

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1951

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 17, 1951)

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

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

Father of mercies, in Thee we live; away from Thee we perish. Thou only canst redeem our life from destruction. As we witness man's inhumanity to man, we confess with sorrow that human devices and designs have deceived and betrayed every fair hope and brought ashes for beauty; the arm of flesh has failed us; man has forsaken Thy ways all holy, and slighted Thy word.

Forbid that fronting a day such as this, freighted with sobering and solemn significance for the long years that stretch ahead, we should meet titanic issues with tiny conceptions and with petty patterns. In this dear land of our love and prayer, may we close our national ranks in a new unity, as powers without pity or conscience seek to destroy the birthright of our liberty of worship and speech and the sanctity of the individual. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, June 12, 1951, 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. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3716) to authorize an exchange of lands in Pueblo County, Colo., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

- S. 178. An act for the relief of Zdenek Marek;
- S. 249. An act for the relief of Ruzena Pelantova;
- S. 361. An act for the relief of Herk Visnapuu and his wife, Naima;
- S. 362. An act for the relief of Tu Do Chau (also known as Szetu Dju or Anna Szetu);
- S. 364. An act for the relief of Mrs. Suzanne Wiernik and her daughter, Genevieve;
- S. 435. An act to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes; and
- S. 648. An act for the relief of Evald Ferdinand Kask.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the Committees on Armed

Services and Foreign Relations, sitting jointly, were authorized to meet this afternoon during the session of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may transact routine business, without debate.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Labor, and Federal Security Administrator, Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting, pursuant to law, the eleventh annual report of the Board (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, AND ST. CROIX, AND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of laws enacted by the Municipal Councils of St. Thomas and St. John, and St. Croix, and the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Resolution 34

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing Congress to refuse the passage of H. R. 3348

"Whereas the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States will soon consider H. R. 3348, which is entitled 'A bill providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on certain mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, and for recodification of all mining claims'; and

"Whereas H. R. 3348 includes the limitation that the assessment work expenditure may be made upon any one of a group of claims only where not more than 10 contiguous claims in any group of mining claims are held in common ownership; and

"Whereas H. R. 3348, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior and the Department of the Interior to make certain rulings, is drafted in such a manner as to prevent the small miner from appealing such rulings to the courts; and

"Whereas the enactment of H. R. 3348 will result in the impairment of the rights of the small miners to locate and patent claims and to perform the assessment work necessary to hold such claims and will result in forcing the small miners from the public domain, thus opening the way for large companies to lease directly from the Department of the Interior, the claims which were discovered and developed by the small miners: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes and urgently requests the Congress of the United States of

America to refuse the passage of H. R. 3348; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby requested to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Joint Resolution 19

"Joint resolution requesting the Congress of the United States of America to amend the Hawaiian Organic Act to permit sale of lands to farmers qualified for Bankhead-Jones Act loans

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii—

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States of America is hereby requested to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act substantially in the following form of bill:

"A bill to amend section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act

"Be it enacted, etc.—

"SECTION 1. That section 73 (1) of the Hawaiian Organic Act is hereby amended by amending the first proviso thereof to read as follows: "Provided, however, That lots may be sold for cash without recourse to drawing or lot and forthwith patented to any citizen of the United States, possessing the qualifications of a homesteader as now provided by law, applying therefor and who has qualified for and received a loan under the provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (July 22, 1937, ch. 517, 50 Stat. 522, 7 U. S. C., ch. 33) as amended or as may hereafter be amended, for the acquisition of a farm."

"Sec. 2. This act shall take effect on and after the date of its approval."

"Sec. 2. Upon its approval, certified copies of this joint resolution shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

"Sec. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect upon its approval.

"Approved this 28th day of May A. D. 1951.

"OREN E. LONG,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

"Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to authorize the issuance of public improvement bonds by the county of Maui without regard to the limitations imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act

"Whereas there has been a very great growth in the population of school age during the past 15 years in the county of Maui; and

"Whereas the supervisors of the county are charged with providing schools for such children; and

"Whereas the heavy storms in the past years have underlined the necessity for flood and drainage controls in many areas of the county; and

"Whereas during the war years the public improvements of the county were under excessive use and strain without possibility of any adequate expansion of old facilities or construction of new ones: Now, therefore,

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii—

"SECTION 1. The board of supervisors of the county of Maui is hereby empowered and authorized to issue bonds in the sum of \$1,500,000: Provided, however, That the limitations and requirements in the Organic Act and chapter 117 of the Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945, as to the total bond indebted-

edness which may be incurred at any time or in any one year shall be waived as to bonds issued under this joint resolution. Said bonds shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of said chapter 117, except as above provided, and shall be serial bonds maturing in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years from the date of the issue of such series, and the last installment not later than 30 years from the date of such issue.

"SEC. 2. The moneys realized from such bond issue shall be expended as follows:

"Construction of new public school buildings	\$1,000,000
"Flood control of Iao stream.....	500,000

"SEC. 3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately upon the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States of America ratifying this joint resolution and authorizing such bond issue, notwithstanding the limitations of section 55 of the Organic Act of the Territory of Hawaii or any other law to the contrary.

"Approved this 26th day of May A. D. 1951.

"OREN E. LONG,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

An act of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania, authorizing the State to enter into a compact with any other State for mutual helpfulness in meeting any civil defense emergency or disaster; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Student Association of Lindenwood College, St. Charles, Mo., favoring the enactment of legislation to make effective all the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

A resolution adopted by the United Forces of Organized Labor in Louisiana, Shreveport, La., relating to the extension and revision of the Defense Production Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

S. Res. 154. Resolution extending the time for investigation of problems relating to the airline industry, the United States merchant marine, domestic land and water transportation, and radio, telegraph, and telephone communications; without amendment, and, under the rule, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 1559. A bill to provide transportation on Canadian vessels between Skagway, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, between Haines, Alaska, and other points in Alaska, and between Hyder, Alaska, and other points in Alaska or the continental United States, either directly or via a foreign port, or for any part of the transportation; without amendment (Rept. No. 419).

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS, 1952—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (REPT. NO. 418)

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill, H. R. 3880, making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June

30, 1952, and for other purposes. It is the revised independent offices appropriation bill, with the revisions, being 10-percent cuts as they appear on each page. I shall file the report later, when it comes from the Appropriations Committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. O'CONNOR (for himself, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUNT, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. WILEY):

S. 1660. A bill to require certain individuals receiving income from unlawful sources to furnish information with respect to their net worth in connection with their income-tax returns; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1661. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144);

S. 1662. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 1663. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code extending provisions of the Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. O'CONNOR when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1664. A bill for the relief of permittees living on Indian lands, Garrison Dam and Reservoir projects, North Dakota, and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MUNDT:

S. 1665. A bill to continue for a temporary period certain powers, authority, and discretion for the purpose of exercising, administering, and enforcing import controls with respect to fats and oils (including butter), cheese, and rice and rice products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1666. A bill for the relief of Shofor Ullah, Ali Moqbul, Tafazzul Miah, Usman Miah, and Maswood B. Chowdhury; and

S. 1667. A bill for the relief of Pino Shaar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1668. A bill for the relief of Pansy E. Pendergrass; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1669. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, with respect to payments for the benefit of persons under legal disability; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 1670. A bill to amend section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act so as to permit the coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program of State employees covered under a State retirement system, if the State by which such retirement system was established had in effect on January 1, 1950, a statute providing for making such retirement system supplementary to the old-age and survivors insurance system; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1671. A bill for the relief of Fireman's Fund Insurance Co.; and

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Fireman's Fund Insurance Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 1673. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of General Services to transfer to the Department of the Air Force certain property in the State of Mississippi; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1674. A bill to give owners of certain special-purpose vessels purchased or requisitioned by the United States an opportunity to reacquire such vessels when they are no longer needed by the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 1675. A bill for the relief of Linda Fisher Greenwald; and

S. 1676. A bill for the relief of Helen Sadako Yamamoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 1678. A bill to provide for segregation of the interests of individual members of the various Indian tribes in funds deposited in the Treasury to the credit of such tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORGANIZED CRIME IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, on behalf of all five members of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference four bills which carry out the recommendations previously submitted unanimously by the committee. I ask unanimous consent that a statement by me explaining the bills be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bills introduced by Mr. O'CONNOR (for himself and other Senators) were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 1660. A bill to require certain individuals receiving income from unlawful sources to furnish information with respect to their net worth in connection with their income-tax returns; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1661. A bill to clarify the provisions of section 8 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 880; 8 U. S. C. 144);

S. 1662. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917 and subsection (a) of section 338 of the Nationality Act of 1940; and

S. 1663. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code extending provisions of the Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. O'CONNOR is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR O'CONNOR

One of the bills would require every individual who has received an income of \$2,500 or more per year from any unlawful

activity to file a declaration of his net worth together with his regular income-tax return.

It has been repeatedly pointed out to the committee in its hearings and investigations that one of the measures of participation in illegal activities, both in determining tax liability and in establishing criminal guilt, is the extent to which an individual's net worth may suddenly increase without legitimate explanation. The committee feels that it is a reasonable extension of the Federal Government's power to protect its revenues to require the submission of the net worth statement, as provided in this proposed enactment.

This provision, together with S. 1529 previously introduced requiring gambling establishments to keep detailed records, and S. 1531 also introduced compelling the preservation of records, would give both tax collectors and other law-enforcement officers additional information relating to persons who are now defying the law in accumulating wealth from unlawful activities.

The second bill is aimed at an obvious weakness in the immigration laws, namely, that it is not presently an offense to smuggle or conceal aliens who are not entitled to enter the United States. This has seriously impeded the efforts of the Federal immigration service and has encouraged open defiance of the immigration laws. The proposed bill would make such smuggling or concealment a felony.

The third bill also would extend the Federal power to deal with undesirable aliens. There is at present no way to reach the case of an alien who has secured a suspension of his deportation proceeding, in the event that new evidence, discovered thereafter, seems to warrant a reconsideration of deportation. This proposed bill would authorize the Attorney General to cancel such a suspension and reopen the case of any alien on the basis of such evidence at any time during a period of 5 years after such suspension.

The fourth would close a gap in the existing laws relating to the transportation of intoxicating liquor. The Liquor Enforcement Act of 1936 restricts the transportation of liquor into or through any State which is totally dry under its own laws, but does not reach such transportation with respect to the so-called local option States. Since flourishing bootlegging operations have sometimes grown up in connection with this type of operation, the proposed change would include them in the restrictive provisions of this general law.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN PERMITTEES ON INDIAN LANDS, GARRISON DAM AND RESERVOIR PROJECT, NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill for the relief of permittees living on Indian lands, Garrison Dam and Reservoir project, North Dakota, and others, and I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement of the bill by me be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1664) for the relief of permittees living on Indian lands, Garrison Dam and Reservoir project, North Dakota, and others, introduced by Mr. YOUNG, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The statement presented by Mr. YOUNG is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR YOUNG

In connection with the Garrison Dam and Reservoir project now under construction in North Dakota by the Corps of Army Engineers, two villages, Sanish and Van Hook, will necessarily be relocated. Plans are progressing satisfactorily for the establishment of a single townsite for the inhabitants of these two communities at a location which has already been selected.

Under existing authority, those who actually own real property within the two villages will be compensated for the loss of their lands, and will thus be enabled financially to establish themselves in homes at the new townsite.

Within the two villages, a number of persons have constructed homes upon Indian lands. They do not have the legal title to the real estate—but they occupy it as permittees. Some 42 homes in the two places fall within this category. The actual cash value of these lots, or of comparable lots in the two towns, would be practically nil. I would say that the range in value would be from \$10 to \$150 per lot.

In nearly every instance the reason why legal ownership remained with the Indians is because they refused to sell the lots at any price. Generally, these home owners classed as permittees are people of modest means, and their forced move to a new location will constitute a real hardship at best.

Unfortunately, under existing law there is no provision whereby these residents may be compensated for the improvements they have constructed, since they are permittees and not owners within the contemplation of the statute.

Thus, it will be observed, a part of the inhabitants will be satisfactorily compensated, while others, whose equity is just as great, will not be. Their claim for compensation should not, in all fairness, be denied them simply because they do not own a lot—which might be worth only \$10.

Similarly, there are a few business installations in the two locations which have constructed improvements upon lands leased from the railroad. According to a recent decision by the Comptroller General of the United States, they fall within a class which may not be compensated for their improvements, since they are lessees only. These businesses, and they are few in number, are situated upon lands owned by the railroad company and leased for a long term for purposes of construction and occupancy. It is well nigh a universal and general practice for railroads to retain the legal title to such property, and they will not sell it under any circumstances. As in the case of the permittees on Indian lands, these lessees do not own the real estate, but nevertheless their leases will be substantial because of the improvements they have constructed.

The measure I have today introduced will authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to compensate these two classes for the very real losses they would otherwise sustain on their improvements.

AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL-SECURITY LAW

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the social-security law so as to permit the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund with the Federal social-security system. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement by me and a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1670) to amend section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act so as to permit the coverage under the old-age and survivors insurance program of State employees covered under a State retirement system, if the State by which such retirement system was established had in effect on January 1, 1950, a statute providing for making such retirement system supplementary to the old-age and survivors insurance system, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 218 (d) of the Social Security Act (relating to exclusion of certain positions from voluntary agreements for coverage of State employees under the old-age and survivors insurance program) is amended to read as follows:

"EXCLUSION OF POSITIONS COVERED BY RETIREMENT SYSTEMS

"(d) No agreement with any State may be made applicable (either in the original agreement or by any modification thereof) to any service performed by employees as members of any coverage group in positions covered by a retirement system on the date such agreement is made applicable to such coverage group unless the State or political subdivision by which such retirement system was established had in effect on January 1, 1950, a statute, ordinance, or other legislative act providing for making such retirement system supplementary to the insurance system established by this title."

The statement by Mr. WILEY is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

My action today in introducing this integration bill is a renewal of an effort which was made during the Eighty-first Congress when I attempted to secure an amendment to H. R. 6000, the omnibus social-security bill. On June 19, 1950, I offered an amendment, as recorded in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 7, page 8796.

WISCONSIN CONSTITUTION PROVIDES FOR INTEGRATION

I pointed out throughout the consideration of the amendment that by no stretch of the imagination could it be construed that my amendment would harm teachers, policemen, firemen, or other municipal employees or groups in other States which preferred to remain outside the social-security system. By way of contrast, the thousands of individuals already covered under the Wisconsin retirement fund wanted then, and want now, to get in under the social-security system, and I feel that they have that elementary right. Wisconsin is the only State of the Union whose constitution provides for integration of the State retirement fund with the Federal system, if Uncle Sam will permit.

FEDERAL COVERAGE, THEN INTEGRATION POSSIBLE

Thus, we have an ironic situation wherein scores of far-sighted Wisconsin municipalities accordingly brought in their employees under the modest State pension system. Over 30,000 individuals are now under the Wisconsin retirement fund. But now these far-sighted municipalities cannot have their workers covered by the Federal system, whereas other municipalities which lagged

in setting up a pension system and which did not plan for it up until after the recent liberalization by the Congress—those other municipalities can have their employees covered under the Federal system and can then include them under the State fund. It seems to me that under this sort of arrangement we are punishing enterprise and vision instead of rewarding enterprise and vision. We are discriminating against innocent workers, their wives, and other dependents. I want to point out that 2 out of 3 individuals past the age of 65 and covered under the State retirement fund have not retired. Why? Largely because pensions are too modest and individuals can barely keep body and soul together on them.

I am, indeed, hoping that the Senate Finance Committee and the House Ways and Means Committee will heed this appeal because I think that it is in the best interests of the workers themselves, of their local and State governments, and of the public interest as a whole. No one will be harmed by the integration proposal; over 30,000 people will be helped.

The joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin is as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Social Security Act to permit the integration of the Wisconsin retirement fund therewith

Whereas the State of Wisconsin and all participating municipalities under the Wisconsin retirement fund have been its inception been committed to the integration of that retirement plan with the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system; and

Whereas the Wisconsin retirement fund cannot be fully effective without such integration since the State plan was formulated so as to dovetail with the Federal system, and such integration would be automatic when Congress removes the existing prohibition against integration; and

Whereas it is absurd that 33 counties, 86 cities, 351 villages, 1,288 towns, and approximately 600 school districts can under the Federal law first come under the Federal system and then subsequently act to be included under the Wisconsin retirement fund, while 37 counties, 77 cities, 15 villages, 1 town, and 29 school districts which have already acted in good faith to be included under the Wisconsin retirement fund are denied the benefits of such integration; and

Whereas public employees under the Wisconsin retirement fund favor such integration because there would be a substantial increase in benefits for the public employees as annuitants, for their wives, and for their dependent children in case of death before retirement; and

Whereas under section 66.903 (2) (f) of the Wisconsin statutes such integration and the increased benefits could be achieved without any material change in cost either to the employees or the employing governmental units; and

Whereas the taxpayers of Wisconsin and the public employees concerned are now as Federal taxpayers required by Federal law to underwrite the ultimate cost of this Federal program and therefore it is unreasonable to pay for the same benefits for public employees in Wisconsin by increasing the cost of the State system; and

Whereas such protection would be especially valuable for persons with a short span of public employment who would receive only modest benefits under the State system; and

Whereas it is discriminatory to deny to the State of Wisconsin the right to make its retirement plan supplementary to the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system when

business and industry have been able to do this for those in private employment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Wisconsin Legislature respectfully requests the United States Congress to amend the Social Security Act by repealing the discriminatory provision now contained in section 218 (d). Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each House of Congress and to each Wisconsin Member thereof.

ORA R. RICE,

Speaker of the Assembly.

ARTHUR L. MAY,

Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

GEORGE M. SMITH,

President of the Senate.

THOMAS M. DONAHUE,

Chief Clerk of the Senate.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC REPORT

Mr. O'MAHOONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 157), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed 2,000 additional copies of Senate Report 210, current session, the report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report on the January 1951 Economic Report of the President, for the use of said joint committee.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENTS RELATING TO RENT CONTROL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference amendments intended to be proposed by me to the rent-control features of the bill (S. 1397) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that I may make a brief statement in connection with the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and, without objection, the Senator from New York may proceed.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, these are simple amendments which would make it illegal for a landlord to deny the rental of housing accommodations to any applicant solely on the ground that the applicant has children.

I think these are most vital amendments, most vital provisions for any rent-control bill that is enacted by the Congress.

I have heard with growing distress the many recitals of difficulties encountered by people with children seeking to find adequate rental accommodations.

Advertisements for "accommodations wanted," are almost piteous in any daily newspaper in their pleas on behalf of families with children. An increasing number of dwelling owners and landlords have been refusing to rent their accommodations to families with children.

In a time of housing shortage, in a time when there is a landlords' market, it is an obligation of Government, insofar as it regulates housing and rentals, to provide also that there shall be no discrimination in housing against families with children.

It goes without saying that this attitude on the part of landlords is anti-social, even if it is understandable from their own viewpoint—from the viewpoint of the preservation of their properties from wear and tear.

If the Government is going to control rents, if the Government is going to prevent evictions, the Government should certainly exercise its authority to prevent the denial of housing on account of children.

I understand that the Committee on Banking and Currency is now considering in executive session the Defense Production Act and, within a few days, will begin consideration of the rent-control features of that act. I hope that the committee will give sympathetic and favorable consideration to the amendments.

I serve notice that I shall submit the amendments on the floor if the committee is unable, through lack of time, to give consideration to these simple proposals now.

Provision taking care of this situation was a major feature of the rent-control bill I introduced last year. This particular feature received sympathetic support in many quarters. I hope that it will become part of the law this year. My amendments provide a penalty for any person who willfully violates its provisions.

This is not a new or revolutionary concept with regard to housing legislation. The Banking and Currency Committee has on many occasions in the past recommended such provisions in other housing legislation and the Senate has approved those recommendations.

On the basis of these precedents and the reasons of substance I have referred to I hope that the Senate will approve this proposal and include this basic charter of antidiscrimination against children in the Defense Production Act of 1951. If there is any provision that is vital to the social health of this country, this is one of them.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3716) to authorize an exchange of lands in Pueblo County, Colo., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

By Mr. BYRD:

An address delivered by him in Richmond, Va., on June 12, 1951, on the occasion of the unveiling of a mural commemorating the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Virginia Declaration of Rights.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

A commencement address on the subject, The Far East and Its Impact Upon American Foreign Policy, delivered by him at Mills College, Oakland, Calif., June 10, 1951.

By Mr. WHERRY:

Memorial Day sermon by Rabbi David Lefkowitz, national chaplain of the American

Legion, at Forest Lawn Cemetery, Omaha, Nebr., May 30, 1951.

By Mr. MORSE:

Article entitled "Manufacturer Denies Link to China Lobby," published in the New York Herald Tribune of June 12, 1951.

Resolutions adopted by the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners.

By Mr. THYE:

Article entitled "Beef Industry Sees Rationing Threat in Price Roll-Back," written by Nat S. Finney and published in the Minneapolis Star of June 8, 1951.

OPERATING COSTS AND PROFITS IN THE CANNING INDUSTRY, 1946-50

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has recently completed a study of Operating Costs and Profits in the Canning Industry, 1946-50. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, the findings of the committee.

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

OPERATING COSTS AND PROFITS IN THE CANNING INDUSTRY, 1946-50

SUMMARY

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry under the leadership of Chairman ELLENDER, has just completed an analysis of operating costs and profits of a representative group of fruit- and vegetable-canning companies for the years 1946 to date.

Payments to producers for raw products canned represent less than 40 percent of the sales value of the canned products. Containers, cases, and labels cost almost as much as the materials canned in some of the recent years.

Profits on invested capital (after taxes) reached the extraordinarily high level of 35 percent the first year after price controls were removed, but losses were more common than profits in both the 1948 and 1949 canning operations. Increased demand in recent months has resulted in substantial profits again in the 1950 canning operations.

Labor costs are around 17 to 20 percent of total canning costs and have not increased in relation to other costs in recent years.

Distribution and selling costs represent approximately 10 percent of the sales dollar and do not show any distinct trend.

PROFITS ON INVESTED CAPITAL

Fluctuations in the yield of canning crops and in consumer demand cause profits in the fruit- and vegetable-canning industry to vary widely from year to year. The year beginning with the harvest of the 1946 crop was the best year on record for the canning industry as a whole. Yields of canning crops were almost uniformly above average. They had been contracted under the prevailing price ceilings. Removal of price ceilings and rationing in the summer and early fall of 1946 resulted in an unusually favorable demand situation.

Profit before taxes for a representative sample of 25 canners was 57.7 percent on the invested capital in 1946-47. After taxes, the remaining profit was 34.9 percent. The year 1947-48 was also highly profitable for the canning industry, but losses were experienced in each of the next 2 years, 1948-49 and 1949-50. The year just closed, 1950-51, was again profitable for the canners. Data from another sample, discussed in the closing paragraphs, indicate that profits per dollar of sales were higher than in 1947-48, although information on profits on invested capital is not available at this time.

The annual profits for the 25 companies, 1946-49, were as follows:

Year	Profits on invested capital	
	Before taxes	After taxes
	Percent	Percent
1946-47.....	57.7	34.9
1947-48.....	24.6	15.1
1948-49 (loss).....	-1.1	-3.4
1949-50 (loss).....	-9.5	-9.6

RAW PRODUCTS VERSUS CONTAINER COSTS

Canners of vegetables pay over three-fourths as much for the containers, cases, and labels used on the cans as they pay for the raw products for canning. Canners of fruits pay around half as much for the containers, cases, and labels as they pay for the fresh fruit canned. The annual figures are as follows:

Year	Cost of containers, cases, and labels as a percentage of raw product costs	
	Vegetable canners	Fruit canners ¹
	Percent	Percent
1946-47.....	75	37
1947-48.....	79	51
1948-49.....	75	49
1949-50.....	97	74
1950-51.....	78	53

¹ Some vegetables canned.

RAW PRODUCT, LABOR, AND OTHER COSTS

When labor and other manufacturing expenses are added to the container costs, they make up around two-thirds of the total cost of canned vegetables. The vegetables purchased for canning represent roughly a third of the total cost of manufacture. Although these percentages varied from year to year, no distinct trend is evident in recent years.

Year	Canned-vegetable costs			
	Raw material	Labor	Containers and all other	Total
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1946-47.....	36	22	42	100
1947-48.....	33	24	43	100
1948-49.....	38	20	42	100
1949-50.....	33	20	47	100
1950-51.....	37	19	44	100

A similar analysis of the costs of manufacture as reported by companies which canned mostly fruits indicates the following:

Year	Canned-fruits costs (including some vegetables)			
	Raw material	Labor	Containers and all other	Total
	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
1946-47.....	49	20	31	100
1947-48.....	41	21	38	100
1948-49.....	44	19	37	100
1949-50.....	36	20	44	100
1950-51.....	43	18	39	100

ADMINISTRATIVE AND DISTRIBUTION COSTS

Canners of vegetables and fruits spend around 10 percent of their sales dollar for brokerage and discounts, administration, and other selling expenses. The detailed figures for the years 1946-50 are as follows:

Administrative and distribution costs as a percentage of total sales	
Year:	Percent
1946-47.....	9
1947-48.....	10
1948-49.....	10
1949-50.....	12
1950-51.....	10

COSTS AND PROFITS AS A PERCENTAGE OF SALES

A summary of the costs and profits for 24 companies (a different sample from those reporting profits on invested capital) indicates the following:

	Costs and profits as a percentage of sales				
	1946-47	1947-48	1948-49	1949-50	1950-51
Cost of operations:	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.	Pct.
Raw products.....	37	33	37	31	34
Labor.....	18	20	19	20	17
All other.....	32	40	41	48	39
Total.....	87	93	97	99	90
Net income before taxes.....	13	7	3	1	10
Provision for income tax.....	5	3	1	1	5
Net profit after tax.....	8	4	2	0	5
Cases sold as a percentage of cases packed.....	98	97	89	98	113

CONTRACT PRICES FOR THE 1951 SEASON

In line with other increases in prices, canners' 1951 contracts with producers provide for substantially higher prices than those prevailing in 1950. There is shown below the United States average price for 1950 as reported by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics and the range in increases reported in 1951 contract prices in different sections of the United States, as reported to the National Canners Association:

	United States average price, 1950 (dollars per ton)	Range in increase in 1951 contract prices in specific geographic areas
Tomatoes for processing.....	\$25.00	20 to 35 percent.
Green peas for processing.....	81.90	12 to 25 percent.
Sweet corn for processing.....	17.60	24 to 40 percent.
Snap beans for processing.....	104.00	8 to 12 percent.
Green lima beans for processing.....	135.00	12 to 13 percent.

MARKETING CHARGES ON CANNED FRUITS AND VEGETABLES, 1949-50

The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has just completed an analysis of the marketing charges for seven fruits and vegetables during the 1949-50 season. They found that the returns to the growers for producing the fruit and vegetables for canning amounted to approximately the same percentage of the consumer's dollar as the retailer's margin. Farmers received from 16 to 24 percent of the consumer's dollar.

Production and marketing charges as a percentage of the retail price of canned fruits and vegetables, 1949-50 season¹

	Cling peaches	Freestone peaches	Bartlett pears	Green beans	Sweet corn	Green peas	Tomatoes
Return to producer of raw product.....	Pct. 18	Pct. 16	Pct. 18	Pct. 25	Pct. 20	Pct. 24	Pct. 24
Cost of processing:							
Containers and supplies.....	22	20	18	14	19	18	18
Direct labor.....	8	13	10	6	7	5	8
Selling and administration.....	7	7	6	7	11	9	8
Other costs.....	12	10	11	9	13	13	13
Processor's profits ²	-4	1	2	6	-3	2	2
Total processing.....	45	51	47	42	47	47	49
Transportation.....	13	10	10	5	5	5	5
Wholesale margin.....	5	6	7	7	6	6	3
Retail margin.....	19	17	18	21	22	18	19
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

¹ From the Marketing and Transportation Situation, BAE, May 1951, table 5.
² Before payment of income taxes.

MARKETING CHARGES ON FROZEN FRUITS AND VEGETABLES

Similar data were compiled by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics on frozen fruits and vegetables. They indicate that farm producers received from 8 to 29 percent of the consumer's dollar spent for the frozen fruits and vegetables selected for study.

Production and marketing charges as a percentage of the retail price of frozen fruits and vegetables, 1949-50¹

	Peaches	Strawberries	Baby lima beans	Peas
Returns to producer of raw product.....	Pct. 8	Pct. 29	Pct. 21	Pct. 21
Cost or processing:				
Containers and supplies.....	17	10	5	8
Direct labor.....	12	5	7	5
Selling and administration.....	6	7	6	7
Other costs.....	15	9	16	17
Processor's profits.....	5	8	9	6
Total processing.....	54	39	43	43
Transportation.....	7	4	3	5
Wholesale margin.....	9	9	12	10
Retail margin.....	21	19	21	21
Total.....	100	100	100	100

¹ From The Marketing and Transportation Situation, BAE, May 1951, table 6.

² Before payment of income taxes.

THE CENTRAL ARIZONA PROJECT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on April 6, I addressed a letter to Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, asking him for certain information relative to Senate bill 75, which was then on the Senate Calendar. That bill relates to the central Arizona project.

On the 16th of April I received an acknowledgment saying that the information I was requesting was being assembled. It dealt with the amount of payments by the irrigators because of the irrigation features of the project.

The bill was voted upon on June 5. On June 6, I received the information from the Secretary of the Interior. I think the Senate will be interested in it, and I ask unanimous consent to have the correspondence printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

APRIL 6, 1951.

HON. OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of Interior,
Department of Interior
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Senate debates on S. 75 are expected to begin April 11, 1951. In preparation for these debates, may I have your answer to a question as follows: What percentage of the amount allocated to irrigation is payable by the irrigators on each Federal reclamation project?

Your courtesy in an early reply will be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

UNITED STATES,
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., April 16, 1951.

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: Your letter of April 6, 1951 asked about what percentage of the amount of costs allocated to irrigation is payable by the irrigators for Federal reclamation projects.

This information is being assembled, and will be forwarded to you as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. WARNE,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1951.
HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KNOWLAND: In further reply to your letter of April 6, 1951, I am pleased to provide you with information on the estimated proportion of costs allocated to irrigation payable by irrigators on Federal reclamation projects. Estimates are used because, in most cases, cost allocations for those reclamation projects undertaken before 1939 were not required, except in the case of a few projects specifically authorized by the Congress. Furthermore, final cost allocations for projects governed by the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 cannot be established until after project construction has been completed, all costs have been incurred, and payment arrangements have been established.

Reclamation projects fall generally into three categories with respect to irrigation reimbursement. The first and largest group includes those projects where all of the construction cost of the project, or all of the irrigation cost allocation, is payable by the irrigators. The second group includes those projects where the extent of irrigation reimbursement is limited by special acts of the Congress. The final group includes a smaller list of projects where irrigation reimbursement is aided through the use of other net project revenues—principally power revenues and municipal and industrial water revenues—in providing for the payment of the costs allocated to irrigation.

Regarding the first group, with the inauguration in 1902 of the Federal reclamation program, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Interior to proceed with the construction of irrigation projects, after the Secretary determined that a project was practicable, and that the estimated cost of construction could be returned to the United States by the irrigation water users in not exceeding 10 annual installments. In other words, the irrigators were required to bear the full cost of project construction even though there were often other benefits, such as flood control, resulting from project construction. Later the Congress raised the maximum pay-out period to 20 years in 1914 and to 40 years in 1926. In addition to authorization of projects by finding of feasibility by the Secretary of the Interior, and, at one time, by the President, other reclamation projects were authorized by specific Federal legislation. Then certain reimbursement cost adjustments for specified irrigation projects were authorized by special acts of the Congress, as, for example, the Omnibus Adjustment Act of 1926. In the following tabulation the congressionally approved cost adjustment is taken into account in estimating the percentage of reimbursement by irrigation.

Projects where it is estimated that all of the construction cost, or the total cost as adjusted by the Congress, or the total irrigation cost allocation, is fully payable by the irrigators, are as follows (this list also includes projects authorized under the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, where it is estimated that irrigation users will pay the full cost of irrigation works): All-American Canal, Arnold, Baker, Belle Fourche, Bitter Root, Burnt River, Cachuma, Carlsbad, Deschutes, Fort Sumner, Frenchtown, Fruitgrowers Dam, Gila, Grand Valley, Grants Pass, Humboldt, Huntley, Hyrum, Klamath, Lower Yellowstone, Milk River, Moon Lake, Newlands, North Platte, Ochoco, Ogden River,

Okanogan, Orland, Owyhee, Paonia, Pine River, Preston Bench, Provo River, Rapid Valley, Salt River, San Luis Valley, Sanpete, Strawberry Valley, Sun River, Truckee Storage, Umatilla, Uncompahgre, Vale, Vermejo, Weber River, Yuma, Yuma Auxiliary.

Logically, the All-American Canal could be omitted from this group, as the irrigation contractors pay nothing toward the construction cost of storage facilities such as provided by Hoover Dam.

The second group of projects include those where the extent of irrigation reimbursability is affected by the special provisions of the Water Conservation and Utilization Act of 1939, and by other special legislation. During the period 1933 to 1940, Congress appropriated large sums for public works throughout the United States. Reclamation projects were among the public works initiated under the authority vested in the President for the expenditure of relief funds. Furthermore, another outgrowth of the depression years was the effort of Congress to provide through reclamation for distressed conditions in the western plains and Mountain States affected by the extreme drought of the mid-1930's. The Conservation and Utilization Project Act of August 11, 1939, authorized the construction of projects on the basis of joint findings of feasibility by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior and approved by the President. The act provided originally for reimbursable appropriations combined with nonreimbursable participation by the Works Progress Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps, thereby making projects with a high total cost per acre feasible, provided sufficient relief labor could be made available to hold the reimbursable portion to a reasonable amount. This act ordinarily would have expired with termination of the WPA and CCC at the beginning of World War II. Congress, by the act of July 16, 1943, modified the original law to permit the completion of water conservation and utility projects which could show a general benefit to the war effort.

Projects in this second category of partial irrigation reimbursability, but without reimbursement aid from other project revenues, and the proportion of the irrigation cost payable by the irrigators, are as follows:

	Percent
W. C. Austin.....	19
Balmorhea.....	58
Buffalo Rapids.....	30
Buford-Trenton.....	58
Eden.....	23
Intake.....	50
Kendrick.....	17
Mancos.....	23
Mirage Flats.....	27
Missoula Valley.....	16
Newton.....	49
Rathdrum Prairie.....	64
Scotfield.....	26
Tucumcari.....	34

All of the projects in the second group, except W. C. Austin, Kendrick, and Tucumcari, were WCU projects. Other legislation established the extent of irrigation reimbursement for the latter three projects.

The third group of reclamation projects include those where the payment of the costs allocated to irrigation is aided by the application of other net project revenues, such as those from power and municipal water, to the return of irrigation construction costs. This list includes, in addition to several projects authorized by special legislation, those projects for which cost allocations are governed by the provisions of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939. This latter act was the first general legislation authorizing cost allocations for reclamation projects; for the first time it brought into reclamation law the concept that benefits from reclamation projects were more than

local in scope, and benefits that were national in character should not be a burden on the beneficiaries of reclamation projects.

Projects where the return of the costs allocated to irrigation is aided from other project revenues, and the percentage of payments estimated to be made by irrigators, include the following:

	Percent
Boise.....	70
Central Valley.....	68
Colorado-Big Thompson.....	28
Columbia Basin.....	26
Minidoka.....	99
Missouri River Basin.....	35
Rio Grande.....	74
Riverton.....	99
Shoshone.....	95
Weber Basin.....	74
Yakima.....	85

Information on the recently authorized Middle Rio Grande, Palisades, and Solano projects is in process of analysis and can be supplied at a later date when the cost allocations have been formalized. Information on the Yakima project does not include the Kennewick and Roza divisions, and not all of the Folsom Reservoir cost and payments are included in the Central Valley project data. You will understand, of course, that the data for the Missouri River basin apply to the basin as a whole, whereas the proportion of reimbursability by individual units of the project is expected to vary considerably around this average.

Thank you very much for this opportunity of providing you with this information.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to suspend the rule.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. I notice that an error has crept into the wording of the bill. It was not the intention of the Committee on Appropriations, or the subcommittee, nor of the Senator from Michigan or the Senator from New Mexico or any Senator, that Freedmen's Hospital should be included in the cut.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. I wanted to ask the Senator from New Mexico to ask unanimous consent—or the Senator from Michigan will make the request—that that limitation be stricken from the bill.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, in order to put the matter before the Senate, I will say that through inadvertence a limitation was included in the bill, as shown on page 13, line 8, as follows: "of which not more than \$2,053,786 shall be available for personal services." I ask unanimous consent that that limitation be stricken, inasmuch as it was included through an error, and in direct contravention of the committee action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when the Senate recessed on yesterday we were discussing the amendment submitted by the Senator from New Mexico with reference to the construction of housing units at the medical center. This morning the Senator from New Mexico received a letter from Assistant Surgeon General W. H. Sebrell, Jr., the Director of the National Institutes of Health, with reference to that particular amendment. The subject was thoroughly discussed by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] and by the Senator from New Mexico. I should like to have Senators who are interested in this amendment listen to this letter:

JUNE 13, 1951.

DEAR SENATOR CHAVEZ: At the request of your subcommittee on appropriations of the Senate, we are submitting the following information concerning certain aspects of housing for key emergency personnel required for operation of the clinical center of the National Institutes of Health.

1. Costs—

I believe the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER] inquired as to costs.

Estimates were made and submitted May 16, 1951, on the costs of Government operation of the 60 units, which had been provided in fiscal 1951 appropriations. These were \$58,000 per annum and included utilities, and direct expense for operation, maintenance, and repair of structures and equipment. When this figure for 60 units is projected to include 250 units, it becomes \$241,000—

Which the Government would have to spend on the upkeep of the structures if the Government were to build them.

Also, for the 250 units, there are additional requirements of \$33,500 for the maintenance and repair of roads and walks, street lighting, and the grounds upkeep, making a total per annum cost of \$274,500.

2. Revenue: As income to offset these costs, estimates were made and submitted also on May 16, 1951. These indicated that from 60 units the annual revenue to the Government would be \$56,600. When this figure for 60 units is projected to include 250 units, it becomes \$236,000.

To the State of Maryland. So in arriving at a conclusion the Senate must decide whether someone should pay taxes to the State of Maryland to the extent of \$250,000, or whether the Government should pay for the upkeep.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield as soon as I have finished reading the letter. Continuing:

However, only 95 percent occupancy can be expected on 250 units. Therefore, the net revenue per annum becomes \$226,400.

3. The difference between the estimated costs of \$274,500 and revenue of \$226,400 is \$48,100. These figures, according to standard Government practice, do not include annual interest on the capital investment or estimates for depreciation.

4. It is estimated that 250 units would represent a capital investment, if built by private enterprise, of approximately \$2,500,000. The county manager of Montgomery County—

The legal, political, and fiscal entity of Montgomery County—

informs us that the tax rate estimated to be applicable here is \$2.40 per \$100 and that evaluations are about 65 percent of construc-

tion costs. When 65 percent of \$2,500,000 is taken, it amounts to \$1,625,000, to which is applied the tax rate. On this tax base Montgomery County would obtain an annual tax revenue of \$39,000. The calculation does not include State tax revenues which would come from net income.

5. The proposed language incorporates those provisions of the Wherry Act (Public Law 211, 81st Cong.) which are applicable to the housing requirements of the Clinical Center.

In other words, within the provisions of the Wherry Act provision could be made applicable to the clinic at Bethesda. Senators should bear in mind that the Senator from New Mexico is not directly interested one way or the other in the Bethesda Center, except from the standpoint of the public welfare and good government. He is not politically or personally interested in the problem.

The term of 99 years for the lease was taken from section 801 (a), which defines the "mortgage" available for insurance under the Wherry Act to mean "a first mortgage on real estate, in fee simple, or on a leasehold (1) under a lease for not less than 99 years which is renewable; or (2) under a lease for a period of not less than 50 years to run from the date the mortgage was executed * * *". Our legal counsel recommended as best for NIH purposes the phrase "not more than 99 years" without the renewable clause of the Wherry Act. In fact, the project—

He is now speaking of the Medical Center—

can be soundly operated and amortized on a 50-year basis if that is preferred.

The provision that the Surgeon General establish terms and conditions for the lease is adapted from section 805 of the Wherry Act, which states: "Whenever the Secretary of the Army, Navy, or Air Force determines that it is desirable to lease real property * * * to effectuate the purposes of this title, the Secretary concerned is authorized to lease such property * * * upon such terms and conditions as in his opinion will best serve the national interest"—

So everything would be kept within proper legal authority.

The extension of the Surgeon General's "terms and conditions" to regulate the private operation of the quarters is similar to section 803, subsection (b) (2), which states that "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, preference or priority of opportunity in the occupancy of the mortgaged property for such personnel and their immediate families shall be provided under such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Commissioner."

I call this portion of the letter particularly to the attention of my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who sponsored the so-called Wherry Act.

The principal feature of the Wherry Act which is not contained in the proposed language is the Government insurance provision to protect the mortgage. After consultation with the Federal Housing Administration and the Bureau of the Budget, we felt confident that the NIH quarters, as a part of a permanent medical research center—

Long ago authorized by the Congress—may well have less investment risk for a private developer than housing projects at isolated military installations. The language would therefore permit the successful bidder to secure conventional private financing or to apply for mortgage insurance under Federal Housing procedure.

We have been hearing about that for years. We have been hearing about get-

ting back to normalcy and letting American business proceed in the way it has proceeded for many years. That is what we are trying to do by this amendment.

The language would therefore permit the successful bidder—

I do not know who he might be, but he would be in private enterprise. He would be investing his own money. He would be taking a chance, including the chance of being able to rent the property—

to secure conventional private financing or to apply for mortgage insurance under Federal Housing procedure.

What is wrong with that? The successful bidder could go to a bank in Maryland or in Washington and he could say, "I have a legitimate business proposal to build houses at the Medical Center in Bethesda. Do you think it is a good business deal?" In other words, Mr. President, he would take a chance, and the banker would take a chance. Under the law he could also apply for conventional mortgage insurance under the Federal Housing procedure. We passed the law. What is wrong with a builder in Bethesda, in order to carry out the provisions of a law which Congress passed, when building houses which are needed at the Medical Center in Bethesda, to applying for mortgage insurance?

I continue to read from the letter:

In the latter case the standard FHA regulations would be incorporated in the terms and conditions determined by the Surgeon General.

It would not be a one-way affair. It would be in keeping with what I think has been the desire, especially on the other side of the aisle, that we let business take its course.

6. To make the intent of the legislation quite clear, especially to the community, it may be desirable—

We are now talking about the fine citizens of Montgomery County, who live within the area in which the National Institutes of Health are located—

it may be desirable to specify clearly a limitation of "not to exceed 250 units, the occupancy of which shall be limited entirely to the employees of the National Institutes of Health."

Mr. President, my home is 2,000 miles from Montgomery County, Md. However, I know Montgomery County. I know families in Montgomery County. I know teachers in Rockville. I know nurses in Bethesda. Some of the residents there are former citizens of my State, who now live within the area. But they own their own homes, and pay taxes in Montgomery County. The interest of the Senator from New Mexico in this instance is not personal or political. I am trying to perform my duty as chairman of a subcommittee which is investigating the requirements of Federal functions. I say to Senators, "Do not tell me that you want the Government to proceed in a normal way, if you object to a committee recommendation that we let private enterprise in the State of Maryland construct houses at no cost to the American taxpayers anywhere in the country, including Mont-

gomery County, and by which the State of Maryland would collect taxes."

The houses would have to be built anyway.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will yield in a moment. Millions of dollars of taxpayers' money has been spent to construct the institution. No one would dare say it should not be there. The National Institutes of Health are a creature of the Congress of the United States. I congratulate the State of Maryland and the people of Montgomery County that the Congress of the United States was able to build the institution in Montgomery County.

The Institute is active. It is investigating the heart conditions of millions of people. It is investigating the mental health of millions of people. It is investigating the causes of cancer throughout the country, and endeavoring to find a cure for that dread disease. It is dealing with human beings and with humanity. Congress, in its wisdom, placed the institution in Montgomery County and has appropriated millions of dollars for it. It is continuing to operate. The people who are connected with the institution are entitled to have a place to sleep. They are entitled to be out of the weather. The only question is whether we want to provide for them through a Government appropriation, by taking the money out of the taxpayers' pockets, or letting American businessmen take a chance. The issue is simple. There is no question in my mind about the necessity of constructing the housing.

I will say to my good friend from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] that I think he sponsored a very fine law. I believe it is in keeping with what we are all trying to fight for, namely, the American way of life. If Jim Jones, of Bethesda or Baltimore, wants to construct 250 units at Bethesda and take the chance that he will get his money back, what is wrong with letting him do it? Is that not preferable to taking money from the Federal Treasury, a process to which so many have been objecting?

I now yield to my good friend from Maryland.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The junior Senator from Maryland certainly does not object to providing adequate housing at the National Health Institutes at Bethesda. I realize that housing will have to be built. However, directly across the road from the Bethesda Medical Center there are apartment units similar to the ones which are proposed to be built under the Senator's amendment. I should like to ask the Senator from New Mexico whether the State of Maryland receives one penny of taxes from any of the apartment units which are located across the street from the Medical Center?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is what we are trying to avoid. That is why we are recommending this kind of construction. Out of all the apartment units at the Naval Clinic the State of Maryland does not receive 1 cent in taxes. We are trying to help the State of Maryland get

some return from the construction of the buildings.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is it not correct to say that under existing law the Government of the United States could tax the property at any time it desired to do so, even though it had been built under private auspices?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Maryland is not going to argue with me along that line, because I know what it means to have land in the ownership of the Federal Government. Sixty-three percent of all the land of my State is not on the tax rolls of my State. Thirty-seven percent of the land of the State pays for the cost of the State Government. I understand what the Senator from Maryland has in mind. I would not like to see the Federal Government go to Virginia and take eight counties completely off the tax rolls. Nor would I like to see the Federal Government do it in New Mexico or in Maryland. But in order to be consistent, what we are trying to do is to help avoid a similar situation in Montgomery County. We are trying to permit the State of Maryland to collect some taxes from this development.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Is there any compelling reason why the conference committee could not strike out the tax provision? Taxes are not paid in similar situations, so why should we in Maryland be treated differently in that respect?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Do I correctly understand that the Senator from Maryland wishes to have arrangements made so that Maryland will be unable to collect taxes in connection with this development?

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. No; I do not. I want Maryland to be able to collect taxes, and that is the only inducement to the county authorities to favor this provision. I know the amendment contains a provision in regard to taxes, but there is no reason why the conference committee could not strike it out, and the conference committee probably would.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I want the Senator from Maryland to have the same faith in me that I have in him.

On page 6418 of the RECORD we find the following:

such quarters and facilities to be constructed and operated without regard to local zoning limitations, but to be subject—

That is rather clear language—

for the term of the lease to State and local taxation on the same basis as other property in the community.

If the Senator from Maryland can suggest clearer language than that to carry out that purpose, we shall be glad to accept it.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I am not complaining about the language, but I point out that there are similar housing units within 100 yards of this very location, and from them the government of Maryland collects no taxes. So it is not very likely that the development now

under discussion would continue to pay taxes for any length of time, because it is an integral part of the hospital—just as much a part of the hospital as is the operating room of the hospital.

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; so far as the legal entities are concerned, they are two separate developments. The development the Senator from Maryland is now discussing is a naval institution, pure and simple. The National Institutes of Health are separate units, created by the Congress for particular purposes. They have nothing to do with taking care of those in the Navy who are sick.

I agree with the Senator from Maryland with regard to the taxation feature. I object just as strenuously as he does to tax exemption, because millions of acres in my State are not on the tax rolls, and I do not like to have the Federal Government take property off the tax rolls in Virginia or in New Mexico or in Prince Georges County or Montgomery County, Md., or any other county, and not make some kind of recompense for it. That is what we are trying to arrange for here; we are trying to place Maryland in the position the Senator from Maryland has in mind.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me, to permit me to make a statement?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. First, I desire to express to the senior Senator from New Mexico our appreciation of his forthrightness and his very commendable attitude. I know full well that the Senator from New Mexico is almost as much a part of the State of Maryland as are the citizens of Maryland who vote there and claim Maryland as their residence.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I love the Free State.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I say that because over a period of many years the Senator from New Mexico has, either directly or indirectly, been associated with Maryland in one way or another, and has been most welcome there. He is highly regarded by the citizens of the State; and I know full well that in connection with this matter he has the interests of the State of Maryland just as much at heart as do we who have been elected from that State.

There are several aspects of this matter to which I should like to address myself, if I may have the permission of the Senator from New Mexico to do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, in making this brief statement, I wish to say first that I associate myself with the position taken yesterday in the Senate by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER]. I am familiar with what he has stated, and I am in full accord with the views he expresses, because I feel that an overriding consideration in connection with this entire matter is the effect on the interests of the property owners and citizens of that very enterprising community. As the Senator from New Mexico well knows, there is hardly to be found a community whose citizens have invested more of their own

possessions and have built homes with greater expectations of personal enjoyment of them than have the citizens of this area of Montgomery County. The splendid residences which they have built give evidence of their interest and faith in that community.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, I should like to ask whether he feels that the expenditure of the millions of dollars at the Bethesda Naval Hospital and the millions of dollars at the National Institutes of Health has interfered with the development the Senator from Maryland has just mentioned.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am very glad the Senator from New Mexico has asked that question, because I happened to be present when the cornerstone of the Naval Hospital was laid by a great American, Franklin D. Roosevelt. Since that time I have followed the progress of that institution and I have familiarized myself with it, so that certainly I know what has transpired there. I am confidently of the belief that that institution has been of great benefit to America. The Senator from New Mexico is entirely correct in what he has so eloquently stated in regard to the humanitarian efforts and the successful endeavors which have been made there in Maryland in the interest of humankind.

Although possibly we in Maryland have suffered by reason of a slight diminution of tax revenues, nevertheless that has been overbalanced, I am sure, by the great benefits which have come to other States and, I may say, to the entire world as a result of the research and other work which has been done there.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am very glad to have the Senator from New Mexico do so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The personnel at the naval hospital and the personnel at the National Institutes of Health are considerable in number, as I am sure the Senator from Maryland will agree.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, I agree.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Those persons make daily purchases within the State of Maryland, and the State of Maryland has a sales tax. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So by reason of the expenditure of these millions of dollars of Federal Government funds, although the State of Maryland may not be able to collect quite as much money in the way of property taxes, it does obtain the benefit of the additional payments which are made in connection with its sales tax. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Although I agree with the Senator, yet probably this is not the time to debate those relative benefits and advantages or disadvantages. However, the Senator is correct in saying that immediate benefits do flow from that source.

I return to the point that the State of Maryland and, in particularly, the immediate community affected, have given much to these very worthy institutions and also have suffered some losses by way of a decrease in tax revenues. However, I prefer not to base my conclusion

upon that consideration as much as upon the immediate effect on the residents who are members of that great and splendid community—and particularly upon the question of whether we in Congress may be doing something which will adversely affect the holdings and homes and residences of the several thousands of families who live in that immediate vicinity.

Mr. President, several questions were raised in yesterday's debate which we think have since been clarified. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico stated that the crux of this issue is whether the nurses' and doctors' quarters, which are to be a part of the Government hospital, shall be built with private money or with Government money, and he, together with one of the other Members of the Senate, understandably indicates a preference for the use of private money.

I may say that I am heartily in accord with the maximum use of private enterprise and the minimum use of public construction; but it seems to me that that principle does not entirely solve the problems which we here face. We believe that Government money will pay for these hospital quarters, no matter what or who constructs and operates them, and that it is for us to consider whether it might be more expensive for the Federal taxpayers if the quarters were privately constructed and operated; because, if this were not so, then the Government might be making a serious mistake by constructing its own buildings elsewhere, as in the case of post offices and Army barracks.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder whether the Senator has considered the question as to which of these programs would throw the heavier burden upon the taxpayers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have given consideration to that, and we believe that ultimately there will be a greater burden thrown upon the local taxpayers if it is financed in the way which has here been suggested. We believe that the nurses' home and the quarters for resident surgeons and house doctors are as much parts of a hospital as are the wards, kitchens, and operating rooms. At the Bethesda Naval Hospital, as has been stated by the junior Senator from Maryland, directly across the road from the National Institutes of Health, quarters are provided for both the professional and the nonprofessional staffs. Every Government hospital of which I have heard provides necessary quarters for its key personnel and offices appropriate to the construction of the hospital. The authorization for this research hospital now under construction included not only the hospital building, but also the necessary service buildings and the essential quarters for the hospital personnel. If this building, which is part of a public construction project on public land, to house public employees, is constructed with private capital and operated privately, the Government will be paying the rent on the building through

the rental allowance it must pay to its commissioned personnel.

It was stated on the floor of the Senate yesterday that there would be annual operating costs of about \$58,000 if the Government were to build and to operate these quarters, and the statement was repeated this morning. But it was not pointed out that there would be an annual rental of approximately from \$200,000 to \$300,000 paid out of appropriated funds if private persons were to operate the 250-unit project.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I do not quite get the Senator's point. I wonder whether the Senator would elaborate on it, because I am very much interested in it. In order that the Senator may understand the point of my question, I may say it is my understanding that in all of the Wherry housing, whether it is connected with military installations or colleges, or whether it is connected with atomic-energy projects, the conditions are prescribed by the Government, and the lessee must account for his own rents.

Yesterday afternoon the distinguished junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], if I understood his statement, said it would cost more to build this project under private enterprise than for the Government to build it, because of the rental consideration, and that the cost to the taxpayer would be greater. What I was apprehensive about last night was whether the project as provided for by the amendment would meet the conditions of the Federal Housing Authority for insurance and in other ways. If those conditions cannot be met, the structure cannot be built by private enterprise. If they can be met, certainly the private enterpriser who builds the project will be able to get the money from the revenues derived with which to pay the necessary annual amortization on the project until it is completely amortized, at which time it will then revert to the one who gives the lease.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may answer—

Mr. WHERRY. If the Senator will pardon me, what I desire the Senator from Maryland to explain to me is this: If that be true, if those provisions are met, then will the Senator please say why he thinks that, if the Government builds this project by direct appropriations, it will cost the taxpayers less money than if it were built otherwise? Does the Senator understand what I mean?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand, and I am in accord with the junior Senator from Maryland, whom I see standing, wanting to comment; and I shall be very glad to have him do so, if he desires.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. The senior Senator from Maryland has the floor, and I would rather have him do it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In answer to the Senator from Nebraska, I may say I agree with the position taken by the junior Senator from Maryland, because I think the allowances which are made to the personnel must necessarily be

such that the builder will be operating at a profit. While we, of course, applaud every effort made to have private enterprise take over, yet in this particular instance, where there are conditions totally different from those covered by construction projects under the Wherry Act—

Mr. WHERRY. Just a moment, please. I did not get the Senator's last statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I was about to say that I think there are conditions obtaining in this case which are vastly different from those which apply to construction under the Wherry Act. I recall being with the junior Senator from Nebraska at the ground-breaking at the Naval Academy.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There, where there was no other housing available and where there were possibilities of deactivation, which of course would make it unattractive possibly for private capital to undertake construction, it was very necessary that the housing should be provided and that the Government should erect it. As the Senator from New Mexico has stated, I think the Senator from Nebraska did a very splendid thing in sponsoring the so-called Wherry Act, but we think the conditions in this instance are so different as to make that act inapplicable.

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

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. What is the difference between the conditions which are imposed by the provisions of the Wherry Act on a project on a military installation, or one near military installations, and this project in Maryland?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Take the one where the Senator from Nebraska personally participated in the ground-breaking: Had it not been for the procedure followed in that construction work, I dare say the facilities would not have been made available, because there were conditions applicable at that location which might very well have made it unattractive to private enterprise.

Mr. WHERRY. I understand that. It is the question of building an installation in an isolated place, where it would not otherwise be built.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. WHERRY. I am trying to resolve this question in my own mind. If the explanation which has been given is correct—and I have no reason to doubt it at all—all the conditions of the Wherry Act are complied with in the case of this installation in Maryland, even regarding insurance. It is even thought to be much better so far as the insurance feature goes than an installation of a military character in an isolated place, and that it is even more attractive commercially. Is it not a fact that all these units will be rented? If anyone who works at the Institutes have an allowance because of his military status, he would have the same privilege anywhere he went.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That would be true, whether he went to Annapolis or wherever he went.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct. If this is to be a private building it must obtain revenue from monthly rentals payable in cash, in order to fulfill the conditions imposed by the Wherry Act, and the situation in that respect would be the same in Maryland as it is supposed to be throughout the country.

I ask the Senator from Maryland to point out wherein there is any difference. If there is no difference, then I am forced to say that certainly the housing should be built in the private-enterprise way, and, for the life of me, I cannot see that it would cost more to do it that way than it would to have it built at Government expense.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the Senator will bear with me for a few more moments, we have made a computation of rentals, cost, and allowances, and we find that there will be made available for rentals approximately \$250,000, which amount, of course, the Government will continue to pay and which we think will more than offset the allowances.

Mr. WHERRY. The allowances are an entirely different matter. They would not make any difference at all. If I built an installation in Washington and an Army officer who could not live on the post had to rent privately, he would pay me the cash, because it would be allowed to him by the Government. There is not involved the question of a subsidy to be paid directly by the Government to the private-enterprise builder. That is the point I am making. There might be difficulties with reference to zoning. There might be a building on Government property constructed by outside builders in the locality. There might be some zoning condition, some opening up of territory to private builders, but if I correctly understand the explanation, I do not see any difference, in the application of the law in Maryland and any other State, with reference to any military or near-military installation, under the provisions of the Wherry Act, which provides that the construction must be amortized by private money until it is paid for, and that then it shall revert to the Government.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator. I have yielded to the senior Senator from Maryland for the purpose of making an explanation, but I do not desire to lose my place on the floor.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from Maryland be allowed to make a statement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the junior Senator from Maryland may proceed.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I should like to answer, if I can, the argument of the Senator from Nebraska. I think there is this difference: If the housing accommodations were not built under Federal auspices and those needing quarters had to get their housing in a private building, it would cost the Government more money, through the

granting of allowances, than it would to build the housing.

Mr. WHERRY. If the officers receive allowances it does not make any difference whether they live in Maryland or in Nebraska. They have to account for the rental.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. It is my understanding that if they are in Government housing they do not get allowances.

Mr. WHERRY. I think it will be found that in the case of officers, they are given rental as a part of their compensation, wherever they are located, and in the event they do not have quarters on the post, they have to pay rental, whether the housing is built privately or by the Government.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, we are talking directly about the National Institutes of Health. There is only one class of persons who would be eligible for allowances. They are commissioned officers in the Public Health Service. Besides that, there are nurses, the custodial force, the man who shovels the coal or turns on the oil for the furnace, and there are other workers who do not receive any allowance and who would be subject to paying rent to the private enterprise.

It is extremely simple, in the opinion of the Senator from New Mexico. I hope Senators will not tell me how much they love private enterprise. There is one thing that should be done; housing must be provided for those connected with the institutes of health. Do we want the Government to build it, or do we want some businessman from the State of Maryland to build it? That is all there is to the question.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have the figures on personnel connected with all the national health institutes, whether they be heart, cancer, mental diseases, tuberculosis, poliomyelitis, sanitation, or milk pasteurization.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Are these the figures requested by the junior Senator from Maryland yesterday?

Mr. HILL. Yes. There are 186 commissioned officers. The civilian personnel is 1,794.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And they do not receive allowances.

Mr. HILL. The latter class, the civilian personnel, have no allowances whatever. Much the larger number of these units will be occupied by civilian employees who receive no allowances. With all appreciation of the distinguished Senators from Maryland, and with all respect for them, the argument they make is an argument against the Wherry Act, which was passed a good many months ago, and which certainly, so far as the evidence before the Appropriations Committee shows, has worked very well. The distinguished author of that act, who deserves much credit for his authorship of it, knows that time and again we have asked the question, "How is the Wherry Act working out? Is it doing what its distinguished author contemplated?" The witnesses have shown us how well it has worked out. The

argument made by the distinguished Senators from Maryland applies merely to that act.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I feel that the project is so greatly needed that whether it be constructed under the Wherry law or under a Government appropriation, it should, nevertheless, be constructed. I think both Senators from Maryland have agreed that the construction of the housing units is needed. If they do not want it done under the Wherry law, I will accept an amendment making a direct appropriation for the construction. But let the units be constructed.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator permit an amendment to make a direct Government appropriation?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to state clearly what is in my mind. I am sure that my able colleague understands that what the Senators from Maryland are trying to do is to protect the people of our State, protect them in their possessions, their residences and holdings, and to avoid any adverse effect on a taxable basis. I am sure the Senator from New Mexico is equally earnest in his desire to preserve those values, and I ask him to give attention to the language on line 10 of the proposed amendment, which states that the quarters and facilities are to be constructed and operated without regard to local zoning limitations. Of course, that has been a matter of considerable concern to our people, because it would indicate that this particular operation and construction of quarters and facilities would be done in defiance of, or certainly leaving out of consideration, all that has been built up in the way of zoning regulations. I am confident that the Senator from New Mexico has no intention to overthrow those safeguards which, of course, are so necessary for the preservation of values. I am wondering whether the Senator is of the opinion that provision could be eliminated and whether he could give assurance, so far as assurance can be given, that the language can be changed—

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the amendment as now submitted was not a recommendation of the committee. After consultation with the class of citizens of Montgomery County, Md., to whom the senior Senator from Maryland has referred, they submitted the amendment which is now being considered. They were property owners in the immediate vicinity, persons for whom I know the Senators from Maryland have the highest regard. But I want the construction to proceed. I think it is needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Certainly if the United States Government constructs this housing, as it will do, because it must do it unless we provide for its construction by private enterprise, along the lines of the amendment offered by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Federal Government is not going to give any consideration to the question of zoning.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand that.

Mr. HILL. There is a much better chance that a private builder, a local citizen of the great State of Maryland, will give much more consideration to zoning than will the United States Government. If the Government undertakes the project I am sure it will build the housing as convenience dictates, and without regard to zoning.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Senator from Alabama is entirely correct. But if the construction is to be by private builders, and if the provision to which I have referred is written into the law in express language, it will represent an entire departure from zoning regulations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish to carry out the ideas expressed by the two Senators from Maryland with respect to protecting the property owners' rights. They have made their investments, and I want to see their homes protected. Why do not the two Senators from Maryland permit us to take the amendment to conference? The conferees will discuss the subject, and I can assure my two good friends from Maryland that, so far as the conferees on the part of the Senate are concerned, we will do nothing that will in any way jeopardize the property rights of any good citizen of Montgomery County or the State of Maryland.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I believe what the Senators have in mind will be accomplished if the Senator from New Mexico will do what I understood him, last night, to say he would do, ask unanimous consent to strike out the syllable "out" in the third word in line 10.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. President, what the Senator says is exactly our position.

Mr. WHERRY. So, after the word "operated", the word "with" would follow, striking out the syllable "out", so the language in that line would be "and operated with regard to local zoning limitations." I believe such a change would solve the whole problem.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In all sincerity, I will say to the two Senators from Maryland that if they will permit us to take the amendment to conference, with that proposed change, we will work the provision out intelligently and within reason.

Mr. WHERRY. So the word would be "with," instead of "without."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, the word would be "with."

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Does the Senator from New Mexico agree to strike out the syllable "out"?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The provision will be acceptable if that change is made, so the word will be "with" instead of "without."

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is agreeable. I shall be glad to take that language to conference so we can discuss the subject intelligently and in a reasonable way. I believe in acting in a reasonable manner. I do not believe in bullheadedness, or in endeavoring to use driving power, or anything like that. I like to discuss what is the best manner of procedure with my fellow Senators and conferees.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. What will this project cost?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I will say to the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee that 250 units, built by private enterprise, will cost approximately \$2,500,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. Two million five hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Could not this matter be postponed until our foreign troubles are settled? We are in a war.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. We have settled the matter now.

Mr. McKELLAR. We are spending sixty to seventy billions of dollars this year. Could we not postpone this item until a little later?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me correct the Senator from Tennessee, to whom I am very much devoted. We are trying to get private enterprise to invest money, without appropriating any of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. McKELLAR. There will be no appropriation under this item?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Not a penny.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. HILL. We have already appropriated \$1,125,000 for this project, which is now available. If we can have the amendment agreed to, and permit private enterprise to construct the project, then that \$1,125,000 will not be taken out of the Federal Treasury; not a penny of it will be taken out of the Federal Treasury for this project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. We are trying to have private enterprise construct the building. I will take the matter to conference, if the Senators from Maryland agree.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I should like to withdraw the point of order I raised against the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I further modify my amendment, on page 1, line 10, by striking out the syllable "out" in the third word, thus leaving the language in that line reading: "and operated with regard to local zoning limitations, but."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Gillette in the chair). The Senator from New Mexico has modified his amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the Senator from New Mexico allow me to thank him very much for his consideration in this whole matter?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico withdraw his motion to suspend the rule?

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes. I submit the amendment, as modified. The junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Butler] has withdrawn his point of order. I ask for action on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant of the chair wishes to

inform the Senator that the point of order was not ruled on.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes, but the Senator from Maryland withdrew his point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question reverts to consideration of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; as modified by the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As modified, the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 27, after "\$250,000" in line 19, it is proposed to insert the following: "Provided, That the Surgeon General is authorized, on such terms and conditions as he determines are appropriate for the efficient operation of the combined hospital and research building, to lease for a total of not more than 99 years a portion of the present site of the National Institutes of Health for the construction, operation, and maintenance thereon by the lessee of rental quarters, but not to exceed 250 units limited exclusively to occupancy by employees of the National Institutes of Health and necessary related facilities, such quarters and facilities to be constructed and operated with regard to local zoning limitations, but to be subject for the term of the lease to State and local taxation on the same basis as other property in the community: *Provided further*, That not more than \$50,000 of the amounts heretofore appropriated for the construction of additional auxiliary structures under this head shall be available for expenditure by the Public Health Service for the preparation of plans and specifications for the construction on the property leased pursuant to the preceding provision, such expenditure to be repaid by the lessee and credited to such appropriation."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for the considerate treatment he has accorded me during the debate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I think the RECORD ought to show that what we have done does not represent an idle gesture, and that the conferees on the part of the Senate will stand by the amendment in conference. I have faith in their doing so, so that if the project is to be built in accordance with the terms of the amendment, it will be built in line with the local zoning regulations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I firmly believe in the action taken by the Senate.

I submit another amendment, Mr. President, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 13, after "title" in line 13, it is proposed to insert the following: "*Provided further*, That the District of Columbia shall pay by check to Freedmen's Hospital, upon the Surgeon General's request, in advance at the beginning of each quarter, such amount as the Surgeon General calculates will be earned on the basis of rates approved by the Bureau of the Budget for the care of patients certified by the District of Columbia. Bills rendered by the Surgeon General on the basis of such calculations shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment; but proper adjustment of amounts which have been paid in advance on the basis of such calculations shall be made at the end of each quarter: *Provided further*, That the Surgeon General may delegate the responsibilities imposed upon him by the foregoing proviso."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Chavez].

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 32, line 6, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$33,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is a proposal to diminish by \$3,000,000—

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I be permitted to finish the sentence, and then I will yield. I will yield at the end of a sentence, but not at the end of a clause.

Mr. WHERRY. I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I believe that Senators should be present to hear the distinguished Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not anxious about that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I would not mind having a quorum call, because the Senator from Illinois is about to discuss the Children's Bureau. I should like to have more Senators listen to the argument of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois may yield for the purpose of a quorum call?

Mr. WHERRY. I so request, Mr. President. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Illinois shall not lose the floor, and that we may proceed with a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	Capehart	Ecton
Anderson	Carlson	Ellender
Bennett	Chavez	Ferguson
Brewster	Clements	Flanders
Bricker	Connally	Frear
Bridges	Cordon	Fulbright
Butler, Md.	Douglas	George
Butler, Nebr.	Duff	Gillette
Byrd	Dworshak	Green
Cain	Eastland	Hayden

Hendrickson	Long	Robertson
Hennings	Magnuson	Russell
Hickenlooper	Malone	Saltonstall
Hill	Maybank	Schoepfel
Hoey	McCarran	Smith, Maine
Holland	McCarthy	Smith, N. J.
Humphrey	McClellan	Smith, N. C.
Hunt	McFarland	Sparkman
Ives	McKellar	Stennis
Jenner	McMahon	Taft
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	Taht
Johnson, Tex.	Moody	Tobey
Johnston, S. C.	Morse	Underwood
Kefauver	Mundt	Watkins
Kerr	Neely	Welker
Kilgore	Nixon	Wherry
Knowland	O'Connor	Wiley
Langer	O'Mahoney	Williams
Lehman	Pastore	Young

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered would reduce by \$3,000,000 the amount granted to the States for maternal and child welfare.

Yesterday, when I proposed to reduce the amounts for the teaching of retail selling, I was accused of being against motherhood, the selling of ribbons, and gifts. I suppose today, in proposing to reduce the amount of the grants to the States for maternal and child welfare, I will be accused not only of being against mothers, but of being against children, the American home, and pure milk.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, it is necessary to observe a very simple fact. In 1951 there was appropriated for this purpose \$30,250,000. The 1952 estimates submitted by the Budget Bureau were \$33,000,000. The House cut the amount to \$30,000,000, or roughly the same as was appropriated last year. There is also a carry-over from last year of approximately \$3,000,000. So if we add the carry-over of \$3,000,000 to the appropriation of \$30,000,000 for this year, we reach a total of \$33,000,000, or the amount which the Bureau of the Budget estimated for 1952.

As I understand it, Mr. President, the carry-over of \$3,000,000 arises from the fact that a number of the States have not fully utilized the grants the Federal Government has made to them. Therefore, I propose that we utilize the unexpended balance, in order to help

reach the total of \$33,000,000, which was recommended. Twenty States of the 48 have had carry-overs; they have not spent all the grants the Federal Government has made to them. Twenty-eight States have spent all the grants which have been made to them. The funds are not transferable, so they cannot be transferred from the 20 States which have carry-overs to the 28 States which do not have carry-overs. Thus, in the 28 States there would actually be a reduction in the amounts requested by the Bureau of the Budget, but they would still get about the same amounts as they got last year.

Mr. President, I know this is a somewhat unpopular proposal to make, for it is unquestionably a fine program. I campaigned for it myself in the 1920's. But I should like to point out that this bill contains funds for other fine programs, which we not only failed to increase over the amounts appropriated last year but actually cut below last year's level. For instance, I think we all agree that the tuberculosis program is a fine one. Yet we cut that appropriation a half million dollars below that of last year. We cut the communicable diseases program nearly a third of a million dollars. We cut the National Heart Institute by nearly a half million dollars and we also cut the National Cancer Institute below what we appropriated last year.

As I say, Mr. President, the maternal and child health program is a good one. But so is research in tuberculosis, communicable diseases, cancer, and heart ailments. All I am saying is that we will not wreck the program, and we can treat it the same as the others by reducing the Senate committee figure of \$33,000,000 down to \$30,000,000, which is about the same level as last year. And, in so doing, we can save \$3,000,000.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the appropriation be reduced from \$33,000,000 to \$30,000,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Aside from the health-research work done in research laboratories and the work done in hospitals, I certainly do not know of anything more important than maternal care and child care; in fact, I am not sure that I do not regard all of them as of equal importance, although it will be recalled that within the last few days I fought with all the force at my command against the proposal to make a reduction in the appropriation for research laboratories and hospitals.

Certainly I believe that maternal care and child care are just as important as our defense efforts. Certainly we cannot afford to jeopardize the welfare of the mothers or to jeopardize the welfare of the children of this country or decrease the care and help we give to them.

I realize perfectly well that we are now in the midst of a great emergency. I know that all of us have to make sacrifices in meeting the requirements of the emergency; but the emergency will not last forever. On the other hand, the children whom we may neglect today

will grow up; and if we do not care for them now, we may have a liability, rather than an asset, later on.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois, for whom I have very great regard, but who I know is as deeply moved by the health needs and moral needs of our country as is any other Member of this body, has objected to the increase of \$3,000,000 in the proposed appropriation, and he has referred to the fact that this year there is a carry-over of \$3,000,000 from the appropriation made last year. As I understand, that carry-over does not benefit all the States of the Union. I believe I am correct in saying that the Senator from Illinois said that 28 of the States have used up their full quotas.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. LEHMAN. Therefore, even though there may be a carry-over on paper, those 28 States—and I do not know which States they are; I do not know whether my own State is included among them—will have cuts made in their funds, if the proposed reduction in the appropriation is made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at this point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The Senator speaks of the 28 States, and he is correct in saying that those 28 States will have cuts made in their funds for maternal care and child-health services. There are also 43 States which will have cuts made in their funds for services to crippled children. So the amendment affects both the 28 States which are involved so far as maternal care and child care are concerned, and the 43 States which are involved insofar as their funds for services to crippled children are concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the able Senator from Alabama for his very valuable remarks; by his statement he has strengthened the case which I am trying to present to my colleagues in the Senate, and he has shown the unwisdom of making the proposed reduction in the appropriation.

It is true that we are asked to appropriate \$3,000,000 more than was appropriated last year, but every Member of this body knows that during the past year the cost of living and the costs of administration and the costs of operation have increased to such a great extent that an increase of more than \$3,000,000 really is required in connection with this appropriation. Therefore, when it is proposed that we appropriate \$33,000,000 instead of the \$30,000,000 which was appropriated last year, the result of adopting that proposal will not be to increase in the slightest degree the scope of the work. All we are asking is that the work continue on an undiminished scale. I wish we could greatly increase the scale of the work, but of course we know the exigencies of the present situation. Therefore, we do not request an increase in the scope or scale of the work; but certainly we ask that this highly important work, which concerns every man, woman, and child in the United States, be not curtailed.

Therefore, Mr. President, I very much hope that my colleagues in the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I have such great respect for the Senator from Illinois that I am really surprised that he should propose the amendment he has submitted. I rise in opposition to it. I know the Senator from Illinois is sincere in his efforts to reduce the expenses of the Government. However, it is quite possible for us to vote for reductions in appropriations which actually will not result in making any savings.

In this instance, the proposed reduction would hit the lifeline of the United States. This amendment, if adopted, would strike a very serious and heavy blow at the funds to be appropriated and made available for the care of crippled children and for maternal care. So I am surprised that my good friend, the Senator from Illinois, should even offer the amendment.

In connection with this amendment, as proposed, I wish to read from the committee hearings on page 527, where there is found the testimony of Miss Katharine F. Lenroot in regard to this item. In speaking of the proposed cut in the funds for child welfare, Miss Lenroot said:

There are similar cuts for child welfare. I totaled up a few of these figures on the three programs for the States. There would be a total cut, for instance, of about \$20,000, roughly, for New Mexico, and other States, in proportion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the figures indicate that this would mean serious curtailment of services and it does not seem to me good economy—

I stress this point—

to let crippled children go with their conditions uncared for when a little work now would prevent, perhaps, a much more serious condition a little bit later, or to let the very high infant-mortality rates in some of the States go without everything possible being done to lower those rates and bring them down to the national average.

Mr. President, these are most serious matters. We try to prepare our children so that in case of necessity or emergency they will be able to make the supreme sacrifice, if need be, and thus be the recipients of nothing more than white crosses over their graves. Yet, by means of this amendment, it is proposed that on the basis of—may I say, measly advice?—we make reductions in the funds to be appropriated for maternal care and the care of crippled children.

Mr. President, a portion of the funds to be appropriated in this connection are to be used to reduce the infant mortality rate. Millions and millions of dollars are appropriated by the Congress to eradicate Bang's disease in cattle, but complaint is made because we try to make a small appropriation—certainly it is very small when compared with the total appropriations which are made—to reduce infant mortality.

I wish to ask the Senator from Illinois a question. What right have we to sermonize to people behind the iron curtain, when we do not do anything about infant mortality, which, in itself, is quite a serious problem?

But I shall proceed with the reading of the testimony of that noble woman. Let those who wish to call her a bureau-

crat do so. I refer to Miss Katharine F. Lenroot. She works for the Government, and I wish there were more Government employees of her type. From page 527 of the hearings, I read:

Senator CHAVEZ. We have the national picture very well, but for the benefit of the Senator from Montana, I wish you would briefly explain again why the House cut that \$3,000,000 because some of the States had balances.

Miss LENROOT. I shall be glad to do that, Senator ECTON.

Senator ECTON. Thank you.

Miss LENROOT. The provisions of the Social Security Act regarding maternal and child health, crippled children, and child welfare—

Possibly they do not deserve our consideration. The committee thought they did, and I believe the red-blooded Americans in this body, who are lovers of humanity, will feel the same way about it. I continue reading—

provide that the States can carry over a part of the fund for 2 years beyond the year for which they are appropriated.

That has been of value to the States in giving continuity to their planning. In reducing the amount for grants from \$33,000,000 as recommended by the budget to \$30,000,000, the House said there was \$3,000,000 already available to the States in balances, but those are very unevenly distributed. About 28 States have no balance or less than \$1,000 for maternal and child-health services; about 43 States have no balance or less than \$1,000 for crippled children's services.

Senator ECTON. There is no way to reallocate?

That is the problem. There is no way to allocate an allotment made to the State of North Carolina, or to the State of Arkansas, the State of Georgia, the State of Alabama, the State of Wyoming, the State of Arizona, or the State of New York. The money cannot be used in North Carolina for maternal and child health, and the other purposes, no matter how much the State may need it.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HOEY. I notice that the committee has stricken out the proviso on page 32, lines 11 to 15, which provided that this money should be allotted on a pro rata basis among the several States. Why was that stricken out?

Mr. CHAVEZ. It was done in order to obtain a more equitable distribution of the allotments to the respective States. It was a question of policy. It was a question of whether, under one formula, one State might obtain a slight advantage over another State. What the committee did was to try to assure that the allocations would be made as equitably as possible, so that every State might receive its proportionate share.

Mr. HOEY. It appears that under the present plans the money has been allotted on a pro rata basis. The committee would strike that out. Upon what basis is it to be allotted?

Mr. HILL. If I may answer the Senator's question, striking out that language leaves the law just as Congress has written it, exactly as the distinguished Senator's committee reported it,

and exactly as we agreed to it in the last Social Security Act. The purpose of that act was to change the existing law, I may say to the Senator and, by striking the language out, we leave the law as it is now, under the basic Social Security Act, as reported by the committee of which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is chairman, and as passed by the Congress.

Mr. HOEY. Upon what basis is it distributed under that law? The language of the bill as it came to the Senate says it shall be upon the basis of the amounts to which the respective States are entitled, and so forth. Upon what basis will it be distributed under the committee amendment?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall endeavor to explain that to the Senator in a moment.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, by striking out that language we declined to do away with the statutory minimum which is written into the basic act.

Mr. HOEY. When the State gets its pro rata share, upon what basis does it get it, if this language is stricken out?

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator kindly let the Senator from New Mexico proceed with his explanation, and give us time to get this information?

Mr. HOEY. Very well.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield for a question?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Am I correct in my understanding that for the fiscal year 1950 this type of work received a total of \$22,000,000?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The statement of comparable adjusted funds available for the fiscal years 1941-52 appears on page 190.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have that page.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In 1950, the agency received \$22,000,000. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So the committee's proposal would give them \$33,000,000, or an increase of 50 percent. The hard-hearted proposal of the Senator from Illinois, to give them \$30,000,000, is an increase of but 40 percent, plus the unexpended balances in 20 States, is it not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. But, Mr. President, I may say that what is proposed is not only possible, but it is also sound. Since the Congress made the appropriation for 1950 it has changed the law with reference to that particular item, hence it is necessary that the increase be made. But the Senate committee is not recommending 1 penny more than was estimated by the Budget Bureau. We increase this particular item for the Children's Bureau only \$3,000,000. I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will not be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I rise to express my opposition to the amendment,

I realize that some agencies of the Government are overstaffed, indeed, three-fourths of them are overstaffed. There are some, however, which have tried to operate efficiently and economically all through the years. I do not like indiscriminate cuts in appropriations, because they hurt not only those who have done good work, but those who have tried to do so. I think this is a very bad program by which to effect economies. "Pogrom," I think the proper word would be. Maybe it is "program," but I do not think so.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I like the remarks of the Senator from Vermont. I should like to cut appropriations for unnecessary automobiles, unnecessary chauffeurs, or unnecessary personnel. But let us be fair. This is one agency of the Federal Government which, as I stated previously, is headed by a noble person. Yes, she might be referred to as a bureaucrat, but I wish there were more of her type of bureaucrats. This item should not be cut one penny.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct about that. I think we were perfectly right in limiting the number of automobiles and chauffeurs and there are also many other places in the bill where we can make cuts. We should use proper care in watching the expenditures of the so-called temporary agencies of Government, because in the provisions relating to those agencies much can be done both economically and politically, and much more can be done advantageously than in cutting the older and conscientious agencies of the Government. Therefore, Mr. President, I hope the amendment will not prevail.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I wish to reply briefly to the question raised by the senior Senator from Illinois, who pointed out that the total appropriation for the care of crippled children had increased at this time to \$22,000,000. I wish to point out that this is a matching proposition. The Federal Government matches appropriations made by the States.

The whole concept of maternal care, the care of children and of crippled children, has changed and advanced in the past 10, 15, or 20 years. When I became Governor of New York there was virtually no provision for the care of crippled children. Gradually that work was undertaken, because it was demonstrated to be of tremendous value to the people not only of New York State, but of the Nation generally. Therefore the work has increased in volume, and the appropriations necessarily have increased very greatly in size.

The cost of government by the States, largely because of fulfilling their necessary and essential duties toward their people, has increased. During the last year I was Governor the budget of the State of New York was under \$400,000,000. Last year it was nearly a billion dollars. I do not claim for a minute that that great increase was due to wastefulness, or to a desire to undertake activities which were not essential in the interests of the people. The budget increase was in excess of 150 percent because of the general increase in the

cost of operation, not only in government, but in private business as well, throughout the country.

The appropriations made for hospitals in New York increased from \$50,000,000 to approximately \$140,000,000. I do not think there has been any greater waste under the present administration in Albany than there was under my administration. The appropriations increased because the needs were present, because costs were higher, and because salaries were higher. Of course, we felt that it was the duty of government to care for its people.

So the increase which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has pointed out has come about normally. It is not a real increase; it is merely to meet the increased cost of operation and the increased needs of our people. The \$33,000,000 which I hope will be appropriated this year will not permit the States to do a single piece of work larger in scope than that which was performed this year. It would simply permit the carrying on of the work on the same scale, at the same tempo, and under the same necessity, as in the past year.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will not lessen our ability to help the mothers and the crippled children in every State of the Union by trying to save a small sum of money. We are spending great sums of money for our Armed Forces. I have voted and shall continue to vote for every defense measure. But do not let our social and health activities be neglected simply to save a small sum of money.

I very much hope that the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the term "carry-over," in describing the sum of \$3,000,000, is a misnomer. It requires explanation. It is not a carry-over. There is no criticism of the Senator from Illinois in my statement. He made a very fine speech, and I concur in what he had to say. It is not a carry-over as to the majority of the States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is a carry-over as to 20 of the States, is it not?

Mr. HILL. That depends upon the particular item. It would be a carry-over for 20 States out of the 48 States, so far as maternal and child health services are concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. So those States which will next year service not only the amount appropriated by the pending bill, but will also have unexpended amounts appropriated for the past year, are in effect being provided with more than \$33,000,000 for the coming year, are they not?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct. We make those funds available for a period of 2 years, and there is a reason for that. As we know, the use of these funds depends upon action by State legislatures, as well as on action by the Congress of the United States.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. If the Congress permitted itself to be controlled in the amount it appropriated by the extent to which one or more States had not used a previous appropriation, would it then follow that the States which have been carrying the program forward on the basis of congressional authorization should be limited to what the State which has spent the least was able to do?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct in his implication. If we followed such a course, and put a heavy penalty on the States which are going forward with the program, and who are putting up their funds and making their sacrifices to carry forward the program we would be unjustly penalizing them.

Mr. KERR. In other words, the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois would be to cripple the States which are carrying out the program, and which most nearly do what is required by the necessities of their children.

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. It would cripple and penalize the States which in good faith have gone forward with what the Congress has said was the kind of program we should follow in providing for maternal care and for our children.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. A short time ago the Senator from Alabama was engaged in a colloquy with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY]. I do not believe the question then raised was cleared up.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator from Kansas permit me to proceed with the other phase? I will say that since that colloquy I have conferred with the chairman of the subcommittee and also with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], who is a member of the committee, and before the debate is concluded we propose to clear up the matter.

Mr. CARLSON. If the Senator will do that I shall appreciate it very much, because I have had some experience in handling programs of this nature.

Mr. HILL. The Senator, as a former distinguished governor of his State has, as he has said, had personal knowledge of the handling of these programs.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is familiar with the report made recently by the Institute of Public Affairs, which is constituted entirely of Democrats, among whose members are the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and a son of former President Roosevelt, and whose director is Dewey Anderson. The director reported that there are 10,000,000 families in the United States having an income of less than \$2,000 a year. Would not the Senator say that the bill is designed to help those particular families?

Mr. HILL. Very definitely so. No bill could have a more definite purpose toward helping those in the low-income groups than the bill now before us, I

will say to my distinguished friend from North Dakota.

Mr. President, 28 States have carried the program forward by putting up funds of their own, by carrying their part of the financial burden. They have carried on what the Congress has prescribed as adequate programs for maternal and child health services. The question is: Are we to penalize those 28 States because 20 States have not gone forward as we feel they should have gone forward with their programs?

Forty-three States have to the fullest extent gone forward with their programs for crippled children's services. Are we now to take money away from these 43 States because 5 of the States have not seen fit—as they had a right to do—to go forward with the full program? That is the question involved here. These States have their programs. We know that the basic Social Security Act provides so far as Federal aid is concerned. They know what we did this year. I think they have a right to expect that we will not cripple or impair or paralyze these programs for next year. That is exactly what the amendment of my distinguished friend from Illinois would do.

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

Mr. HILL. Yes, I yield to my good friend from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. As brought out by the committee, the bill provides a total of \$33,000,000 Federal funds for the 3 services, for child welfare services, for maternal and child health services, and for crippled children's services. A total of \$33,000,000. Is that correct?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that that amount, \$33,000,000, is approximately \$8,000,000 less than the amount for these three services which was authorized by the Eighty-first Congress?

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct. He is a distinguished member of the Senate Committee on Finance. That was the committee which handled the legislation embodying the amendments to the Social Security Act, which amendments authorized the additional \$8,000,000.

Mr. KERR. If the Senate keeps the bill, as reported by the committee, at the sum of \$33,000,000, that will represent an amount \$7,951,800 less than the amount for these three programs which at this time is authorized by the acts of Congress.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Oklahoma is exactly correct, and I thank him for his contribution. I do not know of any Senator who has been more interested in the work of the Children's Bureau, or has done more to help that Bureau, or to further or to strengthen and fortify these great child-welfare programs, than has the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. President, on last Friday the Senate heard one of the most eloquent and moving speeches that certainly I have heard in my somewhat long service on this floor. I refer to the speech of the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. We recall that in that speech he asked us to assess the

value of a child, the value of a healthy mother as compared to a sickly one, the value of a crippled child put back in the main stream of human effort instead of lying all of his life staring at the ceiling. Since the Senator from Vermont asked the value of a child, let us pause for a moment to think of its value. It is difficult to assess. It is particularly hard to assess that value in terms of dollars and cents. But it is not hard to estimate the value of children in the eyes of the people of the United States.

In March the census dazed us by reporting that in the decade from 1940 to 1950 the population of children under 5 years of age increased by 54 percent. That is the largest increase of any element of our population. In these past years, when we have endured war, anxiety, sudden death, long family separations, this increase in our children has been America's affirmation of life. It is as if America wanted to underscore the belief that she has a future by increasing the number of children by more than 50 percent, taking on the emotional burdens, the financial burdens, the long-term planning, the sacrifices that go with the care of the young.

Merely considering the past 5 years, that is, from 1945 to 1950, a grand total of over 20,000,000 children have been born in the United States. From a statistical standpoint at least one-fourth of these children were unexpected when we consider the birth rate of 10 years ago. Sometimes on some matters we are not entirely certain as to the drift of the sentiment of the people of our country. I think the 5-year birth rate of 20,000,000 is sufficient answer as to whether or not the American people feel that our children are important.

The Children's Bureau, which is the agency of our Federal Government which serves our children, has been given many increased duties and functions in recent years. I referred a few minutes ago to the amendments to the Social Security Act which Congress passed about a year and a half ago. That act imposed new duties, new functions, on the Children's Bureau.

The Senate has already, Mr. President, as we know, made two 5-percent cuts in the appropriations for the personnel of the Children's Bureau. We have already cut off 10 percent, so far as the personnel for the Children's Bureau is concerned. Now the amendment of the Senator from Illinois proposes that we whack off \$3,000,000 from the funds that go as aid to the States for carrying forward these great programs for children.

Where do these cuts lead us? Where do they end? They end with much slower progress in the work for crippled children throughout the country. Today there are some 31,400 crippled children on State waiting lists. They are children who cannot receive any care, children who cannot receive any rehabilitation, children who cannot receive any medical attention. All they can do is to wait, because the funds are not available to provide personnel and equipment to go forward with their care and rehabilitation.

These cuts will mean reductions in the various offices in the States and in State-employed personnel. They will mean a reduction in the ranks of medical directors in small cities, public-health nurses, and social workers. The result will be that the compelling need for the care of our children can no longer be met. Special programs for children with rheumatic heart disease will be impaired. The cerebral palsy program for our children, the program for epileptics, and other such programs will be impaired, slowed down, and cut off in much of their work and benefits. As I have said, these cuts will eliminate specially trained people, pediatrically trained doctors and nurses. Heaven knows, today there is the most acute shortage the country has ever known in this type of personnel. We are getting along with far less today than the compulsion of the need requires.

Mr. President, we hear much about the emergency which confronts us. We all share a deep concern with respect to expenditures and a deep desire to cut down expenditures wherever they can be wisely and properly cut down. But we do not know how long this emergency may last. It may last 5 years, 10 years, or 20 years.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield to my friend.

Mr. KERR. On the basis of the statement just made, which I think is well founded and in accordance with the very distinct probabilities, is it not a fact that, as we look forward to the time 10 or 15 years from now, we look forward to the time when children now in the age brackets which make them eligible for this help will be the ones upon whom the survival of the Nation will depend?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. In fact, the Senator has anticipated me, and has expressed much better, I am sure, than I would have expressed it, the very thought which I had in mind and was about to give expression to.

I intended also to make the point that we can dismantle a factory and put the machinery away, properly grease it and care for it, or we can put the Navy in moth balls; but we cannot put our children in moth balls. We cannot reclaim the golden minutes if we lose them today.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. May I ask the Senator from Alabama if he thinks that it would be easier to obtain an adequate appropriation if we were dealing with a piece of machinery?

Mr. HILL. I think the RECORD will show that the Senator's question answers itself. Very likely, if we were considering a piece of machinery, we would not have the same difficulty we are having in trying to get funds for the care of our children.

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

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. KERR. On the basis of experience, has it not been demonstrated that it is often easier to get an appropriation

to improve the blood stream of a bull than it is to provide adequate funds for the prevention of deterioration and delinquency in youth?

Mr. HILL. The Senator is absolutely correct. A little earlier in the debate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], cited figures to show how much more money is going for bulls, cows, heifers, and other animals, and for plants of all kinds, than we are able to get for our most precious possession, our children, our citizens of tomorrow, as the Senator from Oklahoma has stated.

A child will not remain static. A child continues to grow. Either we give the child the opportunity now for a healthy, strong, normal body, and the opportunity now to develop into a strong and healthy citizen, or the opportunity is lost and gone forever.

Mr. President, I very much hope that the Senate, in emphatic fashion, will vote this amendment down, and that we can send back to our people in the States the message that the Congress keeps faith with the States, keeps faith with our children, and that we are going to continue to provide the funds necessary to carry forward these great programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment on page 32, line 6.

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

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I am happy to align myself with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and other Senators who are opposed to the so-called Douglas amendment to reduce by \$3,000,000 the appropriation for the child welfare services, the maternal and child health services, and the crippled children's services.

The requirements and necessities for this money are on the increase; they are not on the decrease. As the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has just reminded us, for the past few years our Nation has seen the greatest increase in the birth rate it has ever known. In 1947, births in this country exceeded the staggering total of 4,000,000. Even today, the increase in the birth rate is being reflected in the greatly increased requirements of our schools and of every other facility in our Nation having to do with the training and care of youth. My information is that for the last part of 1950 and the first part of 1951 the birth rate has again increased, to the point where it is entirely probable that the all-time record of approximately 4,000,000 in 1947 will be exceeded in 1951.

In the last Congress authorization was given for a little more than \$40,000,000 for these three services. That was a great increase in the amount of Federal funds provided for these services.

The Senator from Illinois has called attention to the fact that some of the States have not used all the funds previously appropriated. The State of Oklahoma is one of the States. My information is that the State of Oklahoma even now has its program in operation to the point where the remaining amount of the appropriation will be available in the succeeding fiscal year and where there will be a deficit even on the basis of a \$33,000,000 appropriation being made.

I think the Senator will find that in a number of States, by reason of the greatly increased appropriation last year, the State programs have not yet quite caught up, either with the tempo of the needs for the program within the States or with the amount made available by the Federal Government. I believe that such a situation is short-lived. I hesitate to think how tragic it would be if, by reason of the Federal Government's failure to provide the funds which it had indicated it would provide by the authorization of the Eighty-first Congress, there should come to our attention, as I believe there surely would, a great increase in the number of children who could not be reached because of limited funds.

Mr. President, this is the greatest nation on the earth. It is the strongest and the richest nation on the earth. It has attained that distinction because of the abundance of its natural resources and the character and quality of its people. We are now in the midst of the graduation season of our colleges and universities. It has been my privilege to attend a few such exercises during the past weeks. It has been a tremendous thrill to me to see the thousands of American youth coming from our colleges and universities through their graduation and moving into the blood stream of the Nation. It is a source of great pride and gratification to learn that between 450,000 and 500,000 young Americans will graduate this year from our colleges and universities. What a transfusion of strength and power it will be as they move into the blood stream of the Nation and make their contributions of physical courage, mental ability, and spiritual character. I do not believe that all the universities and colleges in the world outside of our Nation will graduate so great a number this year. I know of no fact more reassuring, as we contemplated the troubled condition of the world and the crises we face, than to realize the tremendous increase in spiritual and mental power provided by the ever greater numbers of American youth.

Mr. President, on the basis of the birth rate in this country for the past 6 years and on the basis of the increased opportunities and necessities for education, I believe it is entirely possible that within a decade we shall see American colleges and universities graduating a million youth every year. However, there will be hundreds of thousands of them who will not be graduated if the Nation fails to meet its responsibilities to them in the form of a greater educational program and in the form of such programs with reference to which the appropriation is

being made available. The future strength and power of the Nation will be as great as the mental and moral and spiritual forces of our people make it.

We have surpassed the world in scientific development and industrial progress. We have surpassed the world in the matter of the utilization of resources for constructive and beneficial purposes. But the future of the Nation and the future of the world depend upon the generation of American youth of this day.

The appropriation in the amount of \$33,000,000 is inadequate. It is not excessive. It is tragic to contemplate a drastic arbitrary reduction on the basis of a hypothesis which does not exist, and in spite of the definite realities of the situation as the situation does exist. I believe it is tragic that the appropriation is not in the amount of \$40,000,000 or \$41,000,000, as authorized by the Eighty-first Congress. It was not an ill-conceived act by the committees of the two Houses of Congress. It was action which was taken after the fullest consideration had been given to the subject and after the fullest presentation had been made of the pertinent facts. The action of the committee in recommending an appropriation of \$33,000,000 was not one which was hastily taken or taken in the absence of knowledge. It was taken by the committee after it had given consideration to the facts as they had been presented to it.

Mr. President, America would be doing herself an injustice, and she would be doing her future an injustice, if the reduction were made. Over and beyond that, Mr. President, she would, in the midst of her greatest prosperity and strength and in the midst of her greatest need for the fullest development of her youth, be taking an action which would be penny-wise and pound-foolish and detrimental in the extreme to her youth. To the extent that she damaged them she would certainly damage herself. A continuation and an expansion of the policy in the name of economy could bring about a weakening of the fiber of America to her very destruction.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, as the temporary acting leader of the minority which is the Republican Party I desire to associate myself fully and entirely and completely with each and every one of the words spoken by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I think it is one of the finest speeches I have ever heard made on the floor of the Senate insofar as it pertains to the youth of this country. It was a clear, succinct, patriotic, and statesman-like summing up of all that is involved in the pending amendment.

A few years ago in the State of North Dakota, during the years of the depression, the Bank of North Dakota made a fund of \$150,000 available to graduates of our high schools who because of their financial status were unable to go to college. We made the money available in loans of \$300 a year at 1 percent interest, payable some years after they graduated and were able to repay the money. I may say that today the record shows that 96 percent of that money has been returned to the Bank of North

Dakota by these young men and women, who became school teachers, doctors, lawyers, and leaders in agriculture.

I find that in my State we have had a remarkably fine record insofar as the administration of child welfare services and crippled children's services and maternal and child-care services are concerned. And the people of North

Dakota are justly proud of those who have often sacrificed money, time, and opportunity to get better positions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, two tables giving the apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1951 for grants to States

for maternal and child health, crippled children's, and child-welfare services. I call particular attention to North Dakota's position on the schedule and the fact that the State matched the Federal funds.

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

Apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's and child-welfare services

	Total	Maternal and child health services	Crippled children's services	Child welfare services
Balances from prior years.....	\$3,078,724	\$870,518	\$294,286	\$1,913,920
Appropriation prior to enactment H. R. 6000.....	22,000,000	11,000,000	7,500,000	3,500,000
Supplemental appropriation requested under H. R. 6000.....	11,250,000	3,000,000	3,375,000	4,875,000
Total.....	36,328,724	14,870,518	11,169,286	10,288,920

State	Total available to States, 1951	Maternal and child health services			Crippled children's services			Child welfare services, total available to States, 1951
		Total available to States, 1951	Total available to States, 1951, fund A	Total available to States, 1951, fund B	Total available to States, 1951	Total available to States, 1951, fund A	Total available to States, 1951, fund B	
Alabama.....	\$1,128,237	\$504,323	\$151,079	\$353,244	\$338,546	\$116,475	\$222,071	\$285,368
Alaska.....	298,144	117,260	57,260	60,000	123,947	53,947	70,000	56,937
Arizona.....	360,215	173,118	98,118	75,000	107,320	87,320	20,000	79,777
Arkansas.....	814,904	399,316	119,153	190,163	254,319	93,599	160,720	251,260
California.....	1,015,055	456,313	328,166	128,147	295,127	211,309	83,818	263,615
Colorado.....	440,555	218,383	91,383	127,000	93,925	73,925	20,000	128,247
Connecticut.....	460,944	126,894	101,894	25,000	194,926	92,666	102,260	139,124
Delaware.....	288,217	112,908	79,908	33,000	120,310	100,310	20,000	64,999
District of Columbia.....	349,284	117,480	77,480	40,000	185,533	65,533	120,000	46,271
Florida.....	569,957	253,198	121,698	131,500	145,029	95,198	49,831	171,730
Georgia.....	1,120,413	488,304	159,427	328,877	285,411	119,571	165,840	346,698
Hawaii.....	363,669	130,239	70,239	60,000	163,938	63,938	100,000	69,492
Idaho.....	322,347	97,141	72,141	25,000	83,088	63,088	20,000	142,118
Illinois.....	973,082	297,770	264,515	33,255	280,345	189,284	91,061	394,967
Indiana.....	825,553	315,331	188,940	126,391	193,770	119,919	73,851	316,452
Iowa.....	701,049	321,395	232,678	88,717	195,702	97,839	97,863	183,952
Kansas.....	428,880	147,765	102,447	45,318	118,557	85,499	33,058	162,558
Kentucky.....	994,419	414,383	141,736	272,647	296,864	111,130	185,734	283,172
Louisiana.....	843,778	381,362	137,330	244,032	243,495	105,935	137,560	218,921
Maine.....	348,440	146,708	100,021	46,687	111,929	68,929	43,000	89,803
Maryland.....	841,153	418,847	114,656	304,191	298,204	90,204	208,000	124,102
Massachusetts.....	768,977	316,752	164,780	151,972	232,381	126,261	106,120	109,844
Michigan.....	1,022,773	446,579	250,060	196,519	298,728	162,768	135,960	277,466
Minnesota.....	656,127	239,491	139,302	100,189	217,896	104,039	113,857	198,740
Mississippi.....	924,800	357,431	128,200	229,231	295,735	100,242	196,493	270,634
Missouri.....	768,958	309,160	190,124	119,036	239,685	118,522	121,163	220,113
Montana.....	324,635	139,843	114,843	25,000	107,177	62,177	45,000	77,615
Nebraska.....	471,357	161,371	111,219	50,152	124,972	74,972	50,000	185,014
Nevada.....	343,426	160,153	135,153	25,000	137,590	117,590	20,000	45,633
New Hampshire.....	270,928	93,136	68,136	25,000	118,296	98,296	20,000	59,496
New Jersey.....	616,118	231,935	206,935	25,000	224,214	124,214	100,000	159,969
New Mexico.....	399,518	132,146	77,146	55,000	85,940	65,940	20,000	91,432
New York.....	1,292,994	468,025	398,025	70,000	420,921	288,341	152,580	404,048
North Carolina.....	1,393,790	594,061	178,507	385,554	396,481	133,703	262,778	433,248
North Dakota.....	312,502	97,835	72,835	25,000	85,887	63,887	20,000	130,780
Ohio.....	1,156,712	442,498	271,580	170,618	282,753	182,501	100,252	431,461
Oklahoma.....	754,115	257,086	163,297	93,789	261,831	98,094	163,737	235,198
Oregon.....	351,026	125,471	93,887	31,384	98,269	78,269	20,000	127,286
Pennsylvania.....	1,461,371	573,897	316,101	257,796	412,800	230,536	182,354	474,334
Puerto Rico.....	965,307	427,676	153,858	274,118	284,861	110,129	174,732	263,470
Rhode Island.....	322,670	115,960	90,960	25,000	159,804	89,804	70,000	47,906
South Carolina.....	805,240	287,309	119,599	167,800	273,720	98,994	174,726	244,121
South Dakota.....	404,929	187,531	162,531	25,000	92,137	64,137	28,000	125,291
Tennessee.....	1,073,429	484,965	147,380	337,585	287,352	117,372	169,980	301,112
Texas.....	1,549,674	638,119	300,716	337,403	483,641	194,428	289,213	427,914
Utah.....	338,050	148,619	98,619	50,000	116,633	66,633	50,000	72,798
Vermont.....	264,025	90,378	65,378	25,000	105,111	85,111	20,000	63,536
Virgin Islands.....	201,933	80,923	55,923	25,000	74,790	54,790	20,000	46,220
Virginia.....	977,190	367,842	169,662	198,280	290,880	115,185	175,695	318,468
Washington.....	484,488	206,486	117,403	89,083	167,281	92,652	74,629	110,721
West Virginia.....	674,456	272,636	121,146	151,390	176,880	93,012	83,968	225,040
Wisconsin.....	791,145	334,225	231,143	103,082	242,085	110,429	131,656	214,835
Wyoming.....	404,376	170,901	145,901	25,000	143,140	123,140	20,000	90,335
Unapportioned reserve fund B.....	491,300	391,350	-----	391,350	100,040	-----	100,040	-----
Total.....	36,328,724	14,870,518	7,870,518	7,000,000	11,169,286	6,731,786	5,437,500	10,288,920

Apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's and child-welfare services

	Maternal and child health services	Crippled children's services	Child welfare services
Balances from prior years.....	\$870,518	\$294,286	\$1,913,920
Appropriation prior to enactment H. R. 6000.....	11,000,000	7,500,000	3,500,000
Supplemental appropriation requested under H. R. 6000.....	3,000,000	3,375,000	4,875,000
Total.....	14,870,518	11,169,286	10,288,920

Apportionment of total funds estimated to be appropriated for fiscal year 1951 for grants to States for maternal and child health, crippled children's and child-welfare services—Continued

State	Maternal and child health services				Crippled children's services				Child welfare services		
	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment 1951 exclusive of reserve fund B	Apportionment 1951 reserve fund B ¹	Prior years' balances available in 1951	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment 1951 exclusive of reserve fund B	Apportionment 1951 reserve fund B ²	Prior years' balances available in 1951	Total available to States, 1951	Apportionment, 1951	Prior years' balances available in 1951
Alabama	\$504,323	\$404,323	\$100,000	-----	\$338,546	\$288,196	\$50,000	\$350	\$285,368	\$285,321	\$47
Alaska	117,260	82,260	35,000	-----	123,947	73,947	50,000	-----	56,937	45,848	11,089
Arizona	173,118	100,633	50,000	\$22,485	107,320	86,484	-----	20,836	79,777	77,643	2,341
Arkansas	309,316	240,177	52,500	10,639	254,319	204,319	50,000	-----	251,269	218,443	32,826
California	456,313	421,313	35,000	-----	295,127	269,627	25,500	-----	263,615	212,945	50,670
Colorado	218,383	116,383	102,000	-----	93,925	93,925	-----	2	128,247	95,520	31,727
Connecticut	126,894	126,894	-----	-----	194,926	104,063	82,260	8,603	139,124	83,810	55,314
Delaware	112,908	87,020	8,000	17,888	120,310	77,545	-----	42,765	54,999	51,265	3,734
District of Columbia	117,480	102,480	15,000	-----	185,533	85,533	100,000	-----	46,271	40,000	6,271
Florida	253,198	203,198	50,000	-----	145,029	145,029	-----	-----	171,730	130,228	41,502
Georgia	488,304	413,304	75,000	-----	285,411	285,411	-----	-----	346,698	284,345	62,353
Hawaii	130,239	95,239	35,000	-----	163,938	83,938	80,000	-----	69,492	61,398	8,094
Idaho	97,141	97,141	-----	-----	83,088	83,088	-----	-----	142,118	77,342	64,776
Illinois	297,770	207,770	-----	-----	280,345	212,499	67,200	646	394,967	228,976	165,991
Indiana	315,331	273,630	12,000	29,701	193,770	193,770	-----	-----	316,452	184,522	131,930
Iowa	321,395	211,526	-----	109,869	195,702	153,657	42,000	45	183,952	177,760	6,192
Kansas	147,765	147,765	-----	-----	118,557	118,557	-----	88	162,558	137,609	24,949
Kentucky	414,383	374,383	40,000	-----	296,864	266,864	30,000	-----	283,172	276,570	6,602
Louisiana	381,362	306,362	75,000	-----	243,495	220,755	22,740	-----	218,921	205,639	13,282
Maine	146,708	105,599	20,000	21,109	111,929	88,929	23,000	-----	89,803	89,671	132
Maryland	418,847	155,669	263,178	-----	298,204	110,204	188,000	-----	124,102	111,614	12,488
Massachusetts	316,752	189,780	126,972	-----	232,381	146,261	86,120	-----	109,844	77,730	32,114
Michigan	446,579	376,671	50,000	19,908	298,728	248,728	50,000	-----	277,466	218,974	58,492
Minnesota	239,491	236,913	-----	2,578	217,896	167,896	50,000	-----	198,740	180,068	18,672
Mississippi	357,431	357,431	-----	-----	296,735	246,735	50,000	-----	270,634	253,339	17,295
Missouri	309,160	269,186	800	39,174	239,685	209,685	30,000	-----	220,113	218,449	1,664
Montana	139,843	95,891	-----	43,952	107,177	81,939	25,000	238	77,615	74,171	3,444
Nebraska	161,371	119,445	20,000	21,926	124,972	94,972	30,000	-----	185,014	118,119	66,895
Nevada	160,153	82,961	-----	77,192	137,590	75,046	-----	62,544	45,683	45,655	28
New Hampshire	93,136	92,913	-----	223	118,296	81,540	-----	36,756	59,496	57,846	1,650
New Jersey	231,935	189,997	-----	41,938	224,214	144,214	80,000	-----	159,969	102,319	57,650
New Mexico	132,146	102,143	30,000	3	85,940	85,783	-----	157	91,432	85,649	5,783
New York	468,025	423,010	45,000	15	420,921	288,341	132,580	-----	404,048	233,473	170,575
North Carolina	564,061	554,061	30,000	-----	396,481	361,481	35,000	-----	453,248	362,170	71,078
North Dakota	97,835	97,657	-----	178	83,887	83,887	-----	-----	130,780	95,788	34,992
Ohio	442,498	423,822	13,300	5,376	282,753	282,568	-----	155	431,461	257,981	173,480
Oklahoma	257,086	204,982	-----	52,104	261,831	191,271	70,560	-----	235,198	207,772	27,426
Oregon	125,471	125,471	-----	-----	98,269	98,269	-----	-----	127,286	89,727	37,559
Pennsylvania	573,897	570,599	-----	3,298	412,890	412,890	-----	-----	474,584	375,768	98,816
Puerto Rico	427,976	427,976	-----	-----	284,861	284,861	-----	-----	253,470	229,871	23,599
Rhode Island	115,960	97,973	-----	17,987	159,804	84,437	50,000	25,367	47,906	45,179	2,727
South Carolina	287,399	287,399	-----	-----	273,720	223,720	50,000	-----	244,121	223,334	20,787
South Dakota	187,631	97,453	-----	90,178	92,137	84,137	8,000	-----	125,261	90,290	34,971
Tennessee	484,965	365,065	\$119,900	-----	287,352	275,352	12,000	-----	301,112	257,887	43,225
Texas	638,119	616,601	-----	21,518	483,641	483,641	-----	-----	427,914	427,848	66
Utah	148,619	102,365	25,000	21,254	116,633	86,633	30,000	-----	72,798	70,877	2,311
Vermont	90,378	89,431	-----	947	105,111	79,291	-----	25,820	68,536	62,818	5,718
Virgin Islands	80,923	79,692	-----	1,231	74,790	73,089	-----	1,701	46,220	40,882	5,338
Virginia	367,842	345,580	-----	22,262	290,880	238,272	50,000	2,608	318,468	238,102	80,366
Washington	206,486	156,486	50,000	-----	167,281	117,281	50,000	-----	110,721	110,721	2
West Virginia	272,536	244,875	20,000	7,661	176,880	176,870	-----	10	225,040	206,064	18,976
Wisconsin	334,225	249,895	-----	84,330	242,085	167,085	75,000	-----	214,835	183,521	31,314
Wyoming	170,901	87,207	-----	83,694	143,140	77,545	-----	65,595	90,335	55,531	34,804
Unapportioned reserve fund B	391,350	-----	391,350	-----	100,040	-----	100,040	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total	14,870,518	12,110,000	1,890,000	870,518	11,169,286	9,000,000	1,875,000	294,286	10,288,920	8,375,000	1,913,920

¹ These allocations are for special projects of Nation-wide significance that will contribute to the development of maternal and child health programs in all States. They represent amounts of less than \$100,000 in all except 5 States. These States are as follows: Alabama, special medical and hospital care project; Colorado, project for care of premature infants; Maryland, projects for premature infants, training of maternal and child health personnel, demonstration of comprehensive county maternal and child health program; Massachusetts, training of maternal and child health personnel and children's dental health; Tennessee, training maternal and child health personnel. (Students from a number of States attend training programs.)

² These allocations are for special projects of Nation-wide significance that will contribute to the development of crippled children's programs in all States. They represent amounts of less than \$100,000 in all except 3 States which are as follows: District of Columbia, rheumatic fever and pediatric care projects; Maryland, projects for cerebral palsy, rheumatic fever, hearing, and training of personnel for crippled children's programs; New York, rheumatic fever and training of personnel for services to crippled children.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, at this time I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] for the fine, enlightened, and courageous fight he has made in behalf of those who, more than anyone else, need help. In the United States there are 10,000,000 families having incomes of less than \$2,000 a year. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico has become their spokesman on this floor. Words on my part would be entirely inadequate to express to the Senator from New Mexico the thanks not only of that bracket, but also of all those in the entire United States and in the Territories. In their behalf I thank the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ferguson	Kerr
Anderson	Flanders	Kilgore
Bennett	Frear	Knowland
Brewster	Fulbright	Langer
Bricker	George	Lehman
Bridges	Gillette	Long
Butler, Md.	Green	Magnuson
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Maybank
Byrd	Hennings	McCarran
Capohart	Hickenlooper	McCarthy
Carlson	Hill	McFarland
Chavez	Hoyer	McKellar
Clements	Holland	McMahon
Connally	Humphrey	Monroney
Cordon	Hunt	Moody
Douglas	Ives	Morse
Duff	Jenner	Mundt
Dworshak	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Eastland	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Ecton	Johnston, S. C.	O'Connor
Ellender	Kefauver	O'Mahoney

Pastore	Smith, N. J.	Underwood
Robertson	Stennis	Welker
Russell	Taft	Wherry
Saltonstall	Thye	Williams
Smith, Maine	Tobey	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "O" of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I shall oppose the Douglas amendment. Only last year the Social Security Act was reconsidered. We increased the amount of the authorization in the item under consideration because we did not think the amount provided was sufficient to carry on the work required in connection with maternal health, crippled children, and child welfare. In my opinion this is not a field in which we should cut the allowances. It is a field in which the Federal Government to a very limited extent helps various pro-

grams primarily for the benefit of children. I am quite willing to have the appropriations in the bill cut, but I do not believe the economy sought in the pending amendment is justified under the circumstances.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The question is on agreeing to the amendment lettered "O" of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. LANGER and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] is unavoidably detained on official business at one of the Government departments.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who is absent on official business, is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 61, as follows:

YEAS—17

Bennett	Butler, Nebr.	Douglas
Bricker	Byrd	Ecton
Butler, Md.	Capehart	Ferguson

Hendrickson	Robertson	Wherry
Jenner	Smith, Maine	Williams
O'Connor	Smith, N. J.	

NAYS—61

Alken	Hill	McKellar
Anderson	Hoey	McMahon
Brewster	Holland	Monrone
Bridges	Humphrey	Moody
Carlson	Hunt	Morse
Chavez	Ives	Mundt
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Neely
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Nixon
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Duff	Kefauver	Pastore
Dworshak	Kerr	Russell
Eastland	Kilgore	Saltanstill
Ellender	Knowland	Stennis
Flanders	Langer	Taft
Frear	Lehman	Thye
Fulbright	Long	Tobey
George	Magnuson	Underwood
Gillette	Maybank	Welker
Green	McCarran	Young
Hennings	McCarthy	
Hickenlooper	McFarland	

NOT VOTING—18

Benton	Lodge	Schoeppel
Cain	Malone	Smathers
Case	Martin	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	McClellan	Sparkman
Hayden	Millikin	Watkins
Kem	Murray	Wiley

So the amendment of Mr. DOUGLAS was rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I had purposed to offer an amendment, which I understand from the Parliamentarian is not in order at this time because of the adoption of the Ferguson amendment. My amendment had reference to the operation of the wage-and-hour law. In my State there are wholesale petroleum marketers who operate in each county. They sell gasoline and oil to farmers and retail service stations, and they are purely local, independent businessmen. However, the wage-and-hour-law examiners who go snooping about, approach one of these local agents, for instance, and say, "You come under interstate commerce." The agent says, "How do I come under interstate commerce? My operations are purely local, among my own customers." The examiner says, "You sell to farmers, and what the farmer produces may go into interstate commerce. Therefore you are in interstate commerce, and, therefore you must abide by the wage-and-hour law."

THREATENED WITH PROSECUTION

These marketers are threatened with prosecution, and some of their employees are likewise threatened with prosecution. They are told they will be fined heavily if they do not comply with the wage-and-hour law. In many instances the salaries paid the employees amount to more than is required by the wage-and-hour law.

Wholesale petroleum marketers are local businessmen, small fellows, who are carrying on their operations. I do not believe, Mr. President, that the act was ever intended to apply to them. They are independent businessmen, who make 95 percent of their sales directly to retail service stations and to farmers. The rest of their sales, amounting to only 5 percent of the total, are made to customers such as road contractors, oil drilling rigs, and small industrial plants. Yet the wage-and-hour snoopers under-

take to bring them all within the jurisdiction of the wage-and-hour law.

SALES LIMITED TO ONE COUNTY

In almost every case, the business of these marketers is limited to a radius of 30 miles and to one county. Only by the wildest stretch of the imagination can they be considered to be in interstate commerce. If they are engaged in interstate commerce, then every person in the United States is engaged in interstate commerce. I do not think the Senate is ready to accept such a concept.

Investigators of the Wage and Hour Division have recently begun a campaign of harassment against wholesale petroleum marketers. These marketers are reasonable men and therefore assumed that a one-county operation was not interstate commerce and that they were not covered by the law. Unfortunately, they reckoned without the legal—or rather, illegal—imagination of the Wage and Hour Division. They now find themselves threatened with suits for back pay over the past two years amounting in some cases to as much as \$9,000.

EMPLOYEES THREATENED

It is significant that these suits do not come from the employees to whom the back pay is allegedly due. They come, instead, from the wage-hour investigators. The employees themselves do not want to sue. In many instances, they are getting a monthly salary in excess of the requirements of the act. The wage-hour investigators insist, however, that, in the absence of any written agreement between employer and employee, the monthly salary applies only to the basic workweek of 40 hours and does not include any payment for overtime beyond 40 hours. In at least one case, an investigator warned employees that if they attempted to waive their allegedly due back pay, they themselves would be subject to fine.

Mr. President, the investigators carry on a process of coercion and intimidation to bring about a supposed compliance with the wages-and-hours law.

The Wage and Hour Division alleges that these marketers are in interstate commerce, because:

(a) They sell petroleum to farmers, and the products which the farmers produce may go out of the State.

In other words, cotton may eventually go to Europe. If a man is a cotton producer, they allege he is in interstate commerce, and therefore the man who sells him his gasoline comes under the wages-and-hours law. That is a ridiculous proposition, Mr. President.

(b) They sell to concerns other than retail outlets, and the products of these concerns may go out of the State. But this amounts to only 5 percent of the marketers' total business.

This legal reasoning is so ridiculous that it would be curious if it were not a life-and-death matter to the businessmen involved. They operate on thin profit margins and cannot afford to pay thousands of dollars in back wages which they do not owe.

LAW SHOULD BE FAIRLY ENFORCED

I have no desire to interfere with the enforcement of the wage-hour law. It ought to be enforced vigorously—but only against those persons to whom it applies. If the Wage and Hour Division has nothing better to do with its investigators than to harass businessmen and their employees who are not covered by the law, then I think it has too many investigators.

Mr. President, farmers are specifically exempted from the wages-and-hours law, but these investigators on the pretext that the farmers may be doing an interstate business by sending some of their products out of the State, want to bring into the system the very people who furnish the farmers with the supplies for operations.

In his testimony before the Appropriations Committees, the Wage and Hour Administrator made much of the fact that 57 percent of all business establishments investigated were found to be in violation of the law. If this figure of 57 percent includes alleged violations by persons who are not covered by the law at all, it is obviously too high. If the Administrator did not investigate anybody except exempt businesses, he might be able to produce a figure of 97 percent violations—or even 100 percent.

BACKLOG OF COMPLAINTS

The Wage and Hour Division has a heavy backlog of complaints of violations of the law. On January 1 of this year, that backlog amounted to 3,773 cases—more than three times its size of a year earlier. The Division ought to devote itself to getting rid of this backlog instead of snooping around people who are not covered by the law and who are not complaining. But it is allotting only 25 percent of its investigative program to complaints.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a memorandum dealing with the subject I have been discussing.

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

THE WHOLESALE MARKETER

(a) There are approximately 50,000 men in this business throughout the Nation, operating in every State. There are roughly 3,000 men in the business in Texas.

(b) The marketer represents the wholesale distribution link between any producer of petroleum on the one hand, and the consumer (viz., service stations, farms, etc.) on the other. Generally there is one marketer for each producer (Texas Co., Gulf, Phillips, Magnolia, etc.) in each county.

(c) The marketer is an independent businessman, this being established by definition in H. R. 6000 (extension of Social Security) last year. His arrangement with a producer ranges from that of consignee, who owns part of the equipment he uses (trucks, tanks, etc.) and operates on a flat commission on all oil and grease sold, to that of jobber on the other hand, who operates completely independently, buying the product at the most favorable price and selling it the same way, and who owns all equipment and stock in his business.

(d) Dollar volume: The average wholesale marketer averages 60,000 gallons of petroleum

per month in sales. (He may range from 20,000 to over 300,000 gallons.) His margin averages between 1 and 2 cents per gallon. He employs 1.3 men only (thus hardly constituting a field of employment, within the intent of this law, but more nearly being a one-man operation). He owns two trucks.

(e) Geographical aspects: He is, by necessity of distribution requirements, located in almost every county. His radius of operation rarely exceeds 30 miles and almost always is limited to his own immediate county.

(f) His customers: Examination of the dollar volume of his business divides his customers as follows:

	Percent
(a) Retail (service stations)-----	65
(b) Farms-----	30
(c) Others (road contractors, oil drilling rigs, small industrial plants)-----	5

EFFECTS OF THE PRESENT LAW

The attached exhibit, a copy of a letter, tells the story of the effects of the interpretation of this law on one individual marketer. In the last 3 weeks in central Texas alone, three additional cases have arisen and the pattern is usually the same.

1. The marketer at present is totally unaware that he is allegedly operating in interstate commerce.

2. An investigator from the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor visits his office, inspects his books, states that he is in interstate commerce for one or more of the following reasons: (No cases have yet been reported where the inspector "found" otherwise.)

(a) He does business with farms and their products may go out of State. (Manifest unfairness of this reasoning lies in the fact that the farmers themselves are specifically exempt from the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.)

(b) He does business with concerns other than retail outlets (regardless of the fact that it is only a fractional amount) and their products may go out of State.

(c) He is therefore subject to the provisions of wages and hours, must put his employees on a 40-hour week at 75 cents per hour minimum, pay time and a half overtime.

(d) He must pay his employees allegedly due back overtime pay for a period of 2 years or face suit for double the amount involved (one-half being a fine). This amount in Texas has ranged from \$1,800 to approximately \$9,000.

(e) Employees are encouraged to press such suits. In at least one case, the investigator warned the employees that if they attempted to waive their allegedly due back pay, they themselves would be subject to fine.

(f) The small operator, faced with this amount in nearly every case is faced with the prospect of going out of business. This in turn would destroy the very jobs the law was designed to aid.

(g) In many instances, the employer is paying a monthly salary equivalent to more than the 75-cent minimum. However, investigators insist, in the absence of any written agreement between employer and employee, that the base figure involves only the base 40 hours and thus "overtime pay at a much higher hourly rate is still due."

SHOULD BE EXEMPT FROM LAW

1. Wholesale marketers do not, as a group, constitute a real employment field, as Congress intended the law to affect. They are largely one-man operations, average 1.3 employees per employer.

2. They are allegedly subject to the provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act because they do business (about 30 percent) with farmers. Yet the farmers themselves

are exempt as a class from the provisions of this same law.

3. They are also allegedly subject to the provisions of the law because they sell oil and grease to small industrial firms whose products may go out of the State. This percentage is so fractional, however, average of 5 percent, as to be manifestly unfair. Their entire purpose is to serve service stations (exempt) and farms (exempt).

4. They cannot (in rural areas particularly) stay in business under these arbitrary rulings. Their margin of profit is too thin, other costs too high, volume too small to face sudden claims for alleged back wages. This will result in their going out of business and the loss of employment to their employees.

5. If this group can be considered, by arbitrary interpretation, to be in interstate commerce, then every single businessman can, by the same token, be so considered. This implies Federal control over all business, occupations, professions. That was not the intent of Congress.

A TYPICAL CASE OF BROWBEATING

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of a letter which sets forth one typical case of browbeating and intimidation on the claim that the persons involved come within the law.

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

MAY 7, 1951.

DEAR ———: With reference to our telephone conversation this afternoon concerning the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor, with ——— of ———, Texas, I will give you the following history:

Mr. ——— is a small gasoline wholesale agent selling ——— oil products at an average of about 1½ cents per gallon, commission. He bought this agency here in 1945, after he was discharged from the armed service of World War II.

He has employed, three truck drivers and one bookkeeper.

About 3 weeks ago, Mr. ——— came to his office in ——— and informed him he was with the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the United States Department of Labor and thought that possibly he came under the Fair Labor Standards Act. At Mr. ———'s suggestion, Mr. ——— let him examine his books and records. He then took out a pamphlet and stated that according to the law, ——— would come under the act, because he sold grease and oil to oil producers and that the oil they produced might eventually go out of the State.

He then informed Mr. ——— that he would have to put all of his men on a 40-hour-week basis and pay time and a half for overtime. He also told Mr. ——— that he would have to pay all of his men the back overtime for a period of 2 years prior to that time. He then checked over ———'s books again and said that the back wages which he would have to pay the employees amounted to about \$4,000.

——— is a small operator, and, of course, this \$4,000 would put him out of business.

——— then talked with his four employees about the matter and told them the situation. They told him that they did not want to sue him for any back wages, that they were satisfied with what he had been paying them, and that they wanted to continue working for him. ——— immediately put all of his employees on the 40-hour-week basis, time and a half for overtime, and is paying them according to such orders. The

employees told Mr. ——— that they would sign any paper or release that was necessary, except that Mr. ——— told them that they would be subject to a \$250 fine if they signed any release or compromise of their claim for back wages. However, they assured Mr. ——— that they did not want any back wages, and they are still on the job and everybody is satisfied except the ——— office of this Bureau.

On May 4, 1951, the ——— office wrote Mr. ———, and I am enclosing herewith the original of their letter.

I have heard of lots of Government interference in private business, and we are all sick of it, but I don't believe that I ever heard of the Government trying to dictate to the employees that they cannot settle their claim for back wages with an employer, even though the employees and the employer are agreed upon it. Possibly individuals, under such a set-up have no right to contract between themselves, without the permission of some bureaucrat.

Mr. ——— does not know what to do with reference to the circumstance in the letter of May 4 that the Bureau at ——— will hold the file open until May 18, 1951, before taking any action against Mr. ———.

I would appreciate your taking some immediate steps in connection with this matter, as I do not believe Congress or anyone else approves of such tactics.

Yours very truly,

GROWING BUREAUCRACY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the regional office of the Wage and Hour Division in Dallas, which covers Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas, is the second largest in the country, exceeded in size only by that in New York, which covers only New York and New Jersey.

There are 180 employees in the Dallas office, of whom 107 are investigators and 11 are investigation supervisors.

Mr. President, this is growing to be a bureaucracy of the worst character. I am glad the Ferguson amendment reducing appropriations for personnel has been agreed to.

OPS AND BEEF—LETTER FROM GRANT E. ANDERSON TO SENATOR THYE

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield to me? Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to read a letter I received from a partner in a business establishment. Two young men established the business after they were discharged from the military forces following the end of the war in 1945. What is set forth in the letter is rather typical of conditions with which some businessmen are now faced, and more especially the young man who is operating on limited capital. The letter comes from the A. & P. Chip Steak Co., North Mankato, Minn. It is dated June 4, 1951, and is as follows:

DEAR ED: Ten years ago when we were driving along some of these long Minnesota roads I never dreamed that I would be writing you as one of your constituents. But with the present beef situation under OPS I thought I would let you know what it is doing to us.

If you remember my partner and myself were down to your farm and talked to you about going into slaughtering our own cat-

tle fearing price control and the result of Government control.

To give you an idea what is happening to us and I imagine other small businesses I will quote figures off invoices from Armour & Co.

The week of January 22, 1951, we purchased from Armour & Co. 52 beef rounds (3,723 pounds) at a price of 44 cents per pound.

The week of May 28, 1951, we were able to purchase from Armour only one (77 pounds) round at a price of 50.55 per pound.

In addition to this we were able to purchase from Swift & Co. two high-priced cuts of beef, one of 25 pounds at 75.60 per pound and 102½ pounds at 70 cents per pound.

We have three other packers calling on us and we were not able to get any beef at all from them.

I could cite you many, many more inequities such as—the ceiling of hamburger patties imposed on us is 60.40 per pound which is the same ceiling as the major packers have as their price.

From the above it seems to me clear that either OPS goes or else we will go.

Ed, I know how busy you are but I wanted to get my two bits worth into Washington where I thought it would do the most good. I would appreciate any information that you could give us on the situation.

Sincerely,

GRANT E. ANDERSON.

This is a veteran who served for many years throughout World War II. He is one of the young men who went into business.

He adds this postscript:

P. S.—Other troubles: My partner, Gibb, is being called back into the Army July 6. We were flooded out for 2 weeks during the flood in North Mankato.

That was the terrific flood of last spring.

How about a job after OPS gets through with us?

This is a letter from Grant E. Anderson, a young man whom I have known for many years. This letter deals with OPS regulations. I stated last spring that we were off to a bad start. I think we are in a bad situation at the present time.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 12, after the word "approval," it is proposed to insert a colon and the following proviso: "Provided, That no State which has, by legislative enactment, provided the conditions under which public access may be had to the records of the disbursements of grants in aid funds shall be denied its allocation of Federal funds

under titles I, IV, X, and XIV if such State has otherwise complied with the governing statutory provisions."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, the chairman of the subcommittee will accept the amendment and take it to conference. I believe that it is necessary.

Mr. JENNER. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-8-51-B."

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

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 16, line 9, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "\$40,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$31,000,000."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this is an amendment to decrease the appropriation suggested by the Senate committee for the maintenance and operation of local schools in federally affected areas.

I was very glad to work and vote for the original bill providing for school construction in federally affected areas, and for the maintenance and operation of such schools. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] performed a very valuable service in getting this legislation to the floor and through the Congress, and I am very much in favor of it. I do think, however, that there are certain facts which we should bear in mind as we vote on the appropriation.

The Office of Education informs us that a total of \$41,500,000 would pay for all the added Federal costs in every district in the country. In other words with this amount we could provide 100 percent of the requested Federal support for the maintenance of local schools to the degree to which those costs had been increased. I think we should remember that, in the first place, there is a tendency to overestimate the added Federal costs. When we are dealing with Uncle Sam it is always easy to be generous by way of padding costs or overestimating costs, particularly when we look forward to the future. So I am personally inclined to sprinkle a little salt on the estimate of \$41,500,000.

There is another offsetting factor which should be borne in mind. It is true that Federal installations bring large numbers of children from outside the school district into the district, thus creating an added strain upon the school resources. But it is also true that in the wake of those children and in the wake of those families will come added stores, and in some cases added housing. Therefore the taxable capacity of the locality is increased along with the burden. The taxable capacity is not increased in the same ratio as the added burden, but it is increased to some extent.

The House of Representatives made an appropriation of only \$28,000,000 for this purpose, which would provide for 68 percent of the estimated total cost, which, as I have said, I think is a padded figure.

The Senate committee raised this amount to \$40,000,000 at the request of the Bureau of the Budget. The appropriation suggested by the committee would meet over 97 percent of all the estimated cost, virtually the entire estimated cost. In view of the fact that I think these budget estimates are excessive, in view of the fact that there is added taxable capacity, and in view of the principle that the localities should assume some share of the burden, I believe it is safe to cut this figure to \$31,000,000. That is \$3,000,000 more than the House figure, and it would provide 75 percent even of the high total cost figures given out by the Office of Education.

I am in favor of the proposal which the eminent Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] advanced, that the Federal Government should meet at least a portion of these costs which are federally created. I am in favor of welfare programs and social reform during periods of prosperity, within the limits of a balanced budget. But I do not believe that in periods of prosperity we should spend grossly excessive amounts above the amounts which we collect in taxes. If we do that, we are allowing our hearts to run away with our heads. We are creating a deficit which can be met only by borrowing; and in periods of prosperity, when workers are employed, such borrowing is generally in the form of bank credit, resulting in bidding up prices, and in inflation. So we do more damage through the indirect effects of the governmental deficit than we realize in benefits from the direct effects of the appropriation.

I wish to make my position very clear. I am for appropriations for welfare; but in a period of full employment I want to have the Government balance its budget, because if the budget is not balanced, inflation is bound to ensue. I submit that this is a sane program of social reform within the confines of a balanced budget.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let me say to the good Senator from Illinois that when he refers to this particular item as a matter of social welfare, he is in error. This is not social welfare at all. It is for the payment of costs of operating the school systems throughout the Nation.

Let me explain why the committee made this recommendation, so that the Senate may be informed as to what it is voting upon. I have stated heretofore, and I repeat, that the Senate is supreme in these matters. If the Senate desires to cut the figure, well and good. However I do not believe the Senate would be justified in cutting one penny from the committee's recommendations unless it had information upon which to justify such a cut.

For what purpose is the \$40,000,000 to be used? It is to be used for payments to school districts, not for social welfare. The committee recommended \$40,000,000, an increase of \$12,000,000 over the House allowance, for which the Senate

received a supplemental estimate, known as Senate Document No. 40, on May 21, together with a change of language to correct an inaccuracy in the estimate and to permit the use of funds in carrying out the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 874.

We should have in mind that last fall when the estimates were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget they were based on what were supposed to be the requirements at that time. The Bureau of the Budget had approved the \$28,000,000. After the approval by the Bureau of the Budget, the Congress of the United States passed Public Law 874, in which the Government was authorized, wherever the Federal Government, because of its national defense activities, caused an impact upon local school districts, to contribute to the work of the public-school system.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. As I understand, a formula was worked out, and the schools which did not meet the requirements of the formula were not considered.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was last fall.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. During the current year, as I understand from the report, only 68 per cent of the schools which met the formula requirements received payments.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In that connection I should like to point out that two school districts in my State have not paid their teachers this year because of the existence of that very situation.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The same situation exists in every State of the Union. For example, there is tremendous activity in South Carolina, in the area which is being developed by the Atomic Energy Commission. Perhaps 20,000 or 30,000 families with children will be brought into the area. In the first place, the Government has taken the land from the people of South Carolina and has thus taken it from the State's tax rolls. Thousands of children will be brought into the area. Such situations are behind the philosophy of Public Law 874, which Congress passed after the original requirements were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget. Since that time the House allowed \$28,000,000. All the Senate committee has done is to take into consideration Public Law 874. On the basis of such consideration it approved \$12,000,000 more. It is that simple.

Mr. President, we should either appropriate the money, or Public Law 874 should not be on the statute books. The Federal Government should contribute what Congress determines to be its just share by reason of the impact of Federal activities in individual States.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The question

is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Moody
Anderson	Hill	Morse
Bennett	Hoey	Mundt
Bricker	Holland	Neely
Bridges	Humphrey	Nixon
Butler, Md.	Hunt	O'Connor
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Jenner	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Connally	Kefauver	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Douglas	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Knowland	Sparkman
Eastland	Lehman	Stennis
Ecton	Long	Taft
Ellender	Magnuson	Thye
Ferguson	Maybank	Tobey
Frear	McCarran	Underwood
George	McCarthy	Watkins
Gillette	McClellan	Welker
Green	McFarland	Wherry
Hayden	McKellar	Wiley
Hendrickson	McMahon	Williams
Hennings	Monroney	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from New Mexico. As I understand the amendment which we are now considering, it proposes to reduce certain funds intended for educational institutions in congested and critical areas. Is that correct?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say, if the Senator will permit me, that I am as much in favor of economy as is any other Member of the Senate. I worked long and hard on the appropriations in an endeavor to effect economies, but the amendments, including the one which is now before the Senate, which affect schools, will do nothing short of inflicting serious injury upon my own State and upon many other States. We have on the Savannah River an atomic energy plant which is taking 250,000 acres of land which will be removed from the tax rolls of South Carolina. It is expected that 35,000 people will be employed at that plant. My State cannot possibly afford to provide the necessary schools and other facilities which will be needed in connection with that development.

I favor economy, but I want the RECORD to show that the kind of economy proposed in this instance, which affects an area comprising 250,000 acres of land and which also affects the farmers, is not an economy from the viewpoint of the people of my State. No one in the State of South Carolina asked that the atomic energy plant be located on the Savannah River, and most of us were very much shocked when we learned that it was to be located there. It takes

250,000 acres of land, including some of the best land in the State. It is estimated that, for its peak operations, the plant will require an influx of 35,000 people, who will be employed there, and who will bring their families with them.

I should simply like to know what the people of my State would expect me to do other than to support to the end an appropriation of the necessary funds with which to develop the schools and other facilities of that district, even though they feel, as I do, that economy is the first order of business. I certainly do not want inflation, but when it comes to making cuts of this kind in connection with the project in the Savannah River Valley, I oppose it.

The Senators from Georgia know the situation in the area to which I have referred as well as I do. Other Senators know it also. The same thing is going to happen in the home State of our distinguished Vice President, in the Paducah area. Certain increases were made in the bill in order to take care of the atomic energy installations, were there not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wanted the RECORD to show that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, let us make clear the reason for the action of the Committee on Appropriations in recommending an increase of \$12,000,000 in this item. The Bureau of Education, under the law, is required to present evidence before the Budget Bureau. It is generally done in the fall of the year. The Bureau of Education for this purpose requested of the Budget Bureau \$28,000,000, which request was approved by the Bureau. After the request had been made and approved, the Congress of the United States passed Public Law 874 for the purpose of caring for the situation which has been outlined by the Senator from South Carolina and similar situations.

When the House of Representatives acted on the appropriation bill the only information it had, so far as the budget was concerned, was that the sum of \$28,000,000 had been approved last fall. It acted upon that information and under those circumstances, and allowed \$28,000,000.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator in a moment. On the 21st of May the Budget Bureau sent to the Committee on Appropriations a supplemental estimate of \$12,000,000 designed to take care of the additional obligations of the Government under Public Law 874; which was acted upon by the House committee. Therefore, all we are doing now is to approve the budget figures.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not true that the additional money was for the purpose of atomic-energy installations at

Paducah, Ky., on the Savannah River in South Carolina, and at other places?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; and also in connection with an installation in North Carolina. It could be used anywhere in the United States.

Mr. MAYBANK. I understand that; but will the Senator not agree with me that, if we materially reduce this appropriation, restoring it, let us say, to the House figure, then these installations will not be properly cared for? Will the Senator say that I am wrong about that?

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; the Senator from South Carolina is not at all wrong. I stated, in his absence, that I felt sure many thousands of acres of taxable land had been or would be taken.

Mr. MAYBANK. The project contemplates the taking of 250,000 acres of land on the Savannah River in South Carolina.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I really did not know the full extent of the area taken, but I said it amounted to thousands of acres. The philosophy behind the enactment of Public Law 874 was that it would in a way compensate for the loss of revenues with which to carry on governmental functions within the respective States.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question at that point?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. In spite of the fact that we now, in fiscal 1951, have an increased load to carry for these federally affected areas, is it not true that it was found possible to fill but 68 percent of the entitlement under the formula which is the basis of our present operations?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. Is it not also correct that, with this increased load, unless additional money is made available, we shall be unable to fill as much as 50 percent of the entitlement under that formula?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. In addition to the matters which have already been mentioned in the areas affected, is the Senator familiar with Keesler Field, located in the heart of the city of Biloxi, Miss., where more than 40 percent of the municipality is federally owned at this time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am not only familiar with Keesler Field, in the Senator's home State, but I am familiar, in a way, with many fields in the State of the Senator from Oklahoma. In my home State there are two of the largest atomic energy activities in the country. What is proposed is only to carry out the authorization which was provided last fall by congressional action, that where local districts are suffering from the impact of Government activities, the Government should participate in a contribution.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have reference to Public Law 874, based on House bill 7940,

which was approved on September 30, 1950, by which time the request had already been made. That is why on the 21st of May a new estimate was submitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

We are either going to comply with the law or we are not. It is all right to say "cut," but why should the State of Georgia, the State of South Carolina, the State of New Mexico, or any other State in the Union, merely because the Federal Government, of necessity, creates a Federal activity, be burdened with the education of many thousands of children?

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not true that the greater the military activity, the greater the demands on the local communities?

Mr. CHAVEZ. There can be no question about that. In the first place, the Government takes away taxable land. The Government takes over acreage in my State. It has been taken over to the extent of millions of acres. Sixty-three percent of the area of my State now belongs to the Federal Government, and, of course, the State cannot collect taxes on it. In the State of Nevada the condition is even worse than that.

Mr. McCARRAN. In Nevada the Government owns 87 percent.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Thirteen percent of the area of the State of Nevada is carrying the costs of the State government. It was to meet that condition that Public Law 874 was passed. The figure in the bill is not an increase by the Senate committee, but an approval of the budget figure.

Mr. MONRONEY. Is it not a fact that if we do not approve this figure, the school terms will have to be cut?

Mr. CHAVEZ. The average State school district cannot stand it.

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

Mr. CHAVEZ. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not a fact that if the increased amount is not provided, communities which have come into existence since the budget was made up will not be treated as are other places in the United States where installations were made prior to that time?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In other words, this bill equalizes the conditions.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They are equalized by an appropriation based on an authorization by the Congress to carry out the purposes of the law.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with reference to this amendment, last year

there was provided by the Federal Government an appropriation, with transfers, totaling \$28,285,000. That amount provided for 68 percent of the cost for educational purposes accruing because of the expansion of Federal installations. In other words, the Federal Government bore 68 percent of the cost. This year the regular and supplemental estimate for this purpose totaled \$40,000,000. That amount is included in this bill, which means that it is recommended on the basis of the estimates, and it enables the Federal Government to pay 97 percent of the total cost. The amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois calls for an appropriation of \$31,000,000. With such a sum the Federal Government would provide 75 percent of the cost. But, even with the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, the Federal Government would be participating to the extent of 7 percent more than it was last year, and on a higher level than obtained last year.

I realize the problem this construction presents in many parts of the country. Unfortunately, in my own section of New England we have not been favored by the administration placing any great installations there. We would like to have some, but we have been skipped in the distribution. We would welcome such installations in our sections.

I believe, Mr. President, since last year the Federal Government provided a total of \$28,285,000, or 68 percent of the funds, that if we provide \$31,000,000 this year, or 75 percent of the total, and 7 percent more than last year, we are doing the fair thing. Therefore I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois will be agreed to, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay," and the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea."

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay," and the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who is absent on official business is paired with the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate is paired with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arkansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] is necessarily absent, and if present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 53, as follows:

YEAS—25

Aiken	Frear	Saltonstall
Bennett	Gillette	Smith, Maine
Bricker	Hendrickson	Smith, N. J.
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Taft
Butler, Md.	Ives	Welker
Capehart	Jenner	Wherry
Douglas	Mundt	Williams
Dworsnak	Nixon	
Ferguson	O'Connor	

NAYS—53

Anderson	Hunt	Monroney
Butler, Nebr.	Johnson, Colo.	Moody
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Clements	Kefauver	O'Mahoney
Connally	Kerr	Pastore
Cordon	Kilgore	Robertson
Eastland	Knowland	Russell
Ecton	Lehman	Smith, N. C.
Ellender	Long	Sparkman
George	Magnuson	Stennis
Green	Maybank	Thye
Hayden	McCarran	Tobey
Hennings	McCarthy	Underwood
Hill	McClellan	Watkins
Hoey	McFarland	Wiley
Holland	McKellar	Young
Humphrey	McMahon	

NOT VOTING—18

Benton	Duff	Malone
Brewster	Flanders	Martin
Byrd	Fulbright	Millikin
Cain	Kem	Murray
Case	Langer	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Lodge	Smathers

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "6-7-51-U," which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period,

insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used for the payment of remuneration for annual or sick leave of classified or Wage Board employees in excess of 20 days of annual leave per year or 12 days of sick leave per year."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I think the facts of annual and sick leave are getting to be fairly well known. Classified and wage board employees now receive 26 working days of annual leave each year, and 15 days of sick leave each year. This 26 days of annual leave, I emphasize, is not on the basis of calendar days, but on the basis of working days.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I may say to the Senator from Illinois that the chairman of the subcommittee will be glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from New Mexico, but I should like to finish the argument, if I may.

Since the Government is on a 5-day week, this amounts to 5½ weeks of annual leave a year, and the 15 days of sick leave, on the basis of a 5-day week, amount to 3 weeks a year. As a matter of fact, workers in the Foreign Service receive 60 days of annual leave a year, and that applies to home duty as well as to foreign duty.

Mr. President, the number of industrial concerns in the country which make such liberal provision for annual and sick leave as does the Government are very few indeed.

I have before me a study by the National Industrial Conference Board, just issued, on vacation practices. That shows that in all the industries surveyed the maximum vacation leave given to any employee is 2 weeks for 47.8 percent of the employees and 3 weeks for 42.9 percent. So the greatest vacation period any employee can get, with respect to over 90 percent of the employees working in all the industries surveyed, is 3 weeks or less. Only 7 percent can have as much as a maximum of 4 weeks. Only a little over 1 percent can have above 4 weeks. The rest get only 1 week. I wish to emphasize that the figures I am now quoting represent the maximum.

Private plans tend to be graduated. The Federal plan is uniform, for all employees, on the first day of entrance into the system as well as at the conclusion of 40 years of service. So what is now being done is to provide 5½ weeks vacation for every employee in the Government service, irrespective of how long he has been employed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a table showing the results of the survey of the National Industrial Conference Board.

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

Maximum paid vacation allowances in 303 companies—by industry

Industry	Hourly employees (number of companies)						Salaried employees (number of companies)					
	Total	1 week	2 weeks	3 weeks	4 weeks	Over 4 weeks	Total	1 week	2 weeks	3 weeks	4 weeks	Over 4 weeks
Total, manufacturing and nonmanufacturing:												
All industries.....	273	9	128	122	12	2	301	3	144	129	21	4
Percent of total.....	100.0	3.3	46.9	44.7	4.4	0.7	100.0	1.0	47.8	42.9	7.0	1.3
A. Manufacturing:												
Total.....	233	9	120	96	8	0	235	3	134	86	11	1
Percent of total.....	100.0	3.9	51.5	41.2	3.4	0	100.0	1.3	57.0	36.6	4.7	.4
Aircraft.....	3		2	1			3		2			¹ (a)
Automotive and farm equipment.....	12		10	2			12		9	2	1	
Building materials.....	12	1	10	1			11		9	2		
Chemicals.....	11		3	5	3		11		4	4	3	
Electrical equipment.....	19		7	10	2		19		9	8	2	
Foods and beverages.....	19		8	11	2		20		8	11	1	
Glass.....	3		3				3		3			
Leather.....	4	1	2	1			4		3	1		
Machinery (except electrical).....	36	1	20	15			36		23	13		
Metals and metal products.....	37	1	20	15	1		37		22	14	1	
Professional scientific instruments.....	7		3	4			7		2	5		
Paper.....	17		3	14			17		6	11		
Petroleum.....	5		2	1	2		6		3	1	2	
Printing and publishing.....	8		4	4			8		4	3	1	
Rubber.....	6		1	5			6		1	5		
Shipbuilding and railroad equipment.....	3		2	1			3		2	1		
Textiles.....	22	4	14	4			22	2	16	4		
Miscellaneous.....	9	1	6	2			10	1	8	1		
B. Nonmanufacturing:												
Total.....	40	0	8	26	4	2	66	0	10	43	10	3
Percent of total.....	100.0	0	20.0	65.0	10.0	5.0	100.0	0	15.2	65.1	15.2	4.5
Wholesale and retail trade.....	4		1	1	2		6		1	2	3	
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	5		1	2	1	¹	23		1	14	6	²
Transportation.....	10		2	8			11		3	8		
Communication.....	3			2	1		4			3	1	
Public utilities.....	16			13		¹	18		2	15		¹
Services.....	2		2				4		3	1		

¹ 24 days.

² In 1 company 2 weeks' vacation but 3 weeks' pay.

³ 22 days.

⁴ In 1 company, 1 month; in 1 company, 22 days.

⁵ 6 weeks.

Source: National Industrial Conference Board, Paid Vacation Practices (1951) p. 6.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield for a question.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that in practice most Federal employees never do take all their leave; they simply accumulate it, so that if their services are terminated they draw terminal leave pay for as much as 60 days. Formerly they were able to draw terminal leave pay for 90 days. Many of them seem to prefer to accumulate annual leave, so that they can draw additional money if and when their Government employment is terminated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Senator went into this question in some detail.

The present leave or vacation practice has developed by accident. The other day I pointed out that in 1898 Congress enacted a law giving civil employees 30 days annual leave. I think there is no doubt that what Congress intended was to give to civil employees the same amount of leave which men in the military service received. Men in the military service received then, and now receive, 30 calendar days of leave each year. But in the year 1900, in the administration of William McKinley, someone in the executive office interpreted the 1898 law as meaning 30 working days. So under the act of 1898 annual leave

became not a vacation of a month, but a vacation of 5 weeks since the Government was on a 6-day week. Then matters went on until 1933. In the economy bill in the spring of 1933, annual leave was cut back to 15 days, which on the basis of a 6-day week, amounted to 2½ weeks' leave.

In 1936 conditions were a bit better. The anxiety to balance the budget may have been somewhat less. In any event, Congress extended annual leave to 26 days. I think there is no doubt as to what the purpose of Congress was in 1936. The Government was on a 6-day week. The provision of 26 days annual leave a year was an attempt to provide a month's vacation and no more, because on the average there are 26 working days in a month, assuming that the employee works Saturdays. No doubt the purpose was to provide a month's vacation.

However, in 1945, after VJ-day, the Government went on a 5-day week. But the leave provisions were not changed, so the 26 days annual leave became 5½ weeks, and the 15 days sick leave became 3 weeks instead of 2½.

Mr. President, I desire to see justice done to Government employees. I believe that in the lower grades we are doing very well for Government employees, although we are not paying those in the upper grades the full market value. However, we give them security. Let me say that, in view of the recent increase in the cost of living I shall be very glad to support the bill which I understand the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is about to re-

port, providing for a salary increase of about 8 percent to offset the increase in the cost of living. I am perfectly willing to do that, and glad to do it. I think we should do it. But I see no reason to give these extraordinary privileges to Government employees.

While I am speaking on this subject, I should like to point out that the postal workers fare very badly indeed in comparison with other workers. They are given 15 days of annual leave a year, and 10 days sick leave. This means that instead of getting 5½ weeks annual leave, they get 3 weeks. Instead of getting 3 weeks sick leave, they get two weeks.

Some of the postal employees have said that what we should do is to raise the postal leave to 26 days, and sick leave to 15 days. In my judgment, we should come down to some uniform basis which can apply to all classes, and not discriminate against the postal service. If my present amendment is adopted, I promise that when the Post Office appropriation bill comes before the Senate I will offer an amendment to raise the level of annual and sick leave for Post Office employees to 20 and 12 days, respectively, as provided in the pending amendment for other Government employees.

Let us consider how many days during the year Government employees really work. We can approach this question by considering how many days there are in which they do not work. With 52 weeks during the year, which is, I think, a correct assumption, and 6 days a week, there is a maximum of 313 days, with 52 days taken out for Sundays.

But, of course, Saturdays are also holidays. That brings the total down to 261. Then there are 26 leave days plus 15 days' sick leave, or a total of 41 days, plus 8 holidays, making a total of 49. Then when visitors of note come to this country there is a day off for governmental employees, in Washington at least, so that the crowds along Constitution Avenue may be swelled.

When, every 4 years, a President is inaugurated from 1 to 2 days are taken off. When it is excessively hot in the summertime, Government departments are closed. I think it is safe to say that the average Government employee does not work more than from 209 to 212 days.

Even on the basis of an 8-hour day, that comes to a little less than 1,700 hours a year. It seems to me not excessive to ask Government employees to perform somewhere between 1,900 and 2,000 hours of work every year. But all my amendment would require is that they work an extra 48 hours and take 18 hours less sick leave.

I believe that this is a chance really to save money and to put the Government service on a self-respecting basis. I have made some computations as to the savings which would be effected by my amendment.

If it were applied to all branches of the Government, it would save not far from \$250,000,000. In justice we should say that from this should be deducted the increased amounts which would go to postal workers if we were to increase their leave to a level of 20 and 12 days respectively. That would represent an increased cost of about \$50,000,000, which we should offset against the economy of \$250,000,000.

As I see it, no real argument can be made against the amendment except the political power of 2,500,000 Government employees. In November 1949, I first proposed a cut in annual leave in speeches off the floor of the Senate. I first offered such a provision as a rider to a deficiency appropriation bill on the 9th of March 1950. It was rejected by a vote of 57 to 14. In April of 1950 I introduced two bills, one providing for 20 days annual and 12 days sick leave, and the other for leave on a sliding scale, depending upon length of service of 10, 15, or 20 days, respectively.

I tried to modify the general appropriation bill on July 20, 1950 by a similar proposal. My proposal was rejected by a voice vote. The Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service considered my two bills. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who was the chairman of the subcommittee, did an extremely good job.

I wish to call attention to what the Government departments did or did not do in this connection. On the 8th of May 1950 the Civil Service Commission recommended that no change be made until a thorough study could be made. On July 17 the Comptroller General made a similar recommendation. On August 7, 1950, the Bureau of the Budget made a similar recommendation. The Postmaster General never went into the question of a thorough study; he merely

made an adverse report from the very beginning.

Not getting much cooperation from governmental agencies, in September 1950 the staff of the subcommittee began a study, asking for the cooperation of the Civil Service Commission and the Bureau of the Budget. I have seen a copy of the committee's staff report, and I think it is an excellent one. It recommends reductions in annual leave although a sliding scale is proposed. I wish to compliment the staff of the committee and the members of the committee for the excellent study which they have produced. I hope that at some time during the course of the debate it may be made a part of the RECORD.

But the record is clear that the governmental administrative agencies are trying to sabotage any cut in leave. They are refusing to commit themselves. They hope we will wear ourselves out and that the issue will be forgotten. The Bureau of the Budget, which should defend the interests of the taxpayers of the country, by silence tends to line up with its fellow employees in the executive departments.

These are harsh words, but I think they are true words. The point is that every time an attempt is made to curtail the privileges of persons in governmental employ the ranks close around them. Various bureaus rally to their defense. I have no intention of attacking governmental employees. I believe that on the whole they are a fine group. On the whole they are hard working and excellent, law-abiding people. However, through accident they have been allowed to obtain privileges, and being human, they want to hold on to them.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The question is whether or not the amendment, if it is adopted as a part of the pending appropriation bill, will become permanent legislation, or whether it will apply only to the appropriations involved in the pending bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The proposal I am making would apply only to the pending appropriation bill. However, it is my intention to offer similar amendments to every appropriation bill. I am waiting for the time when the State Department appropriation bill comes to the Senate. Members of the Foreign Service on duty in the United States get not 5 weeks but 12 weeks vacation each year.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. When the Senator from Illinois offers a similar amendment to each appropriation bill it will, of course, apply to that bill, and only to that bill. Furthermore, if such amendments are agreed to, the provisions will only apply to the new fiscal year. Such provisions will not be in effect, of course, in succeeding years, unless similar provisions are inserted in each appropriation bill each year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. I have grown tired of waiting for permanent legislation to come from the com-

mittee. I have been waiting for the Government to take a stand on this issue. I would like to begin here and now, and not be paid off with promises upon some conjectural future.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does the Senator realize that in the Independent Offices Appropriation bill there is contained a provision, inserted by the committee, which in effect would compel the Administrator to give every employee an opportunity to take the full 26 days leave? Therefore, in this period of emergency, Congress would in effect compel every employee to take 26 days leave, no matter what the demands might be as a result of the defense effort.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say that it may or may not be a good thing. I am not addressing my amendment to the question of whether a Government employee must take his leave in a given year. I am addressing my amendment to the point that I believe the present total amount of leave is excessive, whether it be taken or stored up for the future, and that we should reduce it.

Mr. FERGUSON. If we permit it to be stored for future use and allow it to be paid off in terminal leave, we will get the same result, will we not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No. I would cut the leave from 26 days to 20 days. It would be a saving of 6 days in annual leave. In certain cases of sick leave it would be 3 days. It would be a total saving of approximately \$250,000,000 on all appropriation bills. On the pending bill it would effect a saving of more than \$5,000,000.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Illinois misunderstood my purpose. My point is that if his amendment were not approved, the employees would be able to build up and carry over what he considers to be excessive leave barring some other limitation on its accumulation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Michigan for turning out to be a friend and supporter instead of a side-swiper.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan has been a supporter of all cuts in appropriations.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MOODY. Is it not correct to say that 26 days of leave, computed on a 5-day week, amounts to more than 5 weeks?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It amounts to 5½ weeks. If I remember correctly my school-day arithmetic, 26 divided by 5 is 5½.

Mr. MOODY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Illinois know of any private industry which grants its employees an annual vacation of 1 month with pay?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I learn from a recent study by the National Industrial Conference Board that in all the industries which they surveyed, only 1½ percent of salaried employees get more than 4 weeks vacation with pay, and those are probably for executives and others with extremely long periods of service.

Mr. MOODY. We are talking about 5 weeks in the pending bill, are we not?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. I believe we have a unique situation. I do not believe any industry in the country is so liberal as is our Government. I admire a liberal government, but this is being excessively liberal.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I wonder whether the Senator knows also that in most agencies 15 days of sick leave can be taken without the necessity of submitting a doctor's certificate, but merely upon the person's word. Therefore, to the 5 weeks of leave the Senator should add 3 weeks of sick leave.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. In justice to Government employees it should however be said that not all the employees take their maximum sick leave. The average is somewhere between 8 and 9 days.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I should like to point out to my distinguished colleague from Illinois and to my other colleagues that we are hearing this afternoon a courageous address. We see the distinguished Senator from Illinois standing up on the floor of the Senate, facing the country as a whole, and speaking courageously on an issue which is bound to be unpopular with a large segment of our people. It is typical of the courageous approach which the Senator from Illinois has made to many national issues, and I commend him for that exercise of courage. However, I should like to point out to him perhaps as an effective way to realize his object. I suggest to him that when the Democratic Party meets in Chicago next year it make his point a plank in its national platform.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank my good friend from New Hampshire for his kind words, which, I assure him, I do not deserve. I believe the Democratic convention will meet after the Republican convention has met. If the Republicans should adopt such a plank, I am certain that the Democratic Party will also adopt a similar one.

Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina addressed the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire only to ask a question. Inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois is trying to save money by his amendment, why could not the Senate practice that kind of economy also, in view of the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has stated he would accept the Senator's amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, there is an old saying, beware of the Greeks bearing gifts.

I have been in this body long enough to beware of the chairman of a committee who says in an enticing tone of voice, "Let me take the amendment to conference," because I think that is frequently the parliamentary equivalent of saying, "Let me take the child into the Tower, and I will strangle him to death."

So, Mr. President, I regret to peer rather searchingly at the eminent gentleman from New Mexico when he comes bearing this gift; but personally I wish to have a yea-and-nay vote taken on the amendment. I think this would help it survive the conference committee if it were to pass.

I now yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course, there are Greeks and Greeks.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say that the Greeks as a nation probably had the greatest ability of all the nations in the world, and I meant no reflection on the Senator from New Mexico by implying that his gifts as a chairman might be those of a Greek. I merely wished to say that I have been taught by sad experience to be careful when a person offers a gift or a chairman takes an amendment "to conference."

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, there are some Greeks for whom I have a great deal of respect. Therefore, I consider the Senator's remark a compliment to me.

However, when the Senator from Illinois said he did not wish to injure the Government employees, I am reminded of a man in my home State who was fishing for trout. He made a number of casts, and finally pulled out a beautiful 12-inch trout. He said, "What a beautiful trout this is. I will not hurt it. It is simply beautiful. I will not harm it at all; all I am going to do is gut it."

It seems to me that the Senator from Illinois takes a somewhat similar stand in regard to the effect of the amendment he has submitted. He tells us that he does not wish to harm the Government employees; he says he loves them and knows they are fine. However, he proposes that the Senate take action in a way which would be most harmful to them.

Mr. President, I have agreed to take the amendment to conference, and I made that statement in all sincerity. When I make such an agreement, I expect to act in accordance with it in exactly the same way the Senator from Illinois would act under similar circumstances. When I am instructed by this body to press for the adoption of an amendment in the committee of conference, I follow out the instructions to the very best of my ability and in all sincerity.

No Senator should think that he is the only honest Member of this body. I have the utmost confidence in the integrity and sincerity of purpose of every Member of the Senate. Regardless of any differences of opinion which we might have as to the desirability of including in the bill any particular amendment, far be it from me ever to suggest that any Senator—on either side of the aisle—is not just as honest as I am. Some Senators may not have the same opinion of the amendment that I do; in fact, I am opposed to the amendment. Nevertheless, I understand what the Senate wishes to have done. Certainly as one member of the committee of conference I will not attempt to thwart the purpose of the Senate.

I take my duty as a Senator very seriously. When I became a Member

of this body, I swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States, and I swore that I took that obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion. I believe in constitutional government and I believe in majority rule. The Congress has passed some laws which I do not believe to be correct and proper ones, but I obey those laws because the Congress has passed them.

I want all other Senators to share my feelings in regard to these matters. If we do not have faith in the integrity of each other—faith in the integrity of all Members of this body—there is no use in our proceeding further. I thank the good Lord that I have faith in my fellow citizens and in my colleagues in this body—even my fellow Republicans.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Hear! Hear!

Mr. CHAVEZ. I think they are just as fine, just as honest, just as sincere, just as patriotic, and just as loyal as any Democrat.

If the Senate passes this appropriation bill this afternoon, whatever the Senate decides in that connection is what I, as one of the conferees, will endeavor to carry out in the conference committee, in conjunction with the conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. President, Senators speak of achieving economy, but I point out that we have already taken 5 days in the consideration of this bill. It costs money for the Senate to be in session. Therefore, why cannot we vote now?

I accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, first I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois whether the amendment will really result in reducing the leave of Government employees to 20 days of annual leave and 12 days of sick leave.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Then I raise a point of order against the amendment. I thought the amendment was only a restriction on the appropriation bill. There is quite a difference between the two. As I read the amendment, it would not change the present leave of Government workers from 26 days to 20 days, but still would allow them to have 26 days of annual leave. If I am mistaken about that, I raise a point of order against the amendment, namely, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill, in that it would change the amount of annual leave of Government employees from 26 days to 20 days.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the amendment provides that no funds shall be paid for annual leave in excess of 20 days. Government workers could take additional annual leave at their own expense, if they wished to do so. The amendment would not prevent them from doing that, but would merely bar the appropriation and expenditure of public funds for annual leave in excess of 20 days. Therefore, I submit that the amendment constitutes a restriction, and not legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Therefore, according to the Senator's statement, the amendment, if adopted, would not reduce the annual leave of Government workers from 26 days to 20

days. I wish the Senate to understand that, in the first place. Even if the amendment is adopted, the annual leave of Government workers will continue to be 26 days; the amendment, if adopted, would not change the amount of their annual leave, but would merely restrict the amount of the appropriation which could be used in paying for the annual leave of Government workers. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We believe that if we restrict the amount of money which the Government can pay for annual leave, by providing that these funds may not be used to pay for more than a maximum of 20 days of annual leave, we shall effect these savings; and we have a shrewd surmise that probably not many Government employees will voluntarily take annual leave in excess of 20 days. However, the latter is strictly conjectural.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, let us consider the amendment a little further. It is easy for a Senator to submit an amendment, and often it is easy to have an amendment adopted by the Senate. I believe in listening to the views of the members of the committee who work faithfully and hard on the bills they report to the Senate. I believe that my colleagues also believe that we should listen carefully to the stated views of the chairman of the subcommittee which held the hearings on this particular bill.

I understand the Senator from Illinois to argue, in favor of adoption of the amendment, that "Often the Government employees get an additional day of leave when a celebrity comes to Washington from another country." However, Mr. President, I point out that not all of the employees of the Federal Government live in Washington. As a matter of fact, only about one-tenth of them live in Washington.

So let us consider the facts in connection with this matter.

Let me also point out that if the amendment were adopted and finally became a part of the bill as enacted, a Federal Government employee who expected to be paid from this appropriation probably would take 20 days of annual leave in the coming year, and would let the other 6 days of his annual leave accumulate and be taken in a subsequent year. In that way he would take only 20 days in the year which would be affected by this appropriation bill.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I am not an attorney, and I do not now profess to be speaking in legal terms, but it seems to me that if there is a statute on the books which provides that a Federal employee shall receive 26 days of annual leave, then if, in an appropriation bill, we restrict the actual amount to be paid for the period of annual leave merely to compensation for 20 days, we shall still stand morally responsible as a congressional body for the additional 6 days' pay. It is an indebtedness which the Government would owe the employee. The employee may not receive it this

year, but the Government will be owing the employee for 6 days of annual leave, in every moral sense, under the statute.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. From a moral standpoint, I grant that the Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct. That is one of my reasons for being on the Senate floor today. My committee, which was criticized a few moments ago, has been working on this question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if I may make the point of order, I did not criticize the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I beg to differ with the Senator. The Senator criticized the committee.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I criticized the Government departments for not cooperating fully with the committee.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I think the Senator criticized the committee for not having taken action on the question of leave. However, if the Senator says he did not intend it as a criticism of the committee, that is satisfactory to me. But I am saying to the Senate that my committee, working with the chairman of the Civil Service Commission, has been working on this very subject in an effort to make provision which we could consider equitable to all Government employees.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. The Senator from New York would like to inquire whether any Senator has a bill which he intends to introduce or whether a bill has been introduced to do what the Senator from Illinois has attempted to do by his amendment to the appropriation bill.

Is there an authorization bill? Is there something entirely different in character? Has such a bill been introduced?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Such a bill was introduced. It is Senate bill 832. We referred the bill to the various commissions and departments.

Mr. IVES. Who introduced the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. At the moment, I merely have the number of the bill. It is Senate bill 832.

Mr. IVES. How many Senators joined in introducing the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not recall; but it is before my committee. My committee has made an extensive study of the question. I am now able to tell the Senator from New York that the bill to which I refer was introduced by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that the study which the Senator's committee made was made as the result of the two bills which I introduced at the last session?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator's bills started it off. I give him all the credit.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I do not ask for any credit. I merely want to have the Record straight, that is all.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. But it should be remembered that the bill this year was a new bill. When it was referred to our committee, following the usual custom, a copy of the bill was referred to the various interested departments. They, in turn, have written to us, and they have stated that, as the result of their study, some way ought to be devised which would make it possible for a new employee to receive during his first year, probably not so much as an employee who has been working for the Government for a period of 10 or 15 years. I think Senators will acknowledge the propriety of that. But, by this amendment, all Federal employees would be treated alike.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I want to say that everything the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has said is true. We have been conducting hearings on this highly complicated subject. For example, in Alaska, the situation in regard to Federal employees is entirely different from that in the State of California in regard to the matter of giving the Federal employees more time and more sick leave.

That is not all. There are various occupations which are highly dangerous. I refer particularly to mining, for example, in connection with which people work for the Federal Government in certain mines under conditions which affect adversely their health.

So the question is a very complicated one. It is very easy to say that we shall simply cut off 6 days, but it is a very difficult matter to make a proper application of it.

Furthermore, there is involved the problem of maternity, the problem connected with the birth of a child to a woman working for the Federal Government. We have conducted many hearings on the subject. We have had hearing after hearing.

There are other problems connected with abnormal conditions. There are various diseases which incapacitate employees for varying lengths of time. It might be said that a woman employed by the Government should have only a few days of sick leave, when, as a matter of fact, doctors have testified that sickness sometimes incapacitates employees for long periods of time.

Again, in World War II, the suggestion was made suddenly that Government employees work Saturday afternoons. Later, they were told to work part time on Sunday, and they did. I submit that the committee which now has a bill before it should have the right to consider carefully all the various angles, and that we ought not to adopt this amendment merely because to do so would seem to be the popular thing. I hope the amendment will be rejected.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for a question.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Along the line of the argument submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], in which he spoke merely of a moral obligation, is it not true that, until the Congress itself changes the period of leave from 26 days, as it is now, to 20 days, or to whatever lesser number of days it desires, there would not only be a moral obligation but also a legal obligation imposed upon the Federal Government to observe the present law? Is not that correct?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Speaking without having looked into the matter thoroughly from a legal standpoint, I would say, as a lawyer, that that is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Will the Senator not also agree that, even if the amendment of the Senator from Illinois were adopted, any Government employee could file an action in the United States Court of Claims, through which he could possibly succeed in collecting that to which the law says he is entitled?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my opinion, he could certainly go to the United States Court of Claims. It would then be a question for the court to determine.

Mr. CHAVEZ. So it is more than a moral obligation, although that should be considered as the important controlling factor. Nevertheless, there is also a legal obligation.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina whether he made a point of order against this amendment? I did not understand that he did.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I shall make a point of order, if it is proposed to reduce the employees' leave from 26 days to 20.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the Senator made the point of order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I have not made it as yet.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the studies which were made, was any testimony introduced to show that Government employees work as few as 209 to 212 days a year, as was stated here a moment ago?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Something of the kind was said.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not true that many Federal workers do not take sick leave and that they take pride in the fact that they do not take sick leave?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. A good many of them do not take sick leave; that is true.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not also true that the eight holidays do not always fall on the working days of the week, but sometimes fall on Sunday?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is true.

Mr. LONG. Is it not true that, if a holiday falls on a Sunday, the employees get an additional holiday?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is not always the case.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am glad the Senator answered as he did, "not always," because I have seen some Government employees—I have not seen all of them—but I have seen a great many Government employees who have worked day after day, regardless of whether they were entitled to holidays. There are employees who are at work day after day, and they remain at work, whether it happens to be a 5-day week or a 6-day week. I know employees who work long hours. I do not deny that there are some who sometimes do very little, but I also remember that I never left the Department of Agriculture, even though it might be as late as 11 or 12 o'clock at night, when there was not a light burning in some other person's office, where he was working far into the night, and working without extra pay.

I do not believe the merits are all on one side, as has been suggested here. There are employees who always take advantage of an opportunity, but I want to suggest that there are a great many Government employees who do not take their sick leave, and who take pride in the fact that they do not take sick leave—and there are dozens of them, hundreds of them, even thousands of them, working here in Washington.

As to a day being taken off when there is a parade down the streets of Washington, I do not believe there is an employee in the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, working in a State such as that of the distinguished minority leader, who takes the day off because there is a parade in Washington. I do not believe the delivery of mail is stopped in Keokuk, Kankakee, or Chicago, because there is a parade in Washington. I think we are being a little unjust to the Federal employees.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. If the Senator will check the language of the amendment he will notice that it is clearly a limitation upon the use of funds in this bill, and as such it does not and cannot affect the legal right of a Government employee to 26 days of annual leave and 15 days of sick leave, if necessary. If the philosophy of the amendment is that because of the emergency we should endeavor to induce employees not to take their full statutory sick leave or annual leave, it might be justified. But it would not be justified on the ground of economy, because it simply puts off the evil day when the Government will be required to pay for the accumulated leave. It will be paid when the individual takes it, at a later time, or when the individual is separated from the service of the Government, in which case it becomes terminal leave.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The Senator is correct. It simply postpones the time of payment. It does not prevent the taking of 26 days annual leave or 15 days sick leave. It does not

change the number of days of leave for the employees, but simply puts off to another year the payment of it.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The committee, in considering this question, also had another problem, namely, the case of an employee who had worked for the Government 15, 20, 25, or 30 years. The committee felt that those who had worked longer should have more sick leave and vacation than the ones who had worked only a year or 3 or 4 or 5 years.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. One of the things we found in our investigation was that as people grow older they need a little more leave. When a man takes a position at the age of 21, he may not need much annual leave. After 10 years of service, he would probably need more leave than he needed after 5 years of service. I should like to see a saving of approximately \$200,000,000 effected to the taxpayers of the United States, but the amendment now offered will not save one cent, in the long run.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Does the committee expect to finish its study of the problem and bring some proposal to the Senate for action in the near future?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. We have received letters from the Commission. I can read to the Senator a letter dated June 11. But we wanted to wait to get reports from whatever department would be affected, just as is done by any other committee. Let me read the letter we received on the 11th day of June.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the Senator please state when he addressed his inquiry to the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. On February 9, 1951.

Mr. DOUGLAS. When did he receive the letter from the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. On June 11.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In other words, they waited 4 months, and only after the Senator from Illinois filed his amendment did the Civil Service Commission take a stand on the question.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I do not know whether it was because of what the Senator from Illinois did, or whether the Commission waited until it had finished its investigation so it could make a proper report to us.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It was my purpose to try to ascertain when we might properly deal with the problem. I think the position taken by some Senators is correct, that this particular amendment

simply limits the amount of pay out of the appropriation in the pending bill. I think employees will probably still be entitled to the extra 6 days leave when they want to take it. It is my opinion that it will accumulate. This is a problem which should be dealt with as early as we can deal with it, and when it is properly dealt with, considerable savings will be effected. I believe the present law to be unfair; there are inequities in it, and advantages are afforded which are not deserved.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I agree with the Senator; but we must remember that there are leaves of various kinds in various places, and dealing with the question by one amendment on the floor of the Senate is not so simple a problem as some people think.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with what the Senator from Arkansas has just said. Many Senators believe that 26 days of annual leave in every case is too much, and that 15 days of sick leave in every case is too much, but for a long term of service it may be that extra sick leave and extra annual leave might be desirable. I hope the Senator will report some measure to the Senate so that we can take action.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I have a question which relates to the matter of saving under this amendment. I should like to have the Senator from Illinois give his attention to the question also. As I understood the Senator's statement, he expected the amendment would save approximately \$5,000,000 in this particular bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And in subsequent appropriation bills a total of \$250,000,000 would be saved.

Mr. BENNETT. This is my question: By reducing the amount of money paid for leave, without changing the gross total of a particular department, do we not release that gross fund for the department to spend for other purposes, so that, in effect, we save nothing?

Mr. DOUGLAS. We make it possible for the department to operate with a smaller number of employees.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very anxious to effect savings but I believe I am correct in my feeling that simply paying for 20 days instead of for 26 days, with the other 6 days accumulating as an obligation against the Government, which will eventually have to be paid for until and unless the basic law is changed, is not a sound proposition. The only way we can actually effect a saving is to get a bill reported from the committee as early as possible and deal with it on the floor.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it would be an expense to the Government if we appropriated additional money to provide for those 6 days, but by a continued refusal to appropriate we could prevent the amount from being paid.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. There have been too many cases decided in the Court of Claims to leave us in any doubt that the statement of the Senator is as fallacious as it can be. Claims have been paid to the Ute Indians in connection with a matter which arose in 1850. The Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] was correct in his statement a minute ago. The amendment does not save \$5,000,000 or 5,000,000 cents. It simply postpones payment until a later date.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. IVES. It seems to the Senator from New York that ultimately the only possible saving that could be made would result from the fact that the amount which might be owed would be paid in currency. The currency may have depreciated under its present value. Heaven forbid that that shall ever happen, and heaven forbid that that is the process by which we effect savings.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I should like to advise the Senator from South Carolina that I appreciate the effort he has expended, and I should like to join the Senator from Minnesota and the other Senators who have expressed themselves to the effect that we shall never be in favor of doing something through the back door that we do not have the courage to do through the front door. I feel that the Senator from South Carolina is correct, and I shall support him.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I thank the Senator.

I think the Senate understands that the pending amendment would save nothing, but would only postpone to another year what we are legally obligated to do this year, unless we enact legislation to take care of the matter.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I wish to say that I am deeply impressed with what the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from South Carolina have said about governmental obligations. I think every Member of the Senate who has been Governor of a State can speak from experience that that is the fact. Time and time again, when the Legislature of the State of New York failed to make appropriation to cover the costs of carrying out the provisions of a statute which was passed in that State, the State immediately became liable to claims, which were

always met. So until the statute can be changed I do not believe that there can possibly be any savings by the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

CONTROL AND CURE OF CANCER—
LETTER FROM CHARLES W. TOBEY, JR.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, the Senate has under consideration an appropriation bill which provides an appropriation for research into various diseases which affect the human body, and I have a particular interest in such legislation, because two members of my family are afflicted with subtle and terrible diseases, which have been the source of sorrow and anxiety to me and still are.

This morning I received a letter from my son, who bears my name and is a practicing lawyer in Concord, N. H. Some 3 or 4 years ago he came down with an attack of illness which was diagnosed as cancer, a virulent form, and gave those of us to whom he is precious tremendous apprehension and anxiety. We sought the best medical advice obtainable, but not much hope was given. However, he learned of a treatment given by a doctor in Medford, Mass. Following these treatments, now of about 3 years' duration, he has been so impressed with the results which have accrued in his case, results which have allowed him to continue to carry on his law business, to be extremely active in forwarding my campaign for election in 1950, and to live a normal life, that he feels he has an obligation and a responsibility to release that testimony of the benefits which have accrued to him and to several others whose cases have come to his attention and which he has observed since the beginning of their treatment. He has been so moved by his feeling of interest in his fellow men who may be suffering from the threats and ravages of cancer, he felt it was his duty to write to me and ask me to insert his letter in the body of the RECORD, which I ask unanimous consent to do at this point.

This is done in the hope that some other unfortunates may find improvement and betterment in line with what has come to him and the other cases which he mentioned in his letter. Therefore, I ask, Mr. President, that this letter be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in the further hope that it may come to the attention of some of the great institutions of the country whose officers may want to inquire into it for their own research work.

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

CONCORD, N. H., June 12, 1951.
The Honorable CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DAD: I am writing this letter to you in the hope that what is written here will give incentive to cancer research institutes and clinics to investigate and evaluate a research program which has apparently demonstrated its ability to arrest and dissipate cancerous growth.

Through treatment in our own family you have become acquainted with the research program of Dr. Robert E. Lincoln, of Medford, Mass. It was about 3 years ago that I became his first cancer patient. You will recall that following long medical treatment and a period of hospitalization, you were advised by our family physicians that I had been stricken with an incurable and rapidly growing cancer. That was the year before I commenced treatment with Dr. Lincoln. The diagnosis of reticulum cell lymphosarcoma was confirmed at Tufts Medical School and reaffirmed at Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons. I cannot say, of course, that Dr. Lincoln's treatments are totally responsible for my present state of good health, but having received reports of improvements of other cancer victims who had been under Dr. Lincoln's care, I am deeply convinced that here is a medical discovery that should be investigated at once for the possible benefit of many thousands of homes in America that have been stricken and that will be stricken each month of each year to come.

Following his discharge from service in World War I, Dr. Lincoln obtained his doctorate of medicine in 1926 and became engaged in a coordinated plan of the general practice of medicine together with a collateral research program. He devised an original type of mechanical heart pump and did basic research work in supersonic energy as he applied it to the field of medicine. This latter research work was done under the immediate direction of Prof. George W. Pierce at the Laboratory of Applied Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge.

For the past 25 years he has practiced general medicine in Medford, Mass., where at the same time, he has conducted his research program. He has made a study of viral infection throughout this period. About 5 years ago he succeeded in isolating from patients during certain stages of epidemic infections, certain viruses from which bacteriophages were made. The results which, over the past 5 years, have been constantly observed in patients having various acute and chronic diseases, would strongly indicate that Dr. Lincoln has been successful in isolating the basic viruses and their specific cellular elements that are the cause of these infectious epidemic diseases.

In order to carefully evaluate each patient as they take their treatments every other day, the doctor has limited his research program to an average of 20 to 30 patients daily. From time to time, during the past 3 years, I have seen and talked with a great many of these people and have seen their hospital and clinic reports of their diagnoses and treatments prior to coming to Dr. Lincoln's clinic. The results in these cases, most of whom had been regarded as hopeless by hospitals and medical institutions, have almost invariably demonstrated a steady improvement.

Last October I received an urgent phone call from a total stranger. He had learned of Dr. Lincoln and of the fact that I had been treated by him. This man had a serious cancer problem in his family in which a recurrence was taking place. At the time he called me X-rays showed that certain tissues were being eaten away. I advised him to visit Dr. Lincoln at once with his wife. X-rays which were taken at regular intervals as the treatments went on showed that as early as 40 days after commencement of treatments, the malignant process was not only arrested but that a replacement of normal tissue was taking place. He had been advised by both Boston and New York specialists that his wife's case was incurable and that she would probably not live longer than a period of 6 months. She advised me, following 1 week of treatment, that most of her pain had disappeared. This patient

has now outlived her estimated duration of life by several months.

I have before me a letter written a few days ago by a mother who had a complete breast amputation in August of 1949, due to the presence of a malignant growth. Following a periodic X-ray check-up in February of 1951, her family physician advised her that he had received a disturbing report from the X-ray specialist. Further X-ray pictures which were taken at a prominent Boston hospital confirmed this report. Subsequently, tissue removed for biopsy examination confirmed the diagnosis of cancer. X-ray pictures showed malignant invasion of one of her lungs.

She was first treated by Dr. Lincoln last March. Within the past week inquiry has revealed the following. An X-ray taken 6 weeks after the start of treatment was compared with her previous pictures. The X-ray specialist expressed surprise at the result which showed that the malignant spots had been checked. Her general physical condition was markedly improved.

The last case that I will mention is that of another woman. Following a pathologist's biopsy examination, a diagnosis of carcinoma of the so-called sigmoid portion of the lower bowel or colon was made. The cancer had spread to the neighboring organs, so much so that a complete hysterectomy was done. A colostomy, or false opening of the intestine through the abdominal wall was also performed. This occurred in May of 1950.

Seven months later severe pain again returned and examination showed that her cancer had recurred. Her husband was told that it would be useless to operate again and was advised to bring her home.

There was such a rapid deterioration of her general condition that four months later she was unable to support herself in an erect sitting position in bed. There was constant nausea. At this point her husband describes her condition as follows:

"She was vomiting about four to five times daily, and was being given regular hypodermic injections of drugs to relieve her pain. Her weight had fallen from 155 pounds on February 1, 1951, to 112 pounds on May 18, when she commenced treatments with Dr. Lincoln, a total loss of 43 pounds. The morning following the first treatment, she showed her first real desire for food in several months. She kept this food down and has continued to do so up to the present time" (June 1).

I understand from the doctor that this patient has shown steady progress to a point where she now equally divides her time between bed rest and being up and about. She is now practically free from pain. A continuous and severe burning sensation throughout the entire abdomen, which was due to a chronic colitis of long standing, has disappeared. The rapid loss of weight was not only stopped, but there has been a slight gain of weight since the starting of treatment.

As you know, the evaluation of the component parts of Dr. Lincoln's therapy, together with his clinical results, have been largely corroborated by a number of other investigators working independently. Each one has attested to the therapeutic utility and individual efficiency of Dr. Lincoln's antibiotic agents.

As you can most easily understand, in view of the invasion of our own home by cancer, I am particularly anxious to do all that I can to make this particular treatment available to as many people as possible in the shortest period of time. The medications used in this research work will not be available for widespread distribution until its manufacture has been placed on a commercial level. The present facilities are such that this treatment can be available

only for a limited amount of organized research work at the present time.

I have in mind that the four cancer cases that I have cited are by no means conclusive proof of the efficacy of Dr. Lincoln's therapies as comprising the total answer to the problem of malignancy. However, I have seen enough evidence of a decidedly positive nature, as gaged both by the doctor's own interpretations of his results, those of the corroborating investigators, together with the obvious and visible improvements that I myself have witnessed, to make me feel that every effort should be made to encourage further investigation.

Dr. Lincoln's successful isolation of these viral bodies and their means of propagation has opened the door to an entirely new and wide field of medical research. The results that he and his colleagues are obtaining in the treatment of victims of acute and chronic disease call for a rapidly increased expansion of clinical research along the same lines that have already been activated.

It is for these reasons that I am writing this letter to you, with the request that you place the contents hereof in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in order that various medical research groups may have this matter called to their attention, so that the people, as well as the medical research world, may be encouraged to look further into this new viral field of medical science.

In closing this letter, I would like to mention that Dr. Lincoln has made an irrevocable assignment of his discoveries and therapeutic agents to the Lincoln Foundation, a nonprofit organization dedicated solely to the furtherance of medical research. Accordingly, no monetary profit will ever accrue to any individual or group. He has dedicated his life to this work and has so assigned these antibiotics as to insure continued and increased medical research to the end that the people may be the perpetual beneficiaries of these discoveries.

You and I, as father and son, have worked together over the years on a great many matters that we have felt have been of vital concern to the country and the people. Having lived the subject matter of this letter over the past few years, I am glad to be able to come to you and to have your help and cooperation in this new work.

With my best to you always,
Sincerely,

CHARLES W. TOBEY, JR.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY
APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I believe I should say one or two words about the amendment. I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished and able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service last year, and having looked into this matter considerably, I am of the opinion that there is really no basis upon which we can justify the large amount of leave that the Federal employees are receiving. I know that employees of the Post Office Department and their union officials came to me and urged that the Post Office employees

should have more leave. When we looked into their need for leave we found that they could not make a particularly strong case, except that they could say that the civil-service employees were receiving so much leave, and therefore that they should receive the same amount.

But after studying the question further it was my conclusion, as a member of the committee—and I believe I was the chairman of the subcommittee dealing with the subject at that time—that it is rather unfair to ask the average American worker to pay taxes and receive very little leave himself, in order to pay the expense of someone else receiving an enormous amount of leave that could not be justified. That, to me, seems to be unfair to those who are paying for these conditions for Federal employees.

The point was made, and very correctly so, by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that he knows of many Federal employees who do not take that leave. That is entirely true, and it goes further to demonstrate, to my mind at least, that they receive too much leave, so that they really have little need for all the leave they accumulate.

If I might cite an example fairly close to me; my own administrative assistant worked for a Federal agency for some time. After 5 years he would have been entitled to draw up to 124 days' leave. During those 5 years he drew about 40 days' leave. It happened that he was very busy at his job, and could not find time to take the leave. He was in a responsible position, and in order to do his work as it should be done he could not find time to take all the leave granted under Federal law.

It has been pointed out that the leave runs somewhere around 40 percent of the days of the year. Many employees find that they do not particularly care to take that much leave, but they do rather like to accumulate it, so in the event their services are terminated they would be entitled to draw additional pay for the days of leave to which they were entitled, but of which they did not take advantage.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield after I say that I had in mind that the days of leave include Saturdays and Sundays, sick leave, annual leave, and holidays, which run approximately 153 days.

Mr. ANDERSON. I question that.

Mr. LONG. Well, 104 days represent Saturdays and Sundays. That figure is not difficult to arrive at. Fifteen days for sick leave, 26 days for annual leave, and 8 holidays.

Mr. ANDERSON. Can the Senator from Louisiana pick out a year in which eight holidays come on working days? He stated a moment ago that employees took leave regardless, but the very case of the Senator's administrative assistant proves that employees do not do so. That only shows that the Senator ought to know more Government employees. I am sure if he knew more Government employees he would find that many hundreds and hundreds of them do the very

same thing the Senator's administrative assistant did.

Mr. LONG. I have the very highest admiration for Government employees, and always will have. The point I wish to make, however, is that here is a case of Government employees receiving far more leave than they feel they should take. Here is a case of a Government employee receiving three times more time off at the Federal Government's expense than he feels he can find time to take, believing he is responsible for getting a certain job done. The Senator from New Mexico himself pointed out examples of leaving his office and finding employees who were entitled to leave, still working at their jobs. That is not a case of doing work that they are required to do. It is a case of their volunteering to do over and above the amount of work they are required to do.

I know that Senators are sometimes inconvenienced because of the fact that there are many holidays on which Government employees do not work. Sometimes when we are trying to do work for our constituents we are not able to accomplish it because we cannot do business with Government offices since there are no employees in those offices, especially on Saturdays.

The argument was made to me that employees must have additional time, more than the post office employees get, in order to go home to vote. Actually, my experience has been that there are very few employees who must go home to vote. Most of them who could do so do not. There are much better absentee-voter laws for the benefit of persons who wish to vote but who are not in their States at the time of the election than there were at the time the leave situation was created.

It has also been urged that originally the justification for so much leave was based upon the idea that most Federal employees were in Washington, and that they required about 3 days' travel time to get home and 3 days' travel time to get back to Washington. That situation no longer prevails in the main, because most Federal employees are no longer situated in Washington. In the second place, methods of communication and transportation being what they are, and transportation having become so much more rapid since the leave situation was created, there is no longer a requirement of 3 or 4 days' travel time to go home and several additional days to come back to Washington. Therefore, I believe that sooner or later the public is going to wonder why we do not reduce the amount of leave.

I hope I shall not be misunderstood on the question of the amount of leave which I think is available to Federal employees. I understand that there are 26 days annual leave, and usually about 8 holidays. The junior Senator from Louisiana was under the impression that with respect to most holidays, if the holiday falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the succeeding day is a day of vacation, to allow for that fact.

Therefore, Mr. President, I feel that some action should be taken by the Congress. If we are to take action, what

form should that action take? So far as I can see, the only action which has been taken affecting leave while the junior Senator from Louisiana has been in Congress has been action taken on appropriation bills. I consider that rather unfortunate. Having served as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I believe that that is the proper committee to consider such legislation; yet the committee never got around to it while the junior Senator from Louisiana was a member of the committee, and has not gotten around to it up to this time.

It is my impression that if we put the Congress on record that we do not believe there should be 26 days annual leave, by voting for the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois, with all the defects which might be pointed out in that amendment, at least a start will have been made and I believe that we shall be able to devise a method to surmount the legal defects, and finally obtain a reduction of the excessive leave, such as we probably should have.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the amendment of the Senator from Illinois stands as it is, there seems to be grave doubt that it will save any money. The reason the Senator from Michigan says that is that the following provision is inserted in the independent offices bill:

SEC. 601. No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act, including the government of the District of Columbia, shall be available to pay for annual leave accumulated by any civilian officer or employee during the calendar year 1951 and unused at the close of business on June 30, 1952: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to officers and employees whose post of duty is outside the continental United States: *And provided further*, That this section shall not apply with respect to the payment of compensation for accumulated annual leave in the case of officers or employees who leave their civilian positions for the purpose of entering upon active military or naval service in the Armed Forces of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator inform me whether the measure to which he is referring is already on the statute books of the Nation, or whether it is merely language in a bill which the House has passed?

Mr. FERGUSON. The House passed it in the independent offices appropriation bill.

Mr. LONG. That is not the law. It will have to come before the Senate, and be considered in conference.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct; but without that sort of provision in the pending bill, limiting it to this year, and limiting the amount that may be paid, I do not see how we are going to save any money.

Mr. LONG. I agree with the Senator that from a legislative point of view the amendment might be more in line with what I should like to see, actually to accomplish the result we are seeking.

However, if the senior Senator from Illinois had phrased his amendment as

he would probably have liked to phrase it, a point of order would have been made against his amendment, and he would have been in the position of being required to move to suspend the rule. He would have been subjected to a further delay of 1 day in order to give notice of a motion to suspend the rule. Therefore he would not have been able to get a vote on his amendment. It would have been sidetracked, and we would not have had any action.

I believe that the senior Senator from Illinois acted quite wisely under the circumstances. Certainly he knows that if he is able to obtain approval for this amendment, sooner or later he will be able to accomplish what he is trying to do. If this amendment will not actually save money, he will be able to get more effective language in a future appropriation bill, and have the rule suspended, so as to result in a saving of \$125,000,000, which the senior Senator from Illinois seeks to save. That, I believe, would be a proper economy.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield for a question.

Mr. KERR. As I understand the Senator from Louisiana, he tells us that if this amendment is enacted it will not save any money, but that it will be persuasive as an expression of sentiment on the part of the Senate with reference to the desirability of legislation similar to this, which would save money.

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana understands this amendment to say that funds appropriated for the agencies with which we are dealing here cannot be spent to pay for annual leave in excess of 20 days a year. The money would simply not be spent in that fashion. The argument is made that that provision, standing alone, would mean that possibly the employees might at a later date come back and receive pay for annual leave in addition to that which they might have actually earned. If that argument is correct, then it is true that this amendment would not accomplish what it seeks to accomplish. However, as a practical matter, I point out that if this amendment carries by a substantial vote, even with all the defects anyone might point out in it, the probabilities are that in connection with the next appropriation bill we shall succeed in suspending the rule and placing a rider in that bill which will accomplish exactly what the senior Senator from Illinois seeks to accomplish.

As a practical matter, the junior Senator from Louisiana is of the opinion that if we defeat this amendment we shall go along for another 2 or 3 years, still paying for 26 days annual leave, and that if we adopt this amendment, the probabilities are that we shall succeed during this session—probably in the near future—in so correcting the leave situation that the leave will be more in line with what it probably should be.

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

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

Mr. LONG. I yield first to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. What is the opinion of the Senator from Louisiana as to whether or not this amendment, if adopted, would be effective in saving any money?

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana feels certain that for this year it would prevent that money from being paid out. That is exactly what it says it would do.

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

Mr. LONG. The junior Senator from Louisiana is also strongly of the opinion that if this amendment is adopted particularly if it is adopted by a large vote—the Senate will act on this subject again within a month; and possibly even before the pending appropriation bill becomes law we may enact legislation, in connection with some other appropriation bill, sufficient to see to it that any defect which the Senator now points out in this amendment is cured from a legal point of view.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator think that if at this time there is a legal liability on the part of the Government to pay this money to the employee, and if the total effect of this amendment would be merely to provide that the money should not be paid out of current appropriations, the inevitable result would be that the employees would have a valid claim against the Government, and thereby the Government would be in the position of owing the money and declining to pay it, which would create confusion rather than accomplish the result which the Senator has in mind, with which I am thoroughly in accord?

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Louisiana is strongly of the opinion that if the amendment is adopted, the result will be that during this session Congress will express its will to reduce the amount of annual leave. If the amendment does not carry, the probabilities are that we will get no action on the subject.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a little earlier, I read from a section of the independent offices bill, but I neglected to make special mention of a particular provision in that section. I invite the attention of the Senate to the provision, section 601, in the independent offices bill, and to the following words in that section:

No part of the funds of, or available for expenditure by any corporation or agency included in this or any other act—

That language makes it general legislation. The use of the words "or any other act" makes the provision general in application. It even includes the District of Columbia, which confirms that it is general legislation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In reply to the Senator from Michigan, I would say that what he has stated confirms the position I am taking. The amendment would prohibit money being expended in this year for leave in excess of 20 days. The provision to which the Senator from Michigan invites attention indicates that such leave cannot be stored up for the future.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore there would be no future liability to the Government. The Senator from Michigan has confirmed my argument.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct, assuming the provision in the independent offices bill is ultimately enacted.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, as chairman of the subcommittee which is about to report the independent offices bill I should like to say that this amendment is legislation. There was incorporated in the independent offices bill the provision to which reference has been made because of the confusion we had last year in connection with the so-called Rent Control Board.

Mr. FERGUSON. On the question of accumulated leave, we found that in that agency there was a great amount of accumulated leave which was imposing future liability upon the Government not in harmony with current operations.

Mr. MAYBANK. I am in favor of evening up the leave between the Post Office employees and employees of the other agencies. However, we have provision for such legislation in the bill which will be considered by the Senate tomorrow or the next day, which will take care of the situation. As I understand the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], we are concerned not with a matter of legislation, but a matter of court decision, and therefore, we cannot save any money.

Mr. LONG. It has been argued that there is an obligation on the part of the Government to pay.

Mr. MAYBANK. So far as the independent offices appropriation bill is concerned, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan whether such a provision would be legislation.

Mr. FERGUSON. A point of order could not be raised against it, because it is contained in the House bill as it came to the Senate.

Mr. McCLELLAN. But the Senator is referring to the independent offices bill.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I should like to make a suggestion. I wish to reduce expenditures. I believe in this time of crisis and emergency it is not unreasonable to ask Federal employees to take only 20 days' leave with pay. I do not believe that to be unreasonable at all. However, I should like to accomplish it without simply limiting their pay and still retaining a continuing obligation to pay later. Inasmuch as the only way to correct the situation is by legislation, I should like to suggest that the amendment be withdrawn, and that a proper amendment, in the form of legislation, be made to apply to all appropriation bills for 1952. By suspending the rules of the Senate we could have such a provision apply to every appropriation bill. That is the right way to do it.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, may I ask whether the Senator from Arkansas voted for the amendment to the independent offices bill.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. MAYBANK. The bill will be reported tomorrow.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes. I suggest that we suspend the rules in order to legislate on the question. In the interim I hope the Committee on Post Offices and Civil Service will go into the question and report new basic legislation.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Louisiana a question. He was the chairman of the subcommittee which dealt with questions of this kind. He is familiar with them. If we were to adopt the amendment, making the limitation and cutting down the leave to 20 days, the effect would be to throw a block in the way of the legislation on which we are now working. I should like to read a letter which I received from the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is that the letter which was written 4 months after the Commission was requested for the information?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to read it into the Record, so that Senators will be familiar with the facts. It says:

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE
COMMISSION,

Washington, D. C., June 11, 1951.

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office and
Civil Service, United States Senate,
Room 134, Senate Office Building.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: This is in further reply to your letter of February 9, 1951, requesting the Commission's views concerning S. 832, a bill to reduce the annual leave of Federal officers and employees to 15 days during the continuance of the existing national emergency, and for other purposes.

The Commission opposes the enactment of S. 832. As you know, the facts developed by the joint study recently made for your Committee by the Bureau of the Budget and the Commission show that the savings to the Government as a result of a graduated system similar to that discussed by your staff would be greater than those resulting from a flat cut to 15 or 20 days for all employees. Such a plan is now in use in a number of industrial concerns. While the Commission is not making a recommendation at this time to reduce the leave of Federal employees, it is believed that any change in the leave system should contemplate a graduated scale whereby the amount of annual leave granted employees would be related directly to the employee's length of service. In the Commission's opinion, a graduated system would also be more equitable to career employees.

The Bureau of the Budget has informed the Commission that it has no objections to the submission of this report.

By direction of the Commission:
Sincerely yours,

JAMES M. MITCHELL,
Commissioner.

If the Senator from Louisiana goes along with the amendment he will be throwing a block in our way. We will be unable to do anything with regard to it, and we need not expect the Commission to do anything either.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the Senator if he would be willing to offer an amendment providing for a graduated scale? If so, I would be willing to accept it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In reply to the Senator from Illinois I

should like to say that we have a great many lawyers on the floor of the Senate. Nevertheless we have a staff working on the amendment. It is working out the details. It is not possible to bring up a suggested amendment on the floor of the Senate and do justice to the employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I fully understand the observations made by Senators on the floor. I would point out, however, that I am firmly of the opinion that if we are ever to succeed in reducing the amount of leave, we shall have to do it by way of an amendment to an appropriation bill. Otherwise, with the opposition which would come from various Government agencies, the complications which would be brought about by the opposition raised on the part of many organizations, as well as the pressure upon individual Senators, with no similar counterpressure from the taxpayers, who would have to pay the money involved, in the long run our efforts would probably go for naught. Therefore, I hope the amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, on page 41, in line 24.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SMITH] would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM], who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOPPEL], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—35

Alken	Hendrickson	Mundt
Bennett	Hennings	Nixon
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Butler, Nebr.	Hoey	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Jenner	Stennis
Douglas	Long	Taft
Dworshak	McCarthy	Wherry
Eastland	McClellan	Wiley
Ellender	Monroney	Williams
Ferguson	Moody	

NAYS—36

Anderson	Johnson, Colo.	McKellar
Butler, Md.	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, S. C.	Neely
Clements	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kilgore	Pastore
Ecton	Knowland	Russell
George	Langer	Sparkman
Green	Lehman	Thye
Hayden	Magnuson	Underwood
Humphrey	Maybank	Watkins
Hunt	McCarran	Weiker
Ives	McFarland	Young

NOT VOTING—25

Benton	Frear	Millikin
Bricker	Fulbright	Murray
Cain	Gillette	O'Connor
Capehart	Kefauver	Schoepel
Case	Kem	Smathers
Connally	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dirksen	Malone	Tobey
Duff	Martin	
Flanders	McMahon	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senate has just turned down an opportunity to save \$250,000,000. I think that some of those who voted against this amendment did so in the belief that a bill on the subject should be reported to the Senate by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I believe we should give all encouragement to that committee immediately to proceed to its work. I therefore offer another amendment, as follows:

On page 41, line 24, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service is hereby directed to report to the Senate on or before July 25, 1951, a bill providing that the annual and sick leave of Classified, Postal and Wage Board employees shall be set at 20 days annual leave per year and 12 days sick leave per year; provided further, That the Senate shall proceed to vote on such bill within 30 days after it shall have been reported."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina will state the point of order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I make the point of order that the amendment is in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. LONG. Has the Senator from Illinois yielded for that purpose?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have not yielded for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am making the point to save the time of the Senate, that is all, and because I know the amendment is out of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Who has the floor?
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, we can always find all kinds of excuses for not acting. When an amendment is proposed to an appropriation bill, it is argued that we should take the matter up in a legislative bill. Whenever we try to save money for the Government and for the people, it is always said that it is not being done in the right manner, nor at the right time, nor attached to the right bill. The pea is always underneath another shell and the poor taxpayer is worn out chasing it.

In the great shell game of economy, the taxpayer always seems to lose. I am trying to help him find the pea.

Some have said we should not try to cut annual leave on an appropriation bill, but should do so only on a legislative bill. Well, that is what I am now trying to do. I am trying to assure that those good friends get their expressed wish.

We know perfectly well the influences which are going to be at work to prevent action. Thousands of Government employees will be out in force, and it will be most difficult to act. I know it would be rather rough on the committee to turn its members over to the tender mercies of all the various governmental agencies, unless we gave them some legislative direction. Under this proposal of mine members of the committee could say, "It is not our fault that we are taking this matter up. It is the fault of the Senate as a whole. The Senate is compelling us to report within 12 days, and the Senate must then act within 30 days."

If we really mean business about having this matter handled in a legislative bill, let us adopt this amendment.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, as the chairman of a committee which is being directed what to do, and when to do it, I am not pleased at all with what is now proposed, and I do not think the chairman of any other committee of the Senate would appreciate it. This proposal would, if adopted, be the same as establishing a precedent binding upon every Member of the Senate, whereby the Senate could tell any committee having jurisdiction over a given subject that it must report a bill, whether the members of the committee

believe in it or not. For the Senate to tell the committees what to do suggests that we should simply abolish all committees of the Senate and handle everything upon the floor of the Senate. That, Mr. President, seems to me is what we are facing today.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, that I may make a point of order?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I intend to make a point of order. But I feel that I ought to speak for my committee, and to tell Senators how I feel regarding a proposal of this kind.

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

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. In doing that, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to any Senator on this floor to make a statement with reference to his conviction and his responsibility, and his recognition of his duties?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. So far as I am concerned, when I was sent to the Senate of the United States I was sent here to do my own thinking and to do my own voting, and I intend to do that so long as I am a Senator from South Carolina. I shall not permit anyone from Illinois or from any other State to tell me what to do or what not to do. I think the members of my committee entertain the same feeling. So I make the point of order that this proposal is in the nature of legislation on an appropriation bill, and also that it is out of order for the reason that it would constitute a violation of the rules for the Senate to tell a committee what it must do in regard to a particular bill which may have been referred to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is well taken, and is sustained.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, it is all very well for the Senator from Illinois to talk about economy. It is all very well to have him feel that he is the only Member of this body who is trying to do what is right. But if the Senator from Illinois actually wanted to be consistent, he would let the Senate take action on the pending bill and get through with it. We have wasted much time today. I shall not say what I had in mind to say. We have wasted more of the taxpayers' money by discussing matters which the Senate knew about and understood than I can estimate. For the sake of economy, why not vote on the bill either one way or the other.

I ask for the regular order, Mr. President.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I withdraw my appeal from the ruling of the Chair, and offer instead another amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 41, line 24, it is proposed to strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of any ap-

propriation contained in this act shall be used for the payment of remuneration for sick leave of any classified or Wage Board employee in excess of 12 days per year; or for the payment of remuneration for annual leave in excess of 13 days per year in the case of such an employee who has rendered a total of less than 5 years of active service as a civilian employee or in the Armed Forces of the United States, 19½ days per year in the case of such an employee who has rendered a total of 5 years but less than 15 years of such service, 26 days per year in the case of such an employee who has rendered a total of 15 years of such service."

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I raise the point of order that the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois constitutes legislation on an appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that the amendment is in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we are making every effort to present some measure on this subject which the Senate will adopt. When we propose a uniform cut of a certain number of days, it is said that it should be graduated. The amendment now offered provides for such a graduation, and I believe it is identical with the plan tentatively suggested by the staff of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The amendment will provide 13 days a year for those who have been employed less than 5 years, 19½ days for those who have been employed from 5 to 15 years, and 26 days for those who have been employed more than 15 years. This particular program has great administrative advantages. There are 26 pay periods of 2 weeks each during the Federal year. The days of leave suggested are fractions of 26. The amendment would mean that an employee who has worked less than 5 years would get one-half day's leave per pay period, and those who have been employed for between 5 and 15 years will get three-fourths of a day for each pay period. Finally those employees who have served more than 15 years will receive 26 days, the same as now, or 1 day for each pay period.

At this point in my remarks, Mr. President, unless the Senator from South Carolina objects, I should like to have printed in the RECORD the very excellent report of the staff of the committee.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE
AND CIVIL SERVICE,
April 17, 1951.

The Honorable OLIN D. JOHNSTON,
Chairman, Committee on Post Office
and Civil Service,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON: In accordance with your directions the staff has analyzed the joint report concerning the accumulated

annual leave and length of service of Federal employees submitted to the Committee by the Bureau of Budget and the Civil Service Commission.

The report, based on this analysis, is submitted for the consideration of the committee.

This report is divided into nine parts:

Part I states the recommendations of the staff with regard to annual and sick leave and unemployment insurance.

Part II presents a brief analysis and conclusion of the different Federal leave systems.

Part III presents the justification for a graduated system of annual leave.

Part IV in brief compass describes a method for reduction in backlog of accumulated leave.

Part V is a brief conclusion regarding future accumulation of annual leave.

Part VI presents an analysis of sick-leave benefits, rate of usage and conclusion with specific recommendations.

Part VII describes method of bookkeeping that would save the Government much of the administrative costs with regard to records of accrued sick and annual leave.

Part VIII states the reason and need for unemployment insurance, provided certain leave cuts are adopted.

Part IX presents two schedules of graduated leave systems that should be considered.

Each schedule is divided into three parts: Length of service reported; basis for graduated system; and analysis of graduated system. The adoption of either schedule would save the Government over \$200,000,000 annually.

For the preparation of this report special acknowledgment is due Mr. Don Kerlin of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely yours,

H. W. BRAWLEY,
Staff Director.

SICK AND ANNUAL LEAVE IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

PART I. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Review the several annual- and sick-leave laws with a view to legislation establishing a uniform system throughout the Federal service to the greatest extent practicable.

2. Consider adoption of a graduated system of annual leave based on length of service that will provide employees with adequate time for liberal vacations yearly and for incidental use, yet at the same time, conserve manpower and produce economies.

3. Consider means of forcing an orderly reduction in the large amount of accumulated annual leave to the credit of individual employees.

4. Consider means of preventing unduly large accumulations of annual leave by individual employees in the future.

5. Consider the sick-leave situation with a view to legislation that will reduce what appears to be a too liberal yearly allowance; remove the limitation on the amount of sick leave that may be accumulated in order to provide greater coverage to long-time employees during periods of serious and prolonged illness; and provide reasonable safeguards to minimize the possibility of abuse of the sick-leave privilege.

6. Consider legislative changes in both the annual- and sick-leave laws that will greatly reduce the cost of maintaining individual leave accounts.

7. Consider legislation to cover Federal employees with unemployment insurance, both as a matter of equity and to replace the widespread practice of building up large accumulations of annual leave as insurance against unemployment.

PART II. DIFFERENT FEDERAL LEAVE SYSTEMS

A. Among the several leave systems in effect in the Federal service are the following:

1. Federal employees generally: Approximately 75 percent of all Federal employees are subject to the Uniform Annual and Sick Leave Acts of 1936, as amended. These acts provide leave as follows:

Annual leave

(a) Permanent employees: Permanent full-time employees earn annual leave at the rate of 26 days per calendar year. Permanent part-time employees, for whom there has been established a regular tour of duty covering not less than 5 days in any week, earn annual leave on a pro rata basis.

(b) Temporary employees: Temporary full-time employees earn annual leave at the rate of 30 days per calendar year. Temporary part-time employees for whom there has been established a regular tour of duty covering not less than 5 days in any week earn annual leave on a pro rata basis during each full continuous month of service.

(c) Intermittent employees: Permanent or temporary employees whose services are required either full or part time or on intermittent basis do not earn annual leave provided the agency takes the precaution to notify the employee in writing to that effect at the time of his appointment.

(d) Accumulations: Employees in the United States now may accumulate annual leave in an amount not to exceed 60 days. During World War II (September 8, 1939 to July 25, 1947) employees were permitted to accumulate up to 90 days. Many employees still have such accumulations to their credit.

Employees outside the continental United States are permitted to accumulate annual leave in accordance with agency regulations in effect prior to January 1, 1936. These regulations permit accumulations of annual leave in varying amounts, ranging from 90 to 120 days.

Sick leave may be accumulated by employees both in and outside the continental United States in an amount not in excess of 90 days at the end of any calendar month.

2. Postal field service: Over 360,000 employees in the Postal Field Service are subject to Public Law 134, which grants 15 days annual leave per year and 10 days sick leave per year. By administrative action such employees are not permitted to carry over more than 5 days annual leave from one fiscal year to the next. However, there is no restriction on the amount of sick leave they may accumulate. Departmental employees, postmasters, assistant postmasters, and certain other employees in the post offices throughout the country are subject to the Uniform Annual and Sick Leave Acts of 1936, as amended, and, therefore, earn and accumulate annual and sick leave in the same manner as other Federal employees.

3. Foreign Service—Department of State: Over 8,000 employees in the Foreign Service, Department of State, are subject to the Foreign Service Act of 1946, Public Law 724, in the matter of annual and sick leave. This act gives such employees 60 calendar days annual leave and 15 calendar days sick leave per year. The act permits an accumulation of annual leave in amount not to exceed 180 days and an accumulation of sick leave not to exceed 120 days.

4. Doctors, dentists, and nurses—Veterans' Administration: Several thousand medical employees in the Veterans' Administration are subject to Public Law 293, Seventy-ninth Congress, in the matter of sick and annual leave. This law grants annual leave at the rate of 30 calendar days per year and sick leave at the rate of 15 calendar days per year.

The maximum accumulation of annual leave is not to exceed 120 days. The maximum accumulation of sick leave is not to exceed 90 days.

5. Commissioned officers of the Public Health Service: Approximately 2,300 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service are subject to a leave system under which they accrue annual leave at the rate of 30 calendar days per year and sick leave to the extent the Surgeon General considers justified by the circumstances involved. The accumulation of annual leave is limited to 60 days, but sick leave is granted on the basis of justification, without limitation.

6. Employees of the Government Printing Office: Some 7,000 employees of the Government Printing Office are subject to annual and sick leave laws which grant 30 and 15 days, respectively, each year. However, by administrative action, such employees have been brought under Uniform Annual and Sick Leave Acts for 1936, as amended.

7. Miscellaneous groups: Employees of the Panama Railroad Company, Panama Canal, Maritime Commission, certain field employees of the Department of Agriculture, commissioned officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and employees of the United States Park Service are subject to a variation of leave laws.

B. Conclusion: The conditions of employment, hours of work, and basis of pay of each of the above groups should be thoroughly analyzed with the view to standardization of annual and sick leave laws insofar as may be practical and equitable. The various statutes and administrative directives governing the accumulation of annual leave for United States citizen employees in overseas areas should be standardized, as there is no justification for the wide variation in the amount of annual leave that can be accumulated by employees under like conditions.

PART III. GRADUATED SYSTEM OF ANNUAL LEAVE

A. A system of granting annual leave at a graduated rate based on the length of service of the individual employee has a great deal of merit. Such a practice prevails rather generally in private industry. However, it must be recognized that Federal employees, unlike employees in private industry, are required to charge every absence from official duty to some type of leave, in the main, either to their annual or sick leave account. In private industry, incidental leave for such purposes as paying taxes, attending funerals, car inspection, participation in civic enterprises, and the transaction of personal business is granted without charge to an employee's vacation time. Therefore, any system adopted for Federal use must not only provide for adequate vacations, but must allow a few additional days each year for incidental use.

B. Conclusions: The present allowance of annual leave which generally is at the rate of 26 days a year to permanent employees and 30 days a year to temporary employees is, in some respects, too liberal to many employees and too costly to the Government. It is difficult to justify a system under which a new employee earns the same amount of annual leave during the first year of his employment as does an old employee during his twenty-fifth or thirtieth year of service.

It is even more difficult to justify a system under which a temporary employee earns leave at a greater rate than a permanent employee. These seeming inequities can be corrected on the one hand and substantial savings accomplished on the other by adopting a system under which the amount of annual leave earned by an employee is

based solely on his total length of service.¹ The type of appointment under which an employee is serving at any given time should not affect the amount of annual leave he earns; i. e., a temporary employee should not earn leave at a greater rate than a permanent employee, and a permanent employee with many years of service should not earn leave at a reduced rate in the event he accepts a temporary appointment.

The graduated system outlined on the chart attached hereto gives 13 days' annual leave a year to employees during the first few years of their service, 19½ days a year during the middle years of their service, and 26 days a year during the remaining years of their career. This is sufficient to permit a full two weeks' annual vacation plus three days for incidental purposes to employees in the first category; a full three weeks' annual vacation plus 4½ days for incidental purposes to employees in the middle category; and a full four weeks' annual vacation plus 6 days for incidental purposes to employees in the latter category.

PART IV. REDUCTION IN BACKLOG OF ACCUMULATED LEAVE

A. Generally, existing law permits an accumulation of not over 60 days annual leave. During World War II employees were permitted to accumulate not over 90 days because they could not be spared from their work. In spite of this increase in the maximum amount of accumulation, many employees lost leave at the end of each year and many employees who have reached their maximum accumulation still lose leave each year. The accumulation of annual leave is a two-sided question. On the one hand, many employees by design accumulate leave because of its insurance value during times of prolonged illness, or unemployment and its cash value upon voluntary separation from the service. On the other hand, many employees would like to use leave for vacation purposes, but are prevented from doing so because of work requirements. In either case, the Government pays an extremely high premium on account of accumulated leave, for these reasons:

1. Leave is often accumulated by an employee while he is in a low grade and is paid for at a time when he has risen to a higher grade.

2. When general pay raises (of which there have been several during recent years) go into effect, it increases the value of accumulated leave, and must be liquidated at the increased value.

B. Conclusion: Employees should be required to liquidate excessive current accumulations of annual leave to their credit over a 5-year period at the rate of not less than 20 percent each year. To accomplish this, an employee should be required to use such leave, but if it is administratively determined that it would be detrimental to the Government service for him to be spared, then he should be paid for his leave in cash. So long as the rate of reduction is in keeping with 20 percent per year, in the event the employee leaves the service before the full 5-year period, he should be compensated for the unliquidated amount of leave still to his credit.

PART V. FUTURE ACCUMULATION OF ANNUAL LEAVE

A. Assuming that some type of unemployment insurance will be adopted and that the limitation on the amount of sick leave that may be accumulated will be removed, some positive means of controlling

¹ In computing an employee's total length of service, military service and all Federal employment creditable for retirement purposes should count. In other words, the same formula should be used for leave purposes as applies in the case of retirement.

future accumulations of annual leave should be adopted.

B. Conclusion: The accumulations of large amounts of annual leave should not be permitted in the future. The law should be specific that annual leave is for the purpose of providing employees with time for adequate vacations and the transaction of personal affairs. Furthermore, the law should be equally specific that in the event an agency denies an employee the use of leave for these purposes, it should be required to pay the employee for the leave at the end of the fiscal year. There should be sufficient elasticity in the requirements of law to permit an employee to carry over from one year to another an amount of leave not exceeding that which he has earned during the past year in order that he may either take a prolonged vacation or otherwise juggle his vacation schedule. This privilege should not, however, obligate the Government to compensate him for such carry-over leave in the event he does not use it in this manner.

PART VI. SICK LEAVE

A. Benefits: In general, employees earn sick leave at the rate of 1¼ days a month for a total of 15 days per calendar year. Employees may accumulate sick leave in an amount not to exceed 90 days at the end of any calendar month. In addition an advance of sick leave of not to exceed 30 days may be made to an employee. In most instances advanced sick leave is amortized out of future earnings; however, if because of death, continued illness, or involuntary separation from duty, the advance is not fully liquidated out of future earnings the unliquidated balance is canceled.

B. Rate of usage: The average amount of sick leave used by Federal employees ranges from 7 to 9 days per year. Many employees use little or no sick leave year after year. The great majority use only a normal amount. A relatively few, however, use sick leave as rapidly as it accrues to their credit. There is some indication that a very limited number of employees enjoy good health until they approach or reach the maximum 90-day limit on accumulation, after which time they are ill often enough to prevent the loss of any sick leave. It is to the credit of the Federal service as a whole, however, that for each employee who plans his illnesses so as not to lose sick leave, there are a hundred who guard their health so as not to lose time from their work.

C. Conclusion: In the light of the average rate of usage, 15 days sick leave a year is too liberal. To allow an amount above that actually required by the majority takes the form of a bonus to the very small minority who abuse the use of sick leave. By and large, these few are the very ones least deserving of any reward. Accordingly, consideration should be given to reducing the amount of sick leave to not more than 13 days a year. (One-half day per biweekly pay period.)

At the same time the 90-day limitation on the amount of sick leave that can be accumulated should be removed. When an employee approaches or has reached the 90-day accumulation, the 15 days sick leave theoretically earned by him each year has little or no value. Human nature being what it is, things of little value are treated lightly, and accordingly, the indiscriminate use of sick leave may follow. If on the other hand, there were no limit on the amount of sick leave that an employee could accumulate, there would be more of an inclination to preserve it more carefully as insurance against prolonged illness in the years to come. In the final analysis, if an employee preserves his sick leave for the entire duration of his Federal service, it represents a saving of that much time to the Government and the potential liability is wiped out when

the employee leaves the service. The law should impose a greater obligation on supervision to see that sick leave is used properly. At the same time, supervision should have the right to penalize employees for the abuse of sick leave. Supervision should have the authority to suspend employees for limited periods for flagrant abuse of sick leave.

PART VII. ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS

A. Bookkeeping aspects: Both the annual and sick-leave laws impose a needlessly complex and costly bookkeeping burden on the agencies.

1. Annual leave: The annual-leave law provides that employees shall earn and be credited with annual leave on a calendar-year basis. The Federal-wide payroll procedure is based on 26 biweekly pay periods a year with a twenty-seventh pay period each sixth or seventh year. Accordingly, the 26 biweekly pay periods never correspond precisely with any given calendar year. Therefore, in order to maintain leave accounts in accordance with the law and also so they will be suitable for payroll purposes, it is necessary to make an adjustment in each individual account at the beginning and again at the end of each calendar year. Such adjustments cover 1 to less than 10 days' work (10 days constitute a biweekly pay period), and in terms of leave may amount to a charge or credit of only an hour or so. The total cost of making such adjustments for all employees on the rolls is well in excess of the total value of the leave for the relatively few employees who enter or leave the service during the period involved.

The annual leave law provides, further, that employees shall not have an accumulation in excess of a specified number of days at the end of any calendar year. To comply with this requirement of law, individual leave accounts are brought into balance at the end of each calendar year, instead of at the end of the fiscal year as are the other fiscal accounts of the agency. This conflict in the keeping of accounts is not only costly from an administrative standpoint, but it is one reason why the problem of funds for the payment of terminal leave arises with such frequency.

2. Sick leave: The sick-leave law provides that employees shall earn and be credited with sick leave on a calendar-month basis. The law provides, further, that employees shall not have an accumulation in excess of a specified number of days at the end of any calendar month. To comply with this requirement of law, it is necessary to post and balance the sick-leave portion of each employee account on a calendar-month basis. Accordingly, the handling of sick leave does not coincide with the handling of annual leave, and neither coincides with the handling of the other accounts of an agency.

Conclusion: Credits of both annual and sick leave should be in terms of allowances per biweekly pay period. Maximum accumulations, if any, should be applied either on a biweekly pay-period basis or at the close of the fiscal year.

B. Leave credits: Under existing law when an employee enters on duty or leaves the service, fractional parts of a month in the case of sick leave and fractional parts of incomplete biweekly pay periods in the case of annual leave are considered for the purpose of crediting earned leave or deducting unearned leave. This is a rather complicated procedure and more than a little costly.

C. Conclusion: Periods of less than a complete biweekly pay period should be disregarded for purposes of computing earned leave. The loss to an individual by not counting odd days in computing leave at the time of his entrance on duty and again at the time of his leaving the service is only a

matter of hours and of little consequence. The saving in overhead on a Federal-wide basis is worth capturing.

PART VIII. UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

A. Federal employees generally are not now covered by unemployment insurance.

For this reason, there has been a tendency on the part of many employees to accumulate annual leave as a form of insurance against abrupt separation or long periods of illness. If the limitation on the amount of sick leave that can be accumulated is removed, and Federal employees are accorded

the benefits of some type of unemployment insurance, the two principal reasons for accumulation of annual leave will have been removed.

B. Conclusion: Consideration should be given to covering Federal employees under unemployment insurance.

Comparison of present system¹ of annual leave and a graduated system based on length of service for the 1,258,070 full-time employees for whom length of service was reported²

Years of service	Number of employees	Days leave		Aggregate days leave		Aggregate value		Aggregate difference		Percent reduction	
		Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Days	Value	Days	Value
Less than 5.....	320, 825	26	13	8, 341, 450	4, 170, 725	\$96, 106, 400	\$48, 053, 200	4, 170, 725	\$48, 053, 200	50	50
Over 5 and less than 15.....	770, 349	26	19½	20, 029, 074	15, 021, 805	271, 817, 000	203, 862, 750	5, 007, 269	67, 954, 250	25	25
15 and over.....	166, 896	26	25	4, 339, 296	4, 339, 296	73, 907, 600	73, 907, 600	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	1, 258, 070	-----	-----	32, 709, 820	23, 531, 826	441, 831, 000	325, 823, 550	9, 177, 994	116, 007, 450	28	26

¹ Present system: Present system as used here refers to the Uniform Annual Leave Act of 1936, as amended. Approximately 75 percent of all Federal employees are subject to this act. Major groups under other leave systems are—field employees of the Post Office Department; Foreign Service, Department of State; medical employees, Veterans' Administration; and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

² Employees for whom length of service was reported: Length of service data was obtained on 1,258,070 employees. Employees for whom length of service data was not obtained included 360,700 in the field service of the Post Office Department, 192,100 part-time employees, and 147,000 outside the continental United States. See table 5, p. 23, (committee print), Joint Report of the Bureau of the Budget and the United States Civil Service Commission.

BASIS FOR GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Less than 5-year category: 13 days' annual leave a year for employees with less than 5 years of service compares favorably with leave practices in private industry. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 2 full weeks a year with 3 days additional for incidental use.
2. The over 5- and less than 15-year category: 19½ days' annual leave a year for employees with over 5 and less than 15 years of service follows the more liberal trend in private industry of granting increased leave to employees with more years of service. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 3 full weeks a year with 4½ days additional for incidental use.
3. The 15-year and over category: 26 days' annual leave a year to employees with 15 years or more of service recognizes length of service and the advancing age of the employees. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 4 full weeks a year or a winter and summer vacation of 2 weeks each, plus 6 days' additional for incidental use.

ANALYSIS OF GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Annual savings: The graduated system would produce during the first year of operation a saving of 9,177,994 days of annual leave, with a value of \$116,007,450 for the 1,258,070 employees covered by the survey. This would be a saving of 28 percent in the amount of annual leave and 26 percent in the total dollar value of the leave earned by these employees. On a projected basis to cover an additional 348,300 employees (exclusive of 350,700 employees in the field service of the Post Office Department) in the Federal service at the time of the survey and an additional 500,000 who have been added since that date the total saving would be approximately 18,000,000 days of annual leave with a value of close to \$200,000,000.
2. Increased man-years: This total saving in annual leave is equal to 69,000 man-years. In terms of new employees required by the emergency, it would be necessary to employ 19 persons under the graduated system to obtain the same number of workdays as would result from 20 persons employed under the present leave system. Worked another way the manpower requirements (in production work at least) could be reduced by 5 percent.
3. Emergency and new employees: New employees entering the service either as replacements or as additional staff during the emergency or because of an increase in the Federal service for any other reason would earn during the first 5 years of their employment 13 days less per year under the graduated system than under the present system. During the next 10 years of their employment, the saving would amount to 6½ days per year. After 15 years of service there would be no further saving.
4. Net effect on career employees: A person who enters the service under the present system and is employed for 30 years earns 780 days annual leave. Under the graduated system, such an employee would earn 650 days. This reduction of 130 days is equal to 25 percent. However, fewer than half of all employees who enter the Federal service remain in the service for as long as 10 years, so the total net reduction would be greater than 25 percent.
5. Administrative aspects: The 13-, 19½-, and 26-day allowances are on a graduated basis at the rate of 4, 6, and 8 hours per biweekly pay period, respectively.

Comparison of present system¹ of annual leave and a graduated system based on length of service for the 1,258,070 full-time employees for whom length of service was reported²

Years of service	Number of employees	Days leave		Aggregate days' leave		Aggregate value		Aggregate difference		Percent reduction	
		Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Present system	Graduated system	Days	Value	Days	Value
Less than 5.....	320, 825	26	13	8, 341, 450	4, 170, 725	\$96, 106, 400	\$48, 053, 200	4, 170, 725	\$48, 053, 200	50	50
Over 5 and less than 20.....	854, 933	26	19½	22, 228, 258	16, 671, 193	369, 262, 400	231, 901, 800	5, 557, 065	77, 360, 600	25	25
20 and over.....	82, 312	26	26	2, 140, 112	2, 140, 112	36, 522, 200	36, 522, 200	-----	-----	-----	-----
Total.....	1, 258, 070	-----	-----	32, 709, 820	22, 982, 030	441, 831, 000	316, 477, 200	9, 727, 790	125, 353, 800	30	28

¹ Present system: Present system as used here refers to the Uniform Annual Leave Act of 1936, as amended. Approximately 75 percent of all Federal employees are subject to this act. Major groups under other leave systems are—field employees of the Post Office Department; Foreign Service, Department of State; medical employees, Veterans' Administration; and commissioned officers of the Public Health Service.

² Employees for whom length of service was reported: Length of service data was obtained on 1,258,070 employees. Employees for whom length of service data was not obtained included 360,700 in the field service of the Post Office Department, 192,100 part-time employees and 147,000 outside the continental United States. See table 5, p. 23 (committee print), Joint Report of the Bureau of the Budget and the United States Civil Service Commission.

BASIS FOR GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Less than 5-year category: 13 days' annual leave a year for employees with less than 5 years of service compares favorably with leave practices in private industry. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 2 full weeks a year with 3 days additional for incidental use.
2. The over 5 and less than 20-year category: 19½ days' annual leave a year for employees with over 5 and less than 20 years of service follows the more liberal trend in private industry of granting increased leave to employees with more years of service. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 3 full weeks a year with 4½ days additional for incidental use.
3. The 20-year and over category: 26 days' annual leave a year to employees with 20 years or more of service recognizes length of service and the advancing age of the employee. It allows for 1 sustained vacation of 4 full weeks a year or a winter and summer vacation of 2 weeks each, plus 6 days additional for incidental use.

ANALYSIS OF GRADUATED SYSTEM

1. Annual savings: The graduated system would produce during the first year of operation a saving of 9,727,790 days of annual leave, with a value of \$125,353,800 for the 1,258,070 employees covered by the survey. This would be a saving of 30 percent in the amount of annual leave and 28 percent in the total dollar value of the leave earned by these employees. On a projected basis to cover an additional 348,300 employees (exclusive of 360,700 employees in the field service of the Post Office Department) in the Federal service at the time of the survey and an additional 500,000 who have been added since that date it is estimated that the total saving would approximate 19,000,000 days of annual leave, with a value of over \$200,000,000.
2. Increased man-years: This total saving in annual leave is equal to 73,000 man-years. In terms of new employees required by the emergency, it would be necessary to employ slightly less than 19 persons under the graduated system to obtain the same number of workdays as would result from 20 persons employed under the present system. Worked another way the manpower requirements (in production work at least) could be reduced by more than 5 percent.
3. Emergency and new employees: New employees entering the service either as replacements or as additional staff during the emergency or because of an increase in the Federal service for any other reason would earn during the first 5 years of their employment 13 days less per year under the graduated system than under the present system. During the next 15 years of their employment, the saving would amount to 6½ days per year. After 20 years of service there would be no further saving.
4. Net effect on career employees: A person who enters the service under the present system and is employed for 30 years earns 780 days' annual leave. Under the graduated system, such an employee would earn 617 days. This reduction of 163 days is equal to 30 percent. However, fewer than half of all employees who enter the Federal service remain in the service for as long as 10 years, so the total net reduction would be greater than 30 percent.
5. Administrative aspects: The 13-, 19½-, and 26-day allowances are on a graduated basis at the rate of 4, 6, and 8 hours per biweekly pay period, respectively.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the present amendment would save \$250,000,000 of which is approximately the same sum my original proposal would save. It would be graduated according to length of service, thus conforming more closely to the practice in private enterprise.

I read from a letter to the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], dated June 11, 1951, from Mr. James M. Mitchell of the United States Civil Service Commission:

While the Commission is not making a recommendation at this time to reduce the leave of Federal employees, it is believed that any change in the leave system should contemplate a graduated scale whereby the amount of annual leave granted employees would be related directly to the employees' length of service. In the Commission's opinion, a graduated system would also be more equitable to career employees.

Mr. President, I think the last logical excuse for not taking action has now been removed. We have to fish or cut bait. There has been stalling for over a year on the part of the Civil Service Commission, and there may have been a little bit of delay in the Senate; I am not certain about that. But we now have a chance to act.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield to my genial friend, the very able dialectician from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. On a point of personal privilege, I hope the word means what I think it does.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It means one who is very skilled in argument.

Mr. KERR. I was hoping it had a wholesome meaning, but I wanted to be clear on that point. I thank the Senator.

With reference to my question, does the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois eliminate the liability of the Government in the future to pay the employees to whom the amendment applies for accumulated leave?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator did not follow the very interesting discussion of the Senator from Michigan. The Senator from Michigan pointed out that in the appropriation bill for independent offices, there is a provision that accumulated leave cannot be taken in the future, and that instead an employee must take all the leave granted in a particular year. This amendment prohibits the payment in this year of more than the sums indicated, and the amendment of the section in the independent offices bill prohibits the accumulation of claims in the future, so that the gate is completely locked if the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma was not aware of the fact that the amendment discussed by the Senator from Michigan had become law.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it is well known that it is about to become law.

Mr. KERR. I should like to renew the question and ask the Senator if the adoption of his amendment would eliminate the liability of the Government to the employee whom the Senator's amendment would prevent being paid.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The effect of the two amendments would be just that.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator answer the question with reference to his own amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is not a lawyer, and he is reluctant to commit himself on a legal question.

Mr. KERR. Would the Senator like to be informed with reference to the matter?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Oklahoma a member of the Supreme Court?

Mr. KERR. No; and he does not need to be known that the language of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois would not limit the liability of the Government to the employee, and the Senator from Oklahoma has enough respect for the law to cause him not to vote for a futile and a foolish thing.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG. With regard to the point raised by the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I think the Senator overlooked a vital matter in connection with the independent offices bill. Without suspending the rules, it would accomplish exactly what the Senator from Illinois seeks to accomplish.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays, and yield the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the subject matter which I had intended to discuss has already been covered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. I do not think there is any question that a limitation upon an appropriation bill with regard to the expenditure of money does not change the law, and we would be doing a futile thing by adopting the amendment. There is no question in my mind, and I do not think there should be any question in the mind of anyone else, that if a man who had served his country in the employ of our Government were sick for a longer period than that specified in this limitation on the appropriation, later on another Congress would appropriate the money.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I want to state that it is unfair for us to try at the last moment to change the law by limiting the expenditure of money. The procedure relating to sick leave and annual leave of employees of the Government of the United States has been established after careful study. This proposal is much more important than is any limitation upon annual leave. When we are dealing with the service of an individual, I do not think the Senate should vote for a limitation such as this without giving the employee an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The Government employee does not have to be heard. It is basic law. It is a legal obligation, and, even more, it is a moral obligation.

Mr. McFARLAND. I concede that what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico says is correct, but it might deprive the employee of being paid what was due him at a time when he needed the money for the support of his family

more than at any other period in his life.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That applies to the merits of the case; but the basic consideration is that we should not go through the back door to violate the law.

Mr. McFARLAND. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the law is not correct, let us amend it. The Kefauver committee has been investigating crime, and I say that any time we go around by the back way to avoid the law we are contributing to crime.

Mr. McFARLAND. And we are failing to fulfill our obligations.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am not at all satisfied that the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois reduces the liability of the Government any more than the original amendment proposed by him. But quite aside from that, although I know it is quite within the rules of the Senate, I think it is a great pity that an amendment so important as this, which proposes to change the entire system of leaves, both for vacations and sick leave, should be presented without giving Senators any opportunity whatsoever to study it and know what is in the amendment.

I do not know what is in the amendment, even though it was read. It was hastily read by the clerk. I doubt whether many Senators on the floor know exactly what is proposed to be done by it. And certainly if Senators have listened carefully to the reading of the amendment, and heard it clearly, they have had no opportunity for giving consideration to the effect of the proposed change, a change which will overturn a system which has been in effect in the Government for many years. I say that without passing on the merits of the proposal. But I do not think it is right to submit an amendment, so wide-flung in its implications and in its results, without giving the Members of the Senate an opportunity of knowing what they are considering and are to vote on.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the fact that it is not a simple matter with which we are dealing. It is a matter which goes deeply and profoundly into the hearts and minds of all Government workers. Hearings are given on bills which come to the Senate, in accordance with the custom in the Senate, but by this amendment it is proposed to legislate on the floor without giving the committee a chance to act upon the subject.

What would we be doing thereby? Legal minds of the Senate differ as to just what would be the effect of the amendment. Should we legislate on something about which we are in doubt? The only thing I would ask is that the committee be given time to look into this particular question, and then act upon it as we do on other matters that come before the committee. If that is done, I shall be satisfied to vote on the matter when it is reported to the Senate. Let

Senators amend the bill to suit their individual tastes on the floor of the Senate, but I plead with Senators not to do something hurriedly which they might regret later.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, one of the things I have come to respect most as a Member of the Senate is the work of its committees. It has been my privilege to serve on three of the great committees of the Senate. It has been my privilege to observe them in their work.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator from South Carolina on his remark that legal minds of the Senate differ as to what is in the amendment. Prior to his having made that statement I hesitated to acknowledge that the amendment was not entirely clear to me. I hope I have a legal mind. I hope I have the average mind of a Senator who has had the limited service I have had. But I doubt if more than a few Members of the Senate know as much about everything that every committee of the Senate does as some of the Senators seem to know. There may come a time, Mr. President, when I will feel that I am competent, without a hearing, and without a study, to vote on legislative matters on the floor of the Senate which either have not been heard or have not been acted on by a committee, or which are in the process of being heard or acted on by a committee, but before the committee has had the time or the opportunity or seen fit to bring them to the floor for consideration and action by the Senate.

To me, Mr. President, it is unthinkable that two of the great committees of the Senate should be treated in the manner which the adoption of this amendment would evidence, especially in view of the fact that there is no legal mind on the floor of the Senate, or out of it, that will say that this amendment is anything but futile. It effects no saving to the United States Government. It goes through the motion of saying that employees who are on sick leave beyond a certain period of time shall be denied their pay, if I understand any part of it, but at the same time leaves the Government in the position of being legally indebted to the employee. I do not say that that is an end which should not be attained, Mr. President, but if it is a worthy end, and if it is worthy of our support, it is worthy of being brought in by the front door and not by the back door.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I do not wish unduly to prolong the debate, and it is rare indeed that I have joined with the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND] or the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]; but I wonder how those who serve as members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee feel when they are told by this amendment that they do not have the ability, the honesty, or the integrity to do their job for their country and for the Federal employees. I do not like it at all, and I am sure that other Senators who serve on the committee do not when they see an amendment offered which is conceived in error and urged upon us as a slanderous attack upon the great Senator from South

Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] when he promises that he is going to do his duty, and all the members of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee have promised that they would do their duty respecting this matter.

I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma. I am a country lawyer, and I do not know what the amendment means. I am not one to shoot in the dark.

Mr. President, I say it is about time that we call a halt to all this acting here; that we vote down the amendment, and leave it to the senior Senator from South Carolina and his committee to do what is right in the premises. I am sure we want to do what is necessary. If we adopt an amendment such as this, what is the use of the committee debating the postal rate bill, spending hours of time, day after day, on it? I say it is time to call a halt to such proposals. We should either abandon the committee functions entirely, or go about our work in an orderly way.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I rise for a moment to object to some of the insinuations which have been made here this afternoon as to the purposes, objectives, and intent of the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

The senior Senator from Illinois has made a consistent and determined effort to bring about economy in Government. I have differed with him on many occasions. In fact, I have differed with respect to the majority of the amendments which he has presented to the Senate in an effort to promote the kind of economy he desires. But be that as it may, Mr. President, no Member of this body is more sincere, a finer citizen, or a finer Senator than my friend the senior Senator from Illinois. I have not supported his proposals, but I deeply resent any insinuation as to his purposes, his motives, his convictions, or his ability.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator hear the senior Senator from Illinois intimate or say that we should have a vote on this question and find out about the sincerity of Members of this body?

Mr. HUMPHREY. My only reply to the Senator from Oklahoma is that I believe that if we had less wrangling here, and less insinuation as to motives of Senators, we would accomplish much more in attaining the purposes of legislation.

I know the senior Senator from Illinois as a friend, as does the Senator from Oklahoma. He knows that he is an able fighter, a great debater, with a keen mind and a sense of deep sincerity. All I am saying is that I propose that the Senate vote on this amendment on the basis of its merits as we see them, without in any way impugning the motives of any Senator who proposes an amendment on the floor of the Senate.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Then the Senator from Minnesota recognizes the fact, does he not, that a Senator may vote against this amendment and still be just as sincere as its author when he votes for it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say to the Senator from Oklahoma that Senators who vote against this amendment will do so simply because of what the chairman of the Senate Post Office and Civil Service Committee has said, that he has the right, as chairman of the committee, to have legislative measures referred to his committee. I think that is a rather sound position. But be that as it may, I still say that no Member of this body has given more careful examination or detailed analysis to the budget than has the Senator from Illinois. As a friend and colleague, I rise to support his honorable intentions and purposes.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, suppose Senators forget about hurt sensibilities for the moment, and let us get down to a vote on this amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have said nothing with respect to several of the amendments. I have been compelled to vote against two of them because it seemed to me that the savings were insignificant. I am profoundly favorable to real economy, but I cannot escape the conclusion that we do our cause an injustice and weaken it before the American people, by insisting upon amendments which really accomplish very little when all is said and done, assuming the utmost good faith in offering them and the highest purpose in presenting them to the Senate.

There are appropriation bills coming up in connection with which there could be substantial cuts. If the Senate is then willing really to effect economies, we can get somewhere with a program which will at least lead us back toward a sound financial and fiscal system. There must be cuts in the appropriations ahead of us, some of which will be represented by the highest brass in the country, but I shall not hesitate to vote against them, because I am confident that they are asking for more money than they can wisely or intelligently spend.

There is to be a big appropriation asked, totaling almost \$10,000,000,000, for foreign aid and assistance. The acid test of whether we mean to bring about any economy in Government will come upon such big appropriations, as a result of which large amounts of money are being spent. In the judgment of sound, thinking men and women in this country, we shall accomplish little except to discredit a good cause by cutting off a little here, proposing a little cut there, and making other minor reductions.

With all respect to the Chair—and I have every respect for the Chair—I am satisfied in my own mind that this amendment is clearly and unmistakably subject to a point of order. It is not a question of liming an appropriation. It is not a question of denying an appropriation for something which the Congress has itself authorized by law. This amendment proposes payment of leave pay on a basis vitally, definitely, and radically different from anything written in the law. It is a change of law. It is a change of law for this year, but it is a change of law. This amendment does propose legislation on an appropriation bill.

It would be competent for the Congress to say that there shall be no appropriation made to pay those in the departments who take leave of absence this year, or to say that we will pay for only 50 percent of it. But that is not what this amendment does. This amendment provides that those who have served for 5 years shall receive so much; that those who have served a longer time shall receive more; and that those who have served for the maximum period stated in the amendment shall receive the full amount fixed by the law.

That is a change of basic law in an appropriation act. It can be nothing else. For that reason alone I would vote against it, because I do not believe in general legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I hope there may be some legislation presented by the committee having jurisdiction of this subject. I refer to the committee presided over by the distinguished junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. I have every faith that that committee will bring forth some legislative proposals which will enable us to vote an honest conviction, and not vote against a strong and abiding conviction when we are presented with legislation upon an appropriation bill.

I realize the condition in which our country finds itself. I know cuts must be made in appropriations. It will not suffice to raise ten, fifteen, or twenty billion dollars more in Federal revenues through taxation. Regardless of what is raised by taxation, there will still be left a potential deficit at the end of 1952, unless we also reduce expenditures by at least \$6,000,000,000. We ought to bring to bear the very best common sense possible in this most important juncture of our national and international affairs.

In my opinion, we are proceeding upon a general theory which is suicidal. It is the theory of allocating all of our raw materials and vital materials to the Military Establishment, at a time when the country is in the grasp of a military economy. What does it mean? It means the crucifixion of many small businesses. It means the crucifixion of many manufacturers of farm implements and tools. It means the crucifixion of many taxpayers. It means the reduction of the Federal income itself, because of the crucifixion of the taxpayers out of whose pockets the money must come.

All the restrictions which the Committee on Banking and Currency and my good friend from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] can put upon prices of articles and upon wages and credit will not furnish the answer, if there is not a sensible allocation made as between military and civilian demands.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that, as he knows, he and I have discussed the situation on many occasions, particularly recently. I can only see the same picture that he sees. If to the military are allocated all the steel, all the copper, and all the aluminum, and private business firms throughout the country must curtail their production, there will be less and less money

raised by taxation. Two and two make four.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia has referred to farm-machinery production being cut back, to allocations for railroad cars, and to big factories in Michigan having to materially cut back production. I am in thorough agreement with what he has said. I only hope that we can arrive at some solution before the Defense Production Act expires on June 30. I am of the opinion that we must have some sort of controls. I believe we have a good act. I will say further that the administration of the act has been pretty poor. To my way of thinking it has been pretty bad. The fault lies with its administration.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I am certain that he is correct. There must be controls, but controls alone are not the answer. There must be higher taxes, but higher taxes alone are not the answer. There must be cuts in the expenditures by the Government if we are to put our feet on the road that leads back to sound fiscal and financial policies. Not only is what the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has said true, to wit, that the allocations to which he referred would cut into our revenues, but would add an irrepensible force to inflation.

Mr. MAYBANK. Unemployment, too. Mr. GEORGE. And unemployment. That would be the case regardless of controls. Shall we not approach the problem correctly?

I have every respect and confidence in the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I believe he means to bring about real economy in our spending, and with that I am in fullest sympathy. However, I cannot help repeating that it is a great mistake to fire a 14-inch shell at a little sparrow, even though it is desirable to kill the sparrow and even though a small amount of economy is effected thereby. I believe we would bring discredit upon our efforts in the great job ahead, and the great job ahead clearly indicates that we can effect certain economies in the ordinary supply bills.

However, if there is to be a \$6,000,000,000 saving in our spending, it must be made somewhere along the line. The Military Establishment will have to make savings. It is absolutely vital to the salvation of this Nation. As yet we are not in a world war. As yet we are fighting a minor war in a limited area of the world. If we are to fight that war as it should be fought, and if we are to make real cuts in appropriations as we should make them, we must make certain that our civilian economy will not be allowed to die, at a time when it is so vital and necessary to have the money coming into the Treasury, and when it is so vitally necessary to conserve manpower and prevent inflation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we make a mistake. I rose for the purpose of saying that we should not override one of the standing committees of this body. It is a committee which has been trying to meet its fullest obligation. We should not override the committee by a species of legislation on an appropriation bill. I recognize

the soundness of limiting appropriations. However, when a limitation also becomes legislation, it goes beyond the rules that should be followed in this body.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois on page 41, line 24.

Mr. DOUGLAS and other Senators requested the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senators from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON and Mr. McMAHON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONNOR], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference now being held in Geneva, Switzerland. If present and voting, the Senator from Montana would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is absent on official business, and, if present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] who is absent by leave of the Senate, is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] who is necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from Missouri would vote "yea" and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. CAIN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 14, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—14

E Brewster	J Jenner	T Taft
B Butler, Nebr.	L Long	W Wherry
B Byrd	N Nixon	W Wiley
D Douglas	S Smith, Maine	W William
F Ferguson	S Smith, N. J.	

NAYS—56

A Aiken	C Carlson	E Ellender
A Anderson	C Chavez	G George
B Bennett	C Clements	G Green
B Bridges	D Dworshak	H Hayden
B Butler, Md.	E Eston	H Hendrickson

Hennings	Langer	O'Mahoney
Hill	Lehman	Pastore
Hoey	Magnuson	Russell
Holland	Maybank	Schoeppel
Humphrey	McCarran	Smith, N. C.
Hunt	McCarthy	Sparkman
Ives	McClellan	Stennis
Johnson, Colo.	McFarland	Thye
Johnson, Tex.	McKellar	Tobey
Johnston, S. C.	Monroney	Underwood
Kefauver	Moody	Watkins
Kerr	Morse	Welker
Kilgore	Mundt	Young
Knowland	Neely	

NOT VOTING—28

Benton	Eastland	Martin
Bricker	Flanders	McMahon
Cain	Frear	Millikin
Capehart	Fulbright	Murray
Case	Gillette	O'Connor
Connally	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Cordon	Kem	Saltznstall
Dirksen	Lodge	Smathers
Duff	Malone	

So Mr. DOUGLAS' amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

If there is 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 question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I move that the bill (H. R. 3709) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions promptly to report it to the Senate in the form in which it was recommitted, except with such changes as may be necessary to make the sums available for expenditure by or for the National Cancer Institute, mental health activities, tuberculosis services, venereal disease services, dental health activities, National Heart Institute, National Institutes of Health, Office of Vocational Rehabilitation, and the Children's Bureau identical with the respective amounts proposed for these agencies or services in the bill when it was first reported by the committee to the Senate.

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

Mr. HOEY. Vote!

(Mr. NEELY addressed the Senate. After having spoken, for a few minutes, without completing his speech, he yielded to Mr. McFARLAND to propose a unanimous-consent agreement. Mr. NEELY's speech will be published after it has been concluded.)

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

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield for a question.

Mr. McFARLAND. I was not trying to get the distinguished Senator to stop his speech. I heartily agree that the things being referred to by the Senator should be done, but I do not know that it would do any good to recommit the bill. What I wanted to ask the Senator was

whether he expected to finish his speech tonight or whether he wanted to continue tomorrow and have the bill go over.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, it is late, and Senators are weary. Therefore, I am quite willing to postpone the making of my remarks until tomorrow.

Mr. McFARLAND. Does the Senator expect that he will take quite a little time?

Mr. NEELY. About an hour.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. NEELY. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, of course, I want the Senator from West Virginia to have all the time he actually wants and needs, in order that he may properly and adequately make his views known to the Senate. But we have been considering the pending bill for 5 or 6 days. I know the time has not been taken by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Only one minute so far.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct. Could we not come to some agreement? The only thing which is in order now is the motion of the Senator from West Virginia. The bill has been read the third time, so nothing else can come up except his motion, or a motion of a similar nature. Can we agree, if we go over until tomorrow, to have a vote on the bill at some particular time?

Mr. NEELY. If I may have an hour in which to discuss my motion to recommit, I shall be glad to agree to a final vote at any time that will be satisfactory to the other Members of the Senate.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request, with the understanding that he shall not thereby lose the floor?

Mr. NEELY. I gladly yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia shall have the floor for the purpose of discussing his motion—for a period of how long?

Mr. NEELY. Not more than an hour.

Mr. McFARLAND. For a period of not more than 1 hour, and that the opponents of the motion shall have not more than 1 hour.

Mr. CHAVEZ. May we not have a definite hour fixed at which to vote?

Mr. McFARLAND. In order to obtain an agreement fixing a time for the vote, it would be necessary, under the rules, to have a quorum call.

Mr. CHAVEZ. What about 2 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall restate my unanimous-consent request. I do not want to have a quorum call. I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate convenes tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from West Virginia shall have the floor, and that he be limited to 1 hour in which to discuss his motion to recommit; that the time of the opposition to the motion be limited to 30 minutes, and that the time on the bill be limited—

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like 15 minutes.

Mr. McFARLAND. That the time on the bill be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side.

Mr. WHERRY. That would bring us to 2 o'clock, would it not?

Mr. McFARLAND. That would be approximately 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. It would mean that there would be a vote at 2 o'clock. Then, if agreeable, will the Senator include a provision that we have a vote on the bill at 2 o'clock?

Mr. CHAVEZ. We must first vote on the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. WHERRY. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And then, after that, we must vote on the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Make it "not later than 2 o'clock."

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in order to accommodate everyone, I ask unanimous consent that the rule requiring a quorum call in this connection be waived, and that the time for voting upon the pending motion and for voting upon the bill be fixed at not later than 2 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. O'MAHONEY rose.

Mr. McFARLAND. And that the time of the Senator from West Virginia be limited to an hour. He will have the floor.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I call attention to the fact that as the unanimous-consent request is made, it would seem to limit the debate in favor of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia to the Senator from West Virginia alone. It is possible that some other Senator may wish to take the floor in support of the motion of the Senator from West Virginia, and I think the unanimous-consent request should be so stated as to permit such additional remarks. The Senator from West Virginia has requested an hour, so that the unanimous-consent request now allots him the 1 hour, and then allots 1 hour to the opposition, in any way that it may be divided.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me ask the Senator from West Virginia whether he would be willing to limit the time for speaking in favor of the motion to 1 hour, the time to be controlled by himself?

Mr. NEELY. No. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator will not insist on that limitation.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I am going to restate my first unanimous consent request, and, if it is objected to, then we simply shall have no unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a moment?

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I may say there are probably three or four of us who have been very active in regard to some of the items contained in the bill, and who, because of the legislative and parliamentary situation have not had a chance to express ourselves fully. I remember in my own case that I merely had to say, "I associate myself with the remarks of the Senators from New York

and Alabama." We might desire to say something on the Neely motion. It would not take long in my own case, nor, I am sure, in the case of most of us—possibly 5 or 10 minutes. So I am hoping that the unanimous-consent request will include the 1 hour which the Senator from West Virginia wants, and also provide a certain leeway in regard to time in order that we may be heard.

Mr. McFARLAND. How much time does the Senator want?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I said, in my own case, I would need but 5 or 6 minutes, possibly, but, in any event, not more than 10.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I would be willing to let Senators who intend to speak along the lines suggested by the Senator from West Virginia have 30 minutes of my 1 hour.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow the Senator from West Virginia be given the floor, and that he have 1 hour in which to discuss his motion to recommit; that thereafter the time to discuss the motion to recommit be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to the proponents, 15 minutes to the opponents, and that the time for discussion of the bill be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to the proponents and 15 minutes to the opponents.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserving the right to object, if the Senator from Arizona would make a unanimous-consent request that the Senate vote on this question at, say, 2 or 2:15 o'clock tomorrow, I am sure that would provide ample time for all Senators, and there would be no limitation of an hour on the Senator from West Virginia, or a limitation of 3 minutes on some other Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, there is opposition. If we cannot get a unanimous-consent agreement we shall recess, if that is all right with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, if the Senator would modify his unanimous consent request by substituting 30 minutes for 15 minutes, he would thereby assure the adoption of his proposal.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall make one more attempt, and only one. I am not going to stay here all night propounding requests.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes tomorrow the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], have the floor and that the time to discuss his motion be limited to one hour; that the time thereafter be limited to 1 hour, 30 minutes to a side; that the time for discussing the bill itself be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, the time to be divided between the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the distinguished minority leader, with reference to the bill, and that the time on the motion be divided between the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], unless he favors the motion, in which event, the time shall be divided between the Senator from West Virginia and the distinguished minority leader.

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

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Will the Senator accept an amendment to the request, that I may obtain the floor immediately after the vote upon the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. I cannot add that to the request. I do not believe in farming out the time. I am trying to put a limitation on the debate, which will give the Senator from Wisconsin an opportunity to obtain the floor.

Mr. McCARTHY. Reserving the right to object, I am afraid that immediately after the vote on the bill tomorrow there may be a motion to recess or to adjourn over the week end.

Mr. McFARLAND. I can give the Senator assurance that I am not going to try to keep him from speaking by making a motion to recess immediately after the vote.

Mr. McCARTHY. In other words, I have the Senator's assurance that there will be no such motion made immediately after the vote on the bill.

Mr. McFARLAND. I have no intention of recessing the Senate at that time of day.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the bill has been before the Senate for at least a week. I have been in attendance most of the time. I have listened time and time again to the senior Senator from New Mexico, the chairman of the subcommittee, plead for expediting action. He has pointed out that the bill involves very vital features. It is unfortunate if any Member of this body has found it impossible to be present during the debate, but if we are to take a week or more for the consideration of each of the 12 regular appropriation bills, I wonder when Congress will complete work on the schedule which has been presented to it, even as late as this morning, by the President of the United States. We have received a great deal of criticism about sabotaging the work of this body. I wonder that the senior Senator from New Mexico is willing to accept this kind of an agreement, when he has been pleading for the past week for expediting action on this bill.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I have not yielded, and I refuse to yield for a speech.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator does not have to listen to it.

Mr. NEELY. I said nothing about listening to it. I said I refused to yield for a speech.

Mr. McFARLAND. May we have a decision on the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the unanimous-consent request, and I hope the Senator from Arizona will not object to it. The amendment is that immediately after the vote is taken on the bill, the junior Senator from Wisconsin may obtain the floor.

Mr. McFARLAND. No, Mr. President, I cannot accept that amendment. That is farming out the time of the Senate. I gave the Senator assurance that I would try to let him have an oppor-

tunity to speak, but I am not going to as far as his amendment would go. If the Senator objects, I will withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as stated by the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, if there is anything unreasonable about my request, I withdraw it.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not like to agree to any Senator having the floor at any particular time. The only exception I ever made in that regard was when a Senator was speaking and other Senators wanted the Senate to recess. If the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin were speaking at this time, I would extend him the same courtesy I would extend to the Senator from West Virginia. What he requests is not according to the rules, and I am trying to treat all Senators alike.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a few weeks ago the Senator made a similar agreement with the senior Senator from Texas.

Mr. McFARLAND. I did not make it.

Mr. LANGER. It is a simple request, and I think it should be granted.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I do not want to take the time of the Senate unnecessarily. If I object, I shall be able to get the floor before the vote on the measure. I think, in view of the fact that I am serving notice that I wish to speak tomorrow, and no other Senator has indicated a desire to speak it is a very reasonable amendment to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. McFARLAND. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I have no objection to his obtaining the floor. It is a matter of principle. If I have to agree to such a thing it will be with reluctance.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request as stated? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, now that the agreement has been entered into, will the Chair state what it is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will ask the Senator from Arizona to restate the agreement.

Mr. McFARLAND. First, Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin for not objecting.

The agreement is that tomorrow, when the Senate reconvenes, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] will have the floor and his time to speak on his motion to recommit the bill will be limited to 1 hour; that thereafter the time on the motion to recommit will be limited to 1 hour, to be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] to have charge for the time of the proponents and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to have charge of the time for the opponents, unless he favors the motion, in which event the distinguished Minority Leader shall have charge of the time for the opponents; that thereafter

the debate on the bill will be 30 minutes, 15 minute to a side, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] to have charge of the time for the proponents and the distinguished minority leader to have charge of the time for the opponents.

Mr. WHERRY. I am more interested in the time element than in anything else, and if I correctly understand the interpretation of the agreement, 1 hour will be given the Senator from West Virginia, and an additional hour will be allowed to discuss the motion to recommit if Senators care to take that much time.

Mr. McFARLAND. The total time on the motion to recommit may be up to 2 hours, with the Senator from West Virginia occupying the first hour. Thereafter the additional hour, if used, will be divided between the proponents and the opponents, and the vote on the motion to recommit will take place not later than 2 o'clock.

Mr. WHERRY. Thereafter, 30 minutes will be used, 15 minutes to a side, for what purpose?

Mr. McFARLAND. For discussion of the bill itself.

Mr. WHERRY. So that 2 hours will be available on the motion, and if they are completely used they would take until 2 o'clock. Thereafter there will be 30 minutes for discussion of the bill, 15 minutes to a side. That would make the maximum time for a vote on the bill about 2:30. Am I correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. Are we to vote on the motion at 2 o'clock?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not necessarily. There may be a quorum call.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, because, in the confusion, it was impossible to tell at times what was to happen at a certain hour. Several Senators are very much interested in when the vote will be taken.

Mr. President, there is one thing I should like to say. The junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] told me he had a very important engagement tomorrow. It means a great deal to him and to his family. He would very much have liked to have the Senate continue tonight and finish action on the bill. I urged that he withhold his objection. I told him, however, to use his own judgment. I personally want to thank him for not objecting to the arrangement which has been entered into. It means much to him to be at the place appointed for him to be tomorrow, but, in view of the fact that he is such an industrious and loyal Senator, I suppose he will forego keeping his engagement, and remain in the Senate. If there is one Senator to whom the orchid should be given for going the last mile to help the majority leader and other Senators interested in the bill, it is the junior Senator from New Jersey, who did not object to the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for the statement he has made.

I did have an engagement for tomorrow. I was to be given an honorary degree by my alma mater, Temple University. I was on the point of objecting to the unanimous-consent request. I have seen Senators on this floor from time to time at moments similar to this object for purely selfish reasons. So long as I am a Member of the Senate I shall refuse to be selfish about the business of the Senate. I want to cooperate with the majority leader fully at all times. But I think that other Senators from now on should be a little less selfish about their own notions as to how the business of the Senate should be conducted at times.

I wish that statement to appear in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey for the attitude he has taken. I will say to him that I do not think any objection he would make to anything would be made for selfish purposes. I express my appreciation to him.

Now that the Senator from Wisconsin has returned, I wish to express my thanks to him also for not objecting to the unanimous-consent request. I will add the Senator from Idaho to the list, and to make it unanimous I will add all other Senators.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in case I should be absent tomorrow I now want the RECORD to show very plainly that I am opposed to the motion to recommit; that I am wholeheartedly for the bill as it is now before the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. UNDERWOOD 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.)

TREATY OF FRIENDSHIP, COMMERCE, AND NAVIGATION WITH COLOMBIA—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate Executive M, Eighty-second Congress, first session, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Washington on April 26, 1951. Without objection, the injunction of secrecy is removed from the treaty, and the treaty, together with the President's message, will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the President's message will be printed in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection.

The President's message is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I

transmit herewith a treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation between the United States of America and the Republic of Colombia, together with a protocol relating thereto, signed at Washington on April 26, 1951.

I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the treaty

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 13, 1951.

(Enclosures: (1) Report of the Secretary of State; (2) treaty of friendship, commerce, and navigation, with protocol, signed at Washington, April 26, 1951.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Wayne Coy, of Indiana, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1951 (reappointment); and

Franklin J. Miller, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the United States Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Robert I. Millonzi, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters on the calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

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

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 14, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of May 17), 1951:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provision of section 4 (a) of Public Law 492, Seventy-ninth Congress, approved August 2, 1946, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia nominate the following-named person for appointment as

a member of the District of Columbia Re-development Land Agency:

Francis F. Healy, for the unexpired term of Edward A. Dent, resigned, which term expires from and after March 3, 1954.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for appointment of the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

Ralph E. Knutti

To be dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Edward G. Hampp

To be senior assistant dental surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of captain), effective date of acceptance

Carl J. Witkop, Jr.

To be assistant dental surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

James L. Field Anderson F. Williams
Weldon G. Blodgett Homer F. Stephens
Judson C. Hickey

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Harvey F. Ludwig
John H. Ludwig

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

William T. Nakaoka Basil P. Ketcham
Edward L. Schmidt, Jr. Mario C. Baratta

To be sanitarian (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Ralph L. Perkins

To be physical therapist (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Eleanor G. Loomis

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), title II of the act of August 5, 1947 (Public Law 365, 80th Cong.), and Public Law 36, Eightieth Congress, subject to physical qualification:

To be major

John F. Connole, MC, O411291.

To be captains

Maxwell D. Bentley, MC, O1755218.
William E. Froemming, MC, O466146.
Robert M. Hall, MC, O435168.
David J. LaFla, MC, O991900.
John F. Miley, MC.
Thomas G. Nelson, MC, O1736570.
Robert L. Obourn, MC, O418579.
James J. O'Donnell, MC, O1718228.
Clinton A. Piper, MC.
Spencer B. Reid, MC, O1785579.
Richard A. Rink, MC, O439904.
James E. Shipley, MC, O1756937.

To be first lieutenants

Robert I. Cochran, DC, O982922.
Harold S. Elliott, DC, O736495.
John E. Flick, JAGC, O989982.
Darwin F. Fuller, Jr., DC, O2086818.
Bueford G. Herbert, JAGC, O988322.
Frank Herbert, Jr., MSC, O1997090.
Malcolm L. McCain, JAGC, O989983.
Ernest B. Mingledorff, DC, O987405.
Harvey W. Phelps, MC, O975695.
Harry B. Philp, DC, O1185116.
James J. Proyor, Jr., DC, O981268.
Donald L. Shaneyfelt, JAGC, O549484.

Robert B. Steiner, DC, O2064995.
Hugh T. Verano, JAGC, O1118672.
John W. Whelan, JAGC, O990930.
Charles A. Zuccardi, JAGC, O529346.

To be second lieutenants

Robert M. Altman, MSC, O1035590.
Eugene M. Baker III, MSC, O2202215.
Regina I. Bernat, WMSC, M2869.
Helen V. Bowman, WMSC, M2879.
Mary L. Bradley, ANC, N792818.
Dorothy L. Breland, WMSC, R2559.
Donald F. Callaghan, MSC, O2050427.
Nicholas V. Carroll, MSC, O1543562.
Donna M. Christensen, ANC, N804529.
Thomas A. Costello, MSC, O2051091.
John J. Wilson, MSC, A966631.
Richard W. Whitney, MSC, O969127.
Irene E. Waters, WMSC, M2874.
Vernon J. Tipton, MSC, O688615.
Dona R. Timme, WMSC, J100090.
Keith O. Shafer, MSC, O2047141.
Judith A. Ploss, WMSC, M2881.
Carlyle Nibley, Jr., MSC, O980241.
Mary V. Morris, WMSC, J100093.
Fergus T. Monahan, MSC, O980086.
Don F. McElrath, WMSC, M2872.
Glenn W. Madere, Jr., MSC, O1847102.
Emily R. Lynch, ANC, N804301.
Roger W. Little, MSC, O1305947.
Lorraine T. Leroux, WMSC, M2771.
Dorothy M. Kinnison, WMSC, M2868.
Harriett F. Kingan, ANC, N792553.
Nellie A. Henson, WMSC, M2878.
Margaret G. Gibson, ANC, N792726.
Martha E. Frazee, WMSC, R2562.
Louis H. Foubare, MSC, O1533553.
Nancy E. Dority, WMSC, M2877.
Francis G. Dickinson, MSC, O1691744.
Mary I. Couch, ANC, N804307.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Medical Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to completion of internship, and subject to physical qualification:

To be captains

Anthony A. Borski, O1534682.
Robert I. Bosman, O444500.
Roscoe C. Brand, Jr., O1169034.
Gerald J. Breakstone, O426719.
Otis E. Bridgeford, O1534685.
John E. Buess, O926884.
Thornton R. Cleek, O1041526.
James A. Ewart, O407299.
Hugh S. Geiger, Jr., O747124.
Robert W. Green, O388326.
Thomas M. Hall, O410302.
Joe S. Haney, Jr., O441260.
William O. Kearse, O366344.
Dean McCandless, O414073.
Gordon B. Miller, O451619.
Walter S. Mizell, O513096.
John de La S. Morris, O379852.
Harold W. Mueller, O2209654.
Robert C. Nelson, O363141.
Matthew D. Parrish, O789498.
Arnold M. Reeve, O1296257.
William L. Richardson, O925652.
Thomas D. Sellers, O678337.
James A. Shafer, O671116.
Leo H. Silverman, O325022.
John W. Stark, O460951.
Walter E. Switzer, O854290.
James C. Syner, O566870.
Lewis A. Van Osdel, O420535.
Lloyd T. Wright, O2209672.
Harry H. Youngs, Jr., O1535118.

To be first lieutenants

Henry J. Anlage, O2209658.
Lyal D. Asay, O2201311.
John L. Babb, O2203687.
Timothy G. Barila, O1119740.
William A. Boyson, O422793.
Paul W. Brown, O2209674.
George A. Buckmaster, O516472.
Roswell S. Cheves, Jr., O986904.
Richard L. Colley, O2203696.
Claude W. Della, O2201312.

John W. Eckstein, Jr., O2209662.
Thomas S. Edwards, O2207482.
Harold L. Engel, O986943.
Luther G. Fortson, Jr., O2205611.
Charles M. A. Frankhouser, Jr., O986903.
Vernon L. Fromang, O987809.
Arthur E. Grant, O986910.
Norman L. Grant, O986905.
Rufus R. Lambright, O986853.
Francis H. Hughes, Jr., O986439.
Robert E. Kellenberger, O2209661.
Mortimer V. Kleinmann, Jr., O2203555.
Per H. Langsjoen, O2209666.
Verne G. LaTourrette, Jr., O2201307.
Janus C. Lindner, O722443.
Hugh P. McGrade, O646478.
Edwin A. Meeks, O2205614.
Joseph F. Metzger, O986440.
Carlyle C. Moore, O541618.
Richard H. Mott, Jr., O874899.
Jack R. Muth, O718193.
Fred J. Nahil, O2201310.
William H. Nichols, Jr., O2205609.
James K. Pope, O398863.
Joseph S. Robinette, O1291523.
Karr Shannon, Jr., O986856.
James L. Sheehy, O986907.
John R. Simmons, O986852.
William G. Simonis, O2203689.
Martin E. Smith, O492774.
Noel G. Smith, O446889.
Daniel E. Stalker, O2205612.
Michael H. Sulak, O2207483.
Jonathan B. Torrance, O2210592.
Albert L. Upton, O1545216.
William R. Vineyard, O2209657.
Frederick E. Vultee, Jr., O2201315.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to physical qualification:

To be first lieutenants

William H. Applegate, O404404.
Donald J. Arthur, O1331132.
Donald E. Atkinson, O1338042.
John W. Barber, O1294415.
Thomas A. Beasley, O553357.
Douglas L. Behenna, O1060710.
Robert D. Bentley, O1300268.
Joseph R. Boisvert, O1043322.
James R. Booth, O551815.
Robert C. Brannock, O1001737.
William W. Brush, O1332779.
Frederick Brouillette, O544227.
Frank W. Burpo, O1703017.
Francis J. Bush, O1170302.
Milton F. Callero, O1341745.
Wilford B. Carlisle, O1054202.
James H. Carroll, Jr., O1335116.
James W. Chesnut, O1332350.
William J. Clement, O1950310.
Earl F. Cole, O1291235.
Edward H. Cope, O1316015.
Walter R. Curtis, O445991.
Harry N. Custis, O2016182.
Lawrence M. Dellinger, O1844651.
Faris T. Farwell, O1341217.
Robert L. Freeland, O514566.
Douglass E. Glinski, O1293759.
John F. Grogan, O1059797.
Eric L. Hahn, O470087.
Ransom S. Haig, O1335414.
Albert E. Haines, Jr., O1323832.
Richard H. Harrington, O1119925.
Harry H. Hiestand, O1284704.
Herbert R. Hill, O945849.
Charles M. Honour, Jr., O1341099.
Douglas A. Huff, O1338826.
John A. Jarrett, O1172088.
Gilbert C. Jones, O1306518.
Thomas H. Jones, O1340186.
Stephen T. Kean, O882349.
Chris Kohler, O1179925.
Joseph F. Landers, O441971.
Albert G. Lane, O1281639.
Garland A. Ludy, O558783.
Otis C. Lynn, O1340671.

Everett I. Madden, O959275.
 James A. Manning, O420713.
 Louis J. Maricle, O1587776.
 James K. McCaslin, O487459.
 Gordon H. McGough, O1284179.
 Janis C. McMillan, O1102855.
 Robert N. McNitt, O1633401.
 Robert B. McPherson, O1055385.
 Walter H. Miescher, Jr., O442995.
 Kurtz J. Miller, O1115355.
 John W. Nocita, O1054346.
 George Norrie, Jr., O432408.
 Kenneth M. Oliver, O1119847.
 Wilbern L. Packett, O510523.
 William B. Oxford, O1120635.
 Gerald L. Overstreet, O1001428.
 John L. Olow III, O2033211.
 John F. Parker, O1058095.
 Edwin Paulmann, O1644653.
 George B. Powell, O1181734.
 Wallace W. Price, O1598202.
 Vern W. Reaugh, O1287585.
 Harold B. Roberts, O1287945.
 Raphael J. Schach, O553394.
 Leo W. Shoemaker, O1310159.
 Eb W. Smith, Jr., O425467.
 Carlton E. Stevens, Jr., O1322182.
 Charles R. Teagle, O555866.
 Clark W. Trainer, O1284056.
 Fred A. Tupper, O1178018.
 James M. Vall, O1342021.
 John W. Vessey, Jr., O1688442.
 William L. Walker, O1535430.
 Ace L. Waters, Jr., O441977.
 Ralph J. Webb, O1543559.
 James W. West, O1019794.
 William E. Wyrick, O1334393.

To be second lieutenants

Milan J. Andrichik, O956249.
 William J. Ankley, O949605.
 Ralph C. Antrim, Jr., O2203053.
 Thomas M. Armour, O1332912.
 John R. Armstrong, O955925.
 Horace E. Bailey, O2204439.
 John E. Baker, O2200312.
 Robert M. Baker, O2210042.
 George E. Balcom III, O550178.
 Kenneth K. Barclay, O963270.
 Ernest F. Barrett, O776858.
 Richard M. Beavers, O967704.
 Jack M. Becker, O2204565.
 Cleo O. Bell, O168495.
 William G. Benedict, O2208601.
 Cheney L. Bertholf, Jr., O1341620.
 Courtland Bivens, Jr., O1057360.
 Louis B. Bjostad, Jr., O2208208.
 Gorham L. Black, Jr., O1293189.
 Frederick H. Borland, O962893.
 John H. Boyes, O1552640.
 Wilburn H. Boze, O531545.
 Howard H. Braunstein, O1546619.
 Charles R. Breed, O1058927.
 John L. Buckley, O513497.
 Robert J. Burns, O746854.
 Aubrey A. Butler, O2206237.
 Jerome J. Butler, Jr., O2200421.
 Robert T. Carty, O1688485.
 Eual A. Cathey, O2210322.
 Albert Catullo, O2200522.
 LeRoy W. Caulder, O1310067.
 Bryce T. Cayce, O1688489.
 Warren M. Clark, O1183039.
 Clinton R. Clinedinst, O693848.
 Richard A. Cole, O467174.
 John J. Collins, Jr., O969437.
 Charles E. Connaway, O2206043.
 John R. Connelly, O2210119.
 Richard J. Connolly, O2200007.
 Paul A. Cooper, O2019139.
 Edward F. Corcoran, O2203066.
 Rennie M. Cory, O1686831.
 Arthur L. Cox, O558280.
 Theodore H. Crane, O2209599.
 Elnomac V. Creel, O531685.
 Steven S. Crowell, O2203023.
 Ralph T. Dabbs, O1337401.
 William C. Davidson, O1020548.
 John W. Dearing, O2203404.
 Richard S. Demory, O1014675.
 John F. Dennington, O518107.
 Harold E. Dill, O2204159.
 Roland M. Dixon, Jr., O2206044.
 Hanz K. Druener, O1323673.
 Harris A. Dubois, O2204332.
 John M. Dunn, O945655.
 Joseph B. Duray, O535484.
 Jimmie W. Edmunds, O2210331.
 Thomas G. Ellis, Jr., O1685679.
 Robert W. Engberg, O1685660.
 Donald B. Erickson, O2019570.
 Ludwig Faistenhammer, Jr., O955649.
 Byron A. Falk, Jr., O2203057.
 Paul T. Fancher, O1686791.
 Alex E. Fisher, O949575.
 Merlin W. Foerster, O1589833.
 John J. Foley, Jr., O2200604.
 Charles R. Ford, O965122.
 Donald C. Fox, O2206115.
 Charles S. Francis, O973262.
 Robert A. Garber, O971457.
 Francis Garner, O2017684.
 Hilton E. Geohagan, O2204187.
 John P. Geraci, O2200402.
 James P. Godsey, O955695.
 John R. Goodrich, O832385.
 Robert S. Gordanier, O1647912.
 Homer E. Gray, Jr., O961281.
 Thomas W. Greer, O2202338.
 Thurman M. Groves, O1324462.
 Raymond M. Gunn, O2204020.
 Clinton B. Haden, O2202323.
 Eugene Hammonds, O2202815.
 Donald E. Harkins, O2210388.
 Donald L. Harouff, O2208119.
 James L. Harrington, O1012392.
 Richard Harwood, O1285418.
 Ray R. Hayden, O1048397.
 Carl J. Helton, O1290419.
 Haven H. Hemmings, O2202218.
 Jack B. Hilburn, O2206428.
 Robert W. Hill, O2206403.
 John J. Hoch, O968770.
 Billy D. Hughes, O2208576.
 Donald W. Hyler, O971025.
 Wilfred E. Irish, O1331840.
 Jasper P. Jacques, O2210459.
 Thaddeus S. Janasiewicz, O959623.
 Robert M. Japinga, O2208618.
 Thomas F. Jenkins, O1326848.
 Wilbur G. Jenkins, Jr., O960372.
 Maurice A. Johnson, Jr., O967356.
 Harry T. Jones, O948272.
 Hugh H. Jones, Jr., O2203054.
 Roy M. Jones, O2206012.
 Julius J. Jorgensen, Jr., O2208101.
 Marlon D. Joyce, O2208738.
 Thomas G. Kearney, O2203047.
 Edward L. King, O2204303.
 Richard L. Kirk, O934361.
 Rudolf W. Kogan, O1018889.
 Jim H. Kolster, O971010.
 Reginald W. Koseki, O958603.
 Richard J. Koziel, O2208580.
 Karl J. Krstullich, O964388.
 Robert A. Kuntze, O1686742.
 Charles M. Landis, O2063438.
 Gale L. Larson, O2208220.
 Lyle R. Larson, O2208235.
 Willard Latham, O2206079.
 Thomas M. Lawler, Jr., O2206175.
 Douglas M. Lawrence, O967089.
 Robert E. Lazzell, O508253.
 Addison L. Lewis, O2210296.
 Samuel A. Lewis, O2210466.
 William T. Liffton, O2018897.
 George S. Long, O1171257.
 Henry L. Luers, O2204194.
 William D. Lynch, O1030173.
 Worthington M. Mahone, O1329140.
 William M. Major, Jr., O556631.
 David D. Maul, O2208449.
 Wayne A. Mautz, O2202341.
 James J. McAloon, O1821745.
 Robert S. McClenaghan, Jr., O957207.
 Bruce McClure, O783201.
 Edgar B. McGee, O968331.
 James F. McIntosh, O1101111.
 Terence J. McLarnon, O1185983.
 John L. McNeal, O926672.
 Samuel J. Merrill, O2204100.
 Harold J. Meyer, O1330841.
 Charles F. Miller, O1648764.
 George P. Mooney, O953545.
 John H. Moore, O1328062.

Robert H. Moore, O2204137.
 Ernest H. Morgan, O1328283.
 Richard H. Morley, O960643.
 Charles E. Morris, O1686820.
 John H. Morrison, Jr., O962229.
 Robert M. Mullens, O964632.
 Meredith E. Murphy, O2204318.
 William R. Needham, O2209227.
 Billy B. Nicholas, O2206007.
 Charles J. Norris, O966920.
 Eugene V. Norris, O970091.
 Doyt P. Norton, O2208325.
 Dunbar S. Norton, O958045.
 Joel B. Nyquist, Jr., O1685721.
 John W. Nystrom, O970527.
 Richard E. O'Brien, O1688471.
 Louie W. Odum, O2204134.
 Hubert W. Ogilvy, O539864.
 Joseph L. Parker, O2903046.
 Thomas R. Parsons, O964660.
 Thomas J. Patton, O2206105.
 Paul A. Pencola, O962422.
 Anthony B. Petruzzi, O1685668.
 Dallas M. Peyton, Jr., O958029.
 Eugene Phillips, Jr., O1101165.
 Bernard J. Ploshay, O421380.
 Homer W. Poerner, O2206383.
 Donald F. Polden, O1822053.
 William S. Price, O1341999.
 Harold G. Quackenbush, O452011.
 Antone P. Rapsa, O2204087.
 James C. Redford, O467746.
 Neil Reese, O527101.
 Foy Rice, O1284022.
 Robert L. Richters, O437731.
 Alfred C. Ring, O2203307.
 Bernard L. Robinson, O1120339.
 Elton C. Rodgers, O1045903.
 Lynn O. Rohde, O974794.
 Albert A. Rosner, O2019371.
 Rudolph L. Ruzich, O2202332.
 Joseph F. Schall, O1017309.
 Daniel F. Schungel, O965030.
 James P. Scilley, Jr., O2110025.
 Thomas M. Scovill, O1315221.
 Le Roy V. Sedlacek, O963271.
 Homer L. Sellers, Jr., O1052562.
 Harry G. Sherblom, O1044095.
 Raymond E. Siegrist, O1550052.
 Daniel G. Smaw III, O964178.
 Richard D. Smith, O2202325.
 Robert L. Smith, O1336138.
 Carl B. Smyth, O2206208.
 Clyde H. Stagner, O2208568.
 Allen A. Stiteler, O556958.
 Fred Stivers, Jr., O1651201.
 Jack G. Stoltenberg, O1686619.
 James L. Stone, O945739.
 Robert H. Strohman, O2208318.
 Leon H. Sugg, Jr., O2204325.
 Anthony S. Suglia, O1341921.
 Chester F. Sunski, O466461.
 Quentin S. Swain, Jr., O968049.
 Joseph F. Teel, O2206203.
 Ward A. Thompson, O947294.
 Wilbert A. Tieman, O70532.
 Everett G. Topham, O1951611.
 Frank W. Trinkle, O1686750.
 Jack D. Van Meter, O2208457.
 Allan E. Van Patten, O956816.
 Jesse F. Van Sant, O973335.
 James B. Vaughn, O2210289.
 Fort A. Verser, Jr., O928228.
 James D. Vittioe, O555563.
 William F. Warlick, Jr., O2204340.
 Norbert J. Wayne, O1318357.
 Robert J. Weber, O1341928.
 Marli L. Welch, O1685579.
 Charles G. Wellborn, Jr., O1330497.
 Donald E. Wendling, O2208728.
 Albert L. Wenz, O2200515.
 William A. Whichard, O1340242.
 Charles J. White, O671818.
 Thomas D. Whitlock, O963907.
 Lyndall C. Williamson, O2208474.
 Lloyd G. Wright, O957500.
 Willard S. Wyatt, O2210214.
 Edward P. Wyruchowski, Jr., O1112538.
 Arthur W. Youngren, O956531.
 Anthony Zagarella, O518856.
 Marion B. Zollcoffer, O2204322.
 Frederick R. Zurth, O749806.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Guy E. Peterson, O2205385.
George P. Short, Jr., O2204293.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, effective June 15, 1951, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 506 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947 (Public Law 381, 80th Cong.), subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, and subject to physical qualification:

Carl A. Anderson	John A. Johnson, Jr.
John S. Bailey	Joe T. Knox
John D. Barringer	Raymond F. Korber
William W. Beutler	Mark E. Kuhn
Nelson R. Bickley, Jr.	Erady L. Kunkle
Odie E. Biggs	Matthew B. Lamer, Jr.
Robert M. Blasingame	James D. Langley
Phillip H. Bradley	David L. Lichtenstein
Allan A. Buergin,	Lon U. Lutz,
O2208985	O2206631
Robert B. Burke,	Frederick M. Martin,
O1913006	Jr.
Donald Q. Carmichael	Moyle D. Mitzner
Eugene C. Cochran	John H. Mjoseth
Thomas J. Compton	Donald O. Nachtigal
Daniel L. Criswell	James W. Neff
Lowell M. Davis	Eugene H. Nettles
Michele N. Diana	Robert E. Otterson
William H. Dobson	Charles E. Parker
John E. Donaldson	John E. Parks
Elmore G. Dufour	Gilbert W. Pavlovsky
Loren D. Eaton	John J. Peppard, Jr.
Robert W. Elliott,	Joe H. Pitts
O2209905	Wendell L. Prince
John H. Englund	Bobby D. Reusser
Donn C. Fendler	Keith L. Riley
Leo J. Fitzgerald	Bill D. Saxon
Harry L. Forsyth	John H. Schnibben,
Walter A. Fred	Jr., O2205065
Richard S. Fridy	William K. Short
Donald W. Freeman,	Thaddeus R. Sobieski
O2002672	Herbert J. Stevenson
James E. Gay	Joseph T. Tambe
Richard E. Gillis	Robert C. Taylor
Robert E. Grant	Roger K. Thompson,
Robert L. Greer,	Jr.
O2202853	George G. Tucker, Jr.
Donald R. Hannum	Ray E. Tucker,
Floyd J. Helmick	O966941
Jim C. Hicks	Donald S. Wean, Jr.
Arthur R. Hill, Jr.	Sylvester L. Wilhelm
Stephen H. Janovick,	Milton B. Witty, Jr.
Jr.	Melvin G. Wode
Louis N. Jensen	Webb S. Wraith

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 13 (legislative day of May 11), 1951:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Robert I. Millonzi, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 5, 1952.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Kathleen F. Davis, Ragland.

CONNECTICUT

Lambert W. Harrison, Gullford.

ILLINOIS

Robert P. Cash, Columbia.

Carl R. Hesler, Moline.

Lela M. Campbell, Oakland.

Harry Leonard Thompson, Robinson.

Winsor Brayfield, Sesser.
Herschel B. Wilkinson, West Frankfort.

IOWA

Norman W. Bell, Boyden.
Charles N. Schinker, Norway.
Ray H. Fink, Tripoli.

KANSAS

Alice M. Campbell, Blue Mound.
Gerald E. Harville, Coats.
John W. Robinson, Coffeyville.
George C. Piersall, Hardtner.

KENTUCKY

Vivion L. Sutton, Mackville.

MAINE

Charles E. Frey, South Bristol.

MARYLAND

Irving F. Bodenbug, Fullerton.
Vernon L. Sullivan, Garrison.
Louis A. Stoddard, Joppa.
Morris G. Richardson, Owings Mills.

MISSISSIPPI

Sammy Jo Crawford, Mount Olive.
Charles E. Ross, Weir.

MONTANA

Donald Cameron, Jr., Gardiner.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Maurice E. Kierstead, North Hampton.

NEW YORK

John J. Bohuslaw, Bay Shore.
Hannah M. Curtis, Morrisville.
Anthony M. Cipriano, Mount Morris.

NORTH DAKOTA

Joseph K. Salwek, Crystal.

OREGON

Albert L. Burch, Powers.
Floyd V. Cavanaugh, Seaside.

PENNSYLVANIA

Isaac R. Welker, Irvona.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Francis G. Jurens, Buffalo Gap.

VIRGINIA

Cletus E. Bomgardner, Bumpass.
Alice H. Fields, Castlewood.
Frederick T. Given, Chase City.

WEST VIRGINIA

Carl T. Lee, Ethel.
Edward W. Fitzgerald, Glen Dale.
Lillie M. Wintz, Lorado.

WYOMING

Alexander M. Gilchrist, Kemmerer.
Ira B. Dickinson, Lance Creek.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 13, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal spirit of the living God, in this moment of prayer, may our own spirits be inspired and reassured with a new faith and a new hope as we face tasks which are far beyond all finite wisdom and strength.

We are bringing unto Thee the many needs and problems of our country and the world which we know cannot be solved by legislation alone or by any form of political action, nor by might or power, but only by Thy spirit.

We pray that Thy servants, who are entrusted with the responsibilities of leadership in the affairs of government,

may be richly endowed with some special revelation of Thy divine guidance.

May all that we are seeking to do to build a nobler civilization reflect and validate the reality of Thy spirit within our hearts. May the day speedily come when the presence and influence of Thy spirit, in the life of man, shall conquer all feelings of hatred and unworthy attitudes.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Woodruff, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 33. Concurrent resolution authorizing certain changes in the enrollment of Senate bill 435, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (H. R. 1424) entitled "An act for the relief of T. L. Morrow."

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file reports on 13 bills voted out of the committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

DRAFT OUR BOYS, BUT DO NOT TOUCH THE PRICE OF BEEF

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, it appears that there are separate standards of sacrifice in this emergency—one for men, another for cattle.

We expect our men from 18 to 26 to answer to their names when they are called up for military service to defend us all against the threats of Communist aggression. That is one standard. But when we try to set a fair price in this country for meat—135 percent of parity—we are told that the beef will all go into the black market. Beef is sacred.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, this charge is made with a straight face by people who supposedly believe in democracy. They say the order is bad, therefore it should be criminally violated.

Imagine what we would say in this Chamber if people who set themselves up as spokesmen for our young men would threaten us that unless we repealed the Draft Act they would tell all of the young men to refuse to serve in the Armed Forces.