us," the bishop added. "Many people came to see us secretly and shook our hands warmly in the absolute privacy of hotel elevators."

Bishop Dezsery described the plight of the United States in the words of one of his American friends, a Protestant minister who now lives and works in Geneva, Switzerland. Dezsery quoted the anonymous clergyman thus:

"The country before your eyes is no more that of Lincoln, but that of McCarthy. America is dominated by a hysteria of fear. No European country would live in such fear. The country is a total political and diplomatic failure. Nobody knows what to do.

"The American people normally are very dynamic, but now they are in a state of wavering and great perplexity. President Eisenhower was elected on a program of peace and social progress. This has proved to be an empty illusion.

"Believe me, the American people have lost their faith in everybody; they are only anxious for their future. While reading a newspaper, the average American can do nothing but turn the chewing gum in his mouth."

The number of automobiles astonished Bishop Dezsery, but he had an explanation for the phenomenon. "Americans sweat all their lives to pay for their cars and the mortgages on their homes," he said.

He also explained the use of parking meters: "Cops are paid by corporations owning parking meters for fining those who refuse to pay for their parking."

This instance of collaborationist clergymen preaching Red propaganda is not unique since the death of Stalin, and it coincides with the frequent mention of religious topics on Red broadcasts, with the astonishing authorization to celebrate Christmas and with rumors of the liberation of Cardinal Mindszenty. Stalin's heirs seem to be following the almost forgotten pattern of the czars, who based their despotism on a close alliance between sword and aspergillum (a brush used to sprinkle holy water).

SENATE

Tuesday, January 18, 1955

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

Eternal Spirit, far above us and yet deep within us, in communion with Thee we find peace for our spirits and power for our tasks. In a desperate day of disappointment, disillusionment, and despair, of disruption and confusion, we bow in gratitude for the mercies beyond our deserving which hallow our lot—the sacrament of friendship, the opportunities for service, the joys and privileges of a free life.

We crave Thy wisdom in all the affairs that face us, lest we and all the peoples of the earth drift to disaster. Thou knowest that we supremely care for our schools and our homes, our churches and our communities. We lift up our intercession for the Nation and pray for a day of international neighborhood. O God, put courage into our hearts, understanding into our minds, strength into our arms. Give us a long look and a deep faith in the kingdom of God that shall yet come on the earth. And send us forth, we beseech Thee, with the baptism of Thy spirit, so to live and work that we shall help to leave behind us a fairer world in which Thou canst rear Thy human family. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Johnson of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, January 14, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to authority granted by section 8002 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House had elected Hon. Wilbur D. Mills, of Arkansas, to be a member of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 4) to provide for the continuation in office of certain members of the Commission on Governmental Operations.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2369) to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of January 14, 1955,

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported on January 17, 1955, the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 6) thereon.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate Resolution 58, adopted on February 20, 1950, in part provides that—

> There is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business and to consist of 13 Senators to be appointed by the President of the Senate as soon as practicable after the date of adoption of this resolution and at the commencement of each Congress.

On January 14, 1955, the President pro tempore, acting on behalf of the Vice President, appointed the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] to fill two of the existing vacancies on the committee. The full membership was not named.

On January 29, 1951, at the beginning of the 82d Congress, and again on February 6, 1953, at the beginning of the 83d Congress, the Vice President appointed the full membership.

The Chair today announces the reappointment of the other 10 members of the committee for the 84th Congress.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations may sit while the Senate is in session today. It is not likely that the meeting will take more than an hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 16)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, relating to the budget for the year 1956, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

(For message of the President, see House proceedings of January 17, 1954, pp. 386–411, Congressional Record.)

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment following today's session the President of the Senate and the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses, and found to be truly enrolled.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine business, and I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes, in accordance with the usual practice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENFORCEMENT OF THE RULE OF COMITY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have a brief announcement I should like to make. Yesterday in the House of Representatives the beloved and respected Speaker, Mr. Rayburn, made an announcement of interest, and I think of tremendous importance, to this body. The Speaker advised that it would be his practice during this Congress to enforce strictly the rule of comity between the Houses when Members of that body arose to make derogatory remarks about either the Senate or any Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I should like at this time to announce that, as majority leader, I, too, will follow the long-standing precedents of this body during the coming Congress in the enforcement of this rule of comity. Good relations between

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the House and the Senate and its Members are of the utmost importance in these critical times. I think it is equally important that the standards of Senate rule XIX which apply in the Senate should, under the precedents of comity between the Houses, be vigorously applied if the occasion arises.

It will be my intention to see that that rule is followed in the Senate while I am sitting in this chair as majority leader.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to associate myself with the distinguished majority leader in his remarks. I think the orderly processes of the 2 Houses will be better served if the precedents of comity as between the 2 Houses are followed, and I am sure the public business will be expedited if the Senate observes those precedents and adheres to the rule.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I am delighted to have the minority leader associate himself with the statement I have made. It is quite in keeping with the course of conduct he has always followed.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS (S. DOC. No. 6)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation in the sum of $160,000 for the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, for the year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ADMINISTRATION OF RYUKYU ISLANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the administration of the Ryukyu Islands, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEDICAL CARE FOR DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide medical care for dependents of members of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROVISIONS OF INCENTIVES FOR MEMBERS OF UNIFORMED SERVICES BY INCREASING CERTAIN PAY AND ALLOWANCES

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH FACILITIES

A letter from the executive secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities and the acquisition of land by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics necessary to the effective prosecution of aeronautical research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD OF AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR HOSPITAL CENTER IN THE DISTRICT

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the period of authorization of appropriations for the hospital center and facilities in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COUNCIL ON LAW ENFORCEMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the chairman, Council on Law Enforcement in the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that council for the period February 1 to December 31, 1954 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPEAL OF SERVICE CHARGE FOR AUTHENTICATING DEPARTMENT OF STATE RECORDS

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal a service charge of 10 cents per sheet of 100 words, for making out and authenticating copies of records in the Department of State (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED AWARDS OF CERTAIN CONCESSION CONTRACTS

Two letters from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, awards of proposed concession contracts in Olympic National Park and Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN INDIAN AREAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the provisions of law added to the United States Code by the act of August 15, 1953 (Public Law 280, 83d Cong. 67 Stat. 588) (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

DISPOSAL OF CERTAIN PROPERTY IN BOULDER CITY AREA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPOINTMENT OF MAJ. GEN. FRANK H. PARTRIDGE, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, TO CIVILIAN POSITION IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Maj. Gen. Frank H. Partridge, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

APPOINTMENT OF BRIG. GEN. EDWIN B. HOWARD, UNITED STATES ARMY, RETIRED, TO CIVILIAN POSITION IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the appointment in a civilian position in the Department of Justice of Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Howard, United States Army, retired, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASED PENALTIES FOR SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RODOLFO C. DELGADO, JESUS M. LAGUA, AND VINCENTE D. REYNANTE

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief fo Rodolfo C. Delgado, Jesus M. Lagua, and Vincente D. Reynante (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING THE STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Concurrent Resolution 2—Proposed amendments to constitution of State of Mississippi

"A concurrent resolution submitting an amendment to article 8 of the constitution of the State of Mississippi so as to add an additional section thereto, to be numbered 'section 213-B,' authorizing the legislature by two-thirds vote of those present and voting in each house to abolish public schools and authorize the counties and school districts to abolish public schools, sell and dispose of school buildings, lands, and other property, and make appropriation of public funds, and do such other acts and things deemed necessary to aid and assist educable children of this State to secure an education

"Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That there be and is hereby submitted to the qualified electors of the State of Mississippi for their approval or re-

jection, in an election to be held in accordance with section 273 of the constitution of this State, on Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1954, the following amendment to article 8 of the constitution of the State of Mississippi, to be numbered and inserted therein and added thereto as 'section 213-B' thereof, to wit:

"'SEC. 213-B. (a) Regardless of any provision of article 3, or any other provisions of this constitution to the contrary, the legislature may authorize the establishment, support, maitnenance, and operation of public schools.

"'(b) Regardless of any provision of article 8, or any other provisions of this constitution to the contrary, the legislature shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered, by a two-thirds vote of those present and voting in each house, to abolish the public schools in this State and enact suitable legislation to effect the same.

"'(c) Regardless of any provision of article 8, or any other provisions of this constitution to the contrary, the legislature shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered, by a majority vote of those present and voting in each House, to authorize the counties and school districts to abolish their public schools and enact suitable legislation to effect the same.

"'(d) In the event the legislature shall abolish, or authorize the abolition of the public schools in this State, then the legislature shall be and is hereby authorized and empowered to enact suitable legislation to dispose of school buildings, land, and other school property by lease, sale, or otherwise.

"'(e) The legislature may appropriate State funds and authorize counties, municipalities, and other governmental subdivisions and districts to appropriate funds, including poll tax and sixteenth section funds, to aid educable children of this State to secure an education.

"'(f) The legislature may do any and all acts and things necessary for the purposes of this section, and this section is declared to be, and is, supplemental to all other provisions of this constitution, and legislation enacted under authority hereof shall prevail, whether in conflict with other sections or not.'

"SEC. 2. Said election for the submission of the aforesaid amendment shall be held in every election precinct of this State on said Tuesday, the 21st day of December 1954. Notice of said election shall be given as required by the constitution and same shall be held agreeably to the general election laws of this State, and said amendment submitted therein in the same manner as amendments to the constitution are submitted in regular general elections held in this State.

"Adopted by the house of representatives September 10, 1954.

"Adopted by the senate September 16, 1954."

Special election held in the State of Mississippi, Tuesday, Dec. 21, 1954—Proposed amendment to the constitution of the State of Mississippi—H. Con. Res. No. 2: Adopted, House of Representatives, Sept. 10, 1954; adopted, Senate, Sept. 16, 1954

Counties	For	Against
Adams	1,822	559
Alcorn	642	700
Amite	1,389	133
Attala	1,522	189
Benton	175	381
Bolivar	2,552	256
Calhoun	595	431
Carroll	894	28
Chickasaw	852	131
Choctaw	675	190
Claiborne	547	38
Clarke	1,451	212
Clay	956	83

Special election held in the State of Mississippi, Tuesday, Dec. 21, 1954—Proposed amendment to the constitution of the State of Mississippi—H. Con. Res. No. 2: Adopted, House of Representatives, Sept. 10, 1954; adopted, Senate, Sept. 16, 1954—Continued

Counties	For	Against
Coahoma	1,909	288
Copiah	1,861	134
Covington	542	447
DeSoto	531	302
Forrest	2,352	2,057
Franklin	797	86
George	342	595
Greene	556	177
Grenada	1,490	48
Hancock	525	560
Harrison	5,631	6,064
Hinds	6,999	3,524
Holmes	2,088	70
Humphreys	1,131	32
Issaquena	209	13
Itawamba	228	1,248
Jackson	689	2,872
Jasper	1,135	265
Jefferson	659	60
Jefferson Davis	926	278
Jones	3,108	1,308
Kemper	1,101	137
Lafayette	1,248	690
Lamar	608	447
Lauderdale	3,410	1,634
Lawrence	867	131
Leake	1,687	286
Lee	647	2,332
Leflore	2,663	127
Lincoln	2,187	206
Lowndes	1,413	196
Madison	1,514	131
Marion	1,140	263
Marshall	781	105
Monroe	960	838
Montgomery	1,830	172
Neshoba	1,859	331
Newton	1,666	254
Noxubee	948	52
Oktibbeha	1,521	271
Panola	1,175	170
Pearl River	673	957
Perry	476	232
Pike	1,756	793
Pontotoc	339	1,371
Prentiss	438	1,084
Quitman	733	73
Rankin	1,916	209
Scott	1,590	238
Sharkey	582	92
Simpson	1,479	323
Smith	1,230	342
Stone	312	846
Sunflower	2,465	78
Tallahatchie	2,231	43
Tate	921	55
Tippah	202	1,733
Tishomingo	131	1,618
Tunica	584	12
Union	439	1,434
Walthall	1,037	59
Warren	1,584	462
Washington	2,242	623
Wayne	819	255
Webster	872	189
Wilkinson	598	73
Winston	1,197	187
Yalobusha	952	94
Yazoo	1,945	92
Total	106,748	46,099

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,
New Capitol Building,
Jackson, Miss.

I, Heber Ladner, secretary of state of the State of Mississippi, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a copy of the official tabulation of the votes cast in the special election held on the 21st day of December 1954.

I further certify that 152,847 votes were cast in said election, according to the returns received from the county election commissioners of the 82 counties of the State of Mississippi, and, that 106,748 votes were for the amendment, and 46,099 votes against the amendment.

Witness my signature this the 31st day of December 1954.

HEBER LADNER,
Secretary of State of the State of Mississippi.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 10

"Resolution directing the clerk of the house of representatives to mail, after the December 21, 1954, special election, certified copies of the election returns to the three branches of the Federal Government, namely: the President of the United States, Congress, and the United States Supreme Court

"Be it resolved by the house of representatives, That upon receipt of the official election returns in the office of the secretary of state after the assembling of the people of the State of Mississippi, for the purpose of voting in the December 21, 1954, special election, to be held for the purpose of determining whether or not the constitution of Mississippi, shall be amended, the Clerk of the house of representatives is hereby directed to mail certified copies of the election returns, together with copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to be transmitted to the next Congress, and to the Clerk of the United States Supreme Court. The same shall be mailed by United States mail, postage prepaid, with request of return receipts, signed by the receivers thereof. Said receipts, when returned to the clerk, shall be filed in the office of the clerk, in the Mississippi House of Representatives. The herein-contained direction to the clerk of the house of representatives, shall only be put into effect in the event the majority of the voters of the State of Mississippi vote in said election for the proposed constitutional amendment to the Mississippi constitution.

"The intention of this resolution and the direction to the clerk to carry out the matters herein set out, are being put into effect because of the rights given to the people of the United States, under article 1 of the amendments to the United States Constitution, which is:

"'Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances'; be it further

"Resolved, That the members of the house of representatives, do herein and by the passage of this resolution, feel that we, the people of the South and the State of Mississippi, have been placed in a state of great grievance, because of the United States Supreme Court's decision which declared that there could be no separation of the races.

"Some of our grievances are herein set out, to wit:

"(1) It will bring about grief, heartaches, and no doubt, bloodshed and hatred between the races, who have heretofore been of one accord.

"(2) It leaves the road open for our foes in enemy countries to capitalize upon our differences.

"(3) It will bring about, inevitably, the mixing of the blood of the two races, the Caucasian and the Negro, and thereby destroy the heritage of both races.

"(4) It has engrossed upon our belief that economically there can be equality of the races, but in a different locale. The decision has not destroyed our belief, but has halted our attempt to this end.

"(5) The decision has cost the taxpayers large sums of money in our efforts to right the wrong and injustice which has been perpetuated on our people.

"(6) It will tremendously affect the lives of both races in every way.

"(7) It has impaired and hampered our respect for racial separation as set up by

the Creator of the races. This is true in the localities, principally in the South, where the Negro race predominates in number.

"The above are only a few of the grievances caused by the decision, the probable numbers are too numerous to mention.

"We, the members of the Mississippi House of Representatives, the people of Mississippi, and of the segregated States, resolve that we believe in the majority rule, and submit that this should be the slogan of our national leaders. The majority, we feel, will be reflected in our December 21, 1954, special election.

"We petition the Congress and the President that they use their vote and influence to pass the proposed amendment to our Federal Constitution, involving the race question, which has been introduced by our senior United States Senator from Mississippi; be it further

"*Resolved*, That we petition the enactment of the necessary constitutional amendments and laws necessary to right the great wrong committed against the people of the United States, and we hereby submit that we should have redress for our grievances."

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute problems attending the recent devastation resulting from tidal floods in the Narragansett Bay area, and to lend support for appropriate action in having the situation surveyed, and to make available funds to aid the State of Rhode Island and the cities and towns to finance the protective works recommended

"Whereas hurricanes have devastated much of Rhode Island's shoreline in 1938, again in 1944, and again in 1954, causing hundreds of deaths and hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage; and

"Whereas over $100 million worth of inventory and property damage, most of it uninsured, was caused by hurricane tides and flooding in the port of Providence, and adjacent communities facing on Narragansett Bay; and

"Whereas the Providence metropolitan area, the 19th largest metropolitan area in the United States, is a defense production center containing vital manufacturing facilities as well as important naval installations; and

"Whereas the port of Providence is the market center for almost one million people, a distribution center for petroleum and petroleum products for southern New England, and a hub of communications; and

"Whereas hurricane tides periodically cripple the Providence metropolitan area and the cities and towns fronting on Narragansett Bay for days at a time, a loss which, in time of war or national emergency, might jeopardize the Nation's security; and

"Whereas the Providence area and the State of Rhode Island cannot sustain the full costs of protection from hurricane tides; and

"Whereas preliminary investigation of methods of protecting the port of Providence and communities fronting on Narragansett Bay indicates that a tidal dam and other flood control measures would furnish protection to downtown Providence and adjacent areas; and

"Whereas the Federal Government has provided protection against hurricane tides and river flooding to cities on the Gulf Coast and on inland waterways: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take cognizance of the acute problems presented by a situation peculiar to Rhode Island, and to lend its support to secure appropriate action on the part of the Secretary of the Army to include in the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers:

"1. A full investigation of the problem of protecting the port of Providence and the cities and towns on Narragansett Bay which have also suffered from recurrent flooding, taking into consideration the engineering reports that have already been prepared;

"2. A review of all information on this problem now in the possession of the Rhode Island Development Council, the same to be turned over to the Corps of Engineers to assist that agency in preparing its report;

"3. A full public hearing to be held under the auspices of the Corps of Engineers upon the conclusion of the report; and

"4. Authorization to construct, operate, and maintain such flood control dams and other protective devices that the Chief of Engineers may recommend and the State of Rhode Island and municipalities bordering on Narragansett Bay shall approve and accept and to enter into agreements with the State of Rhode Island and municipalities of interest to share the cost and upkeep of such protective works; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to urge upon Congress the passage of such legislation as may be needed to make funds available to aid the State and the cities and towns in the Narragansett Bay area, to finance the protective works and other flood control measures recommended in the report of the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Army, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the American Association of Port Authorities, Washington, D. C., signed by Lewis I. Bourgeois, chairman, committee on foreign commerce, praying for the enactment of House bill 1, relating to reciprocal trade agreements (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States in favor of the passage of legislation reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill sponsored by Congressman THOMAS J. LANE, of Lawrence, Mass., to reduce from 65 to 60 the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; and

"Whereas many persons who have reached the age of 60 years either have difficulty or cannot receive employment even though they are in good health; and

"Whereas in many cases persons between the ages of 60 and 65 by reason of the lack of social-security benefits either become dependent upon relations or welfare agencies because of inability to secure employment: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to give favorable consideration and enact into law the bill reducing the age at which persons shall be eligible to receive social-security benefits; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to each of the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

A petition signed by Florence Burke, and sundry other citizens of the State of New York, favoring the enactment of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution relating to treatymaking power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ALLOTMENT OF FAS FUNDS TO COUNTIES—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Cook County Board of Commissioners at a meeting held at Grand Marais, Minn., with regard to FAS allotment to counties be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred. I have received similar resolutions from a great many other counties in my State.

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

Resolution No. 55-4

"Whereas the FAS program as it now stands, is 50-percent participation by the Federal Government and 50-percent participation by the counties; and

"Whereas the FAS funds allotted to the counties were meant for and intended to be used by said counties for the improvement of rural highways or farm-to-market roads; and

"Whereas it is becoming more difficult for an increasing number of counties to match the present FAS fund allotment.

"Now, therefore, the Cook County Board of Commissioners do hereby respectfully request the Commissioner of Highways, United States Senators, and United States Congressmen to work together toward effecting legislation changing the present Federal law to read 75-percent participation by the Federal Government and 25-percent participation by the county."

The foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the Cook County Board of Commisioners at a regular meeting held at Grand Marais, Minn., on this 4th day of January 1955.

Attest:

ALFRED H. RINDAHL,
Auditor, Cook County.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

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

S. Res. 13. Resolution to investigate certain problems relating to interstate and foreign commerce, with an amendment, and, under the rule, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO HOLD HEARINGS AND INVESTIGATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report an original resolution extending the authority of the Committee on Armed Services for hearings and investigations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received; and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

The resolution (S. Res. 28), reported by Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Armed Services, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That Senate Resolution 185, 83d Congress, agreed to January 26, 1954, is amended by striking out January 31, 1955, wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof March 31, 1955.

ADDITIONAL CLERICAL ASSISTANTS FOR COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Foreign Relations I report an original resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 29) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Foreign Relations, under Senate Resolution 146, 82d Congress, agreed to August 6, 1951; Senate Resolution 249, 82d Congress, agreed to January 15, 1952; Senate Resolution 33, 83d Congress, agreed to January 30, 1953; and Senate Resolution 179, 83d Congress, agreed to January 26, 1954, authorizing the Committee on Foreign Relations to employ two additional clerical assistants is hereby continued from February 1, 1955, through January 31, 1956.

Mr. GEORGE. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution. I may state that it was offered in the full committee by both the former chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] and myself. It merely continues two clerical assistants to the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, speaking as the minority leader, I have no objection to the resolution. It was offered in the Committee on Foreign Relations, was unanimously approved by the committee, and merely provides for a continuation of the present situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, reference of the resolution to the Committee on Rules and Administration will be waived.

Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to.

CITATION OF DIANTHA D. HOAG FOR CONTEMPT OF SENATE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report an original resolution (S. Res. 31) citing Diantha D. Hoag for contempt of the Senate, and I submit a report (No. 7) thereon.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 31) reported by Mr. McCARTHY, from the Committee on Government Operations, was placed on the calendar as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate certify the report of the Committee on Government Operations of the United States Senate as to the refusal of Diantha D. Hoag to answer questions before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, said refusal to answer being pertinent to the subject matter under inquiry, together with all the facts in connection therewith, under the seal of the United States Senate to the United States attorney for the District of Columbia, to the end that the said Diantha D. Hoag may be proceeded against in the manner and form provided by law.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

William R. Kachel and sundry other persons, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to New Zealand; and

John Lodge, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Spain.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably a group of 1,510 routine nominations in the Air Force, in the grades of lieutenant colonel and below. Since this list has already appeared in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar of this large number of names, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 481. A bill for the relief of Gerard Lucien Dandurand; and

S. 482. A bill for the relief of Capt. Cassius H. Styles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S. 483. A bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 484. A bill for the relief of Michael Aristides Tseperkas;

S. 485. A bill for the relief of Gerasimos Athanase Haberis; and

S. 486. A bill for the relief of Mohammad Hamad Faris (Fares); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 487. A bill to amend chapter 19, title 5, of the United States Code, entitled, "Administrative Procedure," so as to prohibit the employment by any person of any member, official, attorney, or employee of a Government agency except under certain conditions;

S. 488. A bill to improve the administration of justice by the creation of an Administrative Court of the United States;

S. 489. A bill to provide general rules of practice and procedure before Federal agencies;

S. 490. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act, and eliminate certain exemptions therefrom; and

S. 491. A bill to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 492. A bill for the relief of Eva Perro Pobre Reilly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 493. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; and

S. 494. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 495. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Rock City as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 496. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 497. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Washoe reclamation project, Nevada and California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 498. A bill for the relief of Maria Gabriella Byron (Maria Gabriella Michon); and

S. 499. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Airo-Farulla and Joseph Antoine Airo-Farulla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 500. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Ki Young Kwan;

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Elsa Lederer;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Cirino Lanzafame;

S. 504. A bill for the relief of Priska Anne Kary;

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Angelo Spiros Phillippas (George A. Phillips) and Loula Spiros Phillippas (Lola Phillips);

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Emery Nussbaum and Eleanor Nussbaum; and

S. 507. A bill for the relief of Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt, and her minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 508. A bill for the relief of Victoriana Areitio Berincua;

S. 509. A bill for the relief of Dolores Maria Seijo; and

S. 510. A bill for the relief of Mary A. Mouskalis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 511. A bill to authorize John E. Gross to accept the award of the Royal Order of St. Olav, grade of Commander with Star, tendered by the Government of Norway; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 512. A bill providing for the denial of certain Federal grants to States and tax credits to employers in States which fail to make ineligible for unemployment compensation benefits individuals who have claimed the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination when questioned with regard to Communist Party membership or other

subversive affiliations or activities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRETT:

S. 513. A bill to provide for the construction of distribution systems on authorized Federal reclamation projects by irrigation districts and other public agencies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MALONE (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 514. A bill to provide for the disposal of certain Federal property in the Boulder City area, to provide assistance in the establishment of a municipality incorporated under the laws of Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 515. A bill to authorize private transactions involving the sale, acquisition, or holding of gold within the United States, its Territories and possessions, including Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 516. A bill to amend the act of July 3, 1952, relating to research in the development and utilization of saline waters; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 517. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 which penalizes other soil-conservation practices when acreage allotments are exceeded; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 518. A bill for the relief of Elsa Alwine Larsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey):

S. 519. A bill to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE):

S. 520. A bill for the relief of Bernard L. Denn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself, Mr. MORSE, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. HILL, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 521. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 522. A bill to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 523. A bill to establish a basic administrative workweek and pay periods of two administrative workweeks for postmasters, officers, and employees in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 524. A bill to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. MCNAMARA:

S. 525. A bill for the relief of Sergio I. Veira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENDER:

S. 526. A bill for the relief of Paul Peter Fracchione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. ROBERTSON):

S. 527. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to provide that nothing therein shall invalidate the provisions of State laws prohibiting strikes in public utilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 528. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a toll bridge across the Rainy River at or near Baudette, Minn.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 529. A bill to incorporate the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. MURRAY):

S. 530. A bill for the relief of the Sacred Heart Hospital; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 531. A bill to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 532. A bill to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 533. A bill to increase the education and training allowances under the Veterans' Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LANGER):

S. 534. A bill to designate the reservoir above the Heart-Butte Dam in North Dakota as Lake Tschida;

S. 535. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the State of North Dakota, for use as a State historic site, of the land where Chief Sitting Bull was originally buried; and

S. 536. A bill to provide for the return to the former owners of certain lands acquired in connection with the Garrison Dam project of mineral interests in such lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 537. A bill to permit a portion of Federal funds made available to the States for construction or reconstruction of secondary highways to be used by local governmental units for construction or reconstruction of county and township roads; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 538. A bill to prohibit certain reservations of mineral interests by Federal land banks, the Land Bank Commissioner, and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and to provide for disposition of certain mineral interests heretofore reserved by them; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 539. A bill to amend the act of July 10, 1953, which created the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. BRIDGES):

S. 540. A bill to increase the salaries of judges of the United States courts, and to provide that Members of Congress shall receive salary comparable to that of judges of the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 541. A bill for the relief of Martin Aloysius Madden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL):

S. 542. A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRICKER:

S. 543. A bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 544. A bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 545. A bill for the relief of Gabriel Sho-Tse Tsiang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 546. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to relieve innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 547. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND):

S. 548. A bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. STENNIS):

S. J. Res. 21. Joint resolution to establish a Commission on Government Security; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

TEMPORARY MEASURES OF FLOOD CONTROL AND ANTHRACITE MINE DRAINAGE

Mr. DUFF. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage. This is in line with the recommendation of the President in his budget message.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 483) to provide for temporary measures of flood control and anthracite mine drainage, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DUFF (for himself and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION LAW

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would amend the McCarran-Walter immigration law. A similar bill was introduced in the 83d Congress in both the Senate and the House of Representatives.

This bill contains three titles. The first title is designed to eliminate certain serious injustices which were specifically pointed out by the President of the United States in a letter to the then chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], dated December 6, 1953. Among the injustices eliminated are the unrestricted authority given consuls to give or deny visas with virtually no standards for guidance, the discrimination against naturalized citizens, and the future mortgaging of immigration quotas by many countries.

The second title deals with procedural inequities and injustices which have appeared in the administration of the law.

The third title modernizes the quota system by establishing the 1950 instead of the 1920 census figures as the basis for determining national quotas. This would substantially alleviate a serious inequity that exists with respect to nationalities from southern and southeastern Europe, from which immigration is practically impossible today. Finally, it insures that all unused quotas will be used by providing for a redistribution of such quotas from any year to the succeeding year.

This bill goes far toward curing the most serious inequities contained in our present immigration law and should do much to enhance the prestige of the United States in parts of the world where the menace of international communism is greatest.

I ask unanimous consent that an analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 519) to make certain changes in the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. IVES (for himself, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of New Jersey) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The analysis presented by Mr. IVES is as follows:

ANALYSIS OF BILL AMENDING IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALTY ACT (McCARRAN-WALTER IMMIGRATION ACT, PUBLIC LAW 414, 82D CONG.)

SHORT TITLE, "IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1955"

Title I

This title follows recommendations of President Eisenhower as contained in his April 6, 1953, letter to Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS proposing a Senate inquiry into the operations of the McCarran-Walter Act.

Section 101: Amends sections 212 (a) (15) and 241 (a) (8) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether aliens are or are likely to become public charges. The provision which gives controlling effect to the opinion of the consul or of immigration officials, without adequate supporting evidence, is eliminated.

Section 102: Amends subsections (27) and (29) of section 212 (a) of Public Law 414 with respect to standards for determining whether immigrants would engage in subversive activities. The consul and immigration officials would no longer be vested with the authority, without restraint, to determine by their own mental processes the probability of future prescribed conduct.

Section 103: Amends section 287 (a) (1) of Public Law 414 with respect to power of officers and employees of the Immigration and Naturalization Service to interrogate without warrant persons believed to be aliens as to their right to be or remain in this country. Strengthens the term "believed" by requiring "with probable cause," thus preventing improper interrogation of citizens.

Section 104: Repeals sections 352, 353 and 354 of Public Law 414, which provide for loss of nationality by naturalized citizens because of residence abroad. This amendment thus eliminates the stigma of second-class citizenship. Section 104 of the bill also repeals sections 350 and 355 of Public Law 414 which provide for loss of citizenship by native-born citizens because of residence abroad. The principle that native-born citizens will lose their American nationality by residence abroad was introduced to our nationality laws for the first time by Public Law 414. To permit that principle to remain in our law, while repealing the corresponding provision as to naturalized citizens, would discriminate against the native-born citizen.

Section 105: Amends sections 101 (2) (37), 212 (a) (28) (D), 241 (a) (6) (D) and 313 (a) (3) of Public Law 414 by broadening restrictions contained in that act with respect to persons who have advocated a totalitarian dictatorship or have belonged to totalitarian organizations. Nazis and Fascists would, as a result, be barred from the United States without the necessity of proving, as Public Law 414 now requires, that they have advocated, or belonged to organizations which advocated, the establishment of a totalitarian dictatorship in the United States. This closes the loophole in Public Law 414 that now permits the Nazis and Fascists to enter the United States and to become naturalized.

Section 106: By amending section 244 (a) (1), (2), (3), (4), and (5) of Public Law 414 eliminates the standards of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" in granting suspension of deportation, substituting the term "serious hardship."

Sections 107 and 108: By repealing section 3 (c) of the Displaced Persons Act and amending section 201 (e) of Public Law 414 eliminates provision requiring future mortgaging of quotas.

Section 109: By amending sections 202 (a) (5) and 202 (e) and repealing section 202 (b), (c), and (d) of Public Law 414, eliminates quota provisions in the present act which discriminate against Asiatic and colonial peoples. The amendment will restore the law as it existed prior to Public Law 414, by which colonial peoples came under the quota of their mother country. Public Law 414 establishes a quota determined by race for Asiatic peoples no matter in what country of the world they are born, while the quota for non-Asiatics is determined simply by birth within quota areas. The amendment extends the latter provision to persons of an Asiatic race and thus removes the stigma of racial discrimination.

Title II

This title corrects certain administrative deficiencies that have become generally apparent since the beginning of enforcement of Public Law 414.

Section 201: By amending section 101 (a) (6) of Public Law 414, restores preexamination (an administrative procedure adopted in 1935 which permitted an alien in the United States to become a permanent resident by obtaining his immigration visa in Canada instead of being required to make the long and expensive journey to his country of origin for that purpose.)

Section 202: By amending section 212 (9) and (10) permits entry of an alien who has received a pardon for a crime.

Section 203: Amends section 212 (c) of Public Law 414 to restore the law as it existed, and operated satisfactorily, from 1917 to 1952. The result would be to give the Attorney General discretionary power to admit an alien who is returning to an unrelinquished American residence of at least 7 years, with no requirement that the alien was originally admitted to this country for permanent residence.

Section 204. Repeals section 235 (c) of Public Law 414, which permits exclusion without a hearing.

Section 205: Repeals section 241 (d) of Public Law 414, the retroactive provision which makes an alien deportable for conduct prior to December 24, 1952, even though that conduct was not a ground of deportation before Public Law 414 came into effect.

Section 206: Amends section 245 of Public Law 414 which permits the Attorney General to adjust the status of an alien temporarily here to that of an alien admitted for permanent residence. The amendment softens the unnecessarily rigorous requirements which an alien must now meet.

Section 207: (a) Permits judicial review in exclusion and deportation cases.

(b) Establishes a statute of limitations whereby no alien may be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of deportation proceedings.

Section 208: Repeals section 360 (a) of Public Law 414 and substitutes a provision granting judicial review for a person claiming American citizenship who has been denied such right.

Section 209: Amends section 360 (c) of Public Law 414 by broadening provision for judicial review of final determination by Attorney General in refusing entry to persons issued certificate of identity as claimants of American citizenship under section 360 (b).

Section 210: Establishes a Board of Visa Appeals in State Department to review questions involving the denying of visas and the application or meaning of State Department regulations applying to immigration.

Title III

Section 301: Provides for the pooling of unused quotas and their allocation the next succeeding fiscal year to those on waiting lists of quotas 7,000 and under (includes Italian, Greek, Dutch, Austrian, and eastern European quotas). Quotas are to be determined on the basis of the 1950 census instead of the 1920 census as is now the practice.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT RELATING TO REDUCTION OF AGE LIMIT FOR WOMEN FOR BENEFITS OF OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, my first bill since becoming a Member of the Senate. It is introduced on behalf of myself, my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator

from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA].

At the same time, Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Representative in Congress from the Third Oregon District, is introducing a companion bill in the House.

The bill would lower the social-security qualifying age for women from 65 years of age to 60.

This, in my opinion, is a matter of simple fairness and equity. Wives are usually a few years younger than their husbands. If the husband dies at age 65, his widow, unable to receive benefits because she is a few years younger, must prove her poverty and seek public assistance to carry her to age 65. It should be noted that this turning to public assistance increases the burden on general taxation, instead of allowing the widow to draw from funds to which she and/or her husband contributed directly for this purpose.

Requiring a wife to be 65 before the benefits can be received means that only about one-fifth of the married men in America who retire at 65 have wives immediately eligible for wife's benefits. We are all aware that insurance benefits—the husband may possibly be drawing as much as $660 a year—do not cover the cost of even the most modest living for an elderly couple.

Many families must, therefore, live on inadequate benefits for several years before the wife becomes eligible. They may be forced to prove poverty and turn to old-age assistance. If women could qualify at the age of 60, about three-fifths of the families would draw benefits for both husband and wife immediately when the husband reached the age of 65 and retirement.

I believe that women who are working should also be eligible for social-security benefits at the age of 60. It is difficult for women between 60 and 65 to hold jobs, or to find new ones. Older women do only half as well as men in holding onto jobs once they are past the age of 60. This fact should be recognized by giving them the protection they cannot otherwise obtain.

It is well to consider thoroughly the fears of some who are opposed to lowering the age of eligibility to 60 for women workers. They contend that if 60 is the age of eligibility, so, too, will it be the age of dismissal. When that event does occur, it is as a result of company pension plans, not social security. The remedy against that hardship lies in revising inequities in company pension plans, rather than in leaving inequities in the social-security structure.

On the matter of costs, I have obtained informal estimates which indicate that the cost of the benefits—for working women, wives, and widows at 60 instead of 65—would total 1 percent of the payroll. Employees would contribute one-half and the employers would contribute the other half. It might be mentioned that both of our largest labor organizations have declared that their members are ready and willing to assume that cost.

There are other features of social security which should be expanded, Mr. President, but this gain for women is the most imperative at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 521) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to reduce from 65 to 60 years the age at which women may qualify for old-age and survivors insurance benefits, introduced by Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and other Senators) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, and I should like to be indulged for about 30 seconds to say that it deals with school construction. I have often heard it said that there are only two absolutes, namely, death and taxes. I think I can add one other absolute, which is the increase in population; and still another is the increase in the school population. Education, Mr. President, will not wait. So I introduce a bill providing for school construction.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 522) to authorize Federal payments to the States to assist in constructing schools was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN SHORES OF NEW ENGLAND FROM HURRICANE TIDAL FLOODS

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], a bill to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods.

In support of this measure I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Bernard M. Shanley, special counsel to President Eisenhower, dated September 24, 1954, addressed to His Excellency, Dennis J. Roberts, Governor of the State of Rhode Island. This letter indicates that the present national administration will be sympathetic to the approach to the problem proposed in this bill.

I also present for the RECORD, a copy of a letter addressed to me by Hon. Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Acting Secretary of the Navy dated December 16, 1954. This letter indicates the interest of the Navy in a study being made by the Army engineers as provided for in this bill.

Also, for the RECORD, I present a certified copy of a resolution adopted by the Rhode Island General Assembly on January 14, 1955, memorializing the Congress of the United States and recommending an immediate survey of the Narragansett Bay area by the United States Army engineers.

Mr. President, the adjoining States of Massachusetts and Connecticut are also concerned with this effort, as are many industries, civic and public groups throughout southern New England. In this respect, my colleague and I wish to take this occasion to express our appreciation to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], who on Friday, January 14, introduced a measure relating to this same problem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letters and resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 524) to authorize and direct a full investigation of the problem of protecting Narragansett Bay and the southern shores of New England from hurricane tidal floods, introduced by Mr. GREEN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The letters and resolution presented by Mr. GREEN are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., September 24, 1954.

The Honorable DENNIS J. ROBERTS,
Governor of Rhode Island,
Providence, R. I.

DEAR GOVERNOR ROBERTS: The President has asked me to write you concerning your recent letter in regard to utilizing the Corps of Engineers to conduct a prompt preliminary survey of the construction and other means needed to protect Rhode Island shore areas, especially downtown Providence, from tidal waves.

As you know, on September 2, the President found that the recent hurricane had caused damage of sufficient severity and magnitude to certain areas in the State of Rhode Island to warrant Federal assistance to supplement State and local efforts. Accordingly, he issued instructions to the Federal Civil Defense Administrator designating these areas as a major disaster area and subsequently allotted $1,500,000 to provide the necessary Federal assistance. The regional director of the Federal Civil Defense Administration called upon the Corps of Engineers to assist in developing damage surveys of the disaster area, including the coastal sections.

The Corps of Engineers, in accordance with the authority contained in the Flood Control Act of 1950, together with other interested Federal agencies, is currently engaged in a comprehensive survey of the water resources of the New York-New England area. In connection with this survey the Corps of Engineers has initiated a preliminary investigation of the areas damaged by floods aggravated by extreme winds and high tides. These investigations embrace the city of Providence and other areas in Rhode Island but they are expected to develop only a general concept of the protection measures required.

I note in your letter that you are asking your congressional delegation to secure necessary authorization to undertake a thorough study for the development of definitive plans. I can assure you that this administration is sympathetic to this approach to the problem. In the meantime, in order that your rehabilitation program may move ahead as rapidly as possible, the Federal Civil Defense Administration and the Corps of Engineers have been directed to make available to you all pertinent information obtained during the course of the investigation now under way. I am certain that measures can be devised which can be incorporated into the State's rehabilitation plans which would re-

duce in the future such tragic losses as have recently been experienced in Rhode Island and other areas in New England.

The President is deeply concerned with the suffering caused the people of Rhode Island by these devastating hurricanes.

Sincerely,

BERNARD M. SHANLEY,
Special Counsel to the President.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, December 16, 1954.

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR GREEN: This is in further reference to your letter of December 1, 1954, concerning the construction of breakwaters to protect portions of the State of Rhode Island from hurricanes.

The plan as presented in the Providence Journal appears to have merit. However, prior to the determination of a firm Navy position, further development of the project with a view to providing concrete data on the following factors is necessary:

Velocity of waterflow through the narrow (500 feet) openings in the breakwaters at various tidal ranges.

Possible sizes of openings and the effect of the various openings on the maximum tides to be generated upstream.

Effect of the alteration of the tidal prism on adjacent shorelines. At various locations extensive property damage has occurred due to scouring and new deposits in undesired locations because of manmade changes in the normal-flow channel.

The manner in which ship traffic would be routed and controlled while passing through or approaching the restricted openings.

The above information could best be obtained through extensive model studies conducted by the Department of the Army, Corps of Engineers. However, such studies would probably require congressional authorization and funding.

I trust that the information supplied above will satisfy your requirements. If it does not, please do not hesitate to call on me and I will have this matter further investigated.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS S. GATES, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take cognizance of the acute problems attending the recent devastation resulting from tidal floods in the Narragansett Bay area, and to lend support for appropriate action in having the situation surveyed, and to make available funds to aid the State of Rhode Island and the cities and towns to finance the protective works recommended

Whereas hurricanes have devastated much of Rhode Island's shoreline in 1938, again in 1944, and again in 1954, causing hundreds of deaths and hundreds of millions of dollars in property damage; and

Whereas over $100 million worth of inventory and property damage, most of it uninsured, was caused by hurricane tides and flooding in the port of Providence and adjacent communities facing on Narragansett Bay; and

Whereas the Providence metropolitan area, the 19th largest metropolitan area in the United States, is a defense production center containing vital manufacturing facilities as well as important naval installations; and

Whereas the port of Providence is the market center for almost 1 million people, a distribution center for petroleum and petroleum products for southern New England, and a hub of communications; and

Whereas hurricane tides periodically cripple the Providence metropolitan area and the cities and towns fronting on Narragansett Bay for days at a time, a loss which, in time of war or national emergency, might jeopardize the Nation's security; and

Whereas the Providence area and the State of Rhode Island cannot sustain the full costs of protection from hurricane tides; and

Whereas preliminary investigation of methods of protecting the port of Providence and communities fronting on Narragansett Bay indicates that a tidal dam and other flood control meaures would furnish protection to downtown Providence and adjacent areas; and

Whereas the Federal Government has provided protection against hurricane tides and river flooding to cities on the Gulf Coast and on inland waterways: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take cognizance of the acute problems presented by a situation peculiar to Rhode Island, and to lend its support to secure appropriate action on the part of the Secretary of the Army to include in the civil works program of the Corps of Engineers:

1. A full investigation of the problem of protecting the port of Providence and the cities and towns on Narragansett Bay which have also suffered from recurrent flooding, taking into consideration the engineering reports that have already been prepared;

2. A review of all information on this problem now in the possession of the Rhode Island Development Council, the same to be turned over to the Corps of Engineers to assist that agency in preparing its report;

3. A full public hearing to be held under the auspices of the Corps of Engineers upon the conclusion of the report, and

4. Authorization to construct, operate, and maintain such flood control dams and other protective devices that the Chief of Engineers may recommend and the State of Rhode Island and municipalities bordering on Narragansett Bay shall approve and accept and to enter into agreements with the State of Rhode Island and municipalities of interest to share the cost and upkeep of such protective works; and be it further

Resolved, That the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States be, and they hereby are, respectfully requested to urge upon Congress the passage of such legislation as may be needed to make funds available to aid the State and the cities and towns in the Narragansett Bay area, to finance the protective works and other flood control measures recommended in the report of the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby directed, to transmit copies of this resolution to the Vice President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Army, and to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress.

WITHDRAWALS OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in response to a formal resolution approved by the Western States Land Commissioners Association, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill providing for public hearings and a 5-year limitation on future withdrawals of public lands by Executive order.

On June 30, 1952, the Secretary of the Interior reported that a grand total of 68,474,285 acres, or roughly one-sixth of the public domain, exclusive of the Alaskan Territory, was in a reserved or withdrawn status.

This withdrawn acreage included 46,151,091 acres of mineral withdrawals; 2,541,832 acres of temporary withdrawals for national parks, monuments, forests, wildlife preserves, and recreation areas; 16,273,180 acres for military and other defense purposes, and 3,508,182 for other Federal purposes.

These withdrawals have been effected largely by executive decree. In many cases, the withdrawal privilege has been woefully abused by executive agencies, resulting in orders blanketing in tremendous areas when the practical needs could have been met with relatively small withdrawals. In other cases, the actual need for any withdrawal at all appeared highly questionable to residents of the area affected.

In the withdrawal heyday, withdrawal was placed upon withdrawal, to the extent that thousands of dollars will have to be spent in studies of public records, merely to effect an accounting of the land now subject to these multiple withdrawal orders.

This confusion in our public land stewardship interferes with the proper use and disposition of our public lands, because, in most cases, entries for other uses, such as mineral leasing or homesteading, are prohibited until the withdrawal order is formally revoked.

The legal barrier of withdrawal also prevents transfer to some States of literally hundreds of sections of the public domain granted by Congress in statehood enabling acts for support of the common schools. The attorney general of my State, for example, came to Washington a year ago to protest further inclusion of approximately 200,000 acres of assigned Utah school lands in a naval oil shale reservation of 2 million acres in Utah. Those 200,000 acres, I might add, were awarded by Congress in 1896 for support of the Utah public schools, but they remain under Federal domination to this day, even though the area has been surveyed and Federal oil and gas leasing is permitted on the acreage.

Fortunately, the pace of the withdrawal program has abated in recent years. In fiscal year 1953, for example, only 1,207,219 acres were subjected to Federal withdrawals. During that year, the Federal Government revoked 227,004 acres that had been under a withdrawal status, leaving a net contribution to the total withdrawn acreage of about 1 million acres.

My bill does not prevent the executive branch of the Government from ordering withdrawal or reservation of public lands. It merely prescribes that no public lands shall be withdrawn from settlement, entry, location, or sale, except after full public hearings held with the State or States in which the subject lands are situated.

It also fixes a 5-year limit upon so-called temporary withdrawals, which, in the past, have been, in effect, permanent withdrawals in spite of their temporary designation.

The bill further directs the Secretary of the Interior to periodically review the need for continued withdrawal of any public lands under a withdrawn or reserved status, and to hold public hearings and take necessary remedial action when a Governor of a State requests a review of the status of lands believed subject to official release of withdrawal.

The provisions of the act shall not apply to withdrawals specifically authorized by an act of Congress.

For the information of my colleagues, I request unanimous consent to have appended to my remarks the text of resolution 6, as approved at the 1954 convention of the Western States Land Commissioners Association.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 531) to require public hearings prior to withdrawals of the public lands, to limit temporary withdrawals to 5 years, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WATKINS (for himself and Mr. BENNETT) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The resolution presented by Mr. WATKINS is as follows:

RESOLUTION No. 6

Whereas under the several acts of Congress of the United States providing for the survey of public lands, certain sections were granted to the public land States for the benefit of common schools; and

Whereas the Bureau of Land Management Statistical Appendixes for the year 1952 shows that there are in the Western States 116 million acres of unsurveyed lands; and

Whereas because of the failure on the part of the United States to complete the survey of the public lands in said Western States, said States are denied the benefit of the lands granted for the benefit of common schools; and

Whereas the present rate of original surveys indicates that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the unsurveyed lands are being surveyed annually; and

Whereas the recent tendency of the Federal Government to withdraw vast areas of unsurveyed lands for Federal purposes precludes the States from receiving "in place" the school sections on lands which are not now and probably never will be surveyed; and

Whereas because of the many withdrawals by numerous Federal departments and agencies, satisfaction of the school land grants through indemnity selections is greatly curtailed for the reason that practically all of the remaining public domain is of very low value: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Western States Land Commissioners Association assembled in San Francisco, Calif., this 16th day of June 1954—

1. That this association urgently seek passage by the 84th Congress of the United States of legislation providing that before land withdrawals can be made by the Federal Government or branches thereof adequate public notice must be given and an opportunity afforded for a public hearing in the State or States affected.

2. That a time limit of 5 years be placed on all temporary withdrawals, and that all withdrawals, past or present, be made subject to review upon the request of the State in which the withdrawn lands are located, and if upon such request the United States or any department or agency thereof does not see fit to revoke or amend the withdrawal, then and in that event, the request for review by the respective States shall be subject to a public hearing, at which all interested parties will be permitted to present reasons for such requested revocation or amendment.

3. That the secretary of this association is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to each Senator and Representative of the States comprising this association, to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate, and to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives, and to the Governor of each of the States comprising this association.

FINALITY OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT AND COMMON CARRIERS

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act.

This is a bill which was passed by the last Congress, but was vetoed by the President. The veto message has been complied with in this bill, and I believe the bill will meet with the approval of the Congress.

The purpose of this bill is to prevent the Government, by complaint to the Commission, from assailing the rates established. Accordingly, it is proposed that after the quotation or contract has been accepted or agreed to by the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the General Services Administration, or by any official or employee of the United States to whom they may delegate such authority, the rate so established shall be conclusively presumed to be just, reasonable, and otherwise lawful and shall not be subject to attack, or reparation, after the date of such acceptance or agreement upon any grounds whatsoever except for actual fraud or deceit or clerical mistake.

The bill would also prevent consideration of the reduced rates as evidence of unreasonableness of other rates. It also provides that its passage shall not affect transactions other than those carried out under its terms.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 543) to establish the finality of contracts between the Government and common carriers of passengers and freight subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, introduced by Mr. BRICKER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND DOMESTIC ALLOTMENT ACT RELATING TO FARMER-COMMITTEE SYSTEM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 8 (f) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen.

I am sure that many other Senators have had my experience of receiving vigorous protests from farmers on the restrictions placed upon them when deciding whom they shall have represent them as farmer committeemen under the ACP program, formerly the PMA program. Last year Congress intended to correct the situation.

However, after Congress adjourned, the Secretary of Agriculture interpreted the action of Congress as applying only to county committees, not to local committees.

It is the purpose of the bill I am introducing today to make it crystal clear that it is the will and wish of Congress that all committeemen, whether they are on the township, community, county, or State level, be chosen freely by the farmers, without any limitations or restrictions being placed on the farmers in making their selections.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared on the bill be printed in the body of the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 544) to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The statement presented by Mr. HUMPHREY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

I am introducing today a bill to amend section 8 (b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, to provide for administration of farm programs by democratically elected farmer committeemen.

I am sure many of my colleagues have had as I have vigorous protests from farmers to restrictions upon whom they could elect to represent them as farmer-committeemen under the ASC program, the former PMA.

Last year, this Congress accepted my amendment to the Agricultural Act intended to correct this situation and assure farmers the right to elect whomever they might choose to represent them under this committee system.

However, after Congress adjourned, the Secretary of Agriculture interpreted the amendment as applying only to county committees, and not to local committees. Regardless of the legal interpretation, I believe it was the intent of the Congress to give farmers the right to choose any of their neighbors in free and democratic elections, at either township or county levels, without restrictions on the number of terms a farmer might serve. I recall comments on this floor that Senators would not take kindly to a limitation on their tenure, by administrative edict.

Under the farmer committee system, farmers elect township committees from among their neighbors. Chairmen of these township committees meet in county convention, in turn, to select county committees. Under the present departmental interpretation and regulation, tenure of township committees can be limited but not of county committees.

The intention of my bill is to specifically protect the right of farmers to elect whomever they desire, for as many terms as they desire, at either township or county level.

The bill is further designed to correct another administrative restriction on these farmers committees that has brought widespread protest from farmers in the Midwest.

Historically, the farmers serving on these committees in the Midwest have actually administered the programs for which they are responsible. Other farmers have favored this, because they can deal with fellow farmers who understand their local problems.

In other areas of the country, I understand these committees have worked through local county managers, as paid employees of county offices.

Secretary Benson has ordered all county committees in the country to adopt the county-manager plan, making the elected committees more advisory than administrative. While that may work in some areas, it has not been accepted as satisfactory in others. It has led to low-paid clerks with little background or capability trying to administer farm-acreage allotments and the agricultural-conservation program, instead of experienced farm people.

My bill would not prevent use of such county managers where it is desired and has been worked out satisfactorily. However, it does leave it to the discretion of the elected local committees whether they want to perform these administrative functions themselves, or delegate them to a county manager. I believe the change would be in keeping with the spirit of the farmer committee system, to provide as great a local voice as possible in operation of our farm program.

STRENGTHENING OF PENALTY FOR SEDITIOUS CONSPIRACY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill recommended by the Attorney General of the United States to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy advocating overthrow of our Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of our Government.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a letter from the Department of Justice to the Vice President, be printed in the body of the RECORD, and thereafter appropriately referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 547) to amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2384 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$5,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000" and by striking out "six years" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty years."

SEC. 2. Section 2385 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "$10,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$20,000" and by striking out "ten years" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty years," and by adding at the end thereof the following paragraph:

"If two or more persons conspire to commit any offense named in this section, each shall be fined not more than $20,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and shall be ineligible for employment by the United States or any department or agency thereof, for the 5 years next following his conviction."

SEC. 3. The foregoing amendments shall apply only with respect to offenses committed on and after the date of the enactment of this act.

The letter presented by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: There is attached for your consideration and appropriate action a legislative proposal, "To amend title 18 of the United States Code, so as to increase the penalties applicable to seditious conspiracy, advocating overthrow of Government, and conspiracy to advocate overthrow of Government."

The Department of Justice recommends an increase in the penalties provided under existing law with respect to the offenses of seditious conspiracy and advocating overthrow of Government. It is also recommended that a conspiracy provision with increased penalties be added to existing law relating to the offense of advocating overthrow of Government.

With respect to the offense of seditious conspiracy, existing law provides a maximum fine of $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than 6 years, or both (18 U. S. C. 2384). The maximum penalty under existing law for advocating overthrow of Government is a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both (18 U. S. C. 2385). The maximum penalty under existing law for conspiracy to commit offenses relating to advocating overthrow of Government is a fine of $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both. This Department recommends that the penalty provisions for each of the foregoing offenses be increased so that as to each offense the penalty shall be a fine of not more than $20,000 or not more than 20 years' imprisonment, or both.

The need for the increase in penalties for the offenses mentioned above is readily apparent if consideration is given to the fact that approximately one-third of the sentence may never be served if a prisoner conducts himself properly in the penitentiary. A little more than 3 years' imprisonment is entirely inadequate as a deterrent for those who would conspire to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of our Government. This reasoning likewise applies with respect to the offense of seditious conspiracy. It was shown in the recent trial in New York against members of the Nationalist Party for seditious conspiracy that the conspiracy culminated in a shooting in the House of Representatives and the wounding of 5 Congressmen. In addition the co-conspirators participated in acts of violence both in the United States and in Puerto Rico. The 6 years' imprisonment or $5,000 fine, or both, which may be imposed at present appears totally inadequate for offenses of this nature.

In view of these considerations the Department of Justice urges favorable action on the attached proposal which not only would increase but would make uniform the penalties applicable to the offenses in question.

The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Attorney General.

FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF TRI-DAM PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project, California.

The utilization of natural resources for the benefit of the greatest number of people and on the soundest basis possible is an objective of all political parties and all sections of our society. There have been many historic conflicts about the way to achieve this objective. There is not, however, any disagreement that the Federal Government wisely has followed where indicated, a policy of encouraging and assisting groups of our people who formulate and develop plans to improve the economy, the agriculture, and the living conditions of an area through putting to beneficial use the waters of this Nation.

I introduce at this time a bill providing for Federal support of what is to me a commendable example of local initiative in an effort to derive the maximum benefit from unused natural resources. I am delighted to have my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as a coauthor. This measure would provide Federal assistance for local groups which desire to build the so-called Tri-Dam project on the Stanislaus River in California.

This project is a carefully-planned application of the partnership concept of this administration. It does not require Federal assistance in the usual sense. On the contrary, this bill would place prime responsibility on the people through local public agencies who would enjoy the benefits of the project and who ultimately would pay nearly the entire cost of the development.

The proposed legislation would authorize a Federal loan and grant to two public agencies of the State of California, the Oakdale and the South San Joaquin Irrigation districts, to assist in financing a comprehensive $50 million irrigation and hydroelectric project. The amount of Federal financial aid, which is urgently needed because of circumstances beyond control of the two districts, would not exceed $10,370,000. The money would be advanced, for the period before revenues begin coming in from the works, only to bridge the gap between the amount needed to build the project and the amount which can be obtained through the sale of revenue bonds.

The Federal Government has a dual obligation to assist these districts. In the first place, changes in Federal policies since financing plans were made by the districts and approved by the approximately 30,000 members have affected the money market. Beyond that, the project will have definite flood-control features, which historically are an obligation of the Federal Government.

The bill, which was revised and approved at the last session by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, presents a fine opportunity to carry forward the policy of maximum local participation in such development while recognizing the Federal responsibility to extend a helping hand.

The Tri-Dam project, which involves 3 dams and 3 powerplants, will add 230,000 acre-feet of stored water and provide 81,500 kilowatts of hydroelectric energy. It will serve some 121,000 acres with approximately 30,000 people. The proposed legislation which will help make

this project possible contains safeguards to protect the Federal Treasury and the National Government's taxpayers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 548) to provide financial assistance to the Oakdale and South San Joaquin Irrigation Districts, California, in the construction of the Tri-Dam project, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and Mr. KNOWLAND) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TEMPORARY PERMISSION FOR PARKING ON SQUARE 723 OF CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 3), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the Architect of the Capitol should permit the parking, under the control of the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate, of passenger motor vehicles on that part of the United States Capitol Grounds described as square 723, until such time as the Sergeant at Arms determines that such square is no longer needed for parking purposes.

AMENDMENT OF RULE RELATING TO PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUSH, and Mr. STENNIS) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 32), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended—

(a) by inserting "1." before the first paragraph;

(b) by striking out "The officers and employees of the Senate in the discharge of their official duties." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The officers and employees of the Senate when in the discharge of their official duties and, in the case of appointed officers and employees, upon exhibiting a credential card issued under subsection 2 of this rule.";

(c) by striking out the last paragraph of such rule and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Members of the staffs of Senate committees and members of the office staffs of Senators when in the discharge of their official duties and upon exhibiting a credential card issued under subsection 2 of this rule."; and

(d) by adding at the end of such rule the following new subsection:

"2. (a) No officer or employee of the Senate (other than an officer or employee elected by the Senate) and no member of the staff of a Senate committee or member of the office staff of a Senator shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session, unless he exhibits to the doorkeeper at the time he seeks admission a credential card issued by the Secretary of the Senate pursuant to this subsection.

"(b) Each appointing officer of the Senate shall certify to the Secretary the name of each officer or employee whom he has appointed and whose official duties require his admission to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session. The Secretary shall issue to each such officer or employee a credential card in such form as he deems advisable for the use of such officer or employee under this rule.

"(c) The chairman and ranking minority member, acting jointly, of each Senate committee shall, at the beginning of each Congress and at such times during each Congress as may be necessary, certify to the Secretary the names of the members of the staff of the committee whose official duties require their admission to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session. The Secretary shall issue two transferable credential cards, in such form as he deems advisable, for the use of such staff members under this rule, one of which shall be used under the direction of the chairman of the committee and one under the direction of the ranking minority member of the committee. Only one staff member shall be admitted to the floor at any time by authority of each credential card, unless the chairman or ranking minority member of the committee makes a request in writing to the Presiding Officer, in each instance, for the admission of more than one staff member. Members of committee staffs, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne on the rolls of the Secretary as such.

"(d) Each Senator shall, at the beginning of his term and at such times thereafter during his term as may be necessary, certify to the Secretary the names of the members of his office staff whose official duties require their admission to the floor of the Senate while the Senate is in session. The Secretary shall issue two transferable credential cards, in such form as he deems advisable, for the use of such staff members under this rule. Only one staff member shall be admitted to the floor at any time by authority of each credential card. Members of the office staffs of Senators, to be admitted to the floor, must be regularly appointed and borne upon the rolls of the Secretary as such.

"(e) The Secretary shall maintain a current list of all officers and employees of the Senate, members of the staffs of Senate committees, and members of the office staffs of Senators with respect to whom credential cards have been issued under this subsection. A copy of such list shall be kept at the desk of the Presiding Officer at all times when the Senate is in session."

SEC. 2. Rule XXXIII of the Standing Rules of the Senate is further amended by inserting after "Members of National Legislatures of foreign countries" the following: ", upon presenting proper credentials and when accompanied by or presented to the doorkeeper by the President of the Senate or a Member of the Senate."

STANDING COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], I submit a resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business, and I ask that the resolution be appropriately referred. The Senate has before it already a resolution, which I submitted, giving permanent status to the Select Committee on Small Business. Such a step, of course, would be a forward-looking one, but in my judgment, if we are to fulfill our responsibilities to the small-business communities of our Nation, it is essential to give such a committee legislative status.

The resolution (S. Res. 30), submitted by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, and Mr. LONG), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That section 1 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(p) (1) Committee on Small Business, to consist of 13 Senators, to which committee shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the problems of American small business enterprises.

"(2) It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all the problems of American small business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation, and to report to the Senate from time to time the results of such studies and surveys."

SEC. 2. The Select Committee on Small Business established by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, is hereby abolished. The employees, records, and property of the Select Committee on Small Business on the effective date of this section shall thereupon become the employees, records, and property, respectively, of the standing committee established by this resolution.

SEC. 3. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended, effective on the date of beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress and for the remainder of such Congress, to read as follows:

"4. (a) Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 23 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 11 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Small Business, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on 3 standing committees and no more.

"(b) In the event that during the 84th Congress members of 1 party in the Senate are replaced by members of the other party, the 34 third-committee assignments shall in such event be distributed in accordance with the following table:

"Senate seats

Majority	Minority
48	48
49	47
50	46
51	45

"Third committee assignments

Majority	Minority
25	9
23	11
21	13
19	15"

SEC. 4. Section 4 of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended, effective on and after the date of beginning of the 85th Congress, to read as follows:

"4. Each Senator shall serve on 2 standing committees and no more; except that not to exceed 21 Senators of the majority party, and not to exceed 9 Senators of the minority party, who are members of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Committee on Government Operations, the Committee on Small Business, or the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service may serve on 3 standing committees and no more."

SEC. 5. The first 3 sections of this resolution shall be effective on and after the date of beginning of the second regular session of the 84th Congress.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF DONALD R. HEATH, OF KANSAS, TO BE AMBASSADOR TO REPUBLIC OF LEBANON

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I give notice that the nomination of Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Lebanon, will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

REPORT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to present the initial report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation describing its efforts since its formation on July 2 of last year.

The report briefly sets forth the splendid progress which has been made during this period in implementing the Wiley law, Public Law 358, 83d Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATUS AND PROGRESS OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation began to function July 2, 1954. After a selection of key personnel and an advisory board, the United States Army Corps of Engineers was directed, as agent for the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, to blueprint the designs of the navigation project authorized on the St. Lawrence River under Public Law 358, 83d Congress.

Several meetings with the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, and members of the Canadian Cabinet representatives, were held in Ottawa during July and August. The United States delegation was, on each occasion, headed by Deputy Secretary of Defense, Robert B. Anderson.

An exchange of notes between the two governments followed these meetings. These notes were a declaration of intention and a confirmation of desire to work cooperatively and in close collaboration so as to concurrently complete the navigation facilities by the fall of 1958.

The mechanics of financing the United States project have been satisfactorily discussed with the United States Treasury Department. The Corporation has adopted a seal. Several meetings of the advisory board have been held. A branch office has been established at Buffalo, N. Y., and a resident engineering staff has been located at Massena, N. Y.

On November 27, 1954, we advertised for bids from private contractors on our first contract. These bids were opened on December 16, 1954, and the lowest bid, which was exceedingly favorable, will be awarded early in January 1955. The entire project will be under contract by September 1955.

The Corporation is meeting from time to time with the engineering staff of the St. Lawrence Seaway Authority of Canada, as well as the engineers of the Ontario Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Canada and the Power Authority of the State of New York.

We have enjoyed considerable cooperation from many departments of our Government, namely, the Department of Defense, State Department, Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Budget, United States Army Signal Corps and Corps of Engineers, Attorney General's Office, General Services Administration, General Accounting Office, and the Maritime Administration.

Members of our staff have made frequent public appearances to explain to interested audiences the nature of our project which lies ahead. The imagination of the American people has been greatly stimulated since the passage of this legislation which authorizes an historic engineering venture. The keenest interest has been evidenced in so many quarters.

Nearly every port on the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River is actively planning for the future in the development of adequate facilities to meet the demands which will result from increased shipping and import and export trade.

Ground-breaking ceremonies are being discussed by both the Canadian and United States seaway units.

There are still some problems of design facilities and engineering recommendations to be considered by the Canadian Seaway Authority and the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation. However, we expect these discussions to result in ultimate approval and an atmosphere of mutual understanding.

It is anticipated that the determination of toll rates and their application will be concluded long prior to the completion of the navigation project. Present projection of final cost of the United States portion of the seaway indicates that we will come well within our authorization of $105 million.

Cargo tonnage estimates give reasonable assurance that revenue from tolls will retire our debt to the Treasury Department well within the 50-year term specified in Public Law 358, 83d Congress.

Respectfully submitted.

LEWIS G. CASTLE,
Administrator, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

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

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

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him on January 17, 1955, at Chicago, Ill., before the Newspaper Advertising Executives Association.

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address delivered by him on January 18, 1955, before the National Agriculture Limestone Institute, in Washington, D. C.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him on the subject of the United States foreign policy, at the Jewish Community Center, Harrisburg, Pa., on January 16, 1955, and a press release dealing with the subject of his address.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

Address delivered by him at the New York Democratic State Committee victory dinner held on Friday, January 14, 1955.

By Mr. BYRD:

Statement prepared by him in regard to the national highway program.

Statement by Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, in connection with an article entitled "How Admiral Strauss Doctored History," which was published in the Washington Daily News.

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

Statement prepared by him in respect to the President's budget message of January 17, 1955.

By Mr. BENNETT:

Address entitled "Progress in Dairying," delivered by Secretary of Agriculture Benson during the 53d annual Farm and Home Week on the campus of the University of Minnesota.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, yesterday was the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin. Each year the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] and myself have made brief remarks concerning Franklin.

Once again we have the honor and privilege of celebrating the anniversary of the birth of Benjamin Franklin, one of the most illustrious of all Americans. Franklin is a son of both Boston and Philadelphia, for although he was born in Boston on January 17, 1706, the greater part of his life was spent in the City of Brotherly Love. Both Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, therefore, proudly claim him.

In these difficult days it is particularly encouraging and inspiring to us to think back to the times in which Franklin served so well. His autobiography and the many books which have been written about him since his day reveal very clearly that the problems which faced Americans in that time seemed fully as great as those which face us today. They met them squarely, however, and solved them with courage, with commonsense, and with enduring faith in the future of this land.

Franklin devoted his life to service to his fellow man, to the building up of the new democracy that had come into being in the New World. Few men served more effectively or energetically in freedom's name than did he.

It is our continuing hope that now, as we move ahead together in freedom's defense, we may demonstrate day by day the same optimism, the same courage, and the same faith in freedom that characterized Benjamin Franklin throughout every one of his 84 illustrious years.

SECURITY CLEARANCE OF CERTAIN STATE DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "State Department Clears 80 Accused by McCARTHY in 1950," published in the Washington Evening Star of January 17, 1954.

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

STATE DEPARTMENT CLEARS 80 ACCUSED BY McCARTHY IN 1950

(By L. Edgar Prina)

The State Department has informed Senator JOHNSTON (Democrat), of South Carolina, that none of the 80 persons investigated in 1950 by the Tydings subcommittee, following charges by Senator McCARTHY, has been found to be a Communist or disloyal.

Senator JOHNSTON, who is chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, said the finding by "this present Republican administration" * * * should "clear up this matter for all time."

Former Senator Tydings (Democrat), of Maryland, was chairman of the foreign relations subcommittee which investigated Senator McCarthy's charges of Communists in the State Department.

CLEARED BY TYDINGS

The Democratic majority of the Tydings group reported the charges were false and accused the Wisconsin Republican of engaging in a hoax. Senator McCarthy called the report a "whitewash." He helped Senator Butler in his campaign to unseat Senator Tydings in 1950.

Senator Johnston, whose committee is planning a broad inquiry into the Eisenhower administration's employee security program, said he asked the State Department to check their records on the 80 individuals. The Department's reply was signed by Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations and a former Congressman.

According to Senator Johnston, Mr. Morton informed him that 12 of the employees accused by Senator McCarthy were still working in the State Department and that 10 others had transferred to other Government agencies where they were now employed. He added:

"The State Department * * * further verifies the findings of the Tydings committee by stating that, of the eighty-odd names given to the Tydings committee by the Wisconsin Senator as persons then employed, only 40 were in fact employed in the State Department in 1950; 33 had resigned or left the State Department prior to that year and 7 * * * had never been employed by the State Department."

The Senator said that 3 of the persons accused by Senator McCarthy had resigned or been dropped from the Government rolls, "but that none of these 3 was found to be Communists or disloyal to our Government."

The State Department letter to the South Carolinian was not released, but it is understood the three persons referred to above were the diplomats John Paton Davies, Jr., John Carter Vincent, and John Stewart Service.

Mr. Vincent was ousted in 1953 after Secretary of State Dulles found that his work had been below standard, and Mr. Davies was released last November on grounds that he lacked judgment, discretion, and reliability.

START AT BEGINNING

Senator Johnston said he went back to the original McCarthy charges because "in order to proceed in an orderly manner, I thought it desirable to start at the very beginning."

He said he sent the names of the 80 individuals to the State Department for a check last month.

Senator McCarthy said he will not comment until he has read the text of the State Department's report.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in the same connection, I ask that there be printed in the Record a copy of a letter from the State Department to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Johnston], which completely contradicts the story which appeared in the Star.

I am not remotely accusing the Star of falsifying the facts. It did not have the letter at the time this article was written. It merely had an account of the interview with the Senator from South Carolina. If the Senator from South Carolina is correctly quoted, the Star was justified in placing at the head of the article the headline "State Department Clears 80 Accused by McCarthy in 1950."

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

January 10, 1955.

The Honorable Olin D. Johnston,
United States Senate.

Dear Senator Johnston: In response to your letter of November 24, 1954, requesting information with respect to certain previous or present employees of the Department of State, which was acknowledged on December 1, 1954, the following information is transmitted.

Question No. 1: Were these 10 persons publicly accused employees of the State Department?

Of the 10 persons referred to, 8 were or had been employees of the Department of State and 6 of these 8 were on the rolls of the Department of State during February 1950. With respect to the remaining 2 of the 10 in question, they were never on the rolls of the Department of State.

Question No. 2: Who, if any, among these 10 have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to our Government?

You ask if any among these 10 have been proved to be (a) Communists or (b) disloyal to our Government.

As indicated above, 2 of the 10 charged were never on the rolls of the Department of State.

Of the remaining 8, 2 resigned; 1 transferred to another Government agency; the employment of 2 was terminated at the completion of their assignments; 1 was removed from the Department under the provisions of Public Law 733 of the Eighty-first Congress (5 U. S. C. 22-1); 1 was removed after proceedings pursuant to the provisions of Executive Order 9835, as amended by Executive Order 10241, and under authority of Section 103 of the Department of State Appropriations Act of 1952 (65 Stat. 575, 581); and 1 was retired under the provisions of the Foreign Service Act of 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 999, 1016), when it was found that he did not meet the standards for continued employment in the Foreign Service.

You will note that only 2 were discharged, 1 under the provisions of Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress, and 1 by the Secretary in the exercise of his judgment under section 103 of the 1952 Appropriations Act and solely as the result of a finding by the Loyalty Review Board pursuant to Executive Order 9835, as amended, that there was reasonable doubt as to the loyalty of the employee and as a result of his review of the opinion of that Board.

It should be noted that neither Executive Order 9835, as amended, nor Section 103 of the 1952 Appropriations Act, nor Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress requires that it be proved that a person is a Communist before he may be discharged, and no findings to this effect were made in either of the two cases, the findings being made as above noted.

Question No. 1: Who, if any, among these 80 names were employees of the State Department on February 9, 1950? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 2: Who, if any, among these 80 names were not employees of the Department on February 9, 1950? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 3: Who, if any, among these 80 names were never employed by the Department on or before February 9, 1950? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 5: How many of these 80 named persons were working in the State Department on June 1, 1954? (See tab A and the attached list.)

Question No. 6: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons are still working in the State Department? (See tab A and the attached list.)

The list which you obtained from the files of the Senate investigating committee which was attached to your letter, sent to the Secretary by messenger on November 24, 1954, is returned to you with notations which answer questions 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6. The attached reference sheet (tab A) explains the symbols used to answer these questions.

Question No. 4: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons have been proved to be (a) Communists or (b) disloyal to the Government of the United States?

In general, the answer to this question is the same as that contained in paragraph 2 of page 2, except for the additional provisions of Executive Order 10450. Under the provisions of Executive Order 10450, the Department has the responsibility of separating from the rolls of the Department those persons whose continued employment is deemed to be not clearly consistent with the interests of the national security.

In an effort to be specific, the following information relative to the 80 individuals listed is furnished for your information:

Removed under Public Law 733—2.

Removed for suitability reasons under personnel regulations—1.

Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 9835—2.

Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 10450—1.

Resigned (other persons)—32.

Transferred to other agencies—10.

Termination of limited appointments—4.

Separated by reduction in force—8.

Retired—1.

Died—1.

Never employed—7.

Question No. 7: Please also advise whether any employees or former employees in the State Department have been indicted and found guilty under the above law (Sec. 1209 of Public Law 759, 64 Stat. 595, 765); and if so, who are they?

I am sure that you know the Department has no responsibility with respect to the enforcement of this law. According to the records of the Department, no present or former employee has been indicted and found guilty under the provisions of Public Law 759, 81st Congress, 2d session, approved September 6, 1950.

I have attempted to make this reply as responsive as possible to the questions you have raised. If the Department can be of any further service to you and the committee with respect to this matter, we shall be pleased at the opportunity.

Sincerely yours,

Thruston B. Morton,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Secretary of State).

(Enclosures: 1. Reference sheet (tab A). 2. Original list returned.)

Mr. McCARTHY. I invite the attention of Senators to the ninth paragraph in the letter from the State Department to the Senator from South Carolina, in which the State Department tells him that it has no function to clear people of communism or to declare that they are Communists.

I read the paragraph:

It should be noted that neither Executive Order 9835, as amended, nor section 103 of the 1952 Appropriations Act, nor Public Law 733 of the 81st Congress requires that it be proved that a person is a Communist before he may be discharged, and no findings to this effect were made in either of the two cases, the findings being made as above noted.

Therefore, the State Department points out that no findings were made on the question of communism.

I invite the attention of Senators to the figures given by the State Depart-

ment. They show that of the 80 named by me, 69 are no longer with the State Department. Two were removed under Public Law 733;

Removed for suitability reasons under personnel regulations—1.

Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 9835—2.

Resigned during proceedings instituted against them under the provisions of Executive Order 10450—1.

These are all orders and laws having to do with Communist activities.

Resigned—32.

The letter does not so state, but I have checked, and find that the 32 were all under investigation at the time they resigned. They were not cleared. They resigned; and when they resigned, the investigations were dropped.

Transferred to other agencies—10.
Termination of limited appointments—4.
Separated by reduction-in-force—8.
Retired—1.
Died—1.
Never employed—7.

This letter is a complete contradiction of the story that they were all cleared. None of those who resigned were cleared by any agency in the State Department. That is made evident by the letter.

With respect to the item "Never employed, 7," that includes men like Owen Lattimore, who was not on the State Department payroll, but who, according to the McCarran committee, was a principal adviser in shaping State Department foreign policy, and, as stated by the committee, "a conscious, articulate agent of the Communist conspiracy." It includes men like William Remington, who was not on the State Department payroll, but on the payroll of the Department of Commerce. He was working closely with the State Department.

I think this letter should be printed in the RECORD along with the story from the Star, so that anyone reading the RECORD will know how far the story strays from the facts. I do not know whether the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] was misquoted or not. I hope it was a case of misquotation, because his statements as quoted are completely untrue.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to the junior Senator from Wisconsin, I ask unanimous consent that the letter which I wrote to the State Department also be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOVEMBER 24, 1954.

Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As the ranking member of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I desire to assemble accurate data as to employees of the State Department who have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to our Government.

It was on February 9, 1950, that Senator McCARTHY made his first charge that many State Department employees were members of the Communist Party. Pursuant to Senator McCARTHY's charges, a Senate investigation was made to ascertain whether or not there were "employees in the State Department disloyal to the United States." In the course of that investigation Senator McCARTHY publicly accused 10 alleged employees of the State Department as being within one or the other of the categories mentioned.

Question 1: Were these 10 persons publicly accused employees of the State Department?

Question 2: Who, if any, among these 10 have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to our Government?

In addition to the 10 persons publicly accused by Senator McCARTHY, he accused 80 other alleged employees whom he stated were then (February 9, 1950) employees of the State Department. In accusing them, he used numbers for each person instead of their names. Later he gave to the Senate committee 80 names to correspond with each number he had used.

I have obtained this identical list from the files of the Senate investigating committee, which I herewith attach and send to you by messenger.

Question 1: Who, if any, among these 80 names were employees of the State Department on February 9, 1950?

Question 2: Who, if any, among these 80 names were not employees of the State Department on February 9, 1950?

Question 3: Who, if any, among these 80 names were never employed by the State Department on or before February 9, 1950?

Question 4: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons have been proved to be (a) Communists, or (b) disloyal to the Government of the United States?

Question 5: How many of these 80 named persons were working in the State Department on June 1, 1954?

Question 6: Who, if any, among these 80 named persons are still working in the State Department?

I desire also to point out that Public Law 759 (year 1950) provides the following: That any person "who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence and accepts employment, the salary or wages of which are paid from any appropriation or fund contained in this or any other act, shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both."

Question 7: Please also advise whether any employees or former employees in the State Department have been indicted and found guilty, under the above law, and, if so, who they are?

I have attempted to present these questions in precise and clear form and I trust I may have definite and concise answers thereto.

Very respectfully yours,
OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
United States Senator.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that the letter from the State Department, together with my letter, will show that of the 80 persons named by the junior Senator from Wisconsin at that time, about 40 were not even working with the State Department.

I think it will also be found that a great many of those named are still working for the Government. It will be found that not one of them has been convicted during the intervening years.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he resumes his seat?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I invite the Senator's attention to page 3 of the letter which he received from the State Department, of which I also received a copy. It is shown that 61 have left the State Department. All of them were either under investigation, or formal charges had been filed against them. Thirty-two of them were under investigation, with no formal charges filed. The remainder had charges against them, except 10, who were transferred.

The Senator knows also, when he says that they were cleared, that on page 2 of the letter the State Department told him very specifically and honestly that under the Executive orders, and under the law in effect, the State Department did not have the function of determining whether or not those persons were Communists. So when the Senator states, in an interview—if he was properly quoted—that they were all cleared, that is in complete contradiction of this letter. I think the average is fairly good, when we find that 69 out of 80 have disappeared from the State Department.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A great many of them have gone into other departments of the Government.

Mr. DIRKSEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I listened a few moments ago to the discussion when certain matters were inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. I confess my own confusion when I hear these things, because, unless I know the names of the persons and their circumstances, there is no way of making a proper evaluation of the action taken. Would it not be a good idea—and I address this question to my friend from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]—to ascertain whether the 80 persons named in the RECORD actually did work for the State Department? If they did not, we should know it. If they have been transferred to other agencies of the Government, I should like to know that. But, merely to take a general figure without knowing what the circumstances are, it is impossible for me, and I am confident that it is impossible for the country, to come to a conclusion on the matters which have been in controversy since February of 1945. I should like to see the issue resolved with some finality, and I should like to know who the persons are.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have 80 names in my possession. I sent the list of 80 names to the State Department. The State Department broke down the list originally named by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. About 5 years ago they were sent to the committee, first, by numbers. Later, the committee was given the names in confidence. Everything is in confidence. The State Department, in breaking down the list of names, stated that certain persons named never worked for the State Department and certain others were transferred to other departments. They have been analyzed, and I ask unanimous consent that the information may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

REFERENCE SHEET

(Explanation of symbols)

1. Employed on February 9, 1950.
2. Not employed on February 9, 1950.
3. Never employed by the Department of State.
4. Employed on June 1, 1954.
5. Presently employed.

SENATOR M'CARTHY, LIST OF 81

1. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
2. Name deleted, 1.
3. Name deleted, 2.
4. Name deleted, 2.
5. Name deleted, 2.
6. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
7. Name deleted, 1.
8. Name deleted, 2.
9. Name deleted, 2.
10. Name deleted, 2.
11. Name deleted, 2.
12. Name deleted, 2.
13. Name deleted, 2.
14. Name deleted, 2.
15. Name deleted, 1.
16. Name deleted, 2.
17. Name deleted, 2.
18. Name deleted, 2.
19. Name deleted, 3.
20. Name deleted, 3.
21. Name deleted, 1.
22. Name deleted, 1.
23. Name deleted, 1.
24. Name deleted, 1.
25. Name deleted, 1.
26. Name deleted, 1.
27. Name deleted, 2.
28. Name deleted, 3.
29. Name deleted, 3.
30. Name deleted, 2.
31. Name deleted, 1.
32. Name deleted, 1.
33. Name deleted, 1.
34. Name deleted, 1.
35. Name deleted, 2.
36. Name deleted, 1.
37. Name deleted, 1.
38. Name deleted, 1.
39. Name deleted, 2.
40. Name deleted, 1, 4.
41. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
42. Name deleted, 2.
43. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
44. Name deleted, 2.
45. Name deleted, 2.
46. Name deleted, 1.
47. Name deleted, 1.
48. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
49. Name deleted, 1, 4 5.
50. Name deleted, 1.
51. Name deleted, 1.
52. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
53. Name deleted, 2.
54. Name deleted, 1.
55. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
56. Name deleted, 1, 4.
57. Name deleted, 2.
58. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
59. Name deleted, 1.
60. Name deleted, 1.
61. Name deleted, 2.
62. Name deleted, 2.
63. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
64. Name deleted, 1.
65. Name deleted, 1.
66. Name deleted, 2.
67. Name deleted, 2.
68. Name deleted, 1.
69. Name deleted, 2.
70. Name deleted, 1.
71. Name deleted, 2.
72. No name given.
73. Name deleted, 2.
74. Name deleted, 2.
75. Name deleted, 2.
76. Name deleted, 3.
77. Name deleted, 1.
78. Name deleted, 3.
79. Name deleted, 1, 4, 5.
80. Name deleted, 3.
81. Name deleted, 2.

Names have been deleted in order to protect the individuals involved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. My letter to the State Department asked certain questions concerning the matter. Does the Senator from Illinois wish to bring before the public and have published in all the newspapers the names of 80 persons, against very few of whom there is scarcely a scratch? Does the Senator say that the names of all those 80 persons should be made public?

Mr. DIRKSEN. My answer is that if my name were on the list and my integrity and loyalty were impeached time and time again, I should be the first to ask an appropriate agency of the Government to get the file and to submit it to any committee or individual that might have a right to examine it, so that the whole record could be cleared.

It has always seemed phenomenally strange to me that information of this type should be bandied about while people complain either publicly or privately. If they have faith in the integrity of their own case, they should be the first to come to a Member of the Senate or to an appropriate committee and to say, "Put the information where all the world can see it."

Elective officers live in a goldfish bowl. Their lives are open books. Should a double standard, a different standard, be applied to those who work for the Government? That would seem strange to me.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator from Illinois will find, when he reads the RECORD, the letter which I wrote to the State Department. If that does not give all those persons a clear record, so far as the Government is concerned, I do not know what would. Not 1 of those 80 persons has been tried and convicted in a period of 5 years. Why have they not been convicted? We have written into the statutory law of the Nation a provision that anyone who draws a salary from the Federal Government and at the same time is a Communist can be tried, and if convicted, can be sent to a Federal prison for a term of 1 year, and fined $1,000. Yet not one person named on the list has been tried.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I may be trespassing on the 2-minute limitation on speeches, but I wish to conclude by saying that all the material which has been placed in the RECORD today can be nothing more than a general allegation that persons numbered 1, 16, 48, or 79, have something wrong in their files. Nothing will be proved to the Senate or to the country until we can get down to specific cases. It seems to me that we are still tilting at windmills.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator from Illinois will kindly call the State Department or the President of the United States he will be told that those names cannot be made public. If he can get the President to clear them, they can be made public; otherwise they cannot.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I need only add that I did not raise the issue. However, documents will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as of tomorrow morning for the edification and gaiety of the country, and I thought the information ought to be precise and explicit enough to convey some facts which would ultimately resolve the age-old issue.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The only thing I did not want to have happen was to have the name of some innocent person read and to have that person's character besmirched when he is as innocent as a new-born babe.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if I may have 10 seconds more, I should say that if these persons are clean and undefiled, then, of course, they could not be besmirched if their names were printed in the RECORD.

INEQUITIES IN LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I wish to serve notice that I shall, in the immediate future, introduce an appropriate bill designed to remove many existing inequities in labor legislation involving the compensation and the hours of work of laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors with the United States, any Territory, or the District of Columbia. In a great many instances mechanics and laborers are being worked on Government projects far in excess of 40 hours a week, often without any overtime whatsoever, and often at a great deal less per hour than the going union rate in particular localities. So long as such practices are allowed to continue, not only union members in the construction trade, but far-sighted employers who believe in collective bargaining and in contracts with unions, are being severely penalized.

The bill which I intend to introduce, Mr. President, would amend the 8-hour law so as to provide:

First. An 8-hour day and a 40-hour week.

Second. The 40-hour week to be worked on 5 consecutive days, Monday to Friday inclusive.

Third. Overtime at not less than 1½ times the rate paid during the regular working hours for all time worked in excess of 8 hours per day, 40 hours per week, and for all labor performed on Saturday, Sunday, or holidays.

Fourth. That the Secretary of Labor shall predetermine rates of pay for the regular working hours of employees of contractors and subcontractors, as set forth in section 1 of Public Law 403 of the 74th Congress, as amended.

Fifth. That the Secretary of Labor shall enforce all provisions of this act.

Sixth. That any contractor, subcontractor, or Federal official who intentionally violates this act shall be punished, upon conviction, by a fine of $5,000 for each and every violation or by imprisonment for 6 months, or both, for each offense.

Seventh. For the repeal of any portion of any law in conflict with this act.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert at this point in my remarks a document setting forth some examples of existing legislation which involves construction work and which will be affected by my bill, together with some of the violations of our national policy with respect to wages and hours which have occurred on Government contracts.

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

EXISTING LEGISLATION INVOLVED

Davis-Bacon Act: Applies to all construction, alteration or repair, including painting and decorating, where the Government enters into a construction contract in an amount of $2,000 or more. Some of the agencies which engage in this type of work include the Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, Department of the Interior, and General Services Administration. The work covered varies and is of many types, ranging from airbases, Army and Navy installations, post offices, Federal buildings, dredging of rivers, and other types of construction.

National Housing Act: This is the law under which the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) insures mortgages on single family homes and multifamily apartments. The law's prevailing wage provisions are applicable only to multifamily apartments. Single family homes are not covered, with the exception of individual homes built by cooperatives and insured by FHA. Under the Wherry Act amendment, rental housing facilities for military personnel built on or near Government military installations are also covered by the law's prevailing wage provisions. Housing for military personnel built directly by an agency of the Government, such as the Army, is covered by the Davis-Bacon Act.

Housing Act of 1949: The prevailing wage provisions of this law cover slum clearances by local authorities assisted by loans or grants from the Federal Government. The provisions also apply to construction of low-rent public housing. This type of multifamily apartment housing is generally constructed under the sponsorship of a local housing authority pursuant to a loan made by the Public Housing Administration.

Federal Airport Act: This law covers grants-in-aid to States and municipalities or other subdivisions of the State such as counties for the building and repair of airports. The act is administered by the Civil Aeronautics Administration of the Department of Commerce and requires observance on covered airport construction of minimum wage rates established by the Secretary of Labor.

Hospital Survey and Construction Act: This law covers the construction of hospitals, medical centers by States, counties, cities, and even by private organizations where the Federal Government makes a grant toward such construction. It requires the payment of prevailing rates as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

School Survey and Construction Act: This law applies to the erection of schools and other facilities in defense areas or other areas where the impact of Federal operations requires Federal contribution toward the construction of additional school facilities. It also requires payment of prevailing rates as determined by the Secretary.

Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Services Act of 1951: This law covers the construction of housing for defense workers or military personnel and such community facilities as sewers, waterlines, streets, and the like in defense areas. Payment of prevailing rates as determined by the Secretary is required. The Public Housing Administration which administers the public low rent housing program has by regulation required an overtime premium for hours in excess of eight per day, similar to that required under the 8-hour law.

Mr. MURRAY. Violations on Government contracts include—

First. The schedule of wage rates approved by the Secretary has not been posted in a prominent place at the construction site for all craftsmen to see.

Second. Craftsmen are paid an hourly wage scale less than the Secretary's approved minimum rate for their particular job.

Third. Journeymen craftsmen are classified and paid an apprentice's rate when, in fact, they work with journeymen's tools and perform journeymen's work.

Fourth. Workers are employed and classified as apprentices when, in fact, such employees are not duly registered apprentices as required by the Secretary's regulations.

Fifth. Craftsmen are improperly classified and are paid the approved hourly wage rate for the wrong classification. For example, an employee may be shown on the payroll records as a laborer and paid the laborer's approved rate when, in fact, he is doing the work of a plumber, bricklayer, painter, or carpenter and using the tools of the skilled craft.

Sixth. Craftsmen agree to perform for a lump-sum price certain work, such as the painting of a specified number of dwellings, or the installation of a specified amount of electrical wiring, the materials being furnished by the contractor. In such instances, the craftsman is termed a subcontractor for whom no payrolls are kept. His pay when computed on an hourly basis, is less than the Secretary's approved rate for his particular craft.

Seventh. Craftsmen often work for a contractor who is performing both Federal and private construction. It is not unusual in such cases for the craftsmen to be paid a rate lower than the approved rate. In some instances, it has been found that craftsmen are not shown on the payrolls as working on the Federal project.

Eighth. Craftsmen employed on a piece-rate basis often do not receive the approved hourly rate.

Ninth. Craftsmen do not receive the proper overtime pay. In overtime violations, payrolls have been found to show only weekly earnings when they should show the daily and weekly hours worked.

THE FIGHT AGAINST PARALYTIC POLIO

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, the year before us will be a climatic one in our long war against the ravages of paralytic polio.

In the years since 1938, when Americans, under the banner of the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, first banded together to fight this disease, giant steps have been taken toward the eradication of polio.

Last year scientists, supported by the National Foundation, mounted a massive offensive that produced a polio vaccine worthy of mass testing on humans.

Results of these tests are now being evaluated in what is unquestionably one of the most complex scientific projects ever undertaken.

Some time during the coming spring we should have an answer to the vital question: Does this vaccine work?

In the meantime, the job ahead in the polio fight is bigger because we must care for polio patients at the same time we are trying to prevent the disease.

The March of Dimes, now in progress, provides the best way we and other Americans can help get that job done.

The 1955 March of Dimes must raise $64 million to carry on the fight.

Every American should know these facts about the polio fight, and should give as much as he can to the March of Dimes.

In my own State of Delaware, there was a total of 88 polio cases during 1954 compared with only 32 cases for 1953.

This sharp increase in the number of individuals afflicted by infantile paralysis demonstrates the striking power of polio.

Let us hope that at long last we are nearing the end of the struggle to prevent a continuation of the toll which polio extracts annually.

With this goal in mind, I join in the hope that the collective efforts of the American people—together with the untiring labors of medical science—will write the final and glorious chapter in the battle against infantile paralysis.

RACIAL DISCRIMINATION AGAINST UNITED STATES NAVY PERSONNEL AT CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Saturday, January 15, the U. S. S. carrier *Midway*, a great ship with a great war record, docked at Capetown, South Africa. While there, the crew of the *Midway* was given shore leave. It was announced in the press before the *Midway* dropped anchor off Capetown that the 400 nonwhite members of the crew—American citizens, of course, and wearing the great colors of the United States Navy—would, while in Capetown, be treated as colored under the laws of South Africa. In other words, they would be treated in a manner quite different from other American sailors from the *Midway*. They would be barred from access to certain parts of Capetown and from certain public facilities in Capetown.

When news reports of this visit were printed in American newspapers, and when I saw these reports, I was shocked and disturbed. I sent a telegram to the Secretary of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy replied with a telegram to me. Under the circumstances, I recognize that no action could have been taken by the Secretary of the Navy following the receipt of my telegram. There was insufficient time. Yet I cannot help but retain the sense of shock I felt at American citizens being so treated in a foreign country, under the terms of an agreement with the government of

that country. I do not think we should have entered into any such agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a news story in the New York Times of January 14, my telegram to the Secretary of the Navy, his reply to me, and an editorial which appeared in the Monday, January 17, issue of the New York Times, commenting on the whole incident, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times of January 14, 1955]

SOUTH AFRICA TO RESTRICT NEGROES ON UNITED STATES CARRIER

CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA, January 13.—Apartheid, South Africa's system of race discrimination will apply to 400 Negro members of the United States aircraft carrier *Midway* when she anchors at Capetown Saturday.

When ashore the United States Negroes will carry special permits enabling them to consume liquor in mixed blood (colored) bars only. They must drink liquor on the premises and cannot take any away in bottles.

European bars, white hotels, motion picture theaters and bathing beaches also will be out of bounds for them. All United States Negroes will go ashore in uniform, thus making it easy for barkeepers to distinguish them from South African Negroes, who are not allowed to take European liquor.

The Licensed Victuallers and Hotelkeepers Association issued these instructions to its members following consultations with the Government.

JANUARY 14, 1955.

Hon. CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D. C.:

I am deeply disturbed over story in New York Times today that United States Aircraft Carrier *Midway* is to dock tomorrow, Saturday, January 15, at Capetown, South Africa. The story suggests that United States Navy has an agreement with the Union of South Africa that Negro crewmembers are to be treated differently from their fellow crewmembers while on shoreleave. If the facts are as stated it seems to me to constitute official acquiescence and willingness to submit our own citizens to the infamous Apartheid laws of the Union of South Africa in a contradiction of the United States Navy's announced policy of nondiscrimination and integration.

It is my hope that time remains to reverse the planned arrangements for this potentially unfortunate and most embarrassing incident.

Respectfully,
HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 15, 1955.*

Hon. HERBERT H. LEHMAN,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Referring to your telegram of yesterday's date concerning the U. S. S. *Midway* I wish to advise the ship is already in port. The Navy is investigating report of unequal treatment being given to some of our citizens and will promptly present the matter to our Government for handling through established diplomatic channels if the situation warrants it. The Navy as you know does not deal directly with any foreign government nor does the Navy's compliance with the laws of any foreign government while within its jurisdiction indicate the approval or disapproval thereof. We appreciate your interest and your support of the Navy's express policy of nondiscrimination and integration.

JAMES H. SMITH, Jr.,
Acting Secretary of the Navy.

[From the New York Times of January 17, 1955]

THE MIDWAY AT CAPE TOWN

The rule that American personnel of the armed services shall conform to the laws of the country in which they happen to be stationed or which they visit may be sound enough in principle. But there are exceptions. The visit of the United States carrier *Midway* to Cape Town is one of them. In this case someone has slipped and in our judgment slipped badly. Either South Africa should have agreed to waive its segregation practices in respect to the American sailors or the *Midway* should have been kept out of Cape Town.

In the *Midway's* crew there are some 400 American Negroes, Filipinos, and Americans of Japanese descent. Under South African law they may not enter "white" restaurants, hotels, or bars while ashore. We believe that this law is an affront to human decency and that its enforcement against our sailors in Cape Town is an affront to the United States Navy. The Navy seems to have taken it lying down, and that is not in Navy tradition.

Furthermore, we are convinced that if the other crew members of the *Midway* had been allowed to express themselves they would have gladly forfeited their own shore-leave privilege rather than see this insult to their comrades in arms. If the *Midway* actually had to put into Cape Town—and the Navy says it did—the men could have stayed aboard ship, and we think they would have been glad to do so on moral grounds.

We realize that South Africa's race problem is a complex one. We have deplored the "apartheid" policy but do not presume to dictate to others how they will approach and try to solve domestic problems. But we are also trying to solve a segregation problem and have made a most significant advance in the armed services. There is no reason why we should sacrifice that advance, even for 1 or 2 days, to the prejudice of the South Africans.

Our Negro and Filipino and Japanese-descended sailors are good enough to die for their country. If they are not good enough to go ashore in Cape Town, on equal terms, then the Navy should stay out of Cape Town. South African law is one thing, but essential morality is another.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 7237 OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at the desk is a bill, H. R. 2369, which has passed the House. The bill corrects an inadvertent omission in the narcotic tax penalties. It is imperative that the bill be enacted today.

As chairman of the Committee on Finance, and with the approval of the full membership of the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be not referred to the committee, but that it be taken up now for action on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 2369) to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, was read twice by its title.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance spoke to me this morning about the bill and stated that it had the unanimous approval of the Committee on Finance. As I understand, the purpose of the bill is to correct an inadvertent error in the revenue bill, in which a penalty was omitted. Is that an accurate statement?

Mr. BYRD. The statement of the Senator from California is entirely accurate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection. I think it is a very essential bill and should be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The bill was passed unanimously by the House of Representatives. Is not that correct?

Mr. BYRD. That is true.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2369) to amend section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation of the bill.

Section 7237 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 provides penalties for certain narcotic law offenses. In the codification of the narcotic penalties contained in this provision of the 1954 code, the penalties were inadvertently made inapplicable to certain offenses described in part I of subchapter A of chapter 39. While penalties contained elsewhere than in the Internal Revenue Code remained unaffected, the section 7237 penalties were applicable to these offenses under the 1939 code, and there was no intention to make any change in prior law penalties for these offenses, involving traffic in opium, and isonipecaine, opiates, and coca leaves. The bill will simply correct these inadvertencies which occurred in the codification of the 1934 code by making the penalty provisions for all the offenses described in part I of subchapter A of chapter 39, the same as they were before the passage of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

This measure has the approval of the members of the Senate Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 2369) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

URGENT DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS, 1955

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill H. R. 2091, the urgent deficiency appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair). The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the

fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2091) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the committee amendments will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Chapter I—Legislative Branch," on page 2, after line 2, to insert:

SENATE

For payment to Harriet McCarran, widow of Pat McCarran, late a Senator from the State of Nevada, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 6, to insert:

For payment to Mary R. P. Maybank, widow of Burnet R. Maybank, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina, $12,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 9, to insert:

SALARIES, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

The appropriation for salaries of officers and employees of the Senate contained in the Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1955, is made available for the employment of additional clerical assistants for each Senator from the State of Kentucky, so that the allowance for administrative and clerical assistants for such Senators will be equal to that allowed other Senators from States having a population of more than 3 million but less than 5 million, the population of said State having exceeded 3 million inhabitants.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, after line 19, to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Office of the Secretary: For an additional amount for the Office of the Secretary, $4,845: *Provided*, That effective February 1, 1955, the basic amount available for clerical assistance and readjustment of salaries in the disbursing office is increased by $6,600 per annum.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 3, to insert:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES OF THE SENATE

Senate policy committees: For an additional amount for the Senate policy committees, for agency contribution for Federal employees group life insurance, as authorized by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, $220 for each such committee; in all, $440.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 6, to insert:

Joint Committee on Printing: For an additional amount for the Joint Committee on Printing, for agency contribution for Federal Employees Group Life Insurance, as authorized by Public Law 598, 83d Congress, $115.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Inquiries and investigations: For an additional amount for expenses of inquiries and investigations, $795,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, after line 12, to insert:

Stationery: For an additional amount for stationery, $3,550, and the amount available for stationery for committees and officers of the Senate is hereby increased to $13,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Chapter III—Independent Offices," on page 4, after line 15, to insert:

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses," $140,000: *Provided*, That said appropriation shall remain available until May 31, 1955: *Provided further*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon the enactment into law of H. R. 2010, 84th Congress.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not offer an amendment to restore the amount which was requested by the agency affected by this amendment, but I think I should point out that the agency was created by a joint resolution which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations. As I recall, the late Senator Taft offered such a resolution, as I believe the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] also did. I know such a resolution was introduced by former Senator Ferguson. I know that Senator Taft was long interested in the matter.

At long last we have had established a commission to investigate the relations between the States and Federal Government, and other pertinent relations. Such a commission was urged by the Governors of many States. The Commission has compiled a great deal of data and information. That information is ready. The Commission has a staff. It will take a while to complete the data. As a result of such information, the Commission will make recommendations to Congress.

It is a field that is highly controversial. It is a field that engages Representatives and Senators in discussion almost every day. It relates not only to the fiscal field, but to fields involving highways, gasoline, and other taxes, and other related subjects. It seems to me that after the work has been done and data have been assembled, and the agency is now asking for $160,000 to complete its work, we should not exercise the fine art of cheese paring and take off $20,000. The denial of such funds may conceivably stop the work of the agency. It would look as if, after the apples are ripe on the tree, we were not appropriating the money to harvest the fruit.

At the time the full committee considered the matter it was my notion that the entire $160,000 should be allowed.

I wanted to acquaint the Senate with these facts so that if someone, out of the generosity and graciousness of his heart, wanted to move that the Senate restore the amount which was cut, the Senate would have an opportunity to do so.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I should like to inform the Senator that the reduction was made at the suggestion of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], who has inherited from his New England ancestors a sense of thrift, and who does not like to see dollars go out of the Treasury any sooner than necessary. The amount of $18,000 out of the $20,000 was cut below the budget estimate because of a doubt about the need for terminal leave payments. It was stated that many of the employees of the Commission had accrued leave pay due them when transferred from the agency of the Government in which they were formerly employed. It was believed that if such employees went back to their former employment, the additional earned leave benefits could be transferred along with them to their former agencies. In any event, such money would not be due until June or July. The reduction of the fund was not a complete denial of the Commission's request. Funds amounting to about $2,000 were also requested for the purchase of equipment which the committee believed could be obtained from the General Services Administration. I do not think the Commission is going to suffer from the cut. I should also like to bring to the attention of the Senate that the date set forth in the amendment is May 31, 1953. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], who are two Senators who are on the Commission, have asked if it would not be possible to make the date June 30, for the reason that there is so much work to be done in a comparatively short time. The Senators say that the Commission is going to do its very best to bring in a final report on time, and we have a definite commitment that the Commission will submit interim reports. As the Commission finishes one study it will report its recommendations to the Congress. If no report is made until the entire work of the Commission is completed, there might not be an opportunity to consider any of its recommendations during the present session of Congress, whereas if the Commission had made up its mind in any particular field, its recommendation in that field could be referred to the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I think I can concede everything the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said. However, there may be some employees of the Commission who did not come from another agency, so that the jurisdiction over terminal leave would not repose in the other agency. That may or may not be the case, but, as I look at the matter, it is important to make sure that the staff of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations is not dissipated. If someone on the staff should say, "This is the end of it; it appears that Congress is going to be a little niggardly in providing funds to enable us to assemble and get these data together," we may

see defections among the staff of the Commission. For the sake of $20,000, I would not want to undertake the hazard of the agency's not doing a good job. The staff has been at its work a long time. The work will have cost about three-quarters of a million dollars. At the shank of the work, I would not want to be in the position of cutting off $20,000 after the agency has stated to the Budget Bureau, to the President, and to the appropriate committees that, in its judgment, it needed $20,000 to complete its work.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I have in my hand a letter from the Representative from the Fifth Congressional District of Arkansas, Mr. BROOKS HAYS, the sponsor of H. R. 2010. He writes me as follows:

DEAR HUBERT: I regret very much that I made a mistake in the extension date in H. R. 2010 for the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. As you know, it should have been June 30 and not June 1 as the printed bill carries it. I am taking steps to substitute the correct date as fixed by the Commission in its formal request for an extension, and I trust that this error on my part will not embarrass you in getting the necessary funds to enable the Commission to complete its work. I am convinced that the full 4 months is needed.

As to the amount, it seems to me that the committee might well grant the full amount requested since both chairman and staff have been conservative, and I am sure they will be interested in holding expenses down to a minimum. Since the Commission does not have continuing life, it would be an extreme handicap to the staff in winding up its work to run out of money.

With high regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

BROOKS HAYS.

I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the position he has taken is the position which the Commission itself took, in formal resolution, after careful consideration of the needs of the Commission, and with its program finally arrived at. I might say that Mr. Kestnbaum, the chairman of this Commission appointed by the President, is doing an outstanding job.

He is working tirelessly, and he has an able staff which is doing a creditable and very detailed piece of work. So I feel very much as does the Senator from Illinois, namely, that we have almost arrived at the finish line, so to speak. We have gotten over some rather difficult political terrain. As we know, there was a change in the chairmanship, the President had to appoint a new chairman, following the resignation of Mr. Manion. We had a slow start, but we are making progress.

So, as the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] has pointed out, I hope the date "June 30" may be provided in the supplemental appropriation bill on which we are working.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Minnesota offer an amendment to that effect?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I shall do so, if the Senator from Illinois will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment: In the committee amendment on page 4, in line 20, strike out "May 31", and insert in lieu thereof "June 30", so that the date will be June 30, 1955.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, inasmuch as the bill will probably have to go to conference, I shall not object to the amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the committee amendment on page 4, in line 20.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, under the circumstances, and in order to crystallize the matter, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment on page 4, beginning in line 16: In line 19, strike out "$140,000", and insert in lieu thereof "$160,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois to the committee amendment on page 4, in line 19.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed to the committee amendment on page 4, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

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

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Foreign Claims Settlement Commission—Administrative Expenses," on page 5, line 20, after ("Public Law 744)", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (H. R. 2091) was passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference thereon with the House of Representatives, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. SALTONSTALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on page 3 of the bill appears a committee amendment appropriating an additional amount of $795,000 for inquiries and investigations. I have asked the financial clerk of the Senate to prepare a table indicating the total expenditures for current inquiries and investigations by committees of the Senate, and a further breakdown showing what was spent in the present fiscal year. He has not quite completed those figures at this time. However, for the information of the Senate—because the question of the cost of investigating committees is a live one, and before very long will be before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration—I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, the tabulations to which I have referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Contingent expenses, Senate, expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1955, as of Dec. 31, 1954

Appropriated	$1,224,120.00
Committee on Appropriations, S. Res. 193 (investigations division)	400,000.00
Joint Committee on Defense Productions	25,000.00
	425,000.00
Available for other expenses of inquiries and investigations	799,120.00

Expenditures for inquiries and investigations for the period July 1 to Dec. 31, 1954, as follows:

Subcommittees:	
Agriculture and Forestry (S. Res. 304) (importation of wheat)	1,512.92
Armed Services (S. Res. 185) (investigations subcommittee)	43,144.53
Banking and Currency (S. Res. 182) (Federal Reserve matters, etc.)	18,431.83
Banking and Currency (S. Res. 183) (expansion of international trade)	23,829.13
Banking and Currency (S. Res. 289) (FHA housing)	165,854.62
Foreign Relations (S. Res. 214) (technical assistance programs)	845.57
Foreign Relations (S. Res. 193) (International Peace and Security Organization)	11,809.71
Government Operations (S. Res. 189) (Permanent Investigating Subcommittee)	89,932.06
Interior and Insular Affairs (S. Res. 233) (fuel reserves of United States)	1,710.03
Interior and Insular Affairs (S. Res. 271) (critical raw materials)	13,092.01
Interstate and Foreign Commerce (S. Res. 173) (communications, transportation, etc.)	34,810.29
Judiciary (S. Res. 188) (western European refugees)	11,285.62
Judiciary (S. Res. 172) (Internal Security)	96,244.94
Judiciary (S. Res. 181) (investigations subcommittee)	39,594.44

Contingent expenses, Senate, expenses of inquiries and investigations, fiscal year 1955, as of Dec. 31, 1954—Continued

Subcommittees—Continued	
Judiciary (S. Res. 190) (juvenile delinquency)	$88,845.29
Judiciary (S. Res. 62 and 187) (national penitentiaries)	1,123.22
Judiciary (S. Res. 227) (Trading With the Enemy Act)	7,003.70
Labor and Public Welfare (S. Res. 270) (welfare and pension funds)	61,292.43
Rules and Administration (S. Res. 137 and 237) (privileges and elections)	8,928.60
Small Business (S. Res. 115)	671.47
Select Committee to Consider S. Res. 301, 83d Cong	14,630.63
Standing Committees:	
Agriculture and Forestry	190.06
Appropriations	11,120.25
Armed Services	3,615.01
Banking and Currency	1,879.14
District of Columbia	835.27
Finance	989.85
Foreign Relations	4,866.43
Government Operations	478.42
Interior and Insular Affairs	7,064.13
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	1,252.60
Judiciary	7,509.13
Labor and Public Welfare	590.87
Post Office and Civil Service	1,407.65
Public Works	1,804.25
Rules and Administration	3,056.76
Small Business	1,270.62
Total	782,523.48
Paid from 1953 and 1954 appropriations	60,485.02
Total paid from 1955 appropriation	722,038.46
Balance, Dec. 31, 1954	[1] 77,081.54

[1] Of which amount, $42,058.30 held in reserve for advances to committee chairmen.

EXPENSES OF INQUIRIES AND INVESTIGATIONS—SUBCOMMITTEE ALLOTMENTS, EXPENSES, AND BALANCES, DECEMBER 31, 1954

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry (making a study of the importation of wheat) under authority of Senate Resolution 127, agreed to July 10, 1953, Senate Resolution 218, agreed to March 10, 1954, and Senate Resolution 304, agreed to August 11, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 218).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 127	$15,000.00
By S. Res. 304	12,000.00
Total	27,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	11,766.72
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	15,233.28

Committee on Appropriations (subcommittee for the purpose of obtaining factual data) under authority of Senate Resolution 193, agreed to October 14, 1943, and Legislative Branch Appropriation Act for 1955.

Limitation, fiscal year 1955.

Amount appropriated: Legislative Branch Appropriation Act	$400,000,00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	53,583.79
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	346,416.21

Committee on Appropriations (subcommittee investigating any matter within the jurisdiction of the committee) under authority of Senate Resolution 129, agreed to June 26, 1947.

No limitation.

Amount authorized	$50,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	25,848.51
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	24,151.49

Committee on Armed Services (Preparedness Subcommittee) under authority of Senate Resolution 185, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$150,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	80,945.83
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	69,054.17

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee investigating Federal Reserve matters; Export-Import Bank, and defense housing) under authority of Senate Resolution 64, agreed to February 19, 1951, Senate Resolution 248, agreed to January 24, 1952, Senate Resolution 42, agreed to January 30, 1953, and Senate Resolution 182, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 182).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 64	$50,000.00
By S. Res. 248	28,000.00
By S. Res. 42	23,000.00
By S. Res. 182	16,000.00
Total	117,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	96,241.78
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	20,758.22

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee investigating international trade) under authority of Senate Resolution 25, agreed to June 8, 1953, and Senate Resolution 183, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 183).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 25	$67,000.00
By S. Res. 183	83,000.00
Total	150,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	73,898.38
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	76,101.62

Committee on Banking and Currency (subcommittee investigating the FHA) under authority of Senate Resolution 229, agreed to April 23, 1954, and Senate Resolution 289, agreed to August 11, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 229).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 229	$150,000.00
By S. Res. 289	75,000.00
Total	225,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	172,549.15
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	52,450.85

Committee on Finance (subcommittee investigating the social-security programs) under authority of Senate Resolution 300, agreed to June 20, 1950.

No limitation.

Amount authorized	$25,000

No expenditures to December 31, 1954.

Committee on Foreign Relations (subcommittee making a study of foreign technical assistance programs) under authority of Senate Resolution 214, agreed to July 6, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$40,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	15,845.57
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	24,154.43

Committee on Foreign Relations (subcommittee studying revision of the United Nations Charter) under authority of Senate Resolution 126, agreed to July 28, 1953, and Senate Resolution 193, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 193).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 126	$35,000.00
By S. Res. 193	40,000.00
Total	75,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	46,073.35
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	28,926.65

Committee on Government Operations (investigations subcommittee) under authority of Senate Resolution 156, agreed to June 14, 1951; Senate Resolution 251, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 40, agreed to January 30, 1953; Senate Resolution 206, agreed to January 28, 1954; and Senate Resolution 189, agreed to February 2, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 189).

Amounts authorized:	
Balance May 1, 1951	$77,315.18
By S. Res. 156	15,000.00
By S. Res. 251	89,000.00
By S. Res. 40	189,000.00
By S. Res. 189	207,273.00
Total	577,588.18
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	556,199.53
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	21,388.65

Committee on Government Operations (subcommittee investigating the reorganization of the legislative and executive branches of the Government) under authority of Senate Resolution 54, agreed to February 1, 1951; Senate Resolution 252, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 56, agreed to February 20, 1953; and Senate Resolution 184, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 184).

Amount authorized:	
By S. Res. 54	$19,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	9,162.16
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	9,837.84

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (subcommittee investigating the available fuel reserves of the United States) under authority of Senate Resolution 239, agreed to August 15, 1950; Senate Resolution 374, agreed to December 31, 1950; Senate Resolution 33, agreed to January 29, 1951; Senate Resolution 153, agreed to June 29, 1951; Senate Resolution 242, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 45, agreed to February 20, 1953; and Senate Resolution 233, agreed to April 28, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 233).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 239	$20,000.00
By S. Res. 45	10,000.00
Total	30,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	27,828.56
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	2,171.44

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (subcommittee investigating the accessibility and availability of critical raw materials) under authority of Senate Resolution 143, agreed to July 28, 1953; Senate Resolution 171, agreed to January 26, 1954; Senate Resolution 235, agreed to April 28, 1954; and Senate Resolution 271, agreed to July 17, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 271).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 143	$37,500.00
By S. Res. 171	12,500.00
By S. Res. 271	34,000.00
Total	84,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	52,280.29
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	31,719.71

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (subcommittee investigating communications, civil aeronautics, domestic transportation, maritime matters, and wildlife conservation) under authority of Senate Resolution 173, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955:

Amount authorized	$115,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	54,435.58
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	60,564.42

Joint Committee on Defense Production, under authority of Public Law 774, approved September 8, 1950 (Defense Production Act of 1950), as amended by Public Law 95, approved June 30, 1953.

Limitation, fiscal year 1955, $25,000.

No expenditures to December 31, 1954.

NOTE.—Funds to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, of which amount, one-half to be reimbursed by the Senate.

Committee on the Judiciary (subcommittee investigating the flow of escapees and refugees to the Western European nations) under authority of Senate Resolution 326, agreed to June 21, 1952; Senate Resolution 68, agreed to April 22, 1953; and Senate Resolution 188, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 188).

Amount authorized:	
By S. Res. 326	$65,000.00
By S. Res. 68 (allotment reduced)	−18,500.00
By S. Res. 188	10,000.00
Total	56,500.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	40,414.07
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	16,085.93

Committee on the Judiciary (subcommittee investigating the administration, etc., of the Internal Security Act of 1950) under authority of Senate Resolution 366, agreed to December 21, 1950; Senate Resolution 7, agreed to January 29, 1951; Senate Resolution 198, agreed to September 27, 1951; Senate Resolution 314, agreed to May 29, 1952; Senate Resolution 46, agreed to January 30, 1953; and Senate Resolution 172, agreed to January 27, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 172).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 366	$10,000.00
By S. Res. 7	75,000.00
By S. Res. 198	117,000.00
By S. Res. 314	163,800.00
By S. Res. 46	150,000.00
By S. Res. 172	170,000.00
Total	685,800.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	637,325.99
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	48,474.01

Committee on the Judiciary (investigations subcommittee), under authority of Senate Resolution 181, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$87,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	72,914.90
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	14,085.10

Committee on the Judiciary (subcommittee studying juvenile delinquency), under authority of Senate Resolution 89, agreed to June 1, 1953, and Senate Resolution 190, agreed to January 27, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955, or date of final report (earlier).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 89	$44,000.00
By S. Res. 190	175,000.00
Total	219,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	194,682.39
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	24,317.61

Committee on the Judiciary (Subcommittee on National Penitentiaries), under authority of Senate Resolution 187, agreed to January 26, 1954.

Limitation, February 1, 1954, to January 31, 1955.

Amount authorized	$5,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	1,261.68
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	3,738.32

Committee on the Judiciary (making an examination and review of the Trading With the Enemy Act), under authority of Senate Resolution 245, agreed to March 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 47, agreed to January 30, 1953; Senate Resolution 120, agreed to June 24, 1953; and Senate Resolution 227, agreed to April 28, 1954.

Limitations, January 31, 1955 (S. Res. 227).

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 245	$100,000.00
By S. Res. 47	50,000.00
By S. Res. 227	10,000.00
Total	160,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	130,610.23
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	29,389.77

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (investigation of employee welfare and pension funds), under authority of Senate Resolution 225, agreed to April 28, 1954, and Senate Resolution 270, agreed to July 17, 1954.

Limitation, January 31, 1955.

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 225	$75,000.00
By S. Res. 270	50,150.00
Total	125,150.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	72,495.64
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	52,654.36

Committee on Rules and Administration (Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections), under authority of Senate Resolution 234, agreed to May 20, 1954.

Limitation, none (from May 1, 1954).

Amount authorized	$50,000.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	10,023.58
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	39,976.42

Committee on Rules and Administration (Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections), under authority of Senate Resolution 250, agreed to April 13, 1950; Senate Resolution 311, agreed to July 27, 1950; Senate Resolution 209, agreed to September 13, 1951; Senate Resolution 262, agreed to January 24, 1952; Senate Resolution 333, agreed to June 12, 1952; Senate Resolution 106, agreed to June 8, 1953; and Senate Resolution 137, agreed to August 3, 1953.

Limitation, none.

Amounts authorized:	
By S. Res. 250	$50,000.00
By S. Res. 311	25,000.00
By S. Res. 209	10,000.00
By S. Res. 252	75,000.00
By S. Res. 333	100,000.00
By S. Res. 106	75,000.00
By S. Res. 137	37,500.00
Total	372,500.00
Expenditures to Dec. 31, 1954	372,277.62
Balance, Jan. 1, 1955	222.38

Amounts authorized and expenditures by standing committees under authority of sec. 134A of Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, 83d Cong.

	Total authorized	Expended to Dec. 31, 1954	Balance Jan. 1, 1955
Standing committees:			
Agriculture and Forestry	$10,000.00	$8,691.11	$1,308.89
Appropriations	60,000.00	44,978.95	15,021.05
Armed Services	20,000.00	14,159.58	5,840.42
Banking and Currency	20,000.00	16,382.01	3,617.99
District of Columbia	10,000.00	6,448.62	3,551.38
Finance	10,000.00	7,088.02	2,911.98
Foreign Relations	59,000.00	21,556.98	37,443.02
Government Operations	10,000.00	5,952.34	4,047.66
Interior and Insular Affairs	30,000.00	27,777.08	2,222.92
Interstate and Foreign Commerce	20,000.00	11,034.92	8,965.08
Judiciary	40,000.00	27,556.67	12,443.33
Labor and Public Welfare	15,000.00	10,022.35	4,977.65
Post Office and Civil Service	10,000.00	5,540.31	4,459.69
Public Works	35,000.00	8,259.01	26,740.99
Rules and Administration	10,000.00	5,985.77	4,014.23
Total, standing committees (83d Cong)	359,000.00	221,433.72	137,566.28
Total, investigating committees	3,870,538.18	2,808,665.30	1,061,872.88
Overall total, subcommittees and standing committees	4,229,538.18	3,030,099.02	1,199,439.16

SPECIAL COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to create a special Commission on Government Security; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, the full text of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 21) to establish a Commission on Government Security, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, for himself and Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is vital to the welfare and safety of the United States that there be adequate protection of the national security, including the safeguarding of all national defense secrets and public and private defense installations, against loss or compromise arising from espionage, sabotage,

disloyalty, subversive activities, or unauthorized disclosures.

It is, therefore, the policy of the Congress that there shall exist a sound Government program—

(a) establishing procedures for security investigation, evaluation, clearance, and, where necessary, adjudication of Government employees, and also appropriate security requirements with respect to persons privately employed or occupied on work requiring access to national defense secrets or work affording significant opportunity for injury to the national security;

(b) for vigorous enforcement of effective and realistic security laws and regulations; and

(c) for a careful, consistent, and efficient administration of this policy in a manner which will protect the national security and preserve basic American rights.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT SECURITY

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in the first section of this joint resolution, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Government Security (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members, as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(c) Of the members appointed to the Commission not more than two shall be appointed by the President of the United States or the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the same political party.

(d) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

(f) The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(g) Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Members of the Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) The members of the Commission from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. (a) (1) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(2) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(b) All employees of the Commission shall be investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation as to character, associations, and loyalty and a report of each such investigation shall be furnished to the Commission.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 5. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this joint resolution.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. The Commission shall study and investigate the entire Government security program, including the various statutes, Presidential orders, and administrative regulations and directives under which the Government seeks to protect the national security, national defense secrets, and public and private defense installations, against loss or injury arising from espionage, disloyalty, subversive activity, sabotage, or unauthorized disclosures, together with the actual manner in which such statutes, Presidential orders, administrative regulations, and directives have been and are being administered and implemented, with a view to determining whether existing requirements, practices, and procedures are in accordance with the policies set forth in the first section of this joint resolution, and to recommending such changes as it may determine are necessary or desirable. The Commission shall also consider and submit reports and recommendations on the adequacy or deficiencies of existing statutes, Presidential orders, administrative regulations, and directives, and the administration of such statutes, orders, regulations, and directives, from the standpoints of internal consistency of the overall security program and effective protection and maintenance of the national security.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192–194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purposes of this joint resolution, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

INTERFERENCE WITH CRIMINAL PROSECUTIONS AND INTELLIGENCE FUNCTIONS

SEC. 8. Nothing contained in this joint resolution shall be construed to require any agency of the United States to release any information possessed by it when, in the opinion of the President, the premature disclosure of such information would jeopardize or interfere with a pending or prospective criminal prosecution, or with the carrying out of the intelligence responsibilities of such agency.

REPORTS

SEC. 9. The Commission shall submit interim reports to the Congress and the President at such time or times as it deems advisable, and shall submit its final report to the Congress and the President not later than January 15, 1956. The final report of the Commission may propose such legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations. The Commission shall cease to exist 90 days after submission of its final report.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask that it be noted that the joint resolution is cosponsored by the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. We have joined together on this measure; and for the next few minutes I shall discuss why we believe it is an important proposal.

The joint resolution is carefully drawn, and is the reflection of intensive discussions that I have had with Members on both sides of the aisle. It is a matter of sincere satisfaction to me that, following my original announcement of interest in connection with a commission, significant bipartisan support has come to me both in and out of Congress.

There is a grave realization, Mr. President, that our security laws, regulations, and practices need a new look, a careful look, a nonpolitical look. This can be accomplished through a commission along the lines of the one called for by the joint resolution now at the desk.

The real problem facing us is to assure that we shall have an overall Government security program which will realistically and effectively meet the requirements of the national security in this time of peril and at the same time will be consistent with our great national tradition. We must be sure not only that our legitimate security measures are as effective as possible, but also that they are realistic and worthwhile from the standpoint of the total national interest.

Our present total Government mechanism for assuring security does not inspire confidence. Not since 1917, when the Espionage Act was under consideration by the Congress, has there been full-dress consideration by the Congress of the problems of protecting national secrets, and national defense generally,

against subversive penetration. Nor is there any indication that the executive branch has ever devoted inself to consideration of the total security problem. In the past, such action as has been taken in the name of security has been more a random, sporadic response to peril, rather than a carefully considered plan for defense against peril.

With specific regard to the question of employee security, for example, the central investigating agencies are the FBI and Civil Service Commission. It is my understanding that, ordinarily, investigations are conducted by Civil Service Commission unless an agency has its own facilities, as in the case of the Defense, State, Treasury, Justice, Post Office, and Agriculture Departments.

Mr. President, I note here that immediately we see again the variations in pattern. We see two central investigating agencies, namely, the FBI and the Civil Service Commission; and then, off on the side, we see separate Departments which have their own investigatory facilities, totally removed from the civil-service procedures and criteria. Of course, it is always true and apparent that if serious, derogatory information is developed, the case is then referred to the FBI; and, of course, the FBI may also make original investigation, when required by law.

On the basis of information available to me, I am persuaded that the Civil Service Commission and the Federal Bureau of Investigation have maintained high standards of selection for their investigators. The best that can be said for the other agencies, however, is that their standards are variable.

Security investigator is a new profession in Government. Where the Civil Service and FBI are concerned, these investigators are not subject to administrative direction from individually interested agencies; but as to the investigators of other Departments, there is always the danger they will be subject to administrative guidance and suggestions.

The FBI has long maintained the practice of not evaluating its own findings. It is a factfinding and reporting agency, and leaves their evaluation to others. Undoubtedly, this has contributed to its prestige and strength—prestige and strength which are justly deserved, Mr. President, on the basis of the record and the performance. Yet it appears that in other agencies the factfinders are also the evaluators. This means that on occasion, security investigators make recommendations on the facts filed by them.

These points raise bothersome questions. Does the Congress intend to have the security investigator serve as policeman, prosecutor, and judge, all in one?

It is to help find the answers to these questions and to these problems and to many more that I do not have the time—nor do I take the time—to raise, that the Commission which is provided for in the joint resolution we are introducing today is necessary.

We have done many things in the name of security during the past decade; indeed, as a practical matter, our present security system is a phenomenon of only the past decade. We have enacted espionage laws and tightened existing laws; we required investigation and clearance of millions of our citizens; we have classified information and locked it in safes behind locked doors, in locked and guarded buildings, within fenced and heavily guarded reservations. But each of these actions has been taken sporadically and independently and not as part of a rational overall master plan for security.

It is my feeling that the time is long overdue for us to really take a look at what we have created, to evaluate it, to analyze it, and then to assign an appropriate, adequate plan of security which meets all the tests of the protection of our national safety and welfare.

We have not paused in our necessary, though frantic, quest for security to ask ourselves:

What are we trying to protect, and against what?

What can we effectively protect?

What specific measures will give us the degree of protection we want or need?

What price are we willing to pay for security?

Lest I be misunderstood, I realize that individually, as we have discussed these typical questions in our deliberations in the Congress, we have asked ourselves these questions and have come up with immediate answers. The point I am trying to make is that we have never really had placed before us all the laws, rules, regulations, Executive orders, and directives which make up what we call our security system, to see whether there is overlapping and duplication, whether there are loopholes, and areas not properly covered, and to learn whether or not we are creating a program which has a uniformity of application, or whether it runs hot and cold, depending upon the particular attitudes of individual administration officials.

A consequence of our failure to come to grips with the hard realities of the security problem, to understand it, and to bring it under rational control, is that we have in 1955 a complex of Government security statutes, regulations, and procedures which on its face seem contradictory. I do not know whether or not our national secrets and national security generally are being adequately protected under the existing system. I do not think anybody knows or can know—even those men in our Government responsible for security—because the Government's present over-all security mechanism defies understanding, let alone analysis, on the basis of a quick look.

Let us look at the record.

To the extent Congress has legislated at all in this area, it has been primarily concerned with the problems of espionage and unauthorized disclosure of national defense secrets. The basic statute is the Espionage Act of 1917. We have amended this statute a number of times to tighten it in the light of current needs, but we have never really studied it to make sure that a statute written in 1917 to reflect the political, military, and technological problems of that era is adequate in the era of hydrogen bombs, radar, and guided missiles, and the world's most infamous conspiracy, the international Communist conspiracy, which surely is not comparable in its ramifications, its subtleties, and its treachery, to some of the old tyrannies of years gone by.

What we have done, despite the fact that the language of the Espionage Act covers all national defense secrets without limitation, is to enact new self-contained espionage laws applicable to special areas of information.

Thus, in 1946, we enacted a complete self-contained espionage law, included in the Atomic Energy Act, applicable only to atomic energy secrets. In 1951, we enacted a complete, self-contained espionage law applicable to cryptographic data. Each of these new laws closely parallels the original Espionage Act. In some respects the new laws are broader and more stringent; in other respects they are narrower and more lenient. In any event, the original Espionage Act apparently is intended to and does remain applicable to atomic energy and cryptographic information, notwithstanding the enactment of the new laws.

I cannot understand why we need three separate espionage laws. Is it more desirable to have three such laws rather than a single espionage law covering all espionage offenses? I merely ask these questions, without any valid judgment.

The existence of three separate espionage laws creates grave legal problems of reconciling the applicability of these laws in specific prosecutions. This was dramatically demonstrated in the closing phases of the well-known Rosenberg case, when the Rosenbergs were able to seize upon a technicality afforded by the variance in the penalty provisions of the Atomic Energy Act and the Espionage Act. Undoubtedly other such technicalities exist. The existence of three statutes of this kind may well constitute a serious built-in loophole in our security laws.

In this connection, I should point out that a Library of Congress analysis of the Adequacy of United States Laws With Respect to Offenses Against National Security, prepared in 1953 at the request of the distinguished former Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. WILEY] and published as a Senate document, thoroughly documents the inadequacies, inconsistencies, loopholes, and anomalies in the status quo.

It is a very revealing document, and I hope it has been carefully read by Members of the Senate who have concentrated so much of their time and attention upon matters of security.

But the espionage laws are not alone in the state of ambiguity. As the security system grew up, it was every agency for itself. Prior to 1951 when President Truman commenced to bring some order out of chaos by promulgation of Executive Order 10290 establishing uniform minimum standards for classification and safeguarding of national-defense secrets, numerous agencies of the Government had adopted their own regula-

tions for classifying and handling information. Each agency had its own rules; there was no coordination, and very little consistency among them. Every once in a while Congress would make its contribution by superimposing upon this chaos a special requirement for classification of information by a specific agency, as was done in the case of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, and the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950.

President Truman's Executive order, and the more recent one by President Eisenhower, bring considerable coordination and order out of the preexisting confusion, but there remains much that must be done before we can be sure our system makes sense and is truly effective. We still have multiple standards, some purely administrative and some statutory. I think a heavy burden of proof must rest upon those who would tell us that a single, uniform standard would not better serve the cause of security.

I wish to emphasize that the variable standards which are now applicable in the several agencies and departments of the Government defy the mind of man when it comes to bringing about any conformity, any uniformity, or any reasonable degree of fair application in a particular security case as it may go from one department to another.

Equal difficulty prevails with respect to security investigations, and clearance. I am not talking now about the kind of case symbolized in the last few weeks in the Ladejinsky case. However, this is a classic example of what may well be termed confusion compounded in the security system of this Government. It is such a classic example that it has those in high office baffled as to how to justify what has happened.

I refer, rather, to the difficulty prevailing in the very foundations of the personnel security clearance programs, as in the case of the ground rules for classification of information, requirements for investigation and clearance developed independently and without coordination in numerous separate agencies of the Government. Again, Congress helped. Commencing with the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, Congress has since enacted more than a dozen individual laws requiring investigation and clearance for personnel of certain Government agencies. The degree of variation among these statutes in the precise standards and criteria for investigation and clearance is remarkable. The security program established by President Eisenhower is necessarily built upon this uncoordinated statutory foundation, and the statutory foundation imposes definite limitations upon the degree of coordination and consistency which can be achieved under the present security program.

But there is still more to be said about personnel security. We have gone to great lengths to provide special security protection for atomic-energy secrets. Until enactment of last year's Atomic Energy Act there was an inflexible statutory requirement for a full investigation and AEC clearance of all individuals requiring access to classified atomic energy data. We required by law a more stringent investigation and clearance for atomic energy data of only marginal sensitivity than we did in the case of the Military Establishment, which is subject to no statutory security requirements—I emphasize that fact, Mr. President—for access to the most sensitive war plans or scientific data. Conversely, the law prohibited the AEC's giving even high-ranking officers of the Military Establishment, who presumably had been investigated and cleared under military security procedures and who had constant and intimate contact with our greatest national secrets, access even to marginally classified atomic energy data, unless they met the peculiar investigative and clearance requirements of the Atomic Energy Act. All of this has demonstrably impeded the national defense effort.

Fortunately the 1954 Atomic Energy Act remedies this situation to some extent, but much of the anomaly remains. Although there now exists a basis for flexibility of investigation, and for interchange of AEC and Department of Defense clearances, personnel of other Government agencies, including such important ones as the CIA and the State Department, may not be able to have access to AEC information on the strength of their own agency investigations and clearances, but must undergo the specific treatment prescribed in the Atomic Energy Act. Again I think a heavy burden of proof rests upon those who would argue that such ambiguities, complexities, and contradictions are justifiable.

Much of our present fabric of security is built upon the assumption that atomic energy data of any degree of security sensitivity is per se more sensitive and warrants more elaborate protection than any other kind of information.

I should like to hear this assumption defended, because it seems to me that certainly there are many secrets involving war plans, radar, missiles, and the like, which are just as crucial and important as are our atomic energy secrets. Certainly many of our fine research programs are just as crucial and important to our national defense as are our atomic energy secrets. They all need protection. However, the interesting part about this special treatment of atomic energy data is that, in many respects, the actual protection afforded it falls far short of statutory protection afforded other areas of the national security interest.

Thus, the Department of Defense has authority to prevent photographing of its installations, facilities, and equipment, and to control ingress to, egress from, and activities within its property and installations. However, AEC has no such authority, as it found to its embarrassment 4 years ago when its armed security guards apprehended a Chicago radio commentator who had climbed over the fence into the Argonne National Laboratory exclusion area. A plausible legal basis for prosecution could not be found. If the same photographer had walked into a military reservation with his camera, he would have been subject to very severe penalties. Certainly he would have been subject to immediate prosecution.

However, despite all the restrictions which have been imposed on personnel clearance for the Atomic Energy Commission, similar precautions have not been written into law for the benefit of the military authorities. Conversely, we find that the military authorities have statutory requirements in terms of ingress and egress and control over persons on military reservations, but that the Atomic Energy Commission does not have such statutory requirements. Such a situation does not make for a very sensible pattern of security regulation.

All of this demonstrates the presently uneven and inconsistent scheme of security. It may be that despite all these anomalies, inconsistencies, loopholes, and duplications, the security system is working adequately, well, and economically; but I should like to find out by having the Commission proposed under this joint resolution lay the security system as a whole on the table and take a critical look at it. I mean critical in the sense of trying to improve the situation and to develop it fully. This has never been done, to the best of my knowledge. It is imperative that it be done now.

The conclusions derived from such a critical scrutiny will enable us to place the personnel security problem in proper perspective and to consider the problem in terms of meaningful values. It seems to me that we cannot properly cope with the personnel security problem until we understand how the personnel security program fits into the overall program, what it is intended to acomplish, and what it can effectively, justly, and economically accomplish. If we find, for example, that the personnel security program's main purpose is to preserve the security of national defense secrets, we will be able to consider personnel security in relation to the other techniques for accomplishing the same result.

We may find that we have areas of effective choice, and that we can or should relax personnel security standards and tighten the espionage laws and administrative control devices; or that we cannot really have effective security unless we vigorously weed out all persons about whom there is any doubt. I think we should become aware of what choices or alternatives do exist, and the price tag on each.

There are other questions in finding the answers to which Congress needs help. Are we to continue to have each agency make its own final determination without the right of further appeal, or should we establish an independent commission, which will be the final court of judgment in security cases? If such a final court of judgment is desirable, should its service be binding on all departments and agencies?

We must find the answer. Today, there is in existence no court of appeal. In the Ladejinsky case, to which public attention has been focused recently, and in other cases, a man has been shifted from one agency to another. Two agencies have given him clearance, and one agency has not given him clearance. No agency or tribunal exists at the present time where an adjudication of such a

situation can be had, particularly when an obvious division of opinion and attitude exists with reference to an employee's security record.

It is an injustice to the individual, and it may very well be cruel and inhuman treatment of such an individual. However, it is an injustice also to what one might call the effectiveness of orderly government. Surely, an answer must be provided to that question. At least we should provide the means of arriving at an answer.

What should we do with regard to investigations? Should they be centralized under the Civil Service Commission with the assistance of the FBI in special cases? Should we make clear that there is a separation between the investigatory and evaluation functions?

What should we do about uniform criteria? I remind the Senate that we have enacted legislation to provide that administrative agencies which function in a quasi-judicial capacity shall not also act as policemen, investigators, prosecutors, and judges and jury. That subject has been an important item of discussion throughout the past, and Congress has always endeavored to make certain that too much power shall not reside in any one man or in any one group or agency. Therefore I ask: What should we do about uniform criteria? Should we make provisions for a bill of specific particulars against suspected employees in order to help them prepare an adequate defense? What about applicants for Government employment? That is one of the tragedies in the present security system. Should applicants have an opportunity of appealing an adverse decision with regard to security claims?

Under present law, a man may never know why he was not given a Government job. Yet there may be a file in existence containing charges against him, which can be used to blackball him. Such a man can now have no opportunity to make answer, because he does not know the nature of the charges on file against him. That situation may well apply to hundreds of thousands and perhaps even millions of people. Such files may exist in many agencies. A man may seek employment in one agency after another, in all of which such a file may exist, without his having any knowledge of the existence of such a file, and without an opportunity of refuting such charges or criticisms. Yet he is blacklisted and blackballed from holding any Government job. He may be confronted with such a situation not only in trying to obtain a job with the Government, but also in obtaining a job in the defense industry, which provides so much employment in our country.

Furthermore, what about the heavy financial cost each Government employee faces on occasion when they must defend themselves and are then cleared? Does the Government have any responsibility to provide them with counsel?

I am not prepared, Mr. President, to answer these questions, but they are in our minds and in the minds of the American people. We should provide the facts and the intelligence upon which to base an adequate judgment. The American people are wondering whether we can have an effective security system on the one hand and, on the other, still be able to preserve the basic American rights which we know so well under our legal and constitutional systems. We should provide the facts and the intelligence upon which to base an adequate judgment as to all these questions under the system which now operates.

Mr. President, in order to accomplish this objective it would be necessary and wise for the Congress to create a Commission on Government Security. The commission which we propose would have 12 members: four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life; 4 appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and 4 appointed by the Speaker of the House, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life. I would say this would be a blue-ribbon commission, composed of men selected strictly on the basis of competence, ability, and the highest standards of morality and character.

These appointments would be equally divided on a so-called partisan basis, so that the work of the commission would be out of the area of partisan political conflict and would be on the high plane of competent analysis and study for the good of the country and the safety of the Republic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of a remarkable address by one of our former distinguished colleagues, who sat on the other side of the aisle, former Senator Harry P. Cain, member of the Federal Subversive Activities Control Board. The address was delivered at a meeting on January 15. Senator Cain's address emphasizes the strictly bipartisan nature of his agency. He is to be commended for speaking out so plainly. He has spoken his own ideas and his own views. I am not saying whether his views and ideas will be acceptable to many, any, or all of us, but I am saying that, at least, there is deep concern in high places in the Government and throughout the Nation as to an effective security program and its appropriate administrative operation.

Senator Cain calls attention to the necessity for a careful reappraisal of our entire security program and the way in which it is operated, a reappraisal taken out of the realm of political controversy and placed in the hands of a high-level bipartisan commission in which the American public can have full confidence.

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

CAN FREEDOM LIVE WITH INTERNAL SECURITY?

(By Hon. Harry P. Cain)

Mr. Chairman, through what I am about to say, I shall endeavor to adequately express the keenness of my appreciation for your invitation and the joy I am receiving from being in your company. This is no small undertaking for it has been more than 2 years since last I was among you.

Robert Paine suggested that you might be interested in what I have been doing in these last 2 years and how I think the Nation and the Republican Party are doing.

I can satisfy a portion of the suggestions in a single sentence. For the better part of 2 years I have been sitting, listening, and thinking.

In this period, I have been a member of a board of inquiry, referred to by the somber title, the Subversive Activities Control Board, which is a basic part of your Nation's developing internal-security system. In this work, my four colleagues and myself endeavor to determine whether the Attorney General of the United States is absolutely correct in his allegations that listed organizations in our country are dominated, controlled, and directed by the Communist Party, United States of America, or by foreign powers which seek the overthrow and ultimate destruction of the United States.

You read and hear very little about the labors of the Subversive Control Board for reasons which are clear and understandable. The Board itself makes every effort to be free of controversy and the Board looks to our high courts for statements of explanation when Board orders, requiring public registration by Communists and fellow travelers, are made final.

It is encouraging that Communist leaders have repeatedly testified that the Communist Party, United States of America, will be required to commit suicide should the Supreme Court finalize the Board's registration order against that organization.

A fuller discussion about the Board's procedures and substantial legislative authority can be provided in some future opportunity but not tonight. I ought, however, to make an observation. This segment of our internal security system does not suffer, aside from some complicated constitutional questions which are now before the courts, from public criticism or misunderstanding because the methods it employs are in support of the spirit of the Constitution and they provide equal fairness, objectivity, and due process to both parties in any case which is offered to us for adjudication. As a member of the Board, I speak for it in saying that we take nothing for granted nor do we assume that any individual or organization is guilty as charged until that result has been established to our own satisfaction on the public record.

I have a reasonable doubt that anyone ever more enjoyed his service in the United States Senate than I did. Its only conceivable drawback was an exaggerated emphasis on work of every possible kind rather than on an output of thought. I readily confess that I attempted to accomplish too much for too many people in too many directions all at once. In attempting all of this, I lost sight of some fundamentals which have returned to focus during the past 2 years.

Before reflecting on these fundamentals, I want to establish this attitude to be true. In my remarks there will not be, if I can help it, a single unreasonable, unsupportable, or destructive political reference. I am here as a proud Republican but I am speaking as one who feels that his basic allegiance is to his Nation rather than to the political party of his deliberate and considered choice. I labor as a Republican from a hope to be of some small service to our Republic.

No one among us denies that the present is an age of peril. Were we in disagreement about this, we could reach agreement about nothing.

Most of those in authority in each political party refer to the present and the years of our immediate future to be an intended period of peaceful coexistence with our enemies. It makes me much more alert and less gullible to think of these years as being coexistence with conflict. Call these years what you will, they will be demanding of a national preparedness and readiness in the armed services, which will long continue the draft or some counterpart—on the farm and

throughout industry—sufficient to call for hard sacrifices and participation by all of us.

This knowledge doesn't bother or perplex me. I accept it willingly. Like you, I am not living in the past or in the future. We must contribute in some real measure to the age in which we live.

As between our material strength and that of the Soviet Union, I see no particular hazards or defeat in store for the United States. I can only believe as I do that our present leaders and those to come will pursue every intelligent avenue for reconciling our differences with the leaders of international communism short of war. I must remain convinced, as I am, that we shall prevail and survive through any war which may be forced on civilization. In this sense and as a citizen, I have no fear of the Soviet Union whatsoever.

My only major concern is with what we are to be when international communism's ambition for world domination has been defeated in one way or another. Will we or those who follow us be able to say after the conflict has run its course that through its years, even though they be a hundred, we Americans and our Government have maintained and left untarnished our self-respect?

Will we then be able to reassure the rest of the world that America remains a place in which the individual is free because his Government and those in authority in every walk of life have been just?

As for myself, justice or equity and freedom or liberty are the two evidences of human progress and hope which distinguish representative governments and their peoples from those directed by tyrants, dictators, and despots. Other differences are only skin deep and hardly worth mentioning.

I want no victory over the godless forces of oppression which does not include the preservation of these assets without which a free people die and wither away.

Here we are confronted with the greatest challenge of our time. Now is when we must inquire about and make certain that in working to become victorious across the seas, we are permitting no domestic enemies or any acts of cowardice, shortsightedness, arrogance, or stupidity to assault or cripple our bastions of freedom here at home.

How often do you hear it said that because of our overwhelming fear of communism, we are blindly or blithely destroying the Constitution and the Bill of Rights? How often do you hear it said that muddle-headed if well-intentioned dreamers are so enamored of liberty in the abstract that we are doing too little or nothing meaningful in opposing the conspiracy which seeks to drive freedom from the earth?

I listen each day to those who frantically espouse each of these premises. In my judgment, neither contention is even remotely correct but there are far too many citizens who believe one or the other of these contradictory courses to be true.

In our struggle to survive as free men and women, we must keep three elements in balance. They are justice, security, and freedom. It seems apparent to me that none of these elements can stand alone and that no two can operate successfully without the other.

In the years of our past, we have lived by the dictates of freedom and justice. We have known what they were and we have long taken their blessings for granted. We can't say as much about internal security. We have had only the most limited experience with it and that experience has seldom touched the majority among our citizens as individuals.

In terms of time it is reasonable to say that our Nation didn't recognize the pressing need for an internal security system prior to 1947, a mere 8 years ago.

Until the very recent past, there was an understandable reluctance to acknowledge or believe that some Americans, perhaps in considerable numbers, were seeking ways through which to overthrow our Government and destroy our free institutions. Many hardheaded patriots, as well as softheaded ones, couldn't bring themselves to comprehend that some of our citizens were giving their allegiance to a foreign conspiracy which seeks to enslave us. This is America, they said, and such things couldn't happen here. I don't know anyone who now refuses to admit that such evil things haven't happened here. The public record is replete with sad and damaging instances.

During the life of the 80th Congress, our Nation began to grapple with the realities of the postwar era. We were forced to agree that the Kremlin was our enemy because our extended hand of friendship had been cast aside times without number. We were required to admit that the masters of the Kremlin intended to carry out the preachments of Nicolas Lenin exactly as Adolph Hitler attempted to satisfy every intention set forth in Mein Kampf. In both cases the visualized result was to be the same, a return to the Dark Ages.

I do not believe that this current and general understanding prevailed throughout the United States before you sent me to the Senate in late 1946. There were then as many or more who disbelieved it, or did not bother to think about it, as believed this evaluation to be true.

In any event, it was along about 1947 when citizens everywhere began to appreciate that a lasting freedom for the individual was somehow inseparably connected with our national security. From that time on, we have made haste, not always wisely, to perfect and operate a system of internal security which would enable us to remain free as individuals. There could be no other possible reason for such a system in a republic.

I think it a great pity that it took us so long to recognize the intentions and determinations of communism for what they are, but I can serve no good purpose by blaming administrations of the past for their failures to specialize on contemporary history or to admit that evil-minded termites were boring from within or to agree that the Federal establishment included those who were traitors as well as the majority who were and are solidly patriotic. The legitimate purpose of this reference is to indicate the national status of our unawareness, unpreparedness, and inexperience when we began to fashion and tailor a system of internal security for the United States.

Before 1947, the Nation's number one domestic security sentinel was the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But this extremely conscientious and splendid agency, which takes pride in being referred to as Uncle Sam's watchdog, expresses no opinions, grants no clearances, and makes no recommendations. The FBI gathers facts and information, that's all, and leaves an evaluation of these matters, a really difficult undertaking, and the action to be taken on them, if any, up to others.

What too often happened before 1947 was that many in authority perceived too little from the files of substance laid before them by the FBI. It goes without saying that if you can perceive too little, you can also perceive too much, and I want to explore this side of the question before I am through.

To those of you who have thought that your Government has been soft on communism, I would urge a consideration of the following developments:

In March of 1947, our Nation departed from the more tranquil life and times of the past. A Government program was established to examine into the loyalty of those many individuals who serve the Federal establishment as employees.

This was followed by the Internal Security Act of 1950, which created the Subversive Activities Control Board and other domestic security activities. Then came the adoption of the Federal Employees Security Program in April of 1953. As its predecessor loyalty program did, this program requires that every civilian employee or applicant for employment in the executive branch of the Government submit to an investigation for loyalty but it goes much further than loyalty and considers a number of other factors like excess drinking, sex perversion, and bad company which affect the Nations' security. In addition to these farreaching measures, the last, or 83d Congress, stiffened up most of the statutes dealing with espionage, counter-espionage, and sabotage. You may now, for example, be executed as a spy in peacetime.

When you add all of this to the Foreign Agents Registration Act, the Smith Act, various rulings by various Attorney Generals, the continuing and vigilant activities of congressional investigative committees, and the investigative processes of the Civil Service Commission, you have in absolute fact today an internal security system of practically all-inclusive dimensions. With the exception of wire-tapping authority, would you establish much more were you an autocratic ruler in our land?

To those of you who have thought that your Government is so bewildered and frightened about communism as to annihilate the Bill of Rights and the Declaration of Independence at one fell swoop, I can offer these reassurances from our Nation's Chief Executive:

More than a year ago, when our present security system was but several months of age, the President said:

"In this country if someone accuses you, he must confront you; he cannot assassinate you or your character from behind without suffering the penalties an outraged citizenry will impose."

In his state of the Union message last week, Dwight Eisenhower said what I believe he means literally:

"We shall," he said, "ferret out Communist subversion while carefully preserving our traditions and the basic rights of our citizens."

To this point my effort has been to convince you that (a) the United States presently possesses an internal security system which is as devastating and powerful in potential as any other such system to be found anywhere, and that (b) the authoritative declarations which constitute the foundation on which this system has been constructed are in support of our constitutional concepts and traditions. Please permit me to press each of these contentions just a little further.

On the pages of history we see at a glance that the manner in which a government handles the problem of internal security is a significant measuring rod for the freedom that its people hold.

Under the internal security system imposed by the Soviet Union, freedom as we understand it is denied to the average Russian citizen. He lives in dread of the absolute surveillance and the unrelenting control of his conduct. That system is not for us, we say, but the system under which we operate shares a common purpose with the other. Both are designed to protect, to give stability to the form of government in each nation. I know that either system can be employed to serve the same ends—to keep citizens free or to put them in chains.

What I must restate is that we have constructed, because of an imperative need which is recognized by all, a system which can, unless we make it operate in accordance with the assurances offered publicly by the President of our Republic, snuff out the lights of learning while making cowards and mental robots out of free men and women.

These assurances that justice will determine security decisions represent the only

foundation strong enough to support a domestic security system for the United States. In no other fashion can we build a system we can trust or live with and any other system will shortly become identical with what we so rebel against in the Soviet Union and fought so hard against and vanquished so completely in Hitler's Germany.

Let us never forget that in an effort to keep our Nation secure at home, we have constructed an apparatus which can destroy us if we don't watch out.

When Dwight Eisenhower referred to an "outraged citizenry," he was encouraging each one among you to cry out in indignation whenever you encounter or uncover an act of injustice to your fellowman.

The President has told all of us how the internal security machine is expected to work, but he must largely delegate to us, in and out of the Government, the energy, vigilance, courage, and determination to make it work.

Since April of 1953, the Nation has been living with Executive Order 10450, which looks into the loyalty and security reliability of millions of our citizens who are employed by or seek now and in the future to be employed by the Federal establishment. The cornerstone or guide within this order is that no individual shall be employed by or work for the Government unless his or her retention is clearly consistent with the national interest.

What have we learned out of this unique and new experience?

The most encouraging lesson is an admission by many responsible persons in executive and legislative authority that we suffer most from a lack of experience with the security program we have created. I know but few who think the administration of the system has been adequate to the reasonable requirements of freedom. I know but few who believe the system is an adequate answer to the reasonable demands of internal security.

One takes heart from appreciating that changes are under study and improvements in prospect.

We know that the system is under serious attack from many quarters. How much of this is generated by partisan politics or by the Communist inciters of trouble and confusion, I do not know. I was impressed on Wednesday of this week when the District of Columbia Bar Association publicly announced that a special and continuing committee of its leading members has been established to provide legal representation for Government employees who become involved in security cases. This service will be provided without any cost whatsoever to those employees who are unable to obtain counsel of their own choosing or who are without funds to retain an attorney. I need not say that this bar association is strongly opposed to subversion and communism or that a majority of its hundreds of members probably are registered Republicans. It should be noted that the special committee was established with strong encouragement from the president of the American Bar Association and from many high officers within the administration of the Government.

To be impressed by this development is not sufficient. Never before in our history has it been thought necessary to provide protection from the outside free of charge, for the individual against possible and unwarranted abuse and condemnation by his Government. If any steps will cause us to stop and think, this is it.

The only thing of which I am certain is that thoughtful citizens throughout the country are sorely troubled by a lack of information concerning what is going on. I hope the day soon comes when their doubts can be resolved. I hope that Republican leaders will begin to acknowledge the criticisms more rapidly and move more swiftly in correcting mistakes in judgment or procedure when they occur.

My own considered view is that our security system has worked well and fairly on the average but that conspicuous and inexcusable examples to the contrary have occurred much too often. It isn't persuasive that we should be complimented because we seldom err. Our Nation can't long tolerate a system which doesn't soon eliminate the possibility for errors which are disastrous to anyone like you or me when they arise. As I see it, some changes in both attitudes and procedures must be agreed to or the system will never work as the President intends that it shall operate.

Before listing some specific recommendations which I believe might add to the strength and resourcefulness of our beloved country, I want you to think about three instances in which our internal security apparatus has failed completely in one respect or another in its mission of balancing the requirements of freedom with the demands of security.

The first: The case of Wolf Ladejinsky has the more recently been in the public's eye. In reflecting on this sad matter, I speak as a part of that "outraged citizenry" to which Dwight Eisenhower made proper and pointed reference.

I am mindful that some in positions of governmental authority much higher than my own do not share my anxiety over the consequences I expect from the Ladejinsky question. My earnest hope is that they will not think me disrespectful and that they will consider a responsible citizen's point of view.

The Ladejinsky case points up practically every weakness which we can find or trace in our prevailing security system. It includes evidences of the shortsightedness, ruthlessness, smugness, and brutality of bureaucracy at their worst.

Wolf Ladejinsky was naturalized a citizen in 1928. He became a public servant for the Government in 1935 and has been on the Federal payroll ever since. During these 20 years, his written record of service has been noted for its reliability and competence and for his intelligent contributions to our Nation's fight against international communism. Ladejinsky was a powerful fighter in the forces against oppression and slavery long before many among us were conscious of the problem. In his years of service, no supportable question against Ladejinsky's loyalty was ever raised.

Not many months ago, the Foreign Operations Administration sought to secure the services of Ladejinsky who was then under the Agricultural Department's control in Japan. This request was denied because the Agricultural Department stated that Ladejinsky was too invaluable to be replaced.

Subsequently, several new security officers were given assignments by the Agricultural Department. One assumed his duties in early December of last year. They discovered, what everybody knew, that Ladejinsky had worked for Amtorg, a Russian trading concern, through parts of 1929 and 1930 and that he had three sisters who assumedly remain alive today in Russia. Ladejinsky had so stated years ago when he first applied for Government service.

In years and months gone by these matters had been scrutinized carefully by the very strict security division of the State Department when Ladejinsky was on that payroll. This examination took into thoughtful consideration Ladejinsky's faithful years of employment.

The Agriculture Department was unimpressed by the State Department's voluminous file in the matter. Ladejinsky was declared by the Agriculture Department to be a security risk and its security officer announced that the three sisters whom he assumed were alive in Russia was cause sufficient to so stigmatize Mr. Ladejinsky. The brother of these Ladejinsky sisters doesn't know whether they are dead or alive. He has had no word from them or about them in over 8 years.

You have read that the FOA has announced its intention of sending Ladejinsky to the very same assignment for which his services were recently denied because he was said to be indispensable in Japan.

So far as I know, Wolf Ladejinsky has never been faced by any accuser nor has he been confronted with any charges. He became unwillingly a cause celebre because some eager beavers and Johnny-come-latelys in our necessary effort to keep America strong couldn't take the time to talk with him or to relate the points in question to 20 years of a man's private and public life. By such indifference and impetuousness can the good reputation of a good citizen be demolished.

Ladejinsky was saved, if that be the proper way to put it, but his Nation's reputation for the exercise of sound judgment and fair play suffered a real blow, not just here at home but all around the world in those quarters where we seek to merchandise our finest exportable product which is labeled justice.

Ladejinsky was saved because he had friends in high places who have known him intimately through the years, and because nameless, outraged citizens cried aloud in their indignation.

It isn't everyone who can call on a Douglas MacArthur, a WALTER JUDD, and members of both parties in both Houses of the Congress. Men and women of smaller reputations might only consider themselves caught in a trap without knowing where to turn for help or an opportunity to state their case.

I shed bitter tears for a political reason as well. The case of Wolf Ladejinsky hasn't been solved with finality. There has been no retraction or apology over his being labeled a security risk. Great agencies of our great Government proclaim the man's loyalty and need for his splendid services. Another equally great department is silent and seemingly content to let a cloud on a citizen's priceless reputation hang on.

You will hear more about Wolf Ladejinsky. Your political opponents will demand, with justification I can't deny, that a full explanation of the circumstances and details be spread on the public record. This was our job to undertake. We were the ones who blundered. It was for us to explain the manner in which the injustice and contradiction occurred in order that you citizens would be reassured that no similar injustice would happen again. The measure of our collective and individual character is always determined by the way in which we admit our weaknesses and by the steps we take to correct them.

My own prayer is that the examination by the opposition will concern itself solely with facts and not with politics. In this case, we can be further and needlessly hurt regardless of the approach employed.

The second: Victor Havris, of Detroit, was a master sergeant stationed in Europe in 1953. At the age of 32, he had 14 years of loyal service behind him. It was thought by someone that the young man's father had been a Communist. It was developed through a hearing conducted by an Air Force security board that Victor Havris, at the age of 12, had been taken by his father, now dead, to some Communist Party meetings. There was no evidence or charge that young Havris was a Communist or a fellow traveler or that he had ever attended any

Communist gathering since he was 12 years old.

Because of the disclosure that young Havris had been led by the hand of his father to a Communist meeting, he was declared to be a security risk and faced dismissal from the Air Force.

This recommendation was overruled by a special board which was appointed to reexamine the case. A Democratic Congressman from Michigan was the one who prevailed upon the Air Force to delay and reexamine its dismissal decision.

This Congressman, whom I do not know, was an outraged citizen. He understood that the first intention of the Air Force was too much in keeping with the corruption-of-blood practice which the third article of our Constitution denies and which we so deplore in the Soviet Union. In this country, the crimes of the father are not to be visited on the children. A citizen must be judged on his own conduct and performance.

The third: Milo J. Radulovich was a first lieutenant in the Air Force who was not on active duty when questions about his being a security risk were raised in 1953. No doubt about his loyalty was intimated publicly. The case against Radulovich, who was a physics student at the University of Michigan under the GI bill of rights, was based on accusations that his father, John Radulovich, had read pro-Communist publications and that his sister, Mrs. Margaret Fishman, had marched as a picket in pro-Communist demonstrations.

For these reasons, ouster proceedings were initiated against Milo Radulovich. This intended action was concurred in by the board of three colonels who first heard the case and by every staff level until the question was laid before the Air Force Secretary.

Here the Air Force Secretary announced his faith in the American way by reversing the ouster decision, by removing the security risk stigma, and by his declaration that we do not impose retribution on the family as is done so destructively in slave states everywhere. In the case of Radulovich, there was a general assumption, short of the Air Force Secretary, that a person tempted, because of family ties, must inevitably succumb to temptation; that any person subjected to pressure must inevitably weaken even if it requires him to betray his country.

Justice was slow in coming to Milo Radulovich and it remained for one man to grant it. My concern about Radulovich was the attitude of mind which gave birth to the ouster proceedings.

When Milo Radulovich, age 26, heard that his reputation had been restored by the Air Force Secretary, he said: "It's just like having your future handed back to you. Just to say thanks isn't enough. I never expected it; I'm kind of bowled over."

It's time that we begin to worry when a young American, age 26, expresses surprise that he was dealt with justly by his Government.

I now offer to you some recommendations and suggestions which perhaps are durable and lasting in their value. In any event, they represent what I have been thinking about and puzzling over since last we met.

(a) There is a pressing need for the adoption of some method which will guarantee that important or unreconcilable differences between heads of departments in the loyalty and/or internal security fields will be referred for decision to a higher authority.

No internal security system can become effective, understandable, or reasonable unless its standards and the procedures for implementing them are national standards, not departmental or bureau standards.

In the Ladejinsky affair, one standard was advanced by the State Department and the Foreign Operations Administration while a fundamentally contradictory standard was supported by the Agriculture Department. This incredible result bewildered employees throughout the Government and confused people within our country and all around the world.

Probably all of the harm to our Nation's pride, judgment, and reputation for fairness could have been avoided if the difference between the departments had been resolved by a higher authority before any public announcement had been made.

If there isn't one national policy which is advocated and supported from the very top, there can't be any system or understanding or order at all.

The higher authority in question could be the Chief Executive or some high-ranking official to whom such a task is assigned or to a commission which certainly would include within it private citizens for whom the Nation has the fullest measure of respect and confidence in their characters and judgment. I dislike thinking that another burden should be imposed on the President but thought should be given to the need.

(b) We must employ a more meticulous care in the selection of security officers. Because of the scope and newness of the problem, some are assigned to judge others who are simply not qualified for these most difficult of all assignments.

Above all else, the Nation's need is for security personnel who can tell the difference between disloyalty and nonconformity; between treason and heresy.

Every Government worker must be loyal and reliable but there is no reason why they must be rigidly orthodox in their thinking. There is every reason to encourage the iconoclast as well as the conformist to serve the Republic on the public payroll you taxpayers support.

Whether in or out of government, the orthodox mind, because of its strength and singleness of purpose, maintains and preserves progress, but the dreamer and the nonconformist make progress. The opportunity to be different, while being strictly loyal, is a climate we ought to take pains to develop.

I consider the security officer to be the cornerstone in our fight to remain strong and free. Any misfits or second-raters among them are more dangerous to our future than the subversives they endeavor to catch. These are the people who indict the innocent without reason and overlook the guilty for lack of knowledge, training, and experience.

Were I appointing a security officer, I would select no one whose background didn't include a sound and wide knowledge of the theoretical advance and practice of communism since the times of Karl Marx and this same individual would be required to have an equal knowledge and understanding of our Constitution, its Bill of Rights, the movements which produced the Declaration of Independence, and the history of the United States.

(c) Under Executive Order 10450, the function of a security hearing board is to conduct hearings on security cases and offer their decisions to the head of a given agency for him to accept or reject as he thinks best.

The members of these hearing boards are generally chosen from the top level of the administrative working force. The rather large number whom I know personally are conscientious, competent, and desirous of being fair.

Their liabilities are few, but important. They have no tenure of office and they lack a feeling of independence because they are subordinates and subject to the directions of superiors. Another sizable fault is that a majority of them have had no previous experience with hearings and the kind of testimony with which these hearings deal.

These security hearing board members lay no claim to being professionals. They started as rank amateurs and it will take time for some to learn their new business and longer for others. I can only recognize their inexperience to be a perplexing problem. I constantly wonder whether professional hearing examiners could better keep the balance we seek between security and justice.

(d) It might be advantageous to separate the personnel function from the function of internal security. It often happens that the job-suitability interviewer or the processor of personnel forms is called upon to make at least a preliminary judgment on questions of loyalty and security.

As often as not, these persons are trained only in the semiscience of relating an individual's qualifications to a given job which needs to be filled.

Why shouldn't the interviewer or processor pigeonhole an application which indicates that the applicant has been a member of organizations alleged to be subversive? These organizations may not be subversive or perhaps they weren't before they went out of business years ago. No one is likely to encounter any future trouble by shelving a troublesome-looking application. Many a personnel officer will react to security questions as he would to poison. He wants none of either.

Too much has been said about Government employment being a privilege and not a right. Of course, it's a privilege. Why labor the obvious? All an applicant is entitled to is a fair and impartial break. He or she does have that right to be judged competitively and fairly on their job qualifications. Their security status could be judged subsequently by one who is an authority in that field.

We must be alert always to avoid procedures, forms, and attitudes which stimulate the advancement of mediocrity in any way within the Federal structure.

(e) We must increasingly learn to tailor security to the job. An individual may be unsuited for the strictness of security demanded by a particularly sensitive assignment. This does not necessarily imply that the individual couldn't fill many other important assignments with credit to himself and the Government. Our operations and the living in the past never called for such an exercise of good judgment as does the present. If this were Russia, we wouldn't bother much about this exercise. Because we live in America, we must be bothered constantly.

(f) The basic criterion in Executive Order 10450 ought, I think, to be reexamined in the light of every development in the last 20 months.

This criterion, that an accused applicant or employee must meet the test that his employment is "clearly consistent with the interest of the United States" would and does, where literally applied, constitute a burden which can hardly be borne by anyone. It almost makes the employee affirmatively prove that the national interest requires the retention or continuation of his services. Who among us could do that?

I believe that the phrase "clearly consistent" has been the source of much of our trouble and that the cases previously referred to, and others like them, were instigated by it.

"Clearly consistent" can easily be construed to mean without doubts, real or fancied, of any kind. It can be read to mean that pure hearsay or malicious gossip or unsupported allegations constitute doubts to be resolved in favor of the Government. To my knowledge it has been so read.

Such an interpretation implies that a domestic system of absolute security is both

desirable and possible. In point of logic and commonsense, it cannot be either possible or desirable.

Any system through which men and women are judged must provide the judges with room for judgment and discretion.

Instead of the rigidity of "clearly consistent" we might better work toward the latitudes included in language like this:

"No person should be dismissed or denied employment from the Federal service as a security risk unless it is affirmatively found that his retention or employment is reasonably inconsistent with the national interest."

I am not suggesting that an established doubt should not be resolved in favor of the Government. It should be so resolved. What I am suggesting, and what our Nation ought to demand, is that the doubt about an individual be first established before it is resolved against him.

Let the Government judges assume their rightful responsibility for establishing their doubts about any individual to be valid and most of the fear and skepticism concerning our security system would disappear overnight.

In expressing this conviction, I am thinking about you and what you are entitled to should you endeavor to join or remain within the Federal establishment.

(g) The general public has a tendency to consider loyalty and security as being one and the same thing. That doesn't follow. A loyal person can be a security risk and a security risk can be truly loyal. Obviously, a disloyal person is a risk.

We should, I believe, be more specific in our use of the term "security risk."

Drunkards, perverts, drug users, gossipers, and those who insist on keeping bad company may well be security risks while being loyal. We ought to make this distinction clear. When a person is fired as a risk, the reason for their being so considered ought to be stated.

A person who drinks too much can often recover from that indiscretion and build a new life—if given a chance. The risk dismissed for being disloyal will remain disgraced for life.

Here again we should be trying to strengthen our Federal structure without unnecessarily destroying individuals in the process.

Espionage agents will be found among the disloyal. These are the ones we ought to try the hardest to discover. When we do, we ought to execute them. Risks who are otherwise loyal will not often be found in this category. We ought to treat them accordingly—without needless embarrassment or harassment.

You've been most indulgent to permit me to speak so long. There is yet more that could be constructively said but I thought tonight I could say no less. One further observation and I'm through.

The days of the present aren't easy or uncomplicated, yet several simple ideals and principles can't be misunderstood.

A whole clique of spies could hardly do as much damage to us as could our failure as a government to have confidence in our people. Any government, to deserve to survive, must deserve the respect of its citizenry. A government is under no compulsion to be less than severe in punishing crimes against the state, but that government is under every compulsion to extend consideration and just treatment to every citizen. He or she must be treated as what they actually are—the fiber and substance from which a free nation derives its strength and purpose.

Some wise man in the early days of our beginning, perhaps it was Franklin, said: "I give you a Republic if you can keep it."

That's what I've tried to talk about, as a citizen, tonight—How to keep it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I conclude with this thought: The formula for the Commission which has been suggested is not new. It is one which has been applied in the case of the Hoover Commission and other commissions. I am not nearly so much concerned about the numbers on the Commission or the formula for the establishment of such a Commission as I am about the necessity for proceeding with this very important and difficult task.

I think it would be well for every Member of the Senate to remember that we are now talking about the safety of the United States of America, its government and its institutions. We are also, Mr. President, in establishing a security system, trying to find a way by which we can maintain security on the one hand and freedom on the other. This is the greatest challenge to a free people that could possibly be placed before us. We do not, I am sure, want to sacrifice that which distinguishes us as a people and as a Nation from others, particularly from the totalitarians, in our effort to gain what we term security in critical days. I do not believe the problems are irreconcilable. I happen to believe it is possible, and not only possible, but desirable, to have an effective, well-administered, carefully thought-out, consistent security program which will protect the safety and the welfare of the United States of America on the one hand, and, at the same time, fulfill all the requirements of what we call the democratic way of life and the principles upon which our democracy is founded.

As we search for the final solution I suggest we call upon the best our country has to offer. I suggest that we view the problem as one which is apart from the normal apparatus of political institutions and political life. Let us call upon the President and upon those in responsible authority to set the house in order, to make the home of freedom not only secure but orderly.

It is in that spirit and with that thought that I have, along with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], advanced this program. I wish to commend all those who have been working thus far in this field, and to assure my colleagues that there is no conflict of interest between this proposed Commission and the normal and effective functions of the committees of the Congress. We can supplement one another and be of great assistance in arriving at the objective of the protection of the national security and the fulfillment of individual liberty.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CBS TELEVISION PROGRAM CONCERNING THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, earlier I had discussed with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] an announcement I wished to have made on the part of that committee, and particularly the chairman of it.

Mr. Edward R. Murrow is presenting 2 one-half hour programs on See It Now, CBS-TV, January 18 and January 25, from 10:30 to 11 o'clock p. m., eastern standard time, covering the work of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The program will feature interviews and actual scenes taken at a committee session this year.

Mr. President, as I said previously, I am making this announcement in behalf of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I wish to say that I think CBS is to be highly complimented for its keen educational interest in the work of the committee. I think the program will be quite a treat for our colleagues, and I hope it will be of benefit and of educational value to the citizenry of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes the floor, I move that the Senate now adjourn until Friday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, January 21, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 18, 1955:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Donald R. Heath, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Lebanon.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Russell B. Wine, of Texas, to be United States attorney for the western district of Texas, vice Charles F. Herring, resigned.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named licensed officer of the United States Merchant Marine to the grade indicated in the United States Coast Guard:

To be a lieutenant (junior grade)

John Robert O'Connor

The following-named persons to the grades indicated in the United States Coast Guard effective December 10, 1954, to which they were appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

To be lieutenants in the United States Coast Guard

Charles B. Williams
Jay A. Small, Jr.
Alexander D. Holman, Jr.

To be lieutenants (junior grade) in the United States Coast Guard

Walter F. Condon
Rudolph V. Cassani