of the country? Will the reorganization plan strengthen his hand, or does he already have sufficient power to handle the situation?

Mr. KERR. The answer to the Senator's question is very simple. The Secretary of Agriculture will have far greater powers when the reorganization goes into effect than any other Secretary of Agriculture has ever had, but he already has power, which he has spurned to use, to check the decline of the prices of farm products. He is dedicated to using all the power of his office, not to assist farmers to the greatest possible extent in the matter of the prices of farm products, but to prevent any assistance from the Government to aid the farmers in obtaining better prices for their products.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. FREAR. We realize that heretofore the powers under which the Secretary would have to act were in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the previous administration. The reorganization plan will give additional powers to the present administration. Thereby, the Secretary of Agriculture may see fit to use the reorganization plan to curb an economic collapse. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. KERR. I would agree that the plan gives him additional power which would enable him to do so; but in view of his expressed purpose to refrain from doing so, I would say it would give him power further to diminish the prices of farm products, and to accelerate their decline, rather than to halt it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I wish to yield first to the Senator from Tennessee, who was on his feet earlier; then I shall be delighted to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. GORE. Will the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma agree with some mental calculations I have made, to the effect that the people of the United States, who have bought Government bonds in good faith, lost more money today on their bonds than the amount contained in the entire appropriation bill for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct. As I understand, the amount provided in the bill is \$1,400,000,000. The market value of outstanding Government bonds today declined in an amount in excess of the total to be appropriated by the bill. Likewise, the market value of outstanding Government bonds last week declined in an amount in excess of that sought to be appropriated by this bill.

Mr. GORE. Was not that true the week before, and the week before that?

Mr. KERR. I should say that in the past 6 weeks the decline has been to an extent of from 3 to 4 times the amount appropriated by the bill. But even sadder than that, on the basis of either no policy or the negative policy of the Secretary of the Treasury today, the decline will continue; it has not ended.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Several days ago, in colloquy with the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma, I expressed the opinion that if the United States should continue to let the so-called free money market, which means Wall Street, determine the rate of interest on Government bonds, there was but one direction in which it could or would go, and that was up, up, up. Is not that still the situation?

Mr. KERR. The interest rate would go up, up, up; the value of outstanding bonds would go down, down, down.

Mr. GORE. And the value of the product of the laboring of men's hands and the value of the products of the soil would go down, down, down.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Tennessee is tragically correct.

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

Mr. KERR. I shall yield after I have made a correction. The amount proposed to be appropriated by the pending bill is \$1,104,000,000. So in the past 6 weeks the decline in value of outstanding Government bonds has been from 4 to 6 times the appropriations provided in the bill.

I may say further to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee that within the past 10 days the value of cattle in this country has decreased in excess of twice the amount contained in the bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am certain the Senator from Oklahoma, who is a good student of history, recalls much more vividly than I do the tragic period immediately following World War I. The situation which developed then was tragically similar to the situation which is developing now. The Harding administration adopted the hard-money policy by raising interest rates, and the bond market fell. Then the big financial combines garnered on the market the low-priced bonds they could buy, interest rates went up, and a recession set in, which finally ended in a depression in the early years of the 1930's. Does the Senator recall that?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota is eminently correct. I say to him that the same economic forces which were set in motion then, such as the restriction of credit, the increase in interest rates, and the hardening of money, brought on the cycle which ended in that disastrous depression. Were it not for the many programs put into effect by Democratic administrations in the past 20 years, such as minimum wage, unemployment insurance, social security, and other provisions, without having that foundation of strength un-

der our economic structure, I say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that the economic forces which this administration has already set in motion would just as inevitably lead to another disastrous depression.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has made a point of the fact that the bond market is depressed, so that bondholders have suffered a loss and the banking industry itself today is uncertain as to what its future course will be, because it, too, has suffered a loss.

Mr. KERR. To the extent that it now owns outstanding Government bonds,

Mr. HUMPHREY. To the extent that it now owns outstanding bonds.

The Senator has also made the point that the recent issues of Government bonds are selling below par.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The third point which I am sure the Senator is making is that the Government interest rate is but an indicator of the private interest rate.

Mr. KERR. It is but a fixer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It is a fixer, but with compound interest on top of the fix.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If the Government establishes an interest rate, say, at 3¼ percent, it reflects itself somewhere around 5 percent in private credit.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Therefore is it not a fair question to ask, What is the cost to the borrower, to the man who needs credit for his small business, to the farmer who needs commodity credits to tide him over the years, and to the GI who needs credit to build a home? What would the Senator say would be the annual total in increased interest which those consumers of credit would have to pay?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I do not have in mind the figure as to outstanding credit.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would the Senator permit me to refresh his memory?

Mr. KERR. I would.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is private outstanding indebtedness to the tune of \$330 billion.

Mr. KERR. Then the interest rate increase which has taken place in the past few months by reason of the policy of the Secretary of the Treasury means an increase in cost to those borrowers of between \$5 billion and \$6 billion a year, because private interest rates either increased or are in the process of increasing about 2 percent on the total outstanding indebtedness.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I saw a conservative estimate in the Wall Street Journal some weeks ago, which I shall present to the Senate at the time I address the Senate on this subject, which I intend to do this week. This estimate was to the effect that on the basis of one-half of 1-percent increase in the private credit structure, which would be very

conservative, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows, the additional cost to the user of the credit would be approximately \$1,750 million. Yet this administration talks about economy. Every dollar this Government obtains it obtains from the people; and every dollar the people borrow, they must borrow from other people. So actually when we get down to the facts, if we save \$500 million in a great economy wave in the Senate, and then increase the cost or the wages of money to the private borrower, who is the same taxpayer, by the fiscal policy of this administration we have robbed Peter to pay Paul, or we have robbed Paul to pay Peter.

Mr. KERR. We have rewarded those who have the commodity of money in their possession and penalized those who either now owe money or who must borrow money in the course of home building, business operations, farming, or any other activity in which money must be borrowed.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I recall the day when the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] addressed the Senate on the subject of GI interest rates for veterans' housing. I recall that he brought forth some very pertinent economic data on that subject. The Senator from Oklahoma will recall also that the junior Senator from Minnesota and the senior Senator from Oklahoma were engaged in a television debate with the distinguished Presiding Officer [Mr. BENNETT] and the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. The subject of that debate, or the theme of the opposition, was that the increase in interest rates made the dollar more valuable, made it buy more, stabilized the dollar. The Senator from Oklahoma appropriately terms this the hard-money policy.

The junior Senator from Minnesota tried to give an analogy to show how much more the hard dollar buys. Of course, he went back to what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] said in his splendid address to the Senate on this subject.

I recall that the Senator from Alabama pointed out that a GI who needed to borrow money to build a three-bedroom house, under the increased interest rate, with the hard dollar, the stabilized dollar, the solvent dollar, the new GOP dollar, instead of obtaining a three-bedroom house for the amount of money he borrowed, would obtain only a two-bedroom house. That is how much more the hard dollar would buy.

Let us assume the GI needed \$15,000 to build a three-bedroom house under the old interest rate. He would use the same \$15,000, and, with the new, revitalized purchasing dollar he would provide himself with two bedrooms. That is an indication of how much more the hard dollar would buy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma allow me to make an observation at this point?

Mr. KERR. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the GI could obtain the same house by paying

the same amount monthly for 5 years longer.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Certainly. If he can live long enough to make the grade he will be able to have a three-bedroom house; but by that time he will not need three bedrooms.

Mr. KERR. Unless he is housing his grandchildren.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

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

Mr. KERR. Just one word, and then I shall be delighted to yield.

The remarks of my distinguished friends from Minnesota and Alabama were addressed to the situation which had arisen by reason of the increase in the interest rate to the GI to 4½ percent. I say to them that under the policy now being pursued by the Secretary of the Treasury, they might just as well prepare themselves for another increase in the interest rate on GI homes, because it is as inevitable as the continuation of this policy by the Secretary of the Treasury.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In that connection I should like to remind the distinguished Senator that I was speaking the day after the increase went into effect. I made the statement on the floor that I doubted that the increase in the interest rate of one-half of 1 percent would have any effect whatsoever, because the action in connection with the issuance of the three-and-a-quarter-percent bonds had already pushed the interest rates up to such an extent that the private mortgage market would not be stimulated. Is not that exactly the result which occurred?

Mr. KERR. Exactly. The Senator could not have been more prophetic had he been divinely inspired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma 2 or 3 questions.

Mr. KERR. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I remind the Senator that he promised earlier to yield to me. I have waited rather patiently.

Mr. KERR. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the meantime I have accumulated several more questions.

Mr. KERR. There is no Member of the Senate better informed, more alert, or more able than is the Senator from Alabama, either in questioning or in speaking with reference to this issue. I welcome his questions.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate that statement.

Let me say that I live among and represent people who are being hurt by this policy. I do not refer to it so much as the hard-money policy. I refer to it as the hard-credit policy.

Those people must have credit in order to live. They must have credit to operate their businesses. They must have credit in order to make their crops. I know the difficulty that they are having in obtaining credit. I know what the situation is doing to them.

A while ago the Senator from Oklahoma referred to the subject of further financing of the debt. By the way, the

other day I read in the New York Times, as I recall, a statement to the effect that over a period of the next 12 months \$41 billion in public debt must be refinanced. There was a little want ad in the finance column, which read, "Wanted, \$41 billion." We must refinance between \$6 billion and \$8 billion of that amount within a very short time.

The Senator from Oklahoma referred to the rate of interest we would have to pay. I remind the Senator that in connection with the present issue of 1-year notes the interest rate was increased to 2½ percent. I believe that rate replaced a rate of 2 percent. Some of those notes run for as long as 10 years. That shows what happens. The rate is going up and up and up; and the cost to the people has been alluded to by the Senator from Oklahoma. Does not that process take money away from the people to the same extent that an appropriation or the levying of a tax would take it away?

Yet the present administration boasts of the fact that it is cutting appropriations, and it holds out hope, forlorn as it may be, that it will be able to cut taxes. Is the administration not taking it away from the people in another way by this policy and this program?

Mr. KERR. Very definitely so, and it is fixing things so that the ability of the people to pay taxes is being pared down and whittled down and deteriorated, and eventually will be destroyed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma referred a few minutes ago to the depression of the early thirties. I should like to enter a little protest. I know that among the farmers with whom I have lived the depression started long before that. As a matter of fact, it started when the hard-credit policy went into effect.

Mr. KERR. In the twenties.

Mr. SPARKMAN. In the early twenties. That is when the depression started. As in every depression, it was the depressing influence upon the farmers which started us down the toboggan ride that finally hit the people who were profiting when the farmer was suffering, just as is true today.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, may I ask one more question of the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. KERR. I yield further to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I heard a statement made on the television program to which the Senator from Minnesota referred a few minutes ago. I did not see the whole program, but I did see a part of the TV program to which the Senator referred. I heard the statement made that the present policy was being pursued in the interest of those who are saving. Does the Senator from Oklahoma know what I thought when I heard that statement? I thought, What about the people who have been saving up to now? What about the people who now must sell for less than 90 cents on the dollar bonds which they bought for 100 cents on the dollar? That is the situation in the case the Senator from Oklahoma has mentioned. Are they not being hit?

Mr. KERR. Very definitely so.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Are they not the sufferers?

Mr. KERR. They constitute the great bulk of the savers and those who own the great bulk of the outstanding bonds.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not on those bonds that the life insurance companies of America depend today, and on which their business is based. As a matter of fact, in the portfolio of every small bank throughout the country are not those bonds serving as the reserve for their liquid assets?

Mr. KERR. Very definitely. They have been looked upon as an asset which guaranteed the solvency and the liquidity of the average bank. Therefore, whether we call it hard credit or hard money, it adds up to hard times, and its effect will react into every community and every home in the Nation.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. GORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. KERR. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee. Then I shall yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GORE. The demand debt this year—the Government bonds on which the holders have a right to demand redemption—amounts to approximately \$60 billion. That is an astounding figure, as I overheard someone say. Certainly it is an astounding figure. It very much more astounding when we realize that the value of the dollar, the value of the Government bond, and the value of our entire monetary structure depend upon the confidence of the people. Shake their confidence, and the tabernacle of this Government will quiver. How much lower below par must Government bonds fall before that confidence is shaken?

I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma that it is a sad hour. Far from desiring to make partisan capital of it, the junior Senator from Tennessee raises his voice once more in a plea to the administration to stop, look, and think before the confidence of the American people in the integrity of their money and in the integrity of their bonds and in the integrity of their Government is shaken.

Mr. KERR. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and I add that the people's confidence is already shaken. What gives me such concern is whether this administration will act before their confidence is shattered.

The United States Government owes \$260 billion. Yet those in charge of our fiscal policy are doing everything in their power to destroy the confidence of the holders of Government bonds in the value of the bonds. Those responsible for the fiscal policy of the Government are doing everything in their power to increase the cost of the annual interest on those bonds. Further than that, Mr. President, they are doing everything within their power to make it harder, and harder, and harder to get the money with which to pay off that indebtedness, which means that every time the value of the dollar is increased—since we are the world's greatest debtor—the national debt is increasing.

I say, if they were deliberately seeking to betray the trust which the people have

reposed in their hands, they could not do it more effectively.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I make my comment I rise to correct one figure which the Senator from Oklahoma used. I know he was speaking in general terms, but the national debt is not \$260 billion, but \$267 billion plus. That additional \$7 billion is quite a sum of money.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. What I heard the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] say about Republican representations on one television program yesterday causes me to comment on Republican representations made on another program.

That great Republican master of glittering generalities and political hokum and political opportunism, the Director of Mutual Security, Mr. Stassen, was engaged in one of his say-nothing programs yesterday. In the course of that effusion of the wind of a vacuum he had the nerve—when he finally got down to one alleged statement of fact—to tell the American people that under the Eisenhower administration profits were at the highest level and employment was at the highest level in the history of our country. He happens to be wrong.

There is in America a rising graph of unemployment. He had better go to Minnesota and talk to the farmers about profits. What he means is the profits of big business are at the highest level in our history. The little people are already beginning to feel the pinch of the coming Eisenhower depression. Not one word from the big Minnesota wind about that.

I think the time has come—and I intend to be tough about it—if the leaders of this administration seek to give the people the misinformation that characterized the Stassen broadcast yesterday, that their hands should be called, because we must get the facts to the American people and let them understand that if they play along with the group now in control they will have a repetition of what occurred in the twenties.

Mr. KERR. The distinguished Senator from Oregon is utterly right. I say to him—and it is inherent in the remarks he has made—that the people at the crossroads are already aware of it. They are getting the facts the hard way. They are learning them the tragic way. I say that the person who should acquaint himself with the facts is the man, in whatever position he may occupy in the administration, who is acting on the basis that these policies are being helpful to and are accepted gladly by the people, because the shock will come, not when the people learn more about the administration—for the people have already learned about it—but when the administration learns how the people feel.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Several days ago one of my good friends on the other side of the aisle said to me that everything was all right with the 3¼ percent bond

issue; that it showed a slight dip, but had leveled off at about where it should be. At that time it was three thirty-seconds below par.

Did I correctly understand the Senator from Oklahoma to say it went below 99 today?

Mr. KERR. Yes; I believe it was about 98²²/₃₂ today. I think that is correct.

Mr. GORE. Twenty thirty-seconds.

Mr. KERR. Yes; 98²²/₃₂.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That sounds like an auction, except it is going down, instead of up.

Does the Senator from Oklahoma see any sign that it has yet leveled off?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the end mark of the uninformed in government is the statement that everything is all right and that the decline is halted. That is what the Secretary of Agriculture said in his statement which was released on March 8, namely, that the decline in the price of cattle had been halted within 30 days after he took office.

Mr. SPARKMAN. He took full credit for it, did he not?

Mr. KERR. He did. He said the measures he had put into effect had brought it about. Furthermore, there was this tragic and terrible note: He said that the American farmers could look forward to the solution of all their problems in the same effective way that he had solved the problem of the decline of the price of cattle.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was that similar to his undue-disaster statement?

Mr. KERR. It was in line with his philosophy that the Government should have no farm program except to insure farmers against undue disaster.

I wish to say to him that disaster has already overtaken the farmers.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Was it due or "undue"? The farmers do not make that distinction, do they?

Mr. KERR. When unconsciousness sets in, darkness adds nothing to it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield for another question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The question is suggested by the reference the Senator made to a statement the Secretary of Agriculture made, to the effect that everything is all right and that prosperity for the farmer is just around the corner.

Mr. KERR. He said it was already here.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I recall he also said the farmer could look with hope—in fact, that it would be a reality, and that he would see it—to a vigorous export market for his crops.

Yet just a day or two ago I read a statement in which the Secretary of Agriculture showed the terrible decline in exports. The exports of cotton are only 50 percent of what they were last year, and they are going down and down and down.

If it were not for the 90-percent price-support program which is helping our cotton farmers, the price of cotton would be on the toboggan slide, just as it was preceding the great depression.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. Not only the price of cotton, but the price of wheat, the price of corn, the price of peanuts, the price of rice, and the price of tobacco are declining.

I say further to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Alabama, that the American farmer should be alerted to the statement of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who the other day said that fixed-price supports have to go. I wonder where he thinks they will have to go, and where he thinks that will take him and his party, when they do go.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course, the worst question is where the farmers will go when the fixed price-support program is abandoned.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma permit me to ask a simple question, for information? I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Alabama, if the Senator from Oklahoma will consent to my doing so.

Mr. KERR. If unanimous consent is given for that purpose, I shall be delighted to yield.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. In view of the comment on cotton of the Senator from Alabama, can he tell me whether it is true that a great deal of cotton is raised in Texas?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Texas raises a great deal of cotton; yes.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. KERR. Let me say to the distinguished Senator from Oregon that Oklahoma raises some cotton and Oklahoma raises a great deal of wheat. For its size and population, Oklahoma is in the very front rank of the producers of cattle.

Mr. MORSE. The purpose of my question was merely to call that fact to the attention of the Republican Democrats in Texas.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that Texas is the greatest cotton-producing State in the Union.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma recall that in the past week the Secretary of Agriculture admonished the Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, for having gone above his budget estimates on such matters as soil conservation funds and funds for the rural electrification program—the latter being loan funds, not appropriations? Does the Senator from Oklahoma recall that?

Mr. KERR. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma also recall that the Secretary of Agriculture—who, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows, is a very important part of the present administration—is often referred to as one of the strong men in the administration?

Mr. KERR. Yes; he is often referred to as probably the most detrimental man in the administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma agree with me that it is rather peculiar to see the sharp and immediate concern of one of the spokesmen for the Eisenhower administration over the appropriation of reasonable funds for soil conservation and the REA and agricultural research, and yet not to hear one voice in the present administration raised in opposition to the bankers' program of increased interest rates? Is not that rather shocking and strange?

Mr. KERR. It is shocking, indeed, especially in view of these two facts: First, the last utterance I know of by the Secretary of Agriculture in reference to the price of cotton was that the price had not yet declined anywhere near far enough to warrant the taking of emergency action; and second, the continued policy by the Secretary of the Treasury which will result in still further increases in interest rates or still higher interest rates.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that during the campaign and also in recent weeks the administration has said it believed in the REA program?

Mr. KERR. I am aware of that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is not the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that the Secretary of Agriculture testified before the Committee on Government Operations, of which I am a member, that he had no intention in any way of limiting the activities of the REA?

Mr. KERR. I recall that testimony.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma know that the function of the REA is essentially or technically that of help to rural electrification cooperatives and loans to rural electrification cooperatives, or, in short, help and loans to farm people who want electricity? Is not that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The REA borrows money from the Government, does it not?

Mr. KERR. Yes; the national REA borrows its money from the Government. It is not provided funds by congressional appropriations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The present interest rate for the REA is 2 percent on a 35-year loan, is it not?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator from Oklahoma think this administration has any intention whatsoever of giving the farmers of the United States a 2 percent loan on REA funds, when they already have a 30-year loan at 3¼ percent and when there is in the House of Representatives a bill calling for 4 percent REA loans?

Mr. KERR. In answer, I must say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that if the administration had such an intent, it is born of ignorance and will be due to suffer the fate of a still-born project, because by the action of the administration in increasing the interest rate on the money it borrows, the administration set in action an inevitable force which will compel an increase

in the interest rate charged to the local rural electrification cooperatives on the money they have to borrow from the Government.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does it not seem to the Senator from Oklahoma that an administration which scolds Congress for providing even limited funds for soil conservation, agricultural research, the Forest Service, and other vital programs of the Department of Agriculture, and which on the other hand offers a bonanza or gift by way of an increase in interest rates unprecedented in 20 years, is an administration that is not dedicated to the well being of those in America who produce the real wealth, namely, the food, fiber, and work, but is an administration that is interested primarily in the fiscal management and the financial lords of the nation? Is not that a fair statement?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it is but an act consistent with the long record of the Republican Party in putting a premium on the dollar. They have always done it. They promised the people last year that, if returned to power, they would do it again; and I have never seen an administration more diligent in the keeping of a campaign pledge than they have been in their efforts, successful efforts, to increase the value of the dollar, with a proportionate decrease in the value of labor and the value of farm products.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator know the officials in the Treasury Department who are responsible for debt management? Is he aware who those officials may be, other than the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. KERR. My concept is that the Secretary of the Treasury has the direct responsibility. Of course, he has a staff and various assistants who carry out the elements involved in that responsibility.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, would the Senator be interested in knowing that the President has made a special appointment of a special assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, with the express responsibility for debt management—one individual? Does the Senator know that that gentleman is a very able man of fine character, a good citizen, Mr. Randolph Burgess?

Mr. KERR. I am aware of his appointment to the position, and of some of the things he has done in connection with increasing the interest rate on Government bonds and reducing the value of outstanding Government bonds.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may preface my next question by saying that my interrogation concerning Mr. Burgess, is no reflection at all upon his integrity, his ability, his experience, or his character. I know him to be a man of fine character, and, therefore, my questions are only in terms of the knowledge of his policies. Does the Senator from Oklahoma recall that he, as a Senator from Oklahoma, or the junior Senator from Minnesota, or the minority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], or the junior

Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] or the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], or the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] was consulted about the appointment of Mr. Burgess? Did any of us ever have a chance to confirm this appointment? Did the appointment come to this body?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is aware, of course, that it did not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yet is not the office of debt management one of the most important fiscal-policy positions in the Government of the United States?

Mr. KERR. It is important to every citizen.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it not strange that, all at once, when we have a great public debt of \$267 billion, some \$40 billion of which is to be refinanced this year, the decisions in terms of debt-management policy, and of fiscal policy concerning Government bonds, are being made by one who, regardless of his fine ability and his excellent character, has never even been approved by a committee of the Congress, or interrogated by a committee of the Congress, or, much less, confirmed by the Senate? Is not that rather unusual?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, it is unfortunate. Of course, the Senator from Oklahoma takes the position that this official acts merely as an assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, who has the responsibility; and who, I must say to my distinguished friend from Minnesota, served notice on the world that one of the things he aimed to do was to increase the value of the dollar.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator does not mean the distinguished Senator from Minnesota served that notice.

Mr. KERR. No, no; I am informing the Senator from Minnesota that the Secretary of the Treasury gave notice to that effect.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say that when I used the word "distinguished" I was only repeating what the Senator from Oklahoma said—and it was an unwarranted compliment. I was only repeating.

Was the Senator aware of the fact that the manager of the public debt in this country was formerly associated with the National City Bank of New York.

Mr. KERR. I believe that is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is a wonderful banking institution. Again, I may say—and my statement is in no way an innuendo, it is in no way an insinuation, or in any way an effort to derogate the abilities or the capacity of the individual—that it seems to me it is rather important to find out what the attitudes of some of the men in high position may be. Does the Senator recall when we had Mr. Wilson, now Secretary of Defense, before the Armed Services Committee? The Senator recalls that, evidently.

Mr. KERR. I understand, from having read it at the time, that he made the statement, quite frankly, that in his opinion what was good for General Motors was good for the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator also recalls, does he not, that by the time

we got through with his interrogation, the law of the land was complied with, namely, that he had to divest himself of whatever interests he might have in General Motors? Is that not true?

Mr. KERR. There were certain interests of which he had to divest himself in order to be eligible to the position to which he had been appointed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I only make this statement in the form of an interrogation. Is it not worthy of note that similar standards were not applied in connection with some of the fiscal-policy positions in the Government?

Mr. KERR. I may say to my friend from Minnesota that in his campaign last fall the President himself made an issue of the fact that the value of the dollar must be increased, must be stabilized. The man whom he selected to be Secretary of the Treasury was acknowledged to be one well qualified to carry out that policy. The gentleman referred to by the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. Burgess, had not only had experience in the handling of fiscal matters which enabled him to help formulate policies designed to secure the objectives which were desired; but he had also been in an environment that resulted in his having a desire to increase the value of money and, proportionately, to reduce the value of labor and farm products.

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

Mr. KERR. I do.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to make it clear to the Senate that I have high regard for Mr. Burgess as an economist, and as a fine citizen.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Minnesota knows very well that Mr. Burgess is perfectly aware of what he is doing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. All the Senator from Minnesota wishes to point out is that, looking at the money market from the point of view of the National City Bank of New York, the Chase National Bank of New York, the Continental Bank of Chicago, or the Bank of America, of California, is vastly different from looking at it from the point of view of the small-business man who needs a loan in order to continue in business, or a farmer who needs a crop loan in order to harvest his crop, or a GI who needs a house in which to place his family.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently and profoundly correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I can only pick up the help I am receiving from the sidelines, to say that what may be good for the Chase National Bank, or even the National City Bank, is not necessarily good for the folks back home, or for the Nation.

Mr. KERR. Not necessarily.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Would it not be a matter of reasonable hope and, I would say, of reasonable concern for the country, that when credit policies and fiscal policies are to be established, both sides of the credit line be considered, namely, the creditor and the debtor, the borrower and the lender? I respectfully say that in the present instance the Secretary of the Treasury has consulted primarily

the lenders, not the borrowers. That is exactly what is happening in terms of interest rates.

Mr. KERR. Very definitely so; and I say to the Senator from Minnesota, if the Secretary of the Treasury were to try to do that which would result now in giving a direct bonus to the holders of bonds, and to those hereafter purchasing them, he would be guilty of an act which would expose him to impeachment. But he is doing by policy that which he could not do by direct action, that is, increasing the amount of the indebtedness by making the value of the dollar which is owed greater, and thereby making it harder for the Government to obtain it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator familiar with the fact that the Secretary of the Treasury, when appearing before the Finance Committee, explained to the committee that he held no Government bonds and that it would be very inappropriate for him to hold Government bonds because of the enormous influence which the Secretary of the Treasury could have on what happens to Government bonds?

Mr. KERR. I remember that quite well, and as we go further, I think the statement will have more and more significance and will enable us better to understand why the Secretary of the Treasury has no desire to own any Government bonds.

Mr. President, I say, again, that this day will go down in history as having demonstrated what the policy of the Secretary of the Treasury has already done to the economy of the Nation, and it will be a day of prophecy, pointing to still further tragic events, unless the devastating policy of the Secretary of the Treasury is changed.

FINANCIAL POLICY OF EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION — BROADCAST BY FRANK EDWARDS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Frank Edwards is one of the radio broadcasters who speaks courageously and fearlessly to the American people. He states the facts in regard to the many issues which he discusses each night in his broadcasts.

I commend him for the great job of public education which he is doing these days in American radio, when I am so well aware of the fact that it is not easy for a radio commentator to stand up against the pressures which are brought to bear and when it is well known that it is not uncommon for reactionary interests to make clear to radio stations and to sponsors that if they have to listen to ideas they do not like to hear it will have a very definite effect on their support, by advertising and other ways, of a radio station which puts on the air such fearless broadcasters.

On May 19, Frank Edwards had something to say about the problem of turning the Government over to financial operators, and I ask unanimous consent to have an excerpt from that broadcast

made a part of my remarks and printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

When the American people went to the polls last fall, it seems unlikely that very many of them voted to turn this Government over to the financial operators on the Federal Reserve Board. Recently, in a hearing before the House Banking Committee, Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas required Federal Reserve Board Chairman William Martin to furnish the committee with the banking connections of some key Government figures. That reveals that R. B. Anderson, Secretary of the Navy, was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas at the time of his appointment; Budget Director Joseph Dodge was in the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago; Under Secretary of the Treasury Folsom was with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Dr. John Hannah, Assistant Secretary of Defense, was with the Federal Reserve Bank of Detroit; Comptroller of the Currency Ray Gidney was president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland; W. I. Myers, now Chairman of the National Agricultural Advisory Committee was with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; Secretary of the Navy Robert Stevens came from the Federal Reserve Bank of New York; as did Philip Young, Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. And Mr. Randolph Burgess, the architect of the interest rate hikes now being instituted, was a director of the Federal Reserve Bank in New York at the time he came to Washington.

The American people are becoming aware of the real meaning of the financial maneuvers that are going on; the mail to the Senators and Congressmen shows that clearly enough. With the key Government positions being held by bankers, it should surprise no one to see them following a policy that will pour billions of dollars a year into the pockets of other bankers. In brief: This has become a Government of the bankers, by the bankers, and for the bankers.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATURAL GAS ACT—RESOLUTION SUBMITTED BY PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSIONER OF OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution relating to House bills 3769 and 3892, which resolution was sent to me by the public-utilities commissioner of Oregon.

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

Whereas H. R. 3769 and H. R. 3892 (introduced by Congressman HINSHAW, of California, and Congressman HARRIS, of Arkansas, respectively) are now pending in the 83d Congress, first session; and

Whereas such bills would amend the Natural Gas Act by creating a new subsection (c) to section 1 thereof, as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this act shall not apply to any person engaged in or legally authorized to engage in the transportation in interstate commerce, or to the sale in interstate commerce for resale, of natural gas received by such person within or at the boundary of a State and ultimately consumed within such State, or to any facilities used by such person for such transportation or sale, provided such person and operation be subject to regulation by a State commission or other legally constituted local public authority. The matters exempted from the provisions of this act by this subsection are hereby declared to be matters primarily of

local concern and subject to regulation by the several States"; and

Whereas the enactment of such legislation would benefit State jurisdiction and would not materially affect Federal jurisdiction; and

Whereas the several States are able to regulate the matters and things contained in said proposed legislation and the adoption of said proposal appears to be in the public interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the public utilities commissioner of the State of Oregon urges that Congress of the United States to enact said proposed legislation into law.

Signed this 20th day of May 1953.

CHARLES H. HELTUL,
Public Utilities Commissioner of Oregon.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further business to come before the Senate, without objection, and under the order previously entered, the Senate will stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

Thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 2, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 1 (legislative day of May 28), 1953:

UNITED NATIONS

Mason Sears, of Massachusetts, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations.

NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL

John C. Hughes, of New York, to be the United States permanent representative on the North Atlantic Council, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Raymond Henry Fogler, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 1 (legislative day of May 28), 1953:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Joseph E. Talbot, of Connecticut, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1959. (Reappointment.)

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Darrell O. Holmes to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Carl F. White to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 27, with headquarters at Los Angeles, Calif.

Charles F. Brown, Jr., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 42, with headquarters at Louisville, Ky.

Cleta M. Smith to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.

Chester R. MacPhee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 28, with headquarters at San Francisco, Calif.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ARENDS.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast called us to serve our generation in these days of crisis and darkness grant that we may be men and women of spiritual vision, of strong moral character, and of clear-seeing practical wisdom.

We pray that we may eagerly embrace every opportunity we have of assisting mankind find in life its majestic meanings, its lofty purposes, and its enduring satisfactions.

Show us how we may minister more helpfully to all the people of the earth as they look wistfully for a light to illumine the skyline of their hopes and aspirations.

May we be guided by Thy divine spirit in achieving the cooperation of men and nations everywhere in the great task of building a better world.

Grant that no divergency of material interests may break that unity of spirit that we so sorely need as we strive for those blessings of peace and prosperity which none can ever find and enjoy alone.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 28, 1953, was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hawks, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On May 21, 1953:

H. R. 2277. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Roosevelt Memorial Association," approved May 31, 1920, so as to change the name of such association to "Theodore Roosevelt Association," and for other purposes; and

H. R. 4465. An act to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended.

On May 22, 1953:

H. R. 4198. An act to confirm and establish the titles of the States to lands beneath navigable waters within State boundaries and to the natural resources within such lands and waters, to provide for the use and control of said lands and resources, and to confirm the jurisdiction and control of the United States over the natural resources of the seabed of the Continental Shelf seaward of State boundaries.

On May 27, 1953:

H. R. 2420. An act for the relief of Ruth D. Crunk; and

H. R. 3389. An act for the relief of Pio Valensin.

On May 29, 1953:

H. R. 782. An act for the relief of Kurt J. Hain and Arthur Karge;

H. R. 1563. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 2 (a), as amended, to provide that the amount of certain unnegotiated checks shall be paid as accrued benefits upon