

By Mr. BRAY:

H. R. 5542. A bill for the relief of Anthony S. Jarana; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUCKLEY:

H. R. 5543. A bill for the relief of Regina Hochsztain (also known as Regina Tenenbaum) and Chaim Hochsztain; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAWSON of Utah:

H. R. 5544. A bill for the relief of Jacob Frain Zubli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOLLINGER:

H. R. 5545. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lycurgos E. Papadakis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOYLE:

H. R. 5546. A bill for the relief of Hildegard Helena Stern; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALEY:

H. R. 5547. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Thamena Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELLER (by request):

H. R. 5548. A bill for the relief of Samuel Kaufman, Mrs. Pepa Kaufman, and Meyer Kaufman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5549. A bill for the relief of Ervin Eckstein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILBURN:

H. R. 5550. A bill for the relief of Simone Gilliland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 5551. A bill for the relief of Raul Conde, Esperanza J. Conde, and Araceli Conde; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H. R. 5552. A bill for the relief of John Hatgegeorge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILSON of Texas:

H. R. 5553. A bill for the relief of Dr. Lu Jen-lung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5554. A bill for the relief of Zaza A. Brallanti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5555. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Costas Melachrinos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1953

(*Legislative day of Thursday, May 28, 1953*)

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

Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast led us out of bondage with a vision of man's righteousness, Thou who hast taught us that we are faithful children of a just God only when we labor for liberty and justice for all, guide us in our deliberations so that we shall clear the path that leads upward, the way that builds new strength and new hope for the children of men.

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a covenant with Thy law, quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we will be the living witnesses of that covenant in our lives; a covenant that will inspire freemen toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise and the dangers of a new age.

We pray in the hope of our fathers that we shall preserve the freedoms our fathers have won, and raise a standard for the wise and the honest freemen of our day; so that through our labors a just peace shall be to him who is far and to him who is near, and the time shall soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 3, 1953, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1026. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and widows of officers and employees of such Service; and

H. R. 5069. An act to prohibit the introduction or movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. KERR was excused from attendance on the session of the Senate today.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. TAFT, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the District of Columbia and subcommittees thereof were authorized to meet today during the session of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, six nominations are on the Executive Calendar. So far as I am aware, there is no objection to the confirmation of these nominations, and I should like to have them disposed of now. If the minority leader has any objection, I shall be glad to postpone the request for their confirmation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator from Ohio refer to the new reports?

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I know of no objection.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the Senate proceed to the consideration of nominations under the heading "New Reports."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As in executive session, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar under the heading "New Reports."

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel C. Waugh, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

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

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

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

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold Shantz, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

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

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

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

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James W. Dorsey, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Georgia, vice J. Ellis Mundy;

Leonard G. Hagner, of Delaware, to be United States attorney for the district of Delaware, vice William Marvel;

Frank O. Evans, of Georgia, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Georgia, vice John P. Cowart;

Frank D. McSherry, of Oklahoma, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma;

Lester Shields Parsons, Jr., of Virginia, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia, vice A. Carter Whitehead;

Hartwell Davis, of Alabama, to be United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama, vice Edward Burns Parker;

James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be United States attorney for the western district of North Carolina, vice Thomas A. Uzzell, Jr.; and

Leonard Page Moore, of New York, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of New York, vice Frank J. Parker.

REPORT ON NOMINATION OF DALLAS S. TOWNSEND TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on the Judiciary, it gives me great pleasure to report favorably from that committee the nomination of Dallas S. Townsend, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received as in executive session, and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

REPORT ON NOMINATION OF CLINTON G. RICHARDS TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR DISTRICT OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as in executive session, on behalf of and by courtesy of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. LANGER], I report favorably from that committee the nomination of Clinton G. Richards, of South Dakota, to be United States attorney for the district of South Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received as in executive session, and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

REPORT ON NOMINATION OF WENDELL A. MILES TO BE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FOR WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, as in executive session, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. LANGER], I report favorably from that committee the nomination of Wendell A. Miles, of Michigan, to be United States attorney for the western district of Michigan.

I hope that the Senate will take favorable action on the nomination as early as possible. I am sure Mr. Miles will make a very distinguished United States attorney.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received as in executive session, and the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators may be authorized to transact business which

would be in order during the morning hour, speeches not to exceed 2 minutes as is the practice.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT OF MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce, for the period January 1 through March 31, 1953 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

LAWS ENACTED BY MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN AND ST. CROIX, V. I.

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, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

STATEHOOD FOR HAWAII

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, at the request of the Governor of Hawaii, a copy of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii, favoring the enactment of legislation granting statehood to Hawaii (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS BY FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that administration, for the quarter ended March 31, 1953; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ATTENDANCE OF CERTAIN PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL AT ACCREDITED GRADUATE SCHOOLS FOR RESEARCH

A letter from the Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 472, 81st Congress, approved April 11, 1950, entitled "An act to promote the national defense and to contribute to more effective aeronautical research by authorizing professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics to attend accredited graduate schools for research and study" (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AUDIT REPORT ON CORPORATIONS SUPERVISED BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION AND AGRICULTURAL MARKETING REVOLVING FUND (ADMINISTERED BY FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION) (H. Doc. No. 165)

A letter from the Comptroller General, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on corporations supervised by Farm Credit Administration and Agricultural Marketing Revolving Fund (administered by Farm Credit Administration), for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance;

"House Concurrent Resolution 10

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal taxes on the transportation of persons and property as each affects inter-island transportation in Hawaii and transportation between Hawaii and the mainland United States

"Whereas the United States now levies a tax of 15 percent of the amount paid for the transportation of persons, and a similar tax of 3 percent on the amount paid for the transportation of property between the Territory and the mainland United States, and between the several islands of the Territory of Hawaii; and

"Whereas these taxes were imposed as wartime excises to discourage unnecessary transportation of persons and property, which reason is no longer sufficient to justify continuing their levy; and

"Whereas due to the geographic makeup of the Territory virtually all interisland shipments of food and other goods as well as transportation of persons must be accomplished by commercial means and are therefore subject to the payment of these taxes, a condition not true on the mainland with regard to either intrastate or interstate transportation; and

"Whereas these taxes materially increase the cost of transportation of persons and property both from the mainland, to the Territory and within the Territory, thus directly contributing to the high cost of living in the Territory and working great hardship on the people of the Territory who must pay inflated prices for food and other necessities because of these taxes; and

"Whereas the cost to the carriers of collecting these taxes substantially increases the cost of transportation, which cost is ultimately paid by the users of such transportation facilities and results, therefore, in an additional and unnecessary charge upon the public; and

"Whereas these taxes put Hawaii in a very unfavorable position in its competition with Europe, South and Central America, the Caribbean area and other southern trade areas for tourist business, which is Hawaii's third-ranking industry and is rapidly increasing in importance, as well as in Hawaii's bid for a place in the import-export business of the world, inasmuch as transportation to and from the aforesaid mentioned areas are not subject to these taxes; and

"Whereas these taxes definitely discourage passenger travel and shipping activities via commercial means at a time when transportation systems generally are hard-pressed financially, which is particularly detrimental to the low-income groups in the Territory who cannot afford the resultant higher travel costs in the Territory; and

"Whereas the 26th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii also requested the Congress of the United States to repeal said taxes: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 27th Legislature of the Territory (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to repeal the Federal tax on the transportation of persons and the tax on the transportation of property as each applies to travel and shipping within the Territory of Hawaii and as each applies to travel and shipping between the mainland United States and the Territory of Hawaii; and be it further

"Resolved, That duly certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii."

A resolution adopted by the Southern Baptist Convention, at Houston, Tex., relating

to selective service legislation for vocational lay religious workers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN—RESOLUTION OF EXECUTIVE BOARD, DIVISION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST OF AMERICA

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have received today a resolution adopted by the executive board of the division of foreign missions, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, on the humanitarian issue of wheat for Pakistan.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

DIVISION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF
THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., May 28, 1953.

The Honorable ALEXANDER WILEY,
Foreign Relations Committee,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WILEY: The executive board of the division of foreign missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, representing approximately 48 Protestant foreign mission boards and agencies, with an annual overseas expenditure of almost \$40 million, in session in New York City on May 27, 1953, took the following action:

"Whereas it is known that many thousands of people in Pakistan are now suffering from hunger and the effects of malnutrition; and

"Whereas it is understood that on April 3, 1953, the Government of Pakistan requested aid from the Government of the United States for the purpose of securing from this country emergency supplies of surplus wheat: Be it

"Resolved, That the executive board of the division of foreign missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America in session May 27, 1953, record its full support of the request made by the Government of Pakistan and urge officers of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America to present to the appropriate bodies in the United States Government an urgent appeal for favorable action upon this request upon terms mutually agreeable to the two Governments."

The division of foreign missions is deeply appreciative of your interest and concern in meeting Pakistan's dire need of food.

This letter has also been sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles.

Please accept our sincere good wishes in the carrying out of the important responsibilities committed to you.

Respectfully yours,

LUTHER A. GOTWALD,
Executive Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF NORTH IDAHO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, PRIEST LAKE, IDAHO

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, two resolutions adopted by the North Idaho Chamber of Com-

merce, on May 22, 1953, at its spring meeting at Priest Lake, Idaho, relating to imports of foreign metals, and the location of mining claims on public lands.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH IDAHO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ON MAY 22, 1953, AT ITS SPRING MEETING AT PRIEST LAKE, IDAHO

"Whereas the lead-zinc mining industry is of major importance to the economy of North Idaho, and particularly important to communities, businesses, and employees who depend on this industry for their livelihood; and

"Whereas uncontrolled and unrestricted imports of foreign lead and zinc have caused a critical condition in this industry with attendant curtailment of operations, reduced employment, and unfavorable local business conditions; and

"Whereas the record is clear that foreign producers deny the United States consumer lead and zinc when this country needs them and in turn dumps metal in unprecedented amounts when it is not needed; and

"Whereas the industry, its employees and their unions, civic associations, and affected communities have petitioned the United States Congress to correct the abuse of crippling the domestic lead-zinc industry and cease favoring foreign producers, many of whom pay wages unthinkable in America: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the North Idaho Chamber of Commerce joins these communities, organizations, employees, and companies in their case before the Congress and urges that proper legislation be adopted to enable this country to maintain a healthy domestic lead-zinc industry and at the same time continue imports of foreign metal only in an amount actually needed for consumption. We particularly favor the sliding scale import stabilization tax as proposed in H. R. 4294 (Simpson bill) and in the bills introduced by Senator DWORSHAK (S. 1562) and Representative DAWSON (H. R. 4320)."

To the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"RESOLUTION OF THE NORTH IDAHO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, MAY 22, 1953

"Whereas present mining laws of the United States permit the location of mining claims on public lands giving the locator control of all surface rights, including limited use of the timber therein; and

"Whereas it is alleged that unscrupulous individuals have fraudulently taken advantage of these permissive laws to locate mining claims for the purpose other than mining; and

"Whereas present violators of the mining laws are not being prosecuted by governmental agencies charged with that duty; and

"Whereas these abuses are detrimental to both the legitimate mining locator, the mining industry and the general public; and

"Whereas there is now pending before Congress Senate bill 1830 and H. R. 4983, identical bills providing additions to present mining laws which will afford more adequate protection against abuses and fraudulent location of mining claims: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That—

"1. We are opposed to any basic change in the present mining laws which would deprive the locator or patentee of surface rights necessary for mining development of the claim.

"2. We recommend existing rights to prospect for, locate, develop, and ultimately obtain title in fee to mineral lands in the public domain be preserved and safeguarded, and that present mining laws be fully en-

forced by present existing agencies charged with that responsibility.

"3. We recommend that Senate bill 1830 (DWORSHAK) and H. R. 4983 (D'Ewart), now before Congress, be enacted into law."

USE OF INSCRIPTION "IN GOD WE TRUST" ON POSTAGE STAMPS—RESOLUTION OF WINONA (MINN.) AERIE 1243, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the Fraternal Order of Eagles, Aerie No. 1243, of Winona, Minn., relating to the use of the inscription "In God we trust" on postage stamps.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF WINONA AERIE, No. 1243, FRATERNAL ORDER OF EAGLES, WINONA, MINN.

Whereas our postage stamps do not bear the inscription "In God we trust," while our coinage does; and

Whereas our postage stamps reach into millions of foreign homes and offices in which our coinage is never seen; and

Whereas postage stamps, on which the inscription, "In God we trust" will be printed, can be effective means of describing the fundamentally spiritual nature of this country to all nations of the world; and

Whereas in our current struggle against the irreligious philosophy of communism, it is important that we pray to God for help; and

Whereas many foreign nations do not consider Americans basically religious; and

Whereas such postage stamps would serve to remind our own people of their debt to God; and

Whereas Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD, United States Senator, from Montana, who is a member of the Fraternal Order of Eagles, has introduced a bill into the Senate instructing the Post Office Department to place the inscription "In God we trust" on all of our postage stamps: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the officers and members of Winona Aerie, No. 1243, of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in Winona, Minn., hereby express their endorsement of this legislation with the recommendation that it be given speedy attention and prompt passage; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers and members of Winona Aerie, No. 1243, FOE invite other civic, religious, patriotic, and fraternal organizations to join with them in the support of this project.

A. M. MADEGAN,
Worthy President.
HENRY C. EHMCKE,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 57. A bill for the relief of Blanca Ibarra and Dolores Ibarra (Rept. No. 321);

S. 154. A bill for the relief of George Pantelas (Rept. No. 322);

S. 312. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Orsi (Rept. No. 323);

S. 316. A bill for the relief of Vera Lazares and Cristo Lazares (Rept. No. 324);

S. 454. A bill for the relief of Connie Joyce May (Ayako Goto) (Rept. No. 325);

S. 625. A bill for the relief of Michael Raymond Juenger (Joji Hatano) and Vivian Nakajima Nobuko (Rept. No. 326);

S. 1431. A bill for the relief of Holly Layne Roberts (Mariko Uchiyama) (Rept. No. 327);

S. 1607. A bill for the relief of Joseph David Eller (Joseph Ushimura) (Rept. No. 328);

H. R. 663. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alexander Fiala (Rept. No. 329);

H. R. 888. A bill for the relief of Francesca Servello (Rept. No. 330);

H. R. 1103. A bill for the relief of Maria Buffoni and Emma Botta (Rept. No. 331);

H. R. 1187. A bill for the relief of Mother Anna DiGiorgi (Rept. No. 332);

H. R. 1200. A bill for the relief of Ronald J. Palmer and Ronda Kay Palmer (Rept. No. 333);

H. R. 1517. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Predrag Mitrovich (Rept. No. 334);

H. R. 1752. A bill for the relief of William Robert DeGraff (Rept. No. 335);

H. R. 1887. A bill for the relief of Marjorie Goon (Goon Mei Chee) (Rept. No. 336);

H. R. 1888. A bill for the relief of Gary Matthew Stevens (Kazuo Omiya) (Rept. No. 337);

H. R. 1952. A bill for the relief of Cecile Lorraine Vincent and Michael Calvin Vincent (Rept. No. 338);

H. R. 2176. A bill for the relief of Norma Jean Whitten (Rept. No. 339);

H. R. 3244. A bill for the relief of Patricia Ann Dutches (Rept. No. 340);

H. R. 3358. A bill for the relief of Erna Meyer Grafton (Rept. No. 341);

H. R. 3678. A bill for the relief of George Prokofieff de Seversky and Isabelle Prokofieff de Seversky (Rept. No. 342);

H. R. 3724. A bill for the relief of Anthony Lynn Nels (Rept. No. 343); and

H. R. 3758. A bill for the relief of Stavrua Perutsea (Rept. No. 344).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment:

S. 196. A bill for the relief of Alejandro de la Cruz Hernandez (Rept. No. 345);

S. 470. A bill for the relief of Julia Ann Smith (Rept. No. 346);

S. 505. A bill for the relief of Rev. John T. MacMullen (Rept. No. 347);

S. 591. A bill for the relief of Samuel V. Goekjian (Rept. No. 348);

S. 669. A bill for the relief of Helene Olga Iwasenko (Rept. No. 349);

S. 781. A bill for the relief of Dr. Jacob Griffel (Rept. No. 350);

S. 801. A bill for the relief of Eugenio S. Roiles (Rept. No. 351);

S. 1105. A bill to incorporate the National Safety Council (Rept. No. 352); and

H. R. 1482. A bill for the relief of Hilda-gard Schoenauer (Rept. No. 353).

By Mr. LANGER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments:

S. 257. A bill for the relief of Rosette Sorge Savorgnan (Rept. No. 354).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H. R. 1832. A bill to provide for the suspension of the imposition or execution of sentence in certain cases in the municipal court for the District of Columbia and in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 355);

H. R. 3796. A bill relating to the incorporation of the Columbus University of Washington, D. C. (Rept. No. 356);

H. R. 4484. A bill to amend section 365 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of laws for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended, to increase the maximum sum allowable by the court out of assets of a decedent's estate for funeral expenses (Rept. No. 357);

H. R. 4485. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to publication of partnerships (Rept. No. 358);

H. R. 4486. A bill to amend the law of the District of Columbia relating to forcible entry and detainer (Rept. No. 359);

H. R. 4487. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as further amended by an act of April 19, 1920 (title 20, ch. 1, sec. 116, D. C. Code, 1951), relating to continuing decedent's business (Rept. No. 360); and

H. R. 4550. A bill to amend the Code of Laws of the District of Columbia in respect to the recording, in the Office of the Recorder of Deeds, of bills of sale, mortgages, deeds of trust, and conditional sales of personal property (Rept. No. 361).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H. R. 3425. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to appoint a member of the Metropolitan Police Department or a member of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia as Director of the District Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1951 (Rept. No. 362).

By Mr. BARRETT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1004. A bill to amend section 86, Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, as amended (Rept. No. 363); and

S. 1946. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 364).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 755. A bill to provide for the treatment of users of narcotics in the District of Columbia; with amendments (Rept. No. 365).

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1839. A bill to amend section 32 of the Fire and Casualty Act so as to provide that an agent or solicitor may secure a license to solicit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia under that act without taking the prescribed examination, if he is licensed under the Life Insurance Act (Rept. No. 366);

S. 2032. A bill to modernize the charter of Washington Gas Light Co., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 367); and

H. R. 3087. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to permit certain improvements to two business properties situated in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 368).

By Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1691. A bill to authorize Potomac Electric Power Co. to construct, maintain, and operate in the District of Columbia, and to cross Kenilworth Avenue NE, in said District, with certain railroad tracks and related facilities, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 369).

AID TO KOREA WEEK

Mr. BUTLER of Maryland. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) requesting and authorizing the President of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as "Aid to Korea Week" and I submit a report (No. 319) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have discussed with the acting minority leader the matter of considering the joint resolution which was just unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. I have also discussed it with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the action I am about to propose meets with their full approval.

Because Aid to Korea Week will be next week, and it is the intention of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate, when it concludes its business today, recess until Monday, obviously if any action is to be taken on the joint resolution it will have to be taken at this time.

The joint resolution is not on the calendar. I request that the clerk read the joint resolution, including the preamble.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the joint resolution as requested by the Senator from California.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as "Aid to Korea Week."

Whereas the people of the United States feel a strong bond of friendship toward the people of the Republic of Korea in our common fight in defense of freedom; and

Whereas Korean women, children, aged, and maimed have been subject to the ravages of war for almost 3 years; and

Whereas the facilities of the Government of the Republic of Korea and the magnanimous aid of private relief agencies have not to date been nearly adequate for the monumental task of rehabilitation of the millions of injured, destitute, and homeless Koreans; and

Whereas the American military forces in Korea have been so moved by the suffering of the civilians there that they have contributed millions of dollars of their own money to help these stricken people; and

Whereas recent reports estimate there are 9 million dislocated persons, 100,000 orphans, 300,000 war widows, and 15,000 amputees in desperate need in that land which has borne such sacrifice to retain its freedom and independence and to resist Communist aggression; and

Whereas the practice of assistance through private relief agencies is in the best American tradition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is requested and authorized to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as "Aid to Korea Week": And be it further

Resolved, That the President shall by this proclamation call upon the American people, by their observance of this week, to demonstrate their friendship and affection for the distressed people of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report an original concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens, and I submit a report (No. 320) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received, and the concurrent resolution will be placed on the calendar.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 33) was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress favors the suspension of deportation in the case of each alien hereinafter named, in which case the Attorney General has suspended deportation for more than 6 months:

XXXXXX, Adame-Valenzuela, Jose.

XXXXXX, Agoropoulos, Demetrios or James.

XXXXXX, Alexandra, Nicholas Michael De.

XXXXXX, Altadonna, Maria (nee Galati).

XXXXXX, Altamura, Francesco or Frank.

XXXXXX, Ammirato, Teresa Vincenza.

XXXXXX, Anderson, Hjoje, or George Anderson.

XXXXXX, Antonio, Bernardino.

XXXXXX, Antonio, Felix San.

XXXXXX, Apollonio, Luciano Antonio.

XXXXXX, Armendariz, Esteban, or Este-
ban Armendariz-Burclaga.

XXXXXX, Arredondo, Atilano.

XXXXXX, Arredondo, Antonia Cardiel De.

XXXXXX, Ary, Amin Neto.

XXXXXX, Athineos, Nicholas, or Nicolaos Athineos or Nicolas Athineos or Nicolaos Athinaios.

XXXXXX, Baer, Hilda Syralia, formerly Hilda Syralja Carlson or Ellen Carlson (nee Hilda Syralia Wahlstrom).

XXXXXX, Ballon, Carmelo Ricardo.

XXXXXX, Barba-Garcia, Domingo.

XXXXXX, Barreras, Maria Ramirez de, or Maria Ramirez-Garcia.

XXXXXX, Bartelamia, Francesco.

XXXXXX, Batchelor, Lillian Violet (nee Wallis).

XXXXXX, Battaglia, Frank or Francesco.

XXXXXX, Beadle-Esparza, Henry.

XXXXXX, Bicecci, Primo.

XXXXXX, Biebner, Barbara Anna.

XXXXXX, Blackman, Clothilda Eudora or Brewster or Clothilda Blackman.

XXXXXX, Boiko, Fred.

XXXXXX, Bonilla, Ana Elena Rangel-Vargas (nee Ana Elena Rangel-Vargas).

XXXXXX, Boulos, Hamid Michel alias Michel Boulos Macary or Hamid Antoon Boulos.

XXXXXX, Borjas-Chaire, David.

XXXXXX, Brettler, Isaac.

XXXXXX, Brown, Lester Earl.

XXXXXX, Burresci, Lucia.

XXXXXX, Calen, Reynold Sandfried, alias Reynold Sandfried Kalen or Reynold Sandfried Peterson.

XXXXXX, Calomeris, Muriel Hewitt (nee Smith).

XXXXXX, Campbell, Clarence E. B.

XXXXXX, Candelas-Valadez, Jose Rosario.

XXXXXX, Carbone, Mario Vincenzo.

XXXXXX, Cardenas, Elvia Rose or Elvia Rose Cardenas Tweedy.

XXXXXX, Cardenas-Soria, Andres.

XXXXXX, Casale, Umberto Di or Umberta De Casale or Albert Casale.

XXXXXX, Casare, Antonio alias Di Cesare.

XXXXXX, Castillo, Edward or Edwardo Castillo or Eduardo Alvarado or Edward Casillo Alvarado or Enrique Alvarado-Munoz.

XXXXXX, Ceniceros, Guadalupe Vasquez or Antonia Resendez Mendoza or Antonia Resendez.

XXXXXX, Ceniceros, Andres Reyes.

XXXXXX, Cerundolo, Giovanni Nicola.

XXXXXX, Chang, Mao Sheng.

XXXXXX, Chao, Che Shen, alias Paul C. S. Chao.

XXXXXX, Char, Wong Tick, alias Thomas C. Wong.

XXXXXX, Chao, Ming-Chang.

XXXXXX, Chao, Li Chiah Huang.

XXXXXX, Che, Jung Kwong, alias Jung Daw.

XXXXXX, Cheng, Alfonso Chao-Fong.

XXXXXX, Cheng, Wen-Yu.

XXXXXX, Cheng, Helen Kuomei Huang De.

XXXXXX, Cheng, Chung.

XXXXXX, Cheng, Yu Bei Wang.

XXXXXX, Cheo, John Keaghliang or John Kongliang Cheo or Kong Liang Djou.

XXXXXX, Chepanos, Stevan John, alias John Stevan.

XXXXXX, Chew, Ben Foo or Chew Toon Fou.

XXXXXX, Cheon, Chan, alias Chan Chong or Chin Cheong or Chan Cheong.

XXXXXX, Chick, Mak.

XXXXXX, Chien, Fung Soong Yuen (nee Soon Yuen Chien).

XXXXXX, Chin, Yen Sheng.

XXXXXX, Chin, Yuying Elaine.

XXXXXX, Chong, Hee Kee alias Hee Fook.

XXXXXX, Chong, Lazaro Manuel or Lazaro Manuel Chong y Rodriguez alias Manny Chong.

XXXXXX, Chong, Tom Sing alias Lam Kam or Lum Kum.

XXXXXX, Chow, Eng Yee alias Eng Koon alias Henry Chow.

XXXXXX, Chu, Yo Lu.

XXXXXX, Chu, Yi Chiang nee Cheng.

XXXXXX, Chung, Chi Lu.

XXXXXX, Chung, Po or Chung Bia.

XXXXXX, Cohen, Dora or Dora Alvo or Dora Perez.

XXXXXX, Contento, Orfeo Luigi.

XXXXXX, Cook, David Hutchison.

XXXXXX, Corsi, Natale Gino.

XXXXXX, Corral-Castro, Juan.

XXXXXX, Corral-Castro, Francisca.

XXXXXX, Corral-Castro, Maria Luisa.

XXXXXX, Corral, Luis, or Luis Corral-Guerra.

XXXXXX, Csak, Eva Maria.

XXXXXX, Cymberg, Bala (nee Kwalwas-
ser), alias Bala Waldmann.

XXXXXX, Cymberg, Chemia alias Heniek Waldmann.

XXXXXX, Dagnino, Giobatti.

XXXXXX, Deblauwe, Ernest.

XXXXXX, De Franco, Maria Cervantes alias Leonor Cervantes De Franco.

XXXXXX, Dentrinos, Ioannis or John.

XXXXXX, De Paulis, Giovanni alias John De Paulis.

XXXXXX, De Villalon, Micaela Castaneda.

XXXXXX, Di Giacomo, Nicolo.

XXXXXX, Dolesal, Rudolf.

XXXXXX, Douglas, Kenneth Eric, alias Douglas Jones.

XXXXXX, Dousmanis, Constantinos, or Konstantinos Dousmanis or Gus Dousmanis or Costas Dousmanis.

XXXXXX, Dowdall, Margherita, alias Margherita Michetti Dowdall.

XXXXXX, Duarte, Isabel Maria DeCastro.

XXXXXX, Dupre, Percival Edwin or Percy Dupre or Edwin Louis Gonzalez Percival Dupre.

XXXXXX, Eng, Fook Shew.

XXXXXX, Eng, Lon Kong or Eng Lon Kong or Charlie Lon.

XXXXXX, Eng, Sam alias Joe Kee.

XXXXXX, Fafalios, George Marcus.

XXXXXX, Figueroa, Alicia Roque nee Francisco Alicia Roque y Garau.

XXXXXX, Fischer, Wilhelm.

XXXXXX, Foca, Floravanti.

XXXXXX, Fontes, Jose Da Encarnacao Coutinho.

XXXXXX, Foster, Hubert Peter.

XXXXXX, Fox, Edra Young.

XXXXXX, Francis, Benjamin Alonzo.

XXXXXX, Freeman, Louis.

XXXXXX, Fren, Ross or Rose (nee Gorra).

XXXXXX, Freniere, Marie Cecile Denise.

XXXXXX, Fritz, Charles Richard.

XXXXXX, Ganzag, Mary Etta.

XXXXXX, Garcia, Maria Mercedes Martinez (nee Martinez y Perez de Arilicea or Maria Mercedes or Maria Mercedes Martinez).

XXXXXX, Garcia-Correa, Daniel.

XXXXXX, Garifalos, James Athanasios, alias Demetrios Athanasios Garifalos.

XXXXXX, Gee, Ahmed.

XXXXXX, German, John.

XXXXXX, Gilbert, Bella.

XXXXXX, Glazel, Nelly, alias Nelly Katz Falk.

XXXXXX, Godson, Maria (nee Carter).

XXXXXX, Gomez, Gladys Liduvina.

XXXXXX, Gonzalez de Saldana, Estanis-
lada.

XXXXXX, Goodwin, Isabell, or Isabelle Goodman.

XXXXXX, Goodwin, Wilson or Wilson Goodman.

XXXXXX, Goseco, Francisco Bradley, Jr.

XXXXXX, Gott, Euyen.

XXXXXX, Groves, Kenneth Samuels.

XXXXXX, Gracia, Carmen or Carmen Gracia-Tessan.

XXXXXX, Guerin, Guerrino Mario.

XXXXXX, Guillotin, Martha nee Munro.

XXXXXX, Gutierrez-Machado, Celso.

XXXXXX, Guze, Sara alias Susan Guze.

XXXXXX, Hall, Randall Samuel alias Ran-
dall Blackwood or Ronnie S. Hall.

XXXXXX, Hall, William John or Frank William Hall alias John Hibbert.

XXXXXX, Hansen, Adele Catherine.

XXXXXX, Harrison, Charles Aston alias Aston Eric Wilmott.

XXXXXX, Hasslacher, Brosl or Ambrose (Ameros) Hasslacher.

XXXXXX, Haszprunar, Ingrid Angela.

XXXXXX, Heinrich, Martin.

XXXXXX, Heinrich, Sally.

XXXXXX, Heinrich, Edeman Howard.

XXXXXX, Hem, Wang Gum or Gum Hem Wang.

XXXXXX, Henriksen, Hans.

XXXXXX, Ho, Ngok or Se Kam Tjoeng.

XXXXXX, Holoszyc, Leon alias Hippolit Molla.

XXXXXX, Hong, Richard Y (Yun-Sick) or Richard Hong or Ko In Shoko or Yun Sick Hong.

XXXXXX, Hong, Soon Kamp Lee or Rosa-
lind Lee Hong.

XXXXXX, Huber, Reinhard.

XXXXXX, Huber, Helmut Othmar.

XXXXXX, Hynes, Hanyo alias Harry Hynes.

XXXXXX, Iaquilino, Nicholas or Nicola.

XXXXXX, Ichioka, Kumio.

XXXXXX, Ichioka, Sei.

XXXXXX, Inamoto, Noboru.

XXXXXX, Jensen, Knud Borge Johannes or Carl Jensen.

XXXXXX, Jew, Bue or Chai Piu.

XXXXXX, Johnson, Lawrence Cardwell or James Lawrence Johnson.

XXXXXX, Jones, Robert Stuart Hamilton.

XXXXXX, Jordan, Leon George A.

XXXXXX, Jordan, Margaretta Emelie.

XXXXXX, Kaimakliotes, Costas alias Cos-
tas Pavlides.

XXXXXX, Kan, Foo alias Chan Shuck Gun.

XXXXXX, Kao, Tin-Tsung.

XXXXXX, Kao, Siu Lin (nee Siu Lin).

XXXXXX, Katsingris, Antonios Panagiotis.

XXXXXX, Kennedy, William Thomas.

XXXXXX, Klein, Lillian.
 XXXXXX, Koberg, Louise Sophie Marie Schmidt De Wall (nee Fisher).
 XXXXXX, Kober, Wilhelm Heinrich or William Henry Koberg.
 XXXXXX, Koepnick, Bert August or Bert Gust Gwinn.
 XXXXXX, Kolefsky, John George.
 XXXXXX, Kongsgaard, Sverre.
 XXX, Kongsgaard, Dagrun.
 XXXXXX, Kontos, Michael or Makis Kontos.
 XXXXXX, Koppl, Klaus.
 XXXXXX, Kopelowitz, Aaron alias Aaron David Kopelowitz.
 XXXXXX, Krawczyk, Ryszard Metody.
 XXXXXX, Kuchta, Stanislaw.
 XXXXXX, Kuon, Tom Wing or Hon Wing Guen.
 XXXXXX, Kyriacou, Anna (nee Philip-pou).
 XXX, Laconsay, Maxima Castillo or Maxima Valentin Castillo.
 XXXXXX, Ladeira, Joaquin Gomes.
 XXXXXX, Lang, Dong Yep.
 XXXXXX, Langer, Herman Ernst Heinrich.
 XXXXXX, Lawler, Bertha Carrillo or Berta Jimenez or Berta Carrillo Jimenez.
 XXX, Lee, Hee or Hay Lee.
 XXXXXX, Lee, Nam Bow alias Lee Mum Bo alias Mam Bo Lee alias Moy Yu.
 XXX, Lee, Richard Tuh Yu.
 XXXXXX, Lee, Julie Tse Chung (nee Julie Tse Fung Chang).
 XXXXXX, Lee, Sing Ah, or Sing A. Lee.
 XXX, Lee, Yeu Shing, alias James Lee.
 XXXXXX, Leija-Luna, Andres.
 XXX, Leija, Teresa Tobias De.
 XXXXXX, Leonitis, John K., alias Ioannis Kyriakou Leontis.
 XXXXXX, Lepre, Rudolph.
 XXXXXX, Leung, Sai Goon, alias Yeong Yin.
 XXXXXX, Levasseur, Joseph Hector.
 XXXXXX, Limatola, Michele.
 XXXXXX, Lin, Andrew Damon or Andrew (Ta-Wen) Lin.
 XXXXXX, Linderman, Alice H. or Alice Hosana Linderman.
 XXXXXX, Lindo, Carlton Sheridan Raphael.
 XXXXXX, Ling, George Huie.
 XXXXXX, Lio, Mao Lin or Lio Mao Lin.
 XXXXXX, Lombardino, Rosalie (nee Fer-mo).
 XXX, Lopez, Francisco Soria.
 XXX, Cisneros, Emma Soria.
 XXX, Cisneros, Consuelo Soria.
 XXXXXX, Lopez-Jauregui, Cayetano.
 XXX, Lotito, Joseph.
 XXXXXX, Louvis, Panagiotis Efstatihou.
 XXX, Luen, Liu Chiu alias Li Chiu Luen Chao alias Patricia Chao.
 XXXXXX, Mandaat, Jose Ricardo nee Gar-cia y Roca or Richard Mandatt.
 XXXXXX, Marian, Ruth.
 XXXXXX, Markham, George Clifford or George C. Malcolm.
 XXXXXX, Martinez-De Lira, Felipe.
 XXX, Matamoros, Agustin Lopez.
 XXXXXX, Matsuno, Tamaki.
 XXXXXX, Matsuno, Mitoshi.
 XXX, Mastrovincenzo, Francesco.
 XXXXXX, Mayon, Tom alias Semen Marinsky or Samuel May.
 XXXXXX, McKen, Keith Neville.
 XXXXXX, McKenzie, Basil Levy.
 XXXXXX, McHugh, Bethsaida Villacorta (nee Bethsaida Sequerra Villacorta).
 XXXXXX, Mendonis, Andreas or Andrew. XXX, Merriles, Nancy Hain (nee Seva).
 XXXXXX, Miguelucci, Alfredo.
 XXXXXX, Millin, Jack.
 XXXXXX, Minarovitch, Anton or Anton Minarovitch.

XXXXXX, Mitchell, Herbert Louis.
 XXXXXX, Miura, Kansiti.
 XXXXXX, M'Latamou, Day.
 XXXXXX, M'Latamou, Thelma Helen Monica (nee Thompson).
 XXXXXX, Mobijohn, William Edmund.
 XXXXXX, Mohsenin, Nezam.
 XXXXXX, Monaco, Damiano.
 XXX, Moore, Dolores Marie Simonne (nee Dubois).
 XXX, Mpras, Stefanos.
 XXXXXX, Munilla, Jose Antonio or Jose Antonio Munilla y Razoqui.
 XXXXXX, Murillo-Nava, Porfirio.
 XXXXXX, Nakawatase, Hideyoshi, or Fred Nakawatase.
 XXXXXX, Nansheng, Yee, alias Yen Nan-sheng.
 XXXXXX, Napier, Evelyn Russell.
 XXXXXX, Naranjo de Rodriguez, Mer-cedes.
 XXXXXX, Nardone, Ernesto.
 XXXXXX, Natal-Hernandez, Jesus.
 XXXXXX, Navarro-Arevalo, Juan or Juan Arevalo-Navarro.
 XXXXXX, Nees, Polly or Polly Nitskan-skaea or Nitshanskaes or Mrs. Barney Sayet.
 XXX, Ng, Kim Chow alias John Moy or Jung Moy Oi.
 XXX, Ng, Woon Nan alias Stanley Wu.
 XXXXXX, Nicolaou, Mihael Hristov.
 XXXXXX, Niserakes, Panagiotis Peter or Paravioles Peter Niserakes.
 XXXXXX, Noriega, Loreto.
 XXXXXX, Novak, Betty.
 XXX, Obregon-Villanueva, Juan.
 XXXXXX, Obregon, Maria Josefa De.
 XXXXXX, Ohlsen, Carl Siegfried, or Karl Ohlsen.
 XXX, O'Rourke, Samuel Lester.
 XXX, Orozco-Ramirez, Rafael.
 XXX, Ortega-Madrigal, Amador.
 XXXX, Mejia de Ortega, Paula.
 XXX, Ortega-Mejia, Florentina.
 XXX, Ortega-Mejia, Zeferino.
 XXX, Ortega-Mejia, Delfino.
 XXX, Ortega-Mejia, Espedito.
 XXXXXX, Osoria-Chavez, Roberto or Ro-berto Osoria.
 XXXXXX, Osman, Ismail Bin or Smalle Osman.
 XXXXXX, Ottaviano, Vincenzo Francesco or Francis.
 XXX, Palmer, Audrey George alias Ralph Aiken.
 XXXXXX, Palomo, Purifico Ymzon.
 XXXXXX, Pantelaros, Isidores.
 XXXXXX, Pearce, Enrique Raymundo or Henry Ray Pearce.
 XXX, Pelle, Ertedore.
 XXXXXX, Peloponissios, John, alias John Pelos.
 XXX, Petrini, Erminio.
 XXXXXX, Pignato, Vincenza, or Vincenza Bonifazio (nee Cingari).
 XXXXXX, Pizzolato, Edonide alias Edon-ite Pizzolato, alias Giovanni Lamberti alias Pizzolato Edonide.
 XXXXXX, Pomaro, Emmanuela Zarcone or Nelly Pomaro or Nelly Zarcone Pomaro.
 XXXXXX, Pop, Eugen V. or Eugene Valeri Pope.
 XXXXXX, Poulos, Anastasios George.
 XXXXXX, Progin, Vera (nee Marichich).
 XXXXXX, Puccinelli, Aldo.
 XXXXXX, Quelch, Cecil O.
 XXXXXX, Quintana-Serna, Alvaro or Al-varo Quintana or Alvaro Quintana-Cerda or Alvaro Quintana-Gamez.
 XXXXXX, Quiroga-Escamilla, Ruben or Ruben Quiroga.
 XXXXXX, Riddle, Dominga Faustino.
 XXXXXX, Rocha-Almanza, Jose Guada-lupe.
 XXX, Rodriguez, Orlando Hoed.

XXXXXX, Rojas, Francisco Ramon Taveras Y or Francisco Ramon Taveras.
 XXXXXX, Roknich, Gajo or Guy Roknich alias Stevan Rokrich or Stevan Roknick or "Steve."
 XXXXXX, Romney, Eileen.
 XXXXXX, Rosenstein, David Leopold.
 XXXXXX, Rospel, Michel.
 XXXXXX, Rosseland, Sverre.
 XXX, Roy, Joseph Louis Noe.
 XXX, Roy, Yolande Viola Hermine Stella.
 XXXXXX, Rusich, Enrico alias Henry Rusich.
 XXXXXX, Sackenreuther, Annemarie.
 XXXXXX, Sackenreuther, Marie Luise.
 XXXXXX, Saguinsin, Jose formerly Jose Cano Perez.
 XXXXXX, Salo, Paul or Paul Hirvisalo.
 XXXXXX, Samilpa-Galderon, Abraham or Abraham C. Samilpa.
 XXX, Samuels, Eric Edward.
 XXX, Sanchez, Gloria Telles de, alias Neomi Lopez.
 XXXXXX, Schaeffer, Joan Isabelle (nee Campbell).
 XXX, Schintu, Giuseppe.
 XXXXXX, Schnell, Otto Albert, alias Peter Gynt.
 XXXXXX, Sclabassi, Giovanni Bautist or John Sclabassi or Joe Volpati.
 XXXXXX, Segura, Raul Soto.
 XXXXXX, Seltzer, Gertrudes De Castro.
 XXX, Shand, Hubert Benjamin.
 XXX, Shanner, Arthy, alias Ernest Shanner.
 XXXXXX, Sheard, Frederick.
 XXXXXX, Sheem, Cheong or Sin, alias George Cheong Sheem.
 XXX, Shou-Chin, Wang or Shou-Chin Wong.
 XXXXXX, Shun, Lo.
 XXXXXX, Silber, Julius.
 XXX, Silva, Ursula Czaika.
 XXXXXX, Simor, Ferenc, alias Francesco Simor or Francis Simor.
 XXXXXX, Sinclair, Vincent Leslie, alias Byron Summerville.
 XXX, Smith, Gilbert, or James Smith.
 XXXXXX, Soto, Castor Gonzalez.
 XXXXXX, Spitz, Sidonia.
 XXXXXX, Stoddard, Nicole Marguerite (nee Dumas).
 XXXXXX, Stahl, Ragnar Leonard.
 XXXXXX, Stanescu, George Vasili or Gheorge Stanescu.
 XXXXXX, Stanisik, Nikola.
 XXXXXX, Steeves, James Herman.
 XXXXXX, Stein, Ruth, alias Ruchel Mint-zer (nee Marcus).
 XXXXXX, Sun Lee King, alias Lee King San or Lee King Sam.
 XXXXXX, Svon, Sung, alias Svon Pan Dang or Pan Dang Svon.
 XXX, Teixeira, Manuel Jesus or Man-uel De Jesus Teixeira.
 XXXXXX, Thomas, Joseph Anthony Paul, alias Joseph Bugeja.
 XXXXXX, Tiberi, Oliviero.
 XXXXXX, Torrez-Lopez, Jose or Jose Torres.
 XXXXXX, Tsalas, Vasilios.
 XXXXXX, Tsao, Eugene You-Chen.
 XXXXXX, Tsao, Lian Shu.
 XXXXXX, Tsukano, Yoshi (nee Yosi Suziki).
 XXXXXX, Ullah, Rham, alias Raymon Allie or Rahim Ullah.
 XXXXXX, Uzep, William Michael or Vasilios Mikel Uzep or William Uzep or Vasilii Michail Uzepchuk.
 XXXXXX, Valdes, Rene Elio Sosa Y alias Rene E. Sosa.
 XXXXXX, Valdivia-Contreras, Marcos or Marcos Valdivia or Jose Marcos Valdivia.
 XXXXXX, Vasquez, Angelina or Angelina Ibanez y Valle.

xxxxxx	Vasquez-Gonzales, Luis or Luis Vasquez or Luis G. Vasquez.	xxxxxx	Borghese, Adele Ritol.	xxxxxx	Duval, Alfred Wolfgang formerly Naxer.
xxx	Vavala, Maria Antonio (nee Bruni).	xxxxxx	Bosnos, George Constantino.	xxxxxx	Eloquin, Georges Joseph Francois.
xxxxxx	Vega, Sara Santos De alias Sara Santos De La Torre or Sara Santos or Sara Vega.	xxxxxx	Bosnos, Catalia Cano de.	xxxxxx	Escobar-Segura, Salome or Segura Segura-Escobedo or Jose Hernandez.
xxxxxx	Vidotto, Francesco or Frank.	xxxxxx	Bowen, Herbert Alfred.	xxxxxx	Espinoza-Garza, Gregorio or Gregorio Espinosa.
xxxxxx	Walker, Eileen Mary formerly Palese (nee Tierney).	xxxxxx	Bradshaw, George Robert.	xxxxxx	Espinosa-Orozco, Jesus.
xxxxxx	Walker, Frederick Sylvester.	xxxxxx	Brandl, Elisabeth.	xxxxxx	Esposito, Raimondo.
xxxxxx	Weiss, Aron.	xxxxxx	Braun, Erwin or Erwin Kwiram.	xxxxxx	Estrada, Reginald Nicholas or Reginald Lewis Ronald.
xxxxxx	Wenas, Hendrik Frederik.	xxxxxx	Broderick, Reynold Alexander or Leslie Broderick or George Graham.	xxxxxx	Ete, Usoro Akapan or Usoro Akapan Ete or Rufus Akapan.
xxxxxx	Westerhausen, Egon.	xxxxxx	Brown, Jexblake Wilston.	xxxxxx	Evancho, Mercedes nee Ruiz Ortiz or Mercedes Nunez.
xxxxxx	Wilkins, Fernando Dudley.	xxxxxx	Bruers, Victor Martin.	xxxxxx	Fachini, Vincent c Vincenzo.
xxxxxx	Williams, Daisy Tsung-Fuh Shen.	xxxxxx	Buse, Emil Carl, or Rudolf Brandt.	xxxxxx	Falco, Leopoldo G.
xxxxxx	Wing, Chan or Chin Wing.	xxxxxx	Bustamante, Jose Guadalupe.	xxxxxx	Fazio, Vittorio Di.
xxxxxx	Wong, Check Kwong.	xxxxxx	Calabrese, Joseph Rosolino or Giuseppe Calabrese.	xxxxxx	Flink, Anna (nee Davidesko), or Davidetzki, Anna Finkelstein.
xxxxxx	Wong, King Fong.	xxxxxx	Callsten, Olga Kaarina.	xxxxxx	Flamos, Elefterios Kyriakos.
xxxxxx	Wong, Kwei Mon alias Mon Wong.	xxxxxx	Callsten, Sulo Richard.	xxxxxx	Flores, Eliseo Ramirez.
xxxxxx	Wong, Mary nee Mary Yu.	xxxxxx	Calvera, Carlos Raul.	xxxxxx	Flores, Mariano.
xxxxxx	Wood, George Cyril.	xxxxxx	Calves, Martinez, Antonio.	xxxxxx	Fong, Lai or Lai Chung Ming.
xxx	Wopinsky, Chaim.	xxxxxx	Calvo, Alberto Alfonso or Luis Charbonier or Antonio Alfonso.	xxxxxx	Franco, Maria de Jesus Perida.
xxxxxx	Wong, Sophia Chang.	xxxxxx	Calvo-Camacho, Francisco.	xxxxxx	Franklin, Carol Doreen.
xxxxxx	Yamaguchi, Ritei.	xxxxxx	Campbell, Amos.	xxxxxx	Fraser, Ferdinand Edward.
xxxxxx	Yanes, Virginia nee Ruamero.	xxxxxx	Campos-Rodriguez, Manuel.	xxxxxx	Freeman, Pedro Francisco or Pete Freeman or Piet Vriend or Pedro Francisco Vriend.
xxxxxx	Ybarra-Torrez, Francisco.	xxxxxx	Carrasco-Carrillo, Tomas or Tomas Carrasco or Thomas Carasco.	xxxxxx	Frieze, Henry.
xxxxxx	Ybarra, Fidela Beserra de.	xxxxxx	Carvounis, Ioannis or John Carvounis or John Karvounis.	xxxxxx	Fucilli, Michele or Michael.
xxxxxx	Yerouchalmi, Hadji Hay alias Hay Yerouchaomi alias Yerusalem.	xxxxxx	Cassas, Fanny (nee Fanny Rocheminor) or Fannie or Fanny Cassas; Casson; Cassus; Kassas.	xxxxxx	Gabry, Vincent.
xxxxxx	Yook, Lew alias Song Chong or Fong Chong.	xxxxxx	Castano, Pedro, or Pedro Manuel Andres Castano Vasquez.	xxxxxx	Galimitakis, Zoe Jean (nee Statharakis).
xxxxxx	Yuen, Char, alias Charles Yuen or Yuen Char or Chas Yuen.	xxxxxx	Cavaliero, Isacco or Isaac Davide or John David Cavalieros.	xxxxxx	Galindo-Mercado, Maximo.
xxxxxx	Zabadlija, Dragutin, alias Charles Antonio Zabadlija.	xxxxxx	Cenatiempo, Raffaele.	xxxxxx	Garcia, Jose Garcia.
xxxxxx	Zarnas, George, alias George Tsarnas.	xxxxxx	Cereceres, Francisco.	xxxxxx	Garcia, Maria Oseguera de or Maria Oseguera or Maggie Rodrigues or Maria Gonzales.
xxxxxx	Acevedo-Cadena, Elisa.	xxxxxx	Cereceres, Ismael.	xxxxxx	Garcia-Zapata, Vicent.
xxxxxx	Adachi, Seiko.	xxxxxx	Cereceres, Florentino.	xxxxxx	Garcia, Rosa Rodriguez De.
xxxxxx	Adame-Armendariz, Rodolfo.	xxxxxx	Cereceres, Rosa.	xxxxxx	Garza-Valdovinos, Genaro.
xxxxxx	Alcaraz-Suarez, Benito.	xxxxxx	Cerniglia, Hattie (nee Poriles).	xxxxxx	Garza, Victoria Medina De.
xxxxxx	Ali, Eshad or Ehed Ali.	xxxxxx	Cesare, Pasquale Scotto Di or Pasquale Scotto.	xxxxxx	Giannisis, Elias George.
xxxxxx	Alvarado, Jose Trinidad.	xxxxxx	Challenor, Ivan A. or Ivan Lincoln Herlis or Arthur Clarke.	xxxxxx	Gittens, Lionel Victor, or Lionel Victor Brown.
xxxxxx	Alvarado, Petronilo.	xxxxxx	Chang, Juliet Marie.	xxxxxx	Gold, Harold.
xxxxxx	Alvarado, Maria.	xxxxxx	Chang, David.	xxxxxx	Goldfield, Yosef Lejwa.
xxxxxx	Alvarado, Magdaleno.	xxxxxx	Chin, Tai On or Wan Dai or Chin Hing.	xxxxxx	Gonzalez, Isabelo Lopez.
xxxxxx	Amarant, Adolf.	xxxxxx	Chong, Jew or Lee You Chong.	xxxxxx	Grazioso, Francesco or Frank Grazioso or Francesco Graziose.
xxxxxx	Amato, Giuseppe.	xxxxxx	Christie, James Murray or Murray James Christie.	xxxxxx	Gryz, Jan.
xxxxxx	Angel-Moreno, Jesus.	xxxxxx	Chu, Louise Jen-Cheng Wong or Louise Jen-Cheng Wong.	xxxxxx	Gudgeon, Patricia or Patricia Josephine Smiley.
xxxxxx	Antepara, Carlos Eduardo.	xxxxxx	Chu, Daniel Ta-Kung, or Ta-Kung Chu.	xxxxxx	Guerra-Negrete, Maximiano.
xxxxxx	Arana-Cortez, Vicente.	xxxxxx	Chueng, Shui Ming.	xxxxxx	Halvorsen, Otto.
xxxxxx	Arnold, Brigit.	xxxxxx	Chun, Leong or Hong Chun Leong.	xxxxxx	Hanos, Lorentzo or Louis Hanos.
xxxxxx	Arpadjian, Garabed, or Charles Howard.	xxxxxx	Chung, Ng Yee or Jimmy Lee or Eng Yee Chung or Lim Way.	xxxxxx	Harker, Aramis Alencon or John Constantine Harvey.
xxxxxx	Arrindell, Albertha Yvonne Maria.	xxxxxx	Clarke, Roy Hubert Wycliffe.	xxxxxx	Harrison, Priscilla (nee Garnet).
xxxxxx	Arrojado, Americo or Raul De Matos Correia.	xxxxxx	Cobos, Mary nee Rodriguez or Maria Arza Rodriguez.	xxxxxx	Harvey, John Richard.
xxxxxx	Atalla, Mohamad Mousa.	xxxxxx	Cojulun, Gregorio Pac or Gregory Cojulun.	xxxxxx	Hernandez, Manuela Lopez de Hernandez-Lopez, Tomas Jose.
xxxxxx	Azua, Uvaldo Aguilar.	xxxxxx	Cona, Carmelo.	xxxxxx	Heyka, Antoni.
xxxxxx	Bacoka, Ante or Anton.	xxxxxx	Correya, Thereza Clemente y. Cosenza, Mario or Morris Cosenza.	xxxxxx	Hing, Hoo or Hing Hoo.
xxxxxx	Baptiste, Ronald Philip.	xxxxxx	Cuenin, Frieda Bertha.	xxxxxx	Hoff, Johanna nee Steigler.
xxxxxx	Batista, Jose Pereira.	xxxxxx	Damonte, Nicholas or Nicola M. Deangelis, Giuseppe or Joseph Deangelis.	xxxxxx	Hogikyan, Dr. Azat.
xxxxxx	Beekman, Josephus Antonius Maria.	xxxxxx	Damonte, Nicholas or Nicola M. Deangelis, Giuseppe or Joseph Deangelis.	xxxxxx	Hollander, Vilma Kahan nee Vilma Kahan.
xxx	Beekman, Olga.	xxxxxx	Delise, Olimpio August.	xxxxxx	Holligan, George Everton.
xxxxxx	Bella, Victoria Lopez.	xxxxxx	Denis, Anna Marie.	xxxxxx	Hsu, Man Goon or Man Kwong Hsu or Hsu Man Kwong.
xxxxxx	Berardi, Giuseppe.	xxxxxx	Deutsch, Herman.	xxxxxx	Hunte, Clement Dacosta or Jones.
xxx	Bernstein, Alberto Selig.	xxxxxx	Dickerson, Violet Agatha.	xxxxxx	Ih, Yung Hsiang.
xxxxxx	Bero, Joseph or Joe or Josef.	xxxxxx	Domingo, Vincent George.	xxxxxx	Inoue, Helene.
xxxxxx	Best, Edward Parry or Edward Brathwaite.	xxxxxx	Donizetti, Ermeneigilda.	xxxxxx	Inoue, Kakutaro.
xxxxxx	Bijlaard, Tine.	xxxxxx	Dorochenko, Victor George, or Victor D. Harper.	xxxxxx	Jallorina, Maria Laura Monge de.
xxxxxx	Bio, Matheos Bin.	xxxxxx	Dovidio, Damiano or Don Dovidio.	xxxxxx	James, Margaret Henrietta or Margaret James or Mrs. Octov Jensen or Margaret Henrietta Bailey.
xxxxxx	Block, Robert Christian.	xxxxxx	Duncan, Walter Samuel or Walter Brown or Joseph Newbold.	xxxxxx	Jamrow, Hildegarde Paula nee Hildegarde Paula Willman.
xxxxxx	Blumenthal, Anneliese, or Anneliese Gaertner Blumenthal.	xxxxxx	Dunner, Lloyd Bertram.	xxxxxx	Joe, Chin, or Joe Chin.
xxxxxx	Blythe, Herbert Edwin, or Roy Williams De Valliere.				
xxxxxx	Boczko, Murray or Moszko Boczko.				
xxxxxx	Bodnya, Naser Georges.				
xxxxxx	Bohonowsky, Anton or Anthony or Bohanowsky or Anton or Anthony.				
xxxxxx	Boom, Abraham.				

XXXXXX	Josaphat, Max.	XXXXXX	Medal, Daisy Auxiliadora.	XXXXXX	Ridao, Francisco.
XXXXXX	Juriaco, Antonio.	XXXXXX	Mejia, George Lucas, or George	XXXXXX	Riley, Maria Geertruiide Mul-
XXXXXX	Kalafatidis, Savas or Savas	Lucas.	Meldon, Maurice William.	XXXXXX	ders.
Kalifitidis or	Callifatidis, Savas or Savas		Mezzo, Giovanni Reimondo, or	XXXXXX	Rinde, Olaf.
XXXXXX	Khourl, Youssif Maroun El.		John Mezzo.	XXXXXX	Rodriguez-Cardenas, Andres.
XXXXXX	Kuzele, Tomo.		Michopoulos, John Ethimios or	XXXXXX	Roges, Tomas Abbott.
XXXXXX	Katsafados, Elias (Louis).		John E. Michopoulos.	XXXXXX	Romano, Vincenzo.
XXXX	Keppler, Simon or Koppler.		Miller, Micheline Claire Lotode.	XXXXXX	Romero, Daniel Ona or Daniel
XXXX	Keppler, Vera (nee Erny).		Mincin, Balduino.	XXXXXX	Romero, Juana Ayala or
XXXXXX	Kontovaakis, Nicholas or Nick		Mlotek, Abraham.	XXXXXX	Juana Ayala-Garcia.
Kontos.	Kamakaris, Petros Emanuel.		Moncada, Julian Manrique.	XXXXXX	Roselli, Salminia (nee Spacca-
XXXXXX	Kormadis, Ioannis or John		Mong, Ma.	patelli).	
Calos.	Kovar, Emilia or Emily (nee		Montalvo, Herminia Garcia De.	XXXXXX	Rosenbaum, Isidor.
Skultety).	Kramer, Klara or Ida Kamen-		Montes, Etilvina Revuelta de.	XXXXXX	Ross, Solomon or Solomon
XXXXXX	negorsky.		Moraitis, Stamatios.	Goldstein.	
XXXX	Kon, Ng or Ing Kon.		Moy, Helen or Moy Toy Goon.	XXXXXX	Ross, Polly or Polly Goldstein
XXXX	Khachadurian, Kevorak.		Moy, Joe Gee or Joe You or	(nee Pesca	Gayman).
XXXX	Khachadurian, Alis.		Chow You or Joe Hong.	XXXXXX	Roy, Cyril De or Cyril Randolph
XXXXXX	Kalavrezos, Elias Antoniou, or		Mrwik, Hugo Ludwig.	De Roy.	
Louis Anthony Callas.	Kish, Joseph or Kesh.		Munjee, Amanulla Dostma-	XXXXXX	Sacco, Michael or Michelarcan-
XXXXXX	Kwan, Hin or Lee Chong Sing.		hamed.	gelo Sacco.	
XXXXXX	Kunisch, Albert Adalbert.		Munroe, Elkanah Adolphus or	XXXXXX	Salleh, Janit Ben.
XXXXXX	Kwan, Cheung.		Elkanah Munroe or Manuel Rowe.	XXXXXX	Salong, Peter.
XXXXXX	Lacenere, Donato.		Nassar, Muharib Said.	XXXXXX	Sanchez-Arvizu, Urbano, or
XXXXXX	Lam, Mon King or Mon King		Navarro, Raul Uribe, or Mar-	Orlando Sanchez.	
Lum.	Larsen, Fred.		celino Caudillo.	XXXXXX	Santalo, Oscar Rosendo, or
XXXXXX	Lau, Ah Chun or Lok Shi.		Neverow, Vassili Arsenievich.	XXXXXX	Oscar Rosendo Santalo y Rosello.
XXXXXX	Lebovits, Rita (nee Rita Cas-		Ng, Suey Sing or Ng Suey Sing	XXXXXX	Schiappacasse, Remo Santo, or
sell), or Rita Lebovits.			or Chy Yem.	Remo Schiappacasse.	
XXXXXX	Lee, Kenneth Leo or Kock		Nunez, Hugo.	XXXXXX	Schimmpfennig, Hanz.
Lieng Lee.	Leer, Hans Jorg.		Okuda, Tsutomo Tom.	XXXXXX	Schneider, Celia, or Celina
XXXXXX	Leino, Karl Aran.		Olivas, Maria Luisa (nee	Schneider (nee Klein).	
XXXXXX	Leon, Raymond.		Flores).	XXXXXX	Seidl, Josef.
XXXXXX	Leone, Philip or Filippo.		Olsen, Louis Frederick.	XXXXXX	Serra, Florida, or Florida Giusti.
XXXXXX	Leung, Solomon Wency or Hum		Orto, Mario Dell'.	XXXXXX	Shiu, Yip, or Ip Shui.
Ho Leung.	Leung, Ann Hsi or Yu Tsung		Otero, Constante Soto or Con-	XXXXXX	Silasuvan, Choon.
Hsi.	Leung, Alice or Levi or Maria		stante Soto.	XXXXXX	Sing, William, or Sing Ah Sing.
Lozano.	Lewis, Wentworth H.		Pacheco, Lucina Morales de.	XXXXXX	Smith, Ida Constantia.
XXXXXX	Li, Te Chuan.		Pacheco-Morales, Dimiteria.	XXXXXX	Smith, Joshua Charlsworth.
XXXXXX	Lindberg, Lasse Valdemar.		Pacheco-Morales, Miguel.	XXXXXX	Smith, Lionel Osborn, or Leo
XXXXXX	Ling, Chang Chung.		Panico, Vincenzo.	Osborn Smith.	
XXXXXX	Lis, Josif.		Panovich, Ante Ivan.	XXXXXX	Smith, Milton De Costa, or
XXXXXX	Lisciani, Massimo.		Pantazaras, Nicolaos or Nicolaos	Sam Small.	
XXXXXX	Livingston, Constantine Pre-		Pantas.	XXXXXX	Soljanich, Ante.
ma.	Lopez, Isabelmaria Lorenzo		Pappagallo, Michele or Mike	XXXXXX	Sorensen, Ansgar Izar.
Rosales de or Isabel Maria Lopez.	Lopez, Justo.		Pappagallo.	XXXXXX	Sorensen, Joan Bjorvik (nee
XXXXXX	Lopez, Luis Alberto.		Parisi, Carmine.	Joan Bergljot Bjorvik).	
XXXXXX	Lopez, Teodora Rojo De or Teo-		Parochoguk, Aniela or Nellie	XXXXXX	Soria-Vaca, Gilberto, or Gil-
dora Rojo-Lopez or Teodora Lopez Rojo.	Lorenzo, Juan or Juan Gual-	(nee Murawa).	Passarelli.	berto Soria-Baca.	
XXXXXX	berto Lorenzo-Marti.		Passarelli, Giovanni, or John	XXXXXX	Stamos, Despina Rocha, or Lena
XXXXXX	Lua-Garcia, Memesio, or Ar-		Peddie, Ira or Astanley, Moul-	Stamos.	
turo Lua.	tu.		ton.	XXXXXX	Stephens, Kenneth Roy.
XXXXXX	Macaluso, Calogero.		Pedersen, Leif Helmich.	XXXXXX	Stephenson, Paschal Joseph,
XXXXXX	Mackie, Otto Jalmar or Otto		Penna, Clementina.	or Joscelyn Blake or Paschal Joseph Stevens.	
Maki or Otto Jalmar Lehtimaki or Markie.	Maki, Frank De or Francesco		Penna, Vera Florence or Vera	XXXXXX	Stiller, Alfonso Heinrich.
XXXXXX	Saverio De Maio.		Penna.	XXXXXX	Stoeckel, Elisabeth.
XXXXXX	Manetti, Angelo.		Perez, Francisca Perez De.	XXXXXX	Storm, Meindert.
XXXXXX	Mangassarian, Babgen.		Perez-Perez, Guadalupe.	XXXXXX	Sueiro, Jose.
XXXXXX	Mangassarian, Katharine.		Perez-Perez, Micaela.	XXXXXX	Suey, Low.
XXXXXX	Markub, Sigrid Carmen or		Pipinou, Georgios or George Pi-	XXXXXX	Sullivan, Timothy.
Sigrid Carmen Salong.	de or Maria Luisa Ramirez-Garcia.		pipinou or Gerogio Pipino.	XXXXXX	Surian, Giuseppe.
XXXXXX	Marron-Escamilla, Ramon.		Ploussas, Stamos.	or Ma Tai.	Tai, Mai or Mar Tai or Mar Lai
XXXXXX	Marron, Ana Maria Perez de.		Poo, Wong Zee or Wong Yu		Tatakis, Constantino or Gus
XXXXXX	Marthinson, Sten Olai or Sten		Po.	Tatakis.	Tateosian, Virginia A. (nee Vir-
Ole Marthinson or Sten Marthenson, or	Sten Olai Marthinsen or Stein Olai Mar-		Poy, Yip.	ginia Arakelian), or Mariana Magarian.	
thinson.	thinson.		Progian, Francois.	XXXXXX	Thomas, Frederick.
XXXXXX	Matthews, Josephine or Jose-		Puertas, Alberto.	XXXXXX	Thomen, Luz Trinidad, or Luz
phine Cossin or Josephine Verstappen or	phine Cossin Matthews.		Pulito, Vincenzo.	Rosa or Luz Moller.	
XXXXXX	Maya, Alberto.		Quocck, Quong.	XXXXXX	Rosas, Julius or Julio C. de la
XXXXXX	McCree, Cerilla (or Cerilia)		Rabain, Roger McNeil.	Rosa.	
McDavid.			Rafanelli, Ignazio.	XXXXXX	Tirpak, Ladislav, or Ladislaw or
XXXXXX	McInerney, John.		Rafanelli, Marta.	Leslie John.	
			Rafanelli, Giuseppe.	XXXXXX	Tojo, Dr. Hiromi.
			Rafanelli, Beatrice.	XXXXXX	Tong, Ho, or Ho Toong or
			Ramirez, Maria Luisa Ramirez	Tong Ho.	
			de or Maria Luisa Ramirez-Garcia.	XXXXXX	Tong, Kong, or Gong Tung.
			Ramirez, Shirley or Soledad	XXXXXX	Torchia, Anna Maria.
			Ramirez.	XXXXXX	Trindade, Fernando das Neves.
			Ramirez-Leal, Pedro or Pedro	XXXXXX	Tsolakis, Charles, or Ysidore
			Ramirez or Peter Ramirez or Pete Ramirez.	Tsolakis.	
			Rando, Domenico.	XXXXXX	Tsui, Yat Wah.
			Ressel, Karl Paul.	XXXXXX	Tung, Kung Liang.
			Reynolds, Leslie Augustus or	XXXXXX	Tyrrel, Winnifred, formerly
			Albert Clark.		Manning May Drinkwater, or Edith Jack.
			Rezk, Akl Abi.	XXXXXX	Vajao, Jorge Batista Goncalves,
			Richman, Rose.	or George Vajao.	

xxxxxx Vidal-Solomon, Marta.
 xxxxxx Vilke, Torkel.
 xxxxx Villarejo, Ardenio or Ardenio
 Villarejo y Mendoza.
 xxxxx Volarich Joseph Anton, or Josit
 Anton Volaric.
 xxxxx Vollrath, Elizabeth Forsythe or
 Elizabeth Blanchard Forsythe or Betty Voll-
 rath.
 xxxxx Wagner, Margaret Anna, for-
 merly Gerhardt (nee Hess).
 xxxxxx Wah, Cheung.
 xxxx Wah, Leong.
 xxxxx Walppu, Atte Severi or Valppu.
 xxxxx Wang, Percy Hung-Fan, for-
 merly Wang Hung-Fan.
 xxxxx Wang, Lydia Shul-Chih Yu, for-
 merly Yu Shul-Chih.
 xxxxx Weber, Frederick Richard form-
 erly Reginald Victor Brophy.
 xxxx Weir, Socorro L. (nee Socorro
 Larrazabal).
 xxxxx Wen, Alfred Yueh Hsiung.
 xxxxx Wen, Alma Pui-Hang To.
 xxxxx Wey, Jaw Sean.
 xxxx Wilson, Henry Headley Cas-
 bianca.
 xxxx Witter, Oswald, formerly Oswald
 Aston Witter Kong or Oswald Aston Kong.
 xxxxx Wolfson, Gisela (nee Klein).
 xxxx Wolfson, Montagu Peter.
 xxxxx Wong, Mook Fong or Song Lin
 or Wong Lam.
 xxxxx Woodson, Anthony John.
 xxxxx Wowszik, Guido Victor or
 Guido Victor Hartman.
 xxxxx Wright, Bertram Jefferson.
 xxxxx Wyle, Robert Patterson.
 xxxxx Yan, Chong or Chong Hsein or
 Hsein.
 xxxxx Yan, Lui or Lui Choy Chun or
 Louis Yan or Lewis Yan.
 xxxxx Yaqub, Adil Mohamed or
 Yacub.
 xxxx Yoo, Chan or Chan Soo.
 xxxxx Yosten, Charlotte Elizabeth
 (nee Estabrook).
 xxxxx Yunek, Benjamin.
 xxxxx Yunek, Eva or Eva Comtz.
 xxxxx Zandieh, Fakrezeman Matin-
 razan or Fakre Zandieh.
 xxxxx Zolezzi, Bartolomeo or Barto-
 lomes.
 xxxxx Zuclich, Pio C.
 xxxxx Agravides, Constantina (nee
 Nicolis).
 xxxxx Amador, Francisco Pelavo
 Conejo.
 xxxxx Amarant, Oswald Leon.
 xxxxx Andersen, Leis.
 xxxxx Anderson, Carl Tolver Robert
 or Robert Anderson.
 xxxxx Badalamente, Rosalia formerly
 Bozzo nee Vitale.
 xxxxx Bahosky, Bernard Razzouk.
 xxxxx Bardho, Spiro Largo or Mike
 Bardho or Mihallaq (Llago) Bardhi (Bardo).
 xxxxx Barkovic, Antonio or Anthony
 Barkovich or Tony Bartovich.
 xxxxx Basfield, Edward Richard.
 xxxxx Bauhuber, Ludwig.
 xxxxx Beckett, Peter.
 xxxxx Bejar, Luis or Luis Vejar Ogalla.
 xxxxx Berkowitz, Signor Bella (nee
 Signor Bella Cohen).
 xxxxx Bernardi, Remo.
 xxxxx Bienwald, Gabriele (or Ga-
 brielle) (nee Boehm).
 xxxx Black, Elfriede Renner (nee
 Schulte).
 xxxx Boen, Hie Lo or Louie Boen.
 xxxxx Bonelli, Anita Christalia.
 xxxxx Bones, Elba Mercedes (nee
 Troncoso Gaton).
 xxxxx Bonhomme, Jean Ernest alias
 John Green.
 xxxxx Borgogna, Vincenzo.
 xxxxx Brandon, Robert Jules.
 xxxxx Breuer, Joseph or Josef Breuer.
 xxxxx Breuer, Berta (nee Falk).
 xxxxx Brooke, Paul Peter.

xxxxxx Broomfield, Archibald Henry.
 xxxxx Brown, Joseph Zechariah.
 xxxx Bue, Lee Wah or Henry Lee.
 xxxxx Burfiend, Else Alfrida (nee
 Olsen).
 xxxxx Burnash, Patrick Michael.
 xxxx Burns, Hildebran Patrick.
 xxxxx Burrows, Walter Byron alias
 Walter Fallis.
 xxxxx Carrillo, Charles, or Carlos Ce-
 cilio Des Lazaro.
 xxxxx Carter, Clarence.
 xxxxx Castro, Guido Jorge Cordova Y,
 or Guido Jorge Cordova.
 xxxxx Chan, Chuen.
 xxxxx Chee, You Park.
 xxxx Chen, Pang, alias Hammond P.
 Chen.
 xxxxx Chen, Catherine Chi (nee Chi
 Lu).
 xxxxx Chen, Samuel Shin Tsai, or
 Shih Tsai Chen.
 xxxxx Chen, Wen Hsien Wan.
 xxxx Cheng, Chu.
 xxxxx Cherry, Bertha, or Bertha Rich-
 man.
 xxxxx Cheung, Nagu.
 xxxxx Chi, Hilary Shou Yu.
 xxxxx Chiang, Yao.
 xxxxx Chien, Charles C. F., alias Chi
 Foong Chien.
 xxxxx Shin, Yuen Hing, or Chin Yuen
 Hing.
 xxxxx Ching, Tong Kin.
 xxxxx Chong, Yew Chor or Chong Yew
 Chor, alias Lam Kwai.
 xxxxx Chow, Fu now Mrs. Blau Yang.
 xxxxx Choy, Johnnie, or Choy Fook.
 xxxx Choy, Sam Seng, alias Choy
 Shing.
 xxxxx Christodoulou, Christo or John
 Christ.
 xxxxx Chung, Suey.
 xxxxx Clark, Enos.
 xxxxx Clarke, Vincent Harvey alias
 Harvey Alexander Clarke.
 xxxxx Claxton, Ellen Rebecca (nee
 Hyndman).
 xxxxx Claxton, William Henry.
 xxxxx Coppola, Vincenzo alias Vincent
 Coppola.
 xxxxx Costopoulos, Assimina or
 Assimini.
 xxxxx Couto, John Barallobre.
 xxxxx Cruikshank, George Mair.
 xxxxx Dagris, Ernest.
 xxxx Damjanovich, Jovo.
 xxxx D'Andre, Patrick Olivier, alias
 Krause.
 xxxx Dang, Florence Eudora, alias Flor-
 encia Eudora Low or Florencia Eudora Chong
 or Mrs. Domingo Chee Chong.
 xxxx Davy, Renal.
 xxxx De Hernandez, Gaudalupe Lo-
 pez.
 xxxxx De Lara, Manuele De La Luz
 Mejia.
 xxxxx De Luzuriaga, Eusebio Ruiz.
 xxxxx Dembitzer, Manes.
 xxxxx De Vasquez, Carmen Montes De
 Oca.
 xxxxx Diamantis, Nicholas or Nicho-
 laos John.
 xxxxx Diaz, Albert Rosario.
 xxxxx Diaz, Lydia Rodriguez (nee
 Lydia Rodriguez).
 xxxxx Dodson, Mabel Katherine (nee
 Bell).
 xxxxx Dong, Kee Yeow or Dong Kee
 Yow or Lew Fook.
 xxxxx Dung, Lee or Dung Lee.
 xxxx Dunn, Noel Ostwald.
 xxxxx Echevarria, Leoncio Bilbao.
 xxxx Edwards, Allan Reginald.
 xxxx Elliott, Arthur Alexander, alias
 Isaac Bent.
 xxxxx Errico, Victor, or Vittoreo Er-
 rico.
 xxxxx Esposito, Vincenzo.
 xxxx Esposito, Vincenzo.

xxxxxx Falcone, Rita Maria.
 xxxxx Fang, Henry Ping.
 xxxxx Farn, Mario, or Tang Yet Farm.
 xxxx Fat, Lai.
 xxxxx Fat, Lam.
 xxxxx Feito, Mario Caunedo.
 xxxxx Fernandez, Pedro, or Fernandes.
 xxxxx Fernandez y Gonzalez, Agapito.
 xxxxx Fernandez, Rosalie Boto Y Rod-
 riguez De.
 xxxxx Figuredo, Domingo Acosta, alias
 Domingo Acosta.
 xxxxx Fischer, Albert Robert.
 xxxxx Flamos, Loukas.
 xxxxx Fong, Ah Kew.
 xxxxx Forlini, Michael, or Michele.
 xxxxx Forti, Attilio Joseph.
 xxxxx Fortin, Joseph Albert.
 xxxxx Frassetto, Roberto.
 xxxxx Freed, Alys (nee Bould), for-
 merly Alys Bramen.
 xxxxx Friesner, Rudolf Dawid or Ru-
 dolf David Friesner.
 xxxxx Frost (or Fross), Molly Marie or
 Mary.
 xxxx Fugmann-Christensen, Gert
 alias Gerd Fugmann-Christensen or George
 Schulz.
 xxxxx Gallegos-Chavez, Juan.
 xxxxx Garcia, Alejandro.
 xxxxx Garcia-Rivera, Jose or Joe
 Garcia.
 xxxxx Goitia, Hilda or Hilda Victoria
 Alveraz.
 xxxxx Gonzales, Francisco Javier alias
 Frank Gonzales.
 xxxxx Goodson, Joyce (nee Shai).
 xxxxx Gorostiza, Rusbio Ramos alias
 Chevo Ramos.
 xxxxx Grazia, Joseph Di or Giuseppe
 De Grazia.
 xxxxx Greco, Joseph.
 xxxxx Gronfeldt, Arne.
 xxxxx Guntveit, Severin L.
 xxxxx Gutierrez-Torres, Pedro.
 xxxxx Gutierrez, Enedina Fuentes de.
 xxxxx Hanchar, Adam, or Damian
 Hanczar, alias Joe Charny.
 xxxx Hastings, Patrick Joseph.
 xxxxx Healy, Patrick.
 xxxxx Hernandez, Hortensia alias Hor-
 tensia Martino Garcia.
 xxxxx Hernandez, John Jose.
 xxxx Hess, Frederick Cecil alias Jose
 Hargrave.
 xxxxx Hewitt, George Lorenzo.
 xxxxx Hinkson, Thelma Ellse (nee
 Moore).
 xxxx Ho, Louie On.
 xxxx Hong, Lee Shew or Albert
 Chung.
 xxxx Hong, Wha Sook alias Wha Sook
 Lee Hong.
 xxxxx Hwang, Yung-Yuan.
 xxxxx Hwang, Bertha Samtoy.
 xxxx Iwanade, Isao, alias Nicholas G.
 Johansen.
 xxxx Iwanade, Kaoru, alias Eric R.
 Johansen.
 xxxx Tanahashi, Fumio, alias War-
 ren S. Johansen.
 xxxxx Jaffee, Israel Morris alias Mor-
 ris Jaffee.
 xxxx James, Emanuel or Arthur James.
 xxxxx Johansen, Karen (nee Karen
 Johansen).
 xxxx Jon, Sophie.
 xxxxx Kallimanis, Spyros alias Spirros
 Kalpinanis.
 xxxxx Kavurias, Nicolaos or Kavorias.
 xxxxx Kerner, Salomon.
 xxxxx Kitover, Anna.
 xxxxx Koehler, Emil or Emil Heinrich
 August Johan Koehler or John Wagner.
 xxxxx Konter, Ida Hannah (nee
 Swinbelis).
 xxxxx Krokos, Leoenidas.
 xxxxx Kuun, Arvid Valentine.
 xxxxx Kwai, Sue Gee, or Sung Ah Fat.
 xxxxx Kwok, Gun Bew, or Kwok Bew
 or Ng Hoong.

xxxxxx, Ladendorf, Martha Marie.
 xxxxxx, Lai, Chong or Joey Chong.
 xxxxx, Lai, William T. or Lai Poy.
 xxxxx, Lango, Pablo Perez.
 xxxxx, Lavorante, Ciro.
 xxxx, Ledesma, Genovevo or Genovevo Ledesma-Acosta.
 xxxxx, Lee, Kam Tseung.
 xxxxx, Leo, Ying.
 xxxxx, Leong, Wone alias Sam Wong alias Wone Sam.
 xxxx, Libby, George Patrick.
 xxxxx, Liebowitz, Alexander.
 xxxxx, Lipman, Ida.
 xxxxx, Lo, Ven Sing alias Lo Ven Sing alias Lowe Sing.
 xxxxx, Locario, Daniel Emanuel.
 xxxx, Lopez-Quintero, Jesus.
 xxxx, Loy, Suey or Sue Fong.
 xxxxx, Lozano, Edgardo Manuel.
 xxxxx, Lubrano, Mario, alias Nunzio Lubrano.
 xxxxx, (1), Ludwig, Gisele.
 xxxxx, (2), Hagenfeld, Margarete, alias Margarete Hagenfeld Clark.
 xxxxx, Mahkonen, Saimi Aline, or Salmi A. Mahkonen.
 xxxxx, Mailloux, Lucienda Marie Laura (nee Dube).
 xxxxx, Manning, Samuel Lawrence.
 xxxxx, Manning, Melitta (nee Shottnegg-Zinzenfels).
 xxxxx, Manning, Raymond.
 xxxxx, Mar, Benny or Mar Ben.
 xxxxx, Martin, Manuel Pena alias Manuel Pena.
 xxxxx, Mavris, Panagiotis alias Peter J. Mavis.
 xxxxx, May, Cheng or Cheng Mee or Cheng Moy.
 xxxxx, Medina, Doroteo Soria.
 xxxxx, Melchionna, Generoso alias Genaro Melchiora.
 xxxxx, Mergemekes, Anastasia or Anastasia George Dadakis.
 xxxxx, Miguel, Alberto.
 xxxxx, Millen, Alexander.
 xxxxx, Minikes, Mayer or Major.
 xxxxx, Minino, Ramon alias Ramon Gasamanes.
 xxxxx, Minutolo, Lorenzo.
 xxxxx, Mitchell, Mary Elizabeth or Mary Elizabeth James or Mary Elizabeth Dennis or Mary Elizabeth Bailey or Mary Martin.
 xxxxx, Mon, Lee alias Henry Chung.
 xxxxx, Montello, Gennaro.
 xxxxx, Moon, Kan.
 xxxx, Morelli, Valentine Elizabeth.
 xxxxx, Moreno, Antonio or Tony Moreno.
 xxxxx, Morton, Edith Elva Godsce (nee Gilbert).
 xxxxx, Mugnone, Oreste or Oreste Mugnone Barattolo.
 xxxxx, Mui, Jak Lim or Sang Moy.
 xxxxx, Nemeth, Margit.
 xxxxx, Newmann, Henry Hugo.
 xxxxx, O'Halloran, Thomas Patrick.
 xxxxx, Ontiveros-Ortega, Jose.
 xxxxx, Org, Amalia, or Amalia Schirmer.
 xxxxx, Palmeri, Francesco, alias Francesco Palmier alias Alberto Sinna.
 xxxxx, Palomo, Eufrosina Vergara (nee Mallari).
 xxxxx, Panis, Ricardo Manalaysay.
 xxxxx, Papadopoulos, George.
 xxxxx, Penn, Enid Louise.
 xxxxx, Penn, Muriel Naomi.
 xxxxx, Penoucos Y Lopez, Daniel.
 xxxxx, Perlmuter, Herbert.
 xxxxx, Peters, Johannes Lambertus Adrianus.
 xxxx, Peterson, William James.
 xxxxx, Petrolekas, John or John Lekas.
 xxxxx, Phillips, Frederick Robert.
 xxxxx, Pinson, Lillian May formerly Clarke formerly Myers (nee Fielding).
 xxxxx, Psaranos, Stylianos.
 xxxxx, Raffaelli, Gino.
 xxxx, Reyes, Ofelia Candia y, or Ofelia Candia.

xxxxxx, Richardson, Wilfred.
 xxxxxx, Ricketts, Allen Donald, or Allen Donald, or Allen D. Reeves, or Sidney Wallace.
 xxxxx, Rivera, Victor.
 xxxxx, Robinson, Nina Yankowsky, or Fatima Nina Robinson, or Nina Stevens.
 xxxxx, Rommel, Johannes Max Gustav.
 xxxxx, Rosenfeld, Leah.
 xxxxx, Rosenfield, Louis.
 xxxxx, Rovira, John, or John Rovira Panier, or Juan Rovira Pamies, or John Revero.
 xxxx, Ruber, Peter.
 xxxx, Ruber, Michael.
 xxxxx, Ruchan, Dotty (nee Dvora Hillman).
 xxxxx, Ruiz-Gaitan, Hilario.
 xxxxx, Ruiz-Nino, Antonio, or Antonio Ruiz.
 xxxxx, Ruiz, Manuel Vazquez.
 xxxxx, Salkow, Maria, or Maria Begona Oru or Iturregui.
 xxxx, Salmon, Leonard Alexander, alias Leslie Chaplain.
 xxxxx, Sandro, Alexander Ilych Petroff Von.
 xxxx, Santo, Joaquin Joao.
 xxxxx, Sciancalepore, Marino, or Mario Sciancalepore.
 xxxxx, Sen, Lo, or Sin or Sem or Low Sen.
 xxxxx, Shapiro, Irving, alias Izak Szapiro.
 xxxx, Shaw, John Samuel, or Samuel Shaw or John Brown.
 xxxxx, Shen, Chun Kang, alias John C. K. Shen.
 xxxxx, Shing, Low.
 xxxxx, Shiro, Yasukichi.
 xxxxx, Shui, Chin, or Chen Sui.
 xxxxx, Sibli, Ahmed, alias Manua Sulin or Manue Sulin.
 xxxxx, Silva, Antonio, alias Antonio da Silva alias Sebolo.
 xxxxx, Sing, Chen.
 xxxxx, Sing, Lee.
 xxxxx, Siniscalchi, Matteo.
 xxxxx, Sjogren, Toini Rauha (nee Arvonen).
 xxxxx, Sjokvist, Torsten Stellan.
 xxxxx, Smalic, Krezan, or Chris Smolich.
 xxxxx, Soares, Reginald, or Reginald Suarez.
 xxxxx, Sorensen, Robert.
 xxxxx, Spadafino, Rosa (Rosetta) (nee Reiggiero).
 xxxxx, Stefanatos, Jerry C. or Gerasimos C. Stefanatos.
 xxxxx, Stelatos, Gerasimos.
 xxxxx, Stephens, Maria.
 xxxxx, Storelli, Vito.
 xxxxx, Suey, Sing or Shing Sun.
 xxxxx, Sun, Wong Yat alias Sun Wong.
 xxxxx, Sunn, Mimi (nee Mei-Ta Chang).
 xxxx, Sze, Mal-Wai Yuen Tsung.
 xxxxx, Tablada, Nina Cabrera.
 xxxxx, Tegeder, Ernest or Ernst.
 xxxxx, Teles, Enrique or Henrique Teles.
 xxxxx, Terilli, Mary Josephine alias Mary Josephine Machado alias Mary Josephine Frisello (nee Mary Josephine Tenna).
 xxxxx, Terrazzer, Lucio.
 xxxxx, Thompson, Frederick Oliver.
 xxxxx, Toth, Stephen.
 xxxxx, Tratner, Israel.
 xxxxx, Tricogliou, Michael or Trikogliou.
 xxxxx, Tsung, Chin Gay, or Gay Tsung Chin.
 xxxxx, Ukmor, John or Giovanni.
 xxxxx, Vadala, Domenico.
 xxxx, Valdes, Manuel Ortaga.
 xxxxx, Vasilatos, Demetrios or James Vasilatos or Jim Vasilis or Patakos.
 xxxxx, Ventoso, Jesus.
 xxxxx, Verde, Salvatore or Salvatore John Balente.
 xxxxx, Viera, Victoriano.
 xxxxx, Viso, Giacomo.

xxxxxx, Vito, Tony alias Antonio Tan-credi.
 xxxxx, Wah, Yuen alias Wah Yuen.
 xxxxx, Wals, Rafael.
 xxxxx, Weinberger, Bernard.
 xxxxx, White, Elizabeth.
 xxxx, Wong, Hing or Wong Bow.
 xxxxx, Wong, James, alias Chong Yong Wong.
 xxxx, Wong, Kwai Jimmy.
 xxxxx, Wong, Man-Shun.
 xxxxx, Wong, Florence Kit-Wah Kwan.
 xxxxx, Wong, Sak Sing.
 xxxx, Wong, Sing Fuh.
 xxxxx, Woo, Yu Tsung (nee Dzung).
 xxxx, Yee, Moo.
 xxxxx, Yen, Ma alias Haw Kau.
 xxxxx, Ying, Wong or Mok Him.
 xxxxx, York, Au alias Tan Wan Au.
 xxxxx, Young, Chan Kow alias Kow Chin or Chan Kow.
 xxxxx, Yow, Yuen or John Yau or Yow Yuen or Yen Yow.
 xxxxx, Yuen, Yip or Yip Ying.
 xxxxx, Yun, Yip alias Soo Kun.
 xxxxx, Zamboca, Albert.
 xxxxx, Zamora Y Gonzalez, Armando Eulalio.
 xxxx, Chuen, Ho Wing, or Ho Ming Ngem or Jose Herrera.
 xxxxx, Galvan-Rivera, Antonio.
 xxxxx, Hernandez De Aguilar, Maria De Jesus.
 xxxxx, Hernandez-Hernandez, Jesus.
 xxxxx, Hernandez-Hernandez, Marcial-ano Emilio or Emilio Hernandez.
 xxxxx, Lopez-Lopez, Ignacio or George Casillo or Jorge Castillo.
 xxxxx, Petit, Guiseppe.
 xxxxx, Sanchez-Hernandez, Luis or Luis Hernandez or Luis Sanchez.
 xxxxx, Tavares, Maria Guadalupe Cauz De or Ester Guadalupe Cauz De Tavares or Guadalupe Cauz.
 xxxxx, Williams, Leon Emanuel or Raymond Williams.
 xxxxx, Wong, Ling or George William.
 xxxx, Arendt, Alfred William Peter.
 xxxxx, Aresta, Joao Maria Silva.
 xxxx, Edgar, Sidney Ellis.
 xxxxx, Fenakel, Nikolas, or Niklos.
 xxxxx, Osle-Aloma, Fausto, or Fausto Oslo.
 xxxxx, Osle, Irida Rodriguez or Irida Osle (nee Irida Rodriguez Diaz).
 xxxxx, Xerizotis, Constantin or Gust Zotas.
 xxxxx, Carr, Annie Mary or Nan Carr or Annie Mary Thorgersen.
 xxxxx, Halmeschlager, Elfriede Elizabeth or Norcross.
 xxxxx, Hsun-Hsiang, Nyi or Nyi Husan-Hsin and Henry Nyi.
 xxxx, Islas-Casillas, Canute Jesus.
 xxxxx, Islas, Antonia Gomez de.
 xxxxx, Marinidis, Constantine Marino or Constantine Marino Marinides.
 xxxx, Prieto, Maria Concepcion Panton (nee Conchan Rivas).
 xxxxx, Rieck, John.
 xxxxx, Shek, John Liensheng.
 xxxxx, Shich, Benea or Sih Benea.
 xxxx, Smollar, Waltraut Wiederhold.
 xxxxx, Billinis, Costas Alex.
 xxxxx, Vukic, Ante.
 xxxxx, Schniewind, Paul Werner Konrad.
 xxxxx, Schniewind, Maria Friederike Fernande.
 xxxxx, Matarela, Maurice of Mike Matarela.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

S. 2047. A bill to amend the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for the sale of

Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, to repeal and modify certain of its provisions affected thereby, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. ELLENDER):

S. 2048. A bill to provide for the use of surplus agricultural commodities in paying for offshore purchases of military supplies and other goods and services; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. SMITH of North Carolina:

S. 2049. A bill to prohibit the payment of compensation to officers or employees of the Government who have refused on grounds of self-incrimination to give testimony before congressional committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2050. A bill for the relief of Masao Kato (Michael Francis Dufault) and Kumigai Naoko (Pauline Ann Dufault); and

S. 2051. A bill for the relief of Arthur Alexander Cornelius and Frank Thomas Cornelius; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 2052. A bill for the relief of Methodius Cyrialus Petruch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 2053. A bill for the relief of Loh Bei-Li (Mary Loh); and

S. 2054. A bill for the relief of Cpl. Natale Bunici; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 2055. A bill to amend the act of May 29, 1884, as amended, to provide for the control and eradication of scrapie and blue tongue in sheep, and incipient or potentially serious minor outbreaks of diseases of animals; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 2056. A bill for the relief of Deborah Jordan Williams (Grace Yoko Watanabe); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 2057. A bill for the relief of Magdalene Rose Denes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOBEY:

S. 2058. A bill for the relief of Maj. Kenneth W. Hackett; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2059. A bill for the relief of Bjorn Normann Bough; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

S. 2060. A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for National Guard representation in certain agencies engaged in its administration; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 2061. A bill to amend section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to limit to the 1953 crop the requirement that the prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], I introduce for ap-

propriate reference a bill to amend the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for the sale of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, to repeal and modify certain of its provisions affected thereby, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me, and a sectional analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2047) to amend the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, to provide for the sale of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities, to repeal and modify certain of its provisions affected thereby, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. BRICKER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That this act may be cited as the "Rubber Plant Disposal Act of 1953."

SEC. 2. Section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 101, 50 U. S. C. App. 1921), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. (a) It is hereby declared that the sale of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities to private enterprise pursuant to the provisions of this section will best promote the national security and the public welfare, and will further effectuate the policy set forth in section 2 of this act with respect to the development within the United States of a free, competitive synthetic rubber industry.

"(b) (1) There is hereby established in the Executive Office of the President a Rubber Plant Disposal Board consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, who shall be Chairman, the Attorney General, and the Administrator of General Services. The Board shall appoint a disposal agent who shall, subject to the general supervision and control of the Board and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by it, negotiate promptly for the sale of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities as specified hereinafter. The disposal agent shall receive compensation at the rate of \$17,500 per annum and shall devote his full time to his duties as such agent.

"(2) The Board shall be furnished upon its request all available information concerning the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities in the possession of the department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States designated from time to time by the President pursuant to subsection (a) of section 7 of this act.

"(3) The disposal agent, subject to the approval of the Board, is authorized to employ technical, professional, clerical, and stenographic assistance, and is further authorized to request and receive the assistance of any employee of any department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States concerned with the operation of the Government-owned rubber facilities, and may utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services as may from time to time be needed, being authorized to provide by regulation for exemption of persons whose services are so utilized from the operation of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, and 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

"(c) (1) All dispositions shall be by sale except as provided in subsection (n) of this section.

"(2) The disposal agent as soon as practicable after appointment shall invite, upon 21 days' notice and advertisement, proposals for the purchase of the rubber-producing facilities. The period for the receipt of proposals shall be determined and publicly announced by the disposal agent and in no event shall be less than 60 days nor more than 90 days. All data concerning such facilities which in the judgment of the disposal agent may be reasonably required for the submission of a bona fide proposal shall be furnished by the disposal agent upon request by any prospective bidder unless the disposal agent has reason to believe that such prospective bidder has not identified his principal, or is not financially responsible, or is a poor security risk.

"(3) Proposals shall be in writing, and shall contain—

"(A) identification of the person in whose behalf the bid is submitted, including the business affiliations of such person;

"(B) the facility or facilities which are proposed to be purchased, and the order of preference if more than one facility is proposed to be purchased;

"(C) the arrangements or plans, formal or informal, for the supply of feedstock to, and the disposition of the end products of, the respective facilities proposed to be purchased;

"(D) the amount proposed to be paid for each of the facilities, and, if such amount is not to be paid in cash, then the principal terms of the financing arrangement proposed;

"(E) the general terms and conditions which the prospective purchaser of a facility would be willing to accept in order to make the end product of such facility available for sale to small-business enterprises and users other than the purchaser of the facility; and

"(F) such other information as the disposal agent may reasonably require.

"(4) The disposal agent may, after the termination of the period for the submission of proposals provided for in paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section, disclose the contents of the proposals to such extent as he deems appropriate.

"(5) Each person or group of persons submitting a proposal or proposals shall deposit with the disposal agent cash or United States Government bonds equal to 1 percent of the aggregate amount proposed to be paid but not more than \$100,000. Except in the case of successful bidders, deposits made hereunder shall be refunded without interest and not later than the time when all contracts of sale shall become fully effective as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (1) of this section. In the case of successful bidders, deposits made hereunder shall be applied, without interest, to the purchase price.

"(d) Payment of the purchase price may be made in part by a first lien purchase-money mortgage, in an amount not to exceed 80 percent of the purchase price. The terms of any such mortgage obligation shall be determined by negotiation, and shall provide among other things for a maturity of not more than 10 years, periodic amortization, and an interest rate consistent with interest rates on comparable loans currently made by private lenders. Such mortgage may permit anticipation of prescribed periodic payments by the mortgagor without penalty.

"(e) Promptly after the termination of the period for the receipt of proposals, pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of this section, and for such period thereafter not to exceed 180 days as may be determined and publicly announced by the disposal agent, negotiations shall be conducted with those submitting proposals for the purpose of entering into definitive contracts of sale which shall be binding and effective as to the disposal agent and the bidder, subject only

to the further procedures specified in subsection (1) of this section: *Provided*, That the Board may, upon a finding that further time for negotiation is desirable, extend such period for an additional period not to exceed 90 days. In disposing of a rubber-producing facility, the disposal agent shall negotiate only with those who have submitted proposals for that particular facility unless, in the judgment of the disposal agent, such limited negotiation would defeat the purposes of this act. In such event, the disposal agent may negotiate with those who have submitted bids for any of the facilities.

"(f) (1) The disposal agent shall develop a disposal plan that will realize for the Government the fair value of each Government-owned rubber-producing facility and that will not, in the opinion of the Attorney General, tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. Any disposal pursuant to such plan shall be deemed not to violate the antitrust laws.

"(2) The disposal plan for the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities shall insure that small business enterprises and users other than the purchaser of the facility involved receive a fair share of the end products of the facilities sold.

"(3) The disposal plan shall insure the potential manufacture of not less than 400,000 tons of general-purpose rubber annually and not less than 45,000 tons of butyl rubber annually during the useful life of the facilities sold; otherwise no disposal of such facilities to private ownership shall be effected under this section.

"(4) Each purchaser of a Government-owned rubber-producing facility must present evidence satisfactory to the disposal agent that he is a good security risk and that the proposed management and operations of the facility will be consistent with the national-security interests of the United States.

"(g) All contracts of sale and instruments in execution thereof shall contain an appropriate national-security clause designed to assure the prompt availability of the rubber-producing facilities for the production of synthetic rubber and the component materials thereof for the purposes of national defense when need therefor is declared by the President.

"(h) All contracts of sale shall become fully effective upon the expiration of 30 days after submission to the Board by the disposal agent of the disposal plan as provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (1) of this section, unless such disposal plan is disapproved by the Board within such period and the transfer of possession of all of the rubber-producing facilities included in the disposal plan shall be made as promptly as practicable after the effective date, in accordance with the terms of the contracts, but in any event within a uniform reasonable transfer period.

"(i) Upon termination of the transfer period, as provided in subsection (h) of this section, neither the disposal agent nor the agency designated by the President under section 7 of this act shall make any further sales of synthetic rubber or its component materials except as provided in subsection (j) of this section.

"(j) During the period of 1 year following the termination of the transfer period, the disposal agent shall offer for sale at a price determined in accordance with the Government pricing policy prevailing at the close of the transfer period, all finished stocks of synthetic rubber and its component materials held by the Government at the close of the transfer period in such a manner as to make available to nonpurchasers of facilities and small-business enterprises a fair share of such finished stocks of synthetic rubber. For the purposes of this section a small-business enterprise shall be deemed

to consist of an enterprise independently owned and operated which is not dominant in its field of operation, due regard being given to the number of its employees and dollar volume of business. Any synthetic rubber or component materials not sold during such 1-year period shall thereafter be transferred to the General Services Administration for disposal as surplus property.

"(k) Upon the termination of the transfer period the rubber-producing facilities not sold shall be taken out of production and placed in adequate standby condition as promptly as practicable consistent with sound operating procedures. After the termination of production, such facilities shall be transferred without reimbursement or transfer of funds to the General Services Administration and administered in accordance with the provisions of sections 6, 7, and 8 of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 1227, 50 U. S. C. 456-458), as amended, except that (1) no such facility shall thereafter be operated as a rubber-producing facility for the account of the Government except pursuant to further act of the Congress; (2) no such facility, other than alcohol butadiene facilities, shall be leased for operation as a rubber-producing facility at any time; and (3) no such facility shall be disposed of by sale within a period of 1 year from the termination of the transfer period. In any subsequent sale, the General Services Administration shall secure the advice of the Attorney General as to whether the proposed sale would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws.

"(l) (1) Not later than 30 days after the termination of the negotiating period provided in subsection (e) of this section, the disposal agent shall prepare and submit to the Board a report setting forth—

"(A) the steps taken to elicit bids and the bids which have been received;

"(B) the principal terms of all contracts of sales approved by the disposal agent;

"(C) in the event that there may have been a financially more advantageous bid for any rubber-producing facility than the contract of sale approved, a statement of the reasons why such contract was approved;

"(D) the program to be followed to place in standby condition the rubber-producing facilities not sold;

"(E) an inventory report stating the Government's current stocks of synthetic rubber and its component materials;

"(F) a program for the continuance, to the extent he deems necessary, during the fiscal year following the fiscal year in which the transfer period terminates, of the basic research program on synthetic rubber and its component materials then being carried on by the Government;

"(G) the names of persons who have represented the Government or the purchasers in conducting negotiations or in making contracts for disposal of the rubber-producing facilities; and

"(H) the circumstances under which the disposal agent negotiated for the sale of any rubber-producing facility with bidders who did not submit any proposal for the particular facility.

"(2) Unless the Board disapproves the disposal plan within 30 days after its submission, the disposal agent shall proceed forthwith to carry out the contracts and programs outlined in his report. The Board shall disapprove the disposal plan if it finds that such plan will not realize for the Government the fair value of each rubber-producing facility proposed to be sold, will tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws in the production and marketing of synthetic rubber and its component materials, will not protect the national security and public welfare, or is otherwise not in conformity with the provisions of this section. If the Board disapproves the dis-

posal plan within such 30-day period, it shall submit promptly a report to the Congress setting forth its reasons for such disapproval. Thereafter, no further negotiations shall be held looking toward disposal of the Government-owned rubber-producing facilities unless and until the Congress shall so provide by law.

"(m) No rubber-producing facility shall be sold except in accordance with this section or, so long as it shall remain operative, paragraph (4) of subsection (d) of section 7 of this act.

"(n) Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, the department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States designated by the President under section 7 of this act may, subject to subsections (k), (m), and (q) of this section, at any time before unsold Government-owned rubber-producing facilities are placed in standby condition as permitted by subsection (1) of this section, and after securing the advice of the Attorney General as to whether the proposed lease would tend to create or maintain a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws, enter into a contract of lease for any alcohol butadiene facility for a period of not more than 3 years: *Provided*, That any such lease shall contain (1) a national security clause, and (2) provisions for recapture of each leased facility by the Government and termination of the lease, if the President declares that the national interest so requires. When the unsold rubber-producing facilities are placed in standby under subsection (1) of this section, the Administrator of General Services shall succeed to all rights, powers, and duties of the lessor in leases of alcohol butadiene facilities entered into prior thereto, and shall succeed to the power to make such leases subject to the conditions prescribed in this subsection.

"(o) At the expiration of 1 year after the transfer period or as soon thereafter as the Congress is in session, the President shall report to the Congress concerning the Nation's rubber requirements and resources and the need, if any, for further basic research by the Government relative to the production or use of synthetic rubber.

"(p) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 18 of this act, the term 'rubber-producing facilities' as used in this section shall not include the Government-owned evaluation laboratory at Akron, Ohio.

"(q) All net proceeds from disposal of the rubber-producing facilities shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Sec. 3. The sales, leases, or other dispositions made prior to the enactment of this act, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 101), as amended, shall not be affected by this act.

Sec. 4. The Rubber Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 101), as amended, is further amended as follows:

(a) In subsection (e) of section 10, strike "(a)."

(b) Section 20 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 20. (a) This act shall remain in effect through March 31, 1956.

"(b) If the disposal plan submitted by the disposal agent pursuant to paragraph (1) of subsection (1) of section 9 is not disapproved by the Board within the period provided in paragraph (2) of subsection (1) of section 9, then, at the expiration of 30 days after termination of the transfer period, the following sections and subsections hereof shall be repealed: Sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 10."

Sec. 5. No contract for the sale of any Government-owned rubber-producing facility shall be entered into unless the purchaser (1) certifies to the disposal agent the names of all attorneys, agents, or other persons engaged by or on behalf of the purchaser for the purpose of obtaining such contract of

sale, and the fees paid or to be paid to such persons; and (2) executes an agreement binding the purchaser for a period of 2 years after transfer of any such facility from the disposal agent to it, to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who on the date of such transfer or within a year prior thereto shall have served as a member of the Board or as an attorney, agent, or employee of the Board or the disposal agent in activities involving discretion with respect to negotiations or contracts of sale under this act.

Sec. 6. The Board and the disposal agent, subject to the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 597, 31 U. S. C. 841), as amended, are each authorized to acquire, hold, and dispose of property, determine the character of and necessity for their obligations and expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, and exercise such other powers as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act. All costs incurred by the Board and the disposal agent pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be charged against the operating costs of the Government-owned synthetic rubber program, administered by the department, agency, officer, Government corporation, or instrumentality of the United States designed from time to time by the President pursuant to subsection (a) of section 7 of the Rubber Act of 1948 (62 Stat. 101, 50 U. S. C. App. 1921), as amended.

The statement by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR CAPEHART

The bill would authorize the disposal of the Government-owned synthetic rubber-producing facilities.

It is the strong conviction of the junior Senator from Ohio and myself that the sale of Government-owned rubber-producing facilities to private enterprise as provided in this bill will best promote the national security and the public welfare and will foster a free and competitive synthetic-rubber industry, which in turn will provide full and fair competition for the producers of natural rubber. At the same time the bill requires that the Government obtain the full fair value of each facility sold.

This bill amends section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, and modifies and repeals certain other provisions of that act. It follows closely in many respects the original recommendation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation disposal report and the recommendations of the President. A 3-member Rubber Plant Disposal Board is created by the bill, consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, who is designated as chairman, the Attorney General and the Administrator of General Services. This Board will supervise and control the activities of the disposal agent it appoints, and will approve or disapprove of the disposal plan submitted to it by the disposal agent.

After appointment and upon reasonable notice, the disposal agent invites proposals for the purchase of each of the plants. An adequate period of from 60 to 90 days, to be publicly announced, is established for the submission of proposals. Following that, the disposal agent is given 180 days to negotiate contracts of sale, with provision being made for an additional period of 90 days, if the Board deems it necessary.

At the termination of the negotiation period, the disposal agent is required to submit a full and complete report to the Board, setting forth his recommendations with respect to disposal of the plants and placing in standby those not sold. If the Board does not disapprove the disposal plan, it becomes effective 30 days after submission. In the event the Board disapproves the disposal plan within 30 days after submission,

it must submit promptly a report to the Congress setting forth its reasons for disapproval. Unless and until further authorization is provided by the Congress, no further negotiations may then be conducted.

Criteria are established by the bill to guide the Board in determining whether or not the disposal plan should be approved. The Board must disapprove, if it finds the plan will not realize the full fair value of each rubber-producing facility proposed to be sold, or will violate the antitrust laws, or will not protect the national security and public welfare.

Any plants not sold must be placed in standby with the General Services Administration. Such plants may not be sold for 1 year and may not be operated by the Government except under further act of the Congress. Authority is provided for leasing the Government-owned alcohol butadiene plants for 3 years if they are not sold.

Each person or group submitting a proposal must furnish the disposal agent with certain basic information. The principal must be identified; the facility or facilities proposed to be purchased must be designated in order of preference; any arrangements, formal or informal, for the supply of feedstocks and the disposition of the end products must be indicated; and the general terms and conditions which the prospective purchaser would be willing to accept in order to make the end product of the facility available for sale to small-business enterprises and users other than the purchaser of the facility must be set forth.

A good-faith deposit in cash or United States Government bonds equal to 1 percent of the aggregate amount proposed to be paid but not exceeding \$100,000 must accompany proposals submitted by one person or group. If a bidder is unsuccessful, his deposits are refunded without interest; otherwise they are applied, without interest, to the purchase price.

At least 20 percent of the purchase price must be paid in cash. A purchase-money mortgage for the balance maturing not later than 10 years, carrying the going rate of interest on private loans, may be taken by the Government. The sale may provide for accelerated payment without penalty.

In order to encourage the submitting of proposals, provision is made to limit negotiations to those submitting bona fide proposals.

Several basic principles are enumerated to guide both the Board and the disposal agent in the formulation of a disposal plan. First, the plan must insure that small-business enterprises and users other than the purchaser of the facility involved receive a fair share of the end products produced by the facilities that are sold. Secondly, before the facilities are sold, the plan must insure a potential manufacturer of at least 400,000 tons of general-purpose rubber and at least 45,000 tons of butyl rubber annually. Third, satisfactory evidence must be presented that the purchaser is a good security risk and that the operations of the facility will be consistent with our national security. Fourth, an appropriate national-security clause designed to assure prompt availability for national defense must be included in each contract of sale.

Within 30 days after termination of the negotiating period, the disposal agent must submit to the Board a written report covering the steps taken to obtain proposals; the proposals received; his recommendations as to sale and the main terms of the contracts of sale; an explanation why the high bid was not taken, if such was the case; his program for placing in standby the facilities not sold; an inventory of current synthetic-rubber stocks and component materials held by the Government; his recommendation with respect to the need for further basic research by the Government; the

names of persons representing the Government and the purchasers during the negotiations; and the circumstances under which negotiation was had with a bidder who did not submit a proposal for the particular facility involved.

For a period of 1 year after the transfer of the facilities, the disposal agent is authorized to sell in accordance with Government pricing policies prevailing at the close of the transfer period, all finished stocks and component materials held by the Government. Such sales must be made in a manner to make available to small-business enterprises and nonpurchasers of facilities a fair share of the stocks of synthetic rubber.

The bill prohibits any contract of sale unless the purchaser (1) certifies the names of agents engaged for the purpose of obtaining such contract and the fees paid or to be paid for those services; and (2) agrees not to hire for 2 years a member of the Board, the disposal agent, or any person employed by the Board or disposal agent in activities involving discretion during the negotiations.

All costs incurred by the Board and disposal agent are subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act.

All facilities that can be disposed of or are to be disposed of under this bill, except the Government laboratory at Akron, Ohio. This facility is to engage in basic Government research only for a period of 1 year, at which time the President is to make recommendations to the Congress with respect to the need for further research of this type.

The sectional analysis presented by Mr. CAPEHART is as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF A BILL TO AMEND THE RUBBER ACT OF 1948, AS AMENDED, TO PROVIDE FOR THE SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED RUBBER-PRODUCING FACILITIES

Section 1—short title—The Rubber Plant Disposal Act of 1953.

Section 2 amends section 9 of the Rubber Act of 1948, as amended, to read as follows:

"Sec. 9 (a). Declaration of policy: Sale of these synthetic-rubber plants to private ownership will promote national security and public welfare.

"Sec. 9 (b) (1). Creates Rubber Plant Disposal Board. Chairman, Secretary of Treasury. Other members: Attorney General and Administrator of General Services. Board to appoint full-time disposal agent to negotiate sale of plants. His salary, \$17,500 per year.

"Sec. 9 (b) (2). On request, board can get all available information on plants from RFC, which supervises plant operations.

"Sec. 9 (b) (3). Disposal agent may hire employees and use voluntary services exempt from conflict-of-interest statutes.

"Sec. 9 (c) (1). All disposals to be by sale except for possible lease of alcohol butadiene plants.

"Sec. 9 (c) (2). Disposal agent to invite purchase proposals as soon as practicable, giving 21 days' advertisement. Proposals to be received during 60- to 90-day period set by disposal agent. Data needed by prospective bidders to be furnished by disposal agent, but not to those with undisclosed principal, financially irresponsible, or poor security risks.

"Sec. 9 (c) (3). Written proposals required. Include:

"(A) naming principal and its business affiliations;

"(B) plants to be negotiated for and priority of preference;

"(C) arrangements for feedstocks and use of end products of plants;

"(D) amount to be paid for plants and main financing terms;

"(E) arrangements to make end products available to small business and those who don't purchase a plant;

"(F) other information disposal agent requires.

"SEC. 9 (c) (4). Disposal agent may disclose contents of proposals.

"SEC. 9 (c) (5). Good-faith deposit in cash or United States bonds required. One percent of total amount offered in proposals by one person or group. Maximum of \$100,000. Deposits refunded without interest to non-purchasers. Deposits applied without interest toward purchase price for purchasers.

"SEC. 9 (d). May use purchase money mortgage up to 80 percent of price. Terms set by negotiation. Maturity not over 10 years. Periodic amortization required. Interest rate consistent with private loans. May allow anticipated payments without penalty.

"SEC. 9 (e). After close of time to make proposals, negotiations for sale of plants to be conducted for not over 180 days, with 90-day extension allowed if Board thinks it advisable. Negotiations on each plant held only with those who submit proposals on such plant, unless disposal agent thinks it advisable to extend negotiations to those who submit proposal for any of the plants.

"SEC. 9 (f) (1). Disposal plan to get fair value of plants for Government, and not be inconsistent with antitrust laws in Attorney General's opinion.

"SEC. 9 (f) (2). Disposal plant to insure fair share of end products of each plant for small business and those who do not buy such plant.

"SEC. 9 (f) (3). Disposal plan to insure potential manufacture of at least 400,000 tons of general purpose rubber and 45,000 tons of butyl rubber annually during life of plants; else no disposal.

"SEC. 9 (f) (4). Purchaser must show agent it is a good security risk and management and operations will be in national interest.

"SEC. 9 (g). Sale instruments to have national-security clause to assure plant availability for producing rubber and feed stocks whenever need declared by President.

"SEC. 9 (h). Sale contracts effective 30 days after disposal plan submitted to Board, unless it disapproves disposal plan in that period. Possession of plants to be transferred promptly after effective date under contract terms and within uniform reasonable transfer period.

"SEC. 9 (i). After close of transfer period, disposal agent and RFC can't sell synthetic rubber or component materials except as set out in next paragraph 9 (j).

"SEC. 9 (j). During 1 year after close of transfer period, disposal agent shall offer for sale under Government pricing policy at close of transfer period all finished stocks of synthetic rubber and component materials held by Government. Offer of sale to make fair share of rubber available to small business and those who buy no plant. Small business defined: independently owned and operated, not dominant in field, give due regard to number of employees and dollar volume of business. Rubber or component materials unsold during that yearly period go to General Services Administration for disposal as surplus.

"SEC. 9 (k). At close of transfer period, unsold plants placed in standby with GSA under National Industrial Reserve Act. But no such plant (1) to be operated for Government except under later act of Congress; (2) to be leased for rubber production, except alcohol butadiene plants; and (3) to be sold for 1 year after close of transfer period. Later sale made only on Attorney General's advice whether it would be inconsistent with antitrust laws.

"SEC. 9 (l) (1). Within 30 days after end of negotiating period, disposal agent to report to Board—

"(A) steps to get bid and bids received;

"(B) main terms of contracts of sale proposed;

"(C) why less than highest bid was accepted, if pertinent;

"(D) program to put unsold plants in standby;

"(E) inventory report of Government stocks of synthetic rubber and component materials;

"(F) program to continue basic research on synthetic rubber and component materials for 1 year;

"(G) persons who represented Government or purchasers in negotiations and contract-making for plants; and

"(H) why negotiations were held with those who didn't submit proposal for a particular plant, if pertinent.

"SEC. 9 (l) (2). Unless Board disapproves disposal plan in 30 days after submission, disposal agent proceeds forthwith with sales and programs set out in his report to Board. Board to disapprove plan if fair value not received for each plant, or antitrust laws tend to be violated, or national security or public welfare not protected, or plan not in accord with other statutory disposal requirements. On disapproval of disposal plan, Board to report its reasons promptly to Congress. Thereafter, disposal negotiations end unless Congress enacts new law.

"SEC. 9 (m). No plant to be sold except under this section 9, or unless it becomes obsolete while section 7 of the Rubber Act remains in effect.

"SEC. 9 (n). RFC may lease out alcohol butadiene plants for not over 3 years after getting Attorney General's advice whether lease would be inconsistent with antitrust laws. Each lease to contain national security clause and recapture clause. After unsold plants go into standby, GSA succeeds RFC as lessor on any lease made and gets power to make leases on same conditions.

"SEC. 9 (o). One year after transfer period or as soon as Congress convenes thereafter, President to report to Congress on Nation's rubber needs and resources and need, if any, of further Government basic research on synthetic rubber.

"SEC. 9 (p). Amends definition of 'rubber-producing facilities' in Rubber Act of 1948 to exclude Government laboratory at Akron, Ohio, from disposal plan.

"SEC. 9 (q). Net proceeds from plant disposal to go into United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

Section 3: Sales or leases made in past under section 9 (b) of Rubber Act of 1948 not affected by this act.

Section 4: Rubber Act of 1948 amended further—

(a) to delete "(a)" from section 10 (e), so it will refer to reports required under section 9 as revised by this act, and delete reference to reports already made by RFC and President to Congress.

(b) Amends section 20 to read:

"20. (a) Rubber Act remains effective through March 31, 1956.

"20. (b) if disposal plan takes effect, Rubber Act is amended by repealing section 3 (mandatory use quotas), 4 (import and export controls), 5 (production quotas), 6 (general Government research), 7 (Government operation of rubber plants), 8 (standby facilities), 10 (c) (creation of Government operating corporation), 10 (d) (President's power to transfer facilities, personnel, and funds to other Government agency), and 10 (e) (President's annual report to Congress)."

Section 5: No contract for sale of plant to be made unless (1) purchaser certifies to disposal agent names of purchaser's representatives in negotiations and fees paid or to be paid them, and (2) purchaser makes agreement not to hire for 2 years after transfer of plant any Board member, the disposal agent, or any employee of either having discretionary authority in negotiating sale of

plant, who has been such within 1 year prior to transfer of the plant.

Section 6: Disposal agent and Board to comply with Government Corporation Control Act on expenditures and audits thereof. Expenses of program under this disposal act are charged against Rubber Act appropriations for operating plants.

USE OF SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES IN PAYING FOR OFFSHORE PURCHASES OF CERTAIN SUPPLIES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the use of surplus agricultural commodities in paying for offshore purchases of military supplies and other goods and services. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a joint statement we have prepared be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2048) to provide for the use of surplus agricultural commodities in paying for offshore purchases of military supplies and other goods and services, introduced by Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. MUNDT, and Mr. ELLENDER), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture, together with the Secretary of Defense and other agencies making expenditures or donations in or to foreign countries, shall arrange to use surplus agricultural commodities acquired as a result of price support operations, to the maximum extent practicable, in making such expenditures or donations. Arrangements may include (1) barter, (2) sale of surplus agricultural commodities for foreign currencies, (3) exchange of foreign currencies so acquired for appropriated or other funds available for such expenditures or donations, (4) use of such foreign currencies for such expenditures and donations, and (5) arrangements under which amounts paid for goods and services, or as donations, shall be used by the recipients for the purchase of surplus agricultural commodities. As used in this act the term "surplus agricultural commodities" shall mean agricultural commodities determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be in excess of the quantity required for domestic consumption and export (other than export resulting from the operation of this act). The provisions of this act shall be applicable to agricultural commodities having an inventory value not exceeding \$2 billion; but nothing in this act shall be deemed to limit any authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of agricultural commodities.

The joint statement is as follows:

Senators YOUNG, EASTLAND, MUNDT, and ELLENDER today introduced a bill to provide for the use of surplus agricultural commodities in paying for offshore purchases of military supplies and other goods and services.

In a joint statement the Senators declared that the Commodity Credit Corporation already owned approximately \$3 billion worth of agricultural commodities and pointed out

that they foresaw a distressing situation whereby the Commodity Credit might have an accumulation in excess of \$4½ billion worth of surplus agricultural commodities by the end of the year. Acreage controls are threatened and severe losses in these commodities are becoming more probable as exports continue their drastic decline. These exports of agricultural commodities have declined severely despite a sharp downturn in the prices of exportable surpluses. For example, exports of cotton are off from 6 to 3 million bales. Wheat exports have declined from 410 million bushels to 275 million bushels, and a similar situation exists with fats, tobacco, and other commodities.

The Senators point out that these commodities can be sold abroad through the adoption of programs which would make them available to foreign nations in dire need of these surpluses, thereby preventing great losses to the taxpayers and forestalling agricultural distress which could well have a serious and disastrous effect on the stability of our entire economy.

The bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture, together with agencies making expenditures or donations in foreign countries, to work to the end that surplus agricultural commodities, rather than dollars, may be used in making such expenditures and donations. While the methods by which this end is to be accomplished are left in large measure to the discretion of the agencies administering the purposes of the bill, it is probable that arrangements would include barter, the sale by Commodity Credit Corporation of surplus commodities for foreign currencies, the use of such foreign currencies for the purchase of military and other supplies by the United States, and reimbursement to Commodity Credit Corporation from appropriated funds available for military and other supplies. Funds spent for military supplies might also be earmarked for use by the recipient country for the purchase of surplus commodities.

Surplus agricultural commodities under the bill would be those in excess of requirements for domestic consumption and export (other than such additional export as may result from operation of the bill).

A typical transaction which is contemplated under the bill would be similar to a deal recently consummated whereby Britain bartered 70 jet planes to Brazil for Brazilian cotton. At identically this same time America was purchasing planes from the same manufacturer with dollars in its offshore military-procurement program.

Under this bill the Secretary of Agriculture and the Defense Department would attempt to negotiate for the purchase of these planes with agricultural surpluses. The Secretary of Agriculture and the other affected agencies may use these surpluses wherever dollars are now being used and where their use would be to the advantage of the United States Government.

The bill is limited to \$2 billion worth of surplus commodities which is roughly 50 percent of the agricultural surplus which can be reasonably anticipated as arising during the crop year.

DENIAL OF COMPENSATION TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, as a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prohibit the payment of compensation to officers or employees of the Government who have refused on grounds of self-incrimination to give testimony before congressional

committees. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes regarding the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

The bill (S. 2049) to prohibit the payment of compensation to officers or employees of the Government who have refused on grounds of self-incrimination to give testimony before congressional committees, introduced by Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, from time to time those of us who serve on the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary have had before us, in the subcommittee, Government employees who refused to answer a question or questions designed to establish whether they were connected with Communist or Communist-front organizations.

The bill I have introduced is to prohibit the payment of compensation to officers or employees of the Federal Government who refuse, on grounds of self-incrimination, to give testimony before congressional committees as to whether they have been or are connected with Communist or Communist-front organizations. The bill relates to the taking of testimony, not only before the Internal Security Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, but before all congressional committees. The bill requires that Government employees make known their identification when inquiry is made by a congressional committee.

Mr. President, to me it is unthinkable that a man or woman should be on the Government payroll, serving the Government, and yet at the same time should refuse to identify himself or herself as to whether he or she is a Communist. This bill is designed to correct that situation, if it is possible to correct it.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1949 RELATING TO 90 PERCENT OF PARITY ON PRICES OF BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES FOR 1953 CROP

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to limit to the 1953 crop the requirement that the prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90 percent of parity. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with an explanatory statement by me relating to the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2061) to amend section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 so as to limit to the 1953 crop the requirement that the prices of basic agricultural commodities be supported at 90

percent of parity, introduced by Mr. WILLIAMS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 101 (d) (6) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U. S. C. 1441 (d) (6)) is amended by striking out "1953 and 1954 crops" and inserting in lieu thereof "1953 crop."

The statement by Mr. WILLIAMS is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS

For the past several months we have heard a lot of talk about cutting the budget and reducing taxes.

There is only one way that the Federal budget can be cut, and that is to repeal some of the laws calling for these expenditures.

Our farm program, as administered under the past administration, has cost the American taxpayer billions.

Many of us have been rather harsh in our criticism of the wasteful food-destruction program of the Truman-Brannan regime. We still remember the piles of potatoes that were dumped or burned at a cost to the taxpayers of nearly \$500 million.

Over \$189 million has been spent to remove eggs from the normal channel of trade, thereby raising their cost to the American housewife.

Now it is butter. The Government is buying butter today at approximately 70 cents per pound and either storing it in the already overcrowded warehouses or else selling it for as little as 15 cents per pound. Millions of pounds of this butter are being accumulated with the result the American housewife is being forced to use oleo as a substitute.

The Government is accumulating these surplus agriculture products at a rate of over \$100 million per month with no prospect of disposing of them except to give them away or destroy them—or wait for another war.

Some of these purchases are mandatory under a law passed by the former administration. However, some of them are being accumulated solely at the discretion of the present administration.

The present butter purchasing program was the decision of the present administration.

To finance the procurement of these agriculture commodities the Commodity Credit Corporation, as of March 31, 1953, had committed \$3,495,974,125.99 of its borrowing authority. One year ago (March 31, 1952) they were using \$2,209,150,825.08 which means that they are increasing at the rate of over \$25 million per week.

Many of these perishable commodities are going out of grade and ultimately they can only be disposed of at a tremendous loss.

We have on hand over 200 million bushels of corn that has been in the warehouses over 5 years. I venture to say that very little of this will grade as No. 2 corn today.

I believe we need a farm program, but it must be one based on good common sense and not political expediency.

The Republican Party in its platform for the past 6 years has advocated the repeal of the high support or 90 percent formula and proposed in its place the lower or flexible formula.

This lower formula would allow these huge surpluses to move into normal channels of trade and thereby save millions both to the American consumers and the taxpayers. This lower formula, which has been on our book for over 4 years, was sponsored by two very able representatives, the Senator from Vermont, Mr. AIKEN, the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee; and the Senator from New Mexico who was also a former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON.

However, Congress, while passing this more sensible formula, has each time deferred its effective date with the result that as yet it has never been tried out.

This deferment has not only cost the American taxpayers needless millions, but it has also actually hurt the American farmers rather than helping them.

The excessively high support prices have resulted in the accumulation of high surpluses of all types of commodities with the result that now farm prices are depressed as they were in 1940 and again in 1950. The only thing that bailed the program out by removing the surpluses at that time was war. The American farmers are tired of an agriculture program based upon the principle that we must have a war every 10 years to remove our surpluses.

The farmers need a sound, long-range program, one that will not cost the taxpayers billions, but one that will result in the American consumer getting the food from the farmers at a reasonable price rather than having it destroyed.

To accomplish this purpose I have introduced for appropriate reference a bill, the purpose of which is to advance the effective date of the expiration of the affixed 90 percent guaranteed support level from December 31, 1954 to December 31, 1953. The enactment of this provision would be to place the flexible support formula into effect beginning next year.

I urge the Congress, in the support of a sound economy, to take speedy action on this measure. Failure to take this action will place upon the present administration the responsibility for the tremendous losses which inevitably will accompany a continuation of the accumulation of these perishable products.

Unless we do repeal this mandatory 90 percent support program, the Government will be forced to request acreage controls and marketing allotments. I do not think that the farmers in America want any bureaucrat in Washington to have the authority to tell them how many acres they can plant or how many pigs they can produce. That type of regimentation is just as repulsive under one administration as under another.

AMENDMENT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT RELATING TO EXPEDITION OF TERMINATION OF RAILROAD REORGANIZATION PROCEEDINGS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 978) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to expedite and facilitate the termination of railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act and to require the Interstate Commerce Commission to consider, in stock modification plans, the assets of controlled or controlling stockholders, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

H. R. 1026. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act, with respect to the provisions of certain medical and dental treatment and hospitalization for certain officers and employees of the former Lighthouse Service and for dependents and wid-

ows of officer and employees of such Service; and

H. R. 5069. An act to prohibit the introduction of movement in interstate commerce of articles of wearing apparel and fabrics which are so highly flammable as to be dangerous when worn by individuals, and for other purposes.

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. WILEY:

Messages received by him from League of Women Voters Chapters throughout the Nation endorsing his Memorial Day address.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

Statement prepared by him on United States customs inspectors.

By Mr. GREEN:

Armenian day address delivered by him at Narragansett Hotel, Providence, R. I., Sunday, May 31, 1953.

By Mr. CASE:

Address delivered by Carl R. Gray, Jr., Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by Elmo Roper at an Atlantic Union dinner held in Washington, D. C., on May 14, 1953.

By Mr. TOBEY:

Editorial entitled "Troubles of the FCC," and an article entitled "McCarthy Calls One-Man Hearing After FCC Refuses To Give Hearst TV Channel Assigned to Education," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 22, 1953.

By Mr. THYE:

Editorial entitled "The Government Moves Away from Socialism" published in the current issue of the Saturday Evening Post.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for Mr. BUSH):

Editorial entitled "Why a Balanced Budget?" published in the New York Times of June 4, 1953.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

Letter from William E. Frank, Director of Internal Revenue, with reference to competitive examination for position of Director of Internal Revenue.

ROBERT RAMSPECK

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on May 20, 1953, the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] made some remarks on the floor of the Senate reflecting upon the character of Robert Ramspeck, of Georgia. Mr. Ramspeck has spent many years in the public service, and those who know him have never questioned his character or his motives. Mr. Ramspeck desires to have me offer for the RECORD a letter in which he states his position with respect to the matter concerning which the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has criticized him.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

KENSINGTON, MD., June 1, 1953.

Hon. WALTER F. GEORGE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, 1953, page 5208, there appears a speech made by Senator WILLIAMS, of Delaware, which contains a

charge that I used my position as a Civil Service Commissioner to circumvent section 1310 of Public Law 253 of the 82d Congress.

The law referred to was sponsored by Representative WHITTEN, of Mississippi. It was intended to prevent too rapid promotions in positions under the Classification Act. Its purpose was to save money. While I was Chairman of the Civil Service Commission I made every effort to carry out the intent of the act. Not a single decision made by me was taken with any political intent.

Senator WILLIAMS said: "On October 17, 1952, the Civil Service Commission, under the chairmanship of Mr. Robert Ramspeck, recognizing the days of the New Deal administration were numbered, issued Departmental Circular No. 671, Supplement No. 11, in which was outlined a program whereby all Government agencies were told how they could circumvent the law—section 1310, enacted November 1, 1951—and thus give unearned promotions to their friends."

This statement is not in accordance with the facts. If the Commission had desired to "give unearned promotions to its friends," it could have approved the promotions involved at the pay rate of the higher grades. It did not take such action, thus saving money and carrying out the intention of Representative WHITTEN.

Representative WHITTEN has authorized me to say that the action taken, which Senator WILLIAMS says was illegal, was carrying out his intent—and he thinks it was legal. He has written the Comptroller General to that effect.

Under the law, as amended, which was in effect on October 17, 1952, the Commission had discretion to approve promotions of more than one grade "in order to avoid undue hardship or inequity in individual cases of meritorious nature."

Therefore, if the Commission had been politically inclined, as Senator WILLIAMS charges, it could have approved the salary of the higher grade. It did not do that. What it did was require the agencies to hold the salary promotions to one grade—and permit them to assign employees to the duties of the next higher grade—thus saving money for the taxpayers.

While the Comptroller General has now ruled this practice contrary to the Classification Act, Senator WILLIAMS perhaps does not know that a staff representative of the Commission consulted Mr. Fisher, of the General Accounting Office, before the action was taken, and Mr. Fisher advised our representative that his Office would not object to the practice.

Senator WILLIAMS did not point out the fact that the action he now criticizes was approved by all three Civil Service Commissioners—including the Republican member.

I do not personally agree with the decision of the General Accounting Office in this matter. The Commission has authority to permit employees to be detailed to higher grade work for limited periods, and that is what was done here. Representative WHITTEN concurs in this opinion, and says it did carry out the intent of section 1310.

I would not take up your time with this matter except for the fact that Senator WILLIAMS apparently has embarked upon a crusade to destroy my reputation for honesty and integrity. I have spent many years in the public service, and in every position held I rendered faithful and honest service. I do not propose to let anyone besmirch my reputation.

Since Senator WILLIAMS has put these charges in the RECORD, I want the other side of the question there also. Therefore, I will appreciate it if you will place this letter in the RECORD.

I would welcome an investigation by the Senate, through the Finance Committee or the Post Office and Civil Service Committee,

of every action taken by the Civil Service Commission in connection with the reorganization of the Bureau of Internal Revenue. We may have made mistakes of judgment, but we did an honest job.

A private citizen, which I now am, is at a great disadvantage when a Senator uses the Senate as a forum to attack that citizen. My only recourse is to ask the assistance of yourself as one of my Representatives in the Senate.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

BOB,
Robert Ramspeck.

SMUGGLING OF NARCOTICS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a memorandum received by me from John J. Murphy, president of the United States Customs Inspectors' Association, Port of New York.

I am requesting that the memorandum be printed in the body of the RECORD so that every Member of Congress and all recipients of the RECORD will have easy opportunity to read this message.

In my estimation, this statement on Smuggling of Narcotics adequately points up one of the most serious problems facing America today; and yet, Mr. President, the current appropriations for the customs service have been reduced so drastically that many of the inspectors in the New York area will have to be dismissed.

Mr. President, this is not only false economy, it is actually aiding and abetting communism in this country. It must be stopped. The appropriation must be restored.

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

MEMORANDUM OF UNITED STATES CUSTOMS INSPECTORS' ASSOCIATION, PORT OF NEW YORK

SMUGGLING OF NARCOTICS

The size of the narcotic traffic in this country is almost beyond comprehension. Many law-enforcement agencies state that it is international in origin and that it is controlled in the United States by huge crime syndicates which have turned to the importation and sale of narcotics as a lucrative underworld activity.

This menace, now receiving so much belated attention, has long been known to the customs service, which has the primary responsibility for the prevention of smuggling. Although the responsibility for the prevention of the entry of narcotics is imposed by law on the Bureau of Customs of the Treasury Department, the funds and personnel necessary to do the job have been steadily decreasing, while activities have been as steadily increasing.

One point in the study of the narcotics problem upon which there is complete agreement is that they are imported into the United States from a number of European and Asiatic countries. The shocking accounts of teen-age addiction have aroused the public from its lethargy in some quarters. However, the public generally is not aware of the value of a dollar appropriated at the customs-enforcement level. Customs officers seize the narcotics before they enter the country and while the shipment is in its pure unadulterated form. Try to visualize a large shipment of narcotics as a pillow filled with tiny feathers. When seized by

customs men, the entire load is taken at one swoop. Once the bag of feathers is loosed on the country and enters into the commerce of the underworld, it takes literally thousands of Federal, State, and local enforcement agents to ferret out the little individual feathers which have blown away and are now scattered in countless clandestine directions. It is safe to estimate that the difference in costs of detection is a thousand to one in dollars alone. Consider that a single ounce of morphine represents about 1,750 medical doses, and heroin is 6 or 8 times as strong.

One inspector assigned to the examination of passengers' baggage on the steamship *United States*, arriving at the port of New York, discovered and seized 7½ pounds of opium and a small amount of hashish in the false bottom of a suitcase.

One inspector, carrying out a routine 100-percent baggage inspection at New York International (Idlewild) Airport, became suspicious of a seemingly harmless student and found over 5 pounds of heroin in a false compartment of his suitcase. A searching squad, checking the steamship *Constitution* upon its arrival at New York from France, discovered in an unoccupied stateroom over a pound of heroin concealed in a space behind a panel of an end-lamp cabinet and another cache of over a pound of the same drug concealed between the bottom bureau drawer and the deck. Three months later an additional 2-pound haul was made on the same vessel under almost identical circumstances. In the port of Philadelphia 105 pounds of opium were found on the British tanker *Silverdale*. On the Mexican border 44 pounds of opium was seized, along with marihuana running into the hundreds of pounds. The list from all parts of the country is lengthy and frightening.

Statistics on the number of seizures of narcotics are staggering.

Drug	1952	1951	Change, increase (+) or decrease (-)
Raw opium.....	3,655	376	+872.07
Smoking opium.....	866	181	+378.48
Medicinal opium.....	1	1	(1)
Morphine.....	3	3	(1)
Heroin.....	200	116	+72.41
Cocaine.....	11	5	+120.00
Demerol.....	14	35	-60.00
Miscellaneous drugs.....	2	2	(1)
Marihuana.....	140	1,093	-86.73
Total.....	27,030	32,062	-15.69
Net change.....	31,931	33,874	-5.74

¹ No change.

As will be noted, there is a 5.74 percent decrease in the total number of seizures made in 1952 as against 1951. This is brought about by the 86.37 percent decrease in the number of seizures of miscellaneous drugs. Of particular interest and significance is the extraordinary increase in the important drugs, opium and heroin.

The impressive number of seizures is a tribute to the diligence and steadfastness of the Customs officers who are waging an increasingly unequal fight against the narcotic smuggler. The total Customs staff throughout the United States has been reduced since 1947 by 931 employees to cover all activities. This despite a greatly increased workload. Customs problems are mainly those of lack of manpower. We need more help. In spite of the heroic work of this little band of men we are losing ground to the smuggler.

An article in the New York Times, dated February 18, 1953, stated that "it is estimated that officials succeed in seizing only between 2 and 5 percent of drugs smuggled

across the (Mexican) border." In the United Nations on April 15, 1953, Mr. Harry J. Anslinger, Commissioner of Narcotics, disclosed that the Communist regime in China is controlling the narcotics trade. He stated, "There can be little doubt that the ultimate object of the Communist government's monopoly is directed mainly at the United States. It serves the triple purpose of obtaining United States dollars, extending narcotics addiction, as a means of sabotaging and financing the war in Korea." To stress the boldness of the traffic, he cited one shipment of 200 tons of opium that had been offered for sale and delivery in New York. The report of the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs is replete with such examples. The number one target is New York City where the teeming millions offer a ready and profitable market for the dope peddler.

The Customs force at the port of New York has been steadily dwindling, and incredible as it may seem, there are actually fewer inspectors covering the waterfront today on a 40-hour week than there were on a 48-hour week 30 years ago.

The immense port of New York, extending over 700 miles of shoreline with 1,900 piers and other waterfront installations, is being guarded by fewer Customs men each year.

Mr. Raymond M. Hilliard, executive director of the Welfare and Health Council of the city of New York, urged in 1952 that Congress provide funds to expand the Customs Service in New York noting that most of the heroin reaches the city on ships. He emphasized the availability of heroin which was the most important factor in stimulating addiction among teen-agers and was tending to nullify the council's work. The New York City Police Department's narcotics squad estimates there are 6,000 users in the city schools.

The youthful addict forms the hard center of criminal activity which will give increased power to the underworld. Estimates have been made that drug addicts in New York City alone are stealing at a rate of \$200 million worth of goods per year in order to buy dope. Chicago police estimate that addicts steal personal property at the rate of \$62 million a year and that each new addict has to steal \$20,000 worth of goods a year to feed his habit. There is grim irony in the fact that the drugs for which the addict must pay from \$10 to \$30 per day, if purchased at manufacturers' cost would be only 10 or 15 cents.

In most large cities, crimes of violence including rolling, mugging, purse-snatching, and allied offenses have greatly increased over the past several years. Police attribute most of this upsurge to activity of young addicts. When in the grip of the terrifying demands of his craving, the addict becomes desperate. Out of this come the crimes which terrorize whole cities and add untold wealth and power to the underworld.

Mr. Irving W. Halpern, chief probation officer of the Court of General Sessions, in his 1952 report to the court stated: "In 1948 only 1.5 percent of defendants investigated were convicted of felonies involving narcotics. Last year this percentage rose to 17.1 percent. Simultaneously, the number of women offenders increased by 50 percent over 1951, with almost 35 percent classed as narcotics offenders. The great majority of felons are under the age of 25, and almost half of them came from broken homes. In most cases physical and mental conditions were found normal, but in 685 cases, or 24.98 percent of those examined, narcotics addiction was found. Almost 44 percent of the narcotics offenders had previous narcotic offense records."

The above examples do not begin to scratch the surface as far as material costs and losses

are concerned. The tiny feathers as they scatter over the length and breadth of the country become increasingly hard to find as they pass from hand to hand, and the cost of detection spirals out of sight.

Surely, by every reasoning possible, we must make an all-out effort to seize the bag of feathers on the ship or on the pier. One customs inspector making a seizure of narcotics saves many, many thousands of enforcement dollars spent at other levels. The cost in goods, crime, and human misery is beyond calculation.

The Customs Service spends for salaries 95 cents out of every dollar appropriated. There is no fat, and the muscle we need to fight off the smuggler is growing weaker. An increase in the customs appropriation is an investment that will pay big dividends as it has since the Customs Service was established 164 years ago.

JOHN J. MURPHY,
President.

WHEAT FOR PAKISTAN

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record a letter which I received from the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, signed by the executive secretary, Mr. Luther A. Gotwald. In the letter is incorporated a resolution urging the furnishing of emergency supplies of surplus wheat to the people of Pakistan.

I would note, Mr. President, that some time ago in the early part of May, I presented to the Senate a bill authorizing the shipment of surplus wheat to Pakistan, to alleviate the suffering in that country.

Last evening on the Republican television program in which the President and Members of his Cabinet participated, I noted that one of the legislative programs which was being forwarded to Congress was the request for wheat for Pakistan, to be covered in an administration proposal.

I suggest, Mr. President, that such a proposal is already before the appropriate committees of Congress, and that it is deserving of support. We need no new proposal unless the Republican leadership places partisanship above accomplishment and merit.

This is a very urgent matter, and the more prompt the action the more good will result. I would remind the Senate that last year, by the time we had passed the wheat for India bill, we had lost much of the good will which it was possible to receive from that worthwhile project.

Finally, Mr. President, I also wish to make note of the fact that in the broadcast last evening two other bills were mentioned. One was a bill providing for an amendment to the Food and Drug Act, to tighten up the law and to provide for factory inspections. The second was an extension of the legislation for school construction in areas where there is an emergency, due to Federal Government activities.

Both these bills are before Congress. Again I say the administration would do well to offer its support, and not to insist upon having a special Republican bill introduced. I presented these pro-

posed measures as long as 3 months ago. They have been held in a state of suspended animation by the Republican leadership all this time. I ask for action.

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

DIVISION OF FOREIGN MISSIONS,
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE
CHURCHES OF CHRIST
IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., June 1, 1953.
The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Foreign Relations Committee,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The executive board of the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, representing approximately 48 Protestant foreign mission boards and agencies, with an annual overseas expenditure of almost \$40 million, in session in New York City on May 27, 1953, took the following action:

"Whereas it is known that many thousands of people in Pakistan are now suffering from hunger and the effects of malnutrition; and

"Whereas it is understood that on April 3, 1953, the Government of Pakistan requested aid from the Government of the United States for the purpose of securing from this country emergency supplies of surplus wheat; Be it

"Resolved, That the executive board of the Division of Foreign Missions of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America, in session May 27, 1953, record its full support of the request made by the Government of Pakistan and urge officers of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America to present to the appropriate bodies in the United States Government an urgent appeal for favorable action upon this request upon terms mutually agreeable to the two Governments."

The Division of Foreign Missions is deeply appreciative of your interest and concern in meeting Pakistan's dire need of food.

This letter has also been sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles.

Please accept our sincere good wishes in the carrying out of the important responsibilities committed to you.

Respectfully yours,
LUTHER A. GOTWALD,
Executive Secretary.

THE VOICE OF AMERICA

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may read into the RECORD a letter I have received from the State Department, in response to an inquiry directed by me to that Department.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

MR. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, under date of April 20, 1953, I addressed to the Secretary of State the following letter:

APRIL 20, 1953.
Hon. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, State Department,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I just had brought to my attention an article appearing in the winter, 1952-53 issue of the Public Opinion Quarterly by Mrs. Harold Mendelsohn and Werner J. Cahman entitled "Communist Broadcast to Italy."

That article states that the Communist radio output to Italy as of June 30, 1952,

amounted to more than 78 hours of transmission per week as compared to 23 weekly hours for the Voice of America and the British Broadcasting Corp. combined. It also indicates that Communist radio propaganda relies on a number of propaganda approaches addressed to different specific elements of the population.

I would appreciate it very much if you would check this article and its accuracy for me, and if you would also inform me what the present ratio of weekly broadcasts aimed at Italy is according to your latest studies. I am interested in finding out whether the Communists broadcasts continue to be so much more numerous than our own, even taking the British broadcasts into account. These facts are quite disturbing to me.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

On May 15, 1953, I received from the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Thruston B. Morton, a letter which I believe to be very revealing, and it should certainly alert Congress regarding the kind of predicament in which we find ourselves with our information services and our Voice of America. The letter reads as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, May 15, 1953.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Reference is made to your letter of April 20, 1953, previously acknowledged by telephone, requesting information about an article entitled "Communist Broadcast to Italy" which appeared in the winter issue of the Public Opinion Quarterly.

The figures in this article were accurate as of June 30, 1952. At that time, Communists broadcasts to Italy totaled 78 hours 10 minutes weekly against the combined total of 23 hours for the BBC and the Voice of America. The BBC broadcast 13 hours 15 minutes, and the Voice of America 9 hours 45 minutes.

By December 31, 1952, the ratio had changed markedly; the Communists were broadcasting 93 hours 15 minutes, and the BBC-Voice of America total was 18 hours 20 minutes. The Voice of America had been reduced to 5 hours 5 minutes.

May 1, 1953, the Communists increased their total to 100 hours 15 minutes, while the Voice of America and the BBC remained the same.

One important reason for this comparatively modest amount of Voice of America programming to Italy is our current inability, because of financial limitations, to beam a signal strong enough to be heard regularly and throughout the country. A number of packaged programs prepared by our staff in New York or in Paris are used on a regular basis by the government-controlled radio in Italy.

It seems likely that the increase of Communist broadcasts to Italy was motivated by the desire to influence the Italian elections in June. There is much propaganda for the Communist Party in these programs.

The Communist broadcasts include a quasi-clandestine "Cominform Service" consisting of Italian-language broadcasts prepared by the Italian Communist Party under the direction of the Cominform. While the transmitters which carry these broadcasts are technically identifiable, the source of the program is not announced, thus heightening the illusion that the listener is hearing the Italian Home Service programs. Much material, including speeches by top Italian Communist leaders, is recorded in Italy. These programs have titles such as "Oggi in Italia" (Today in Italy), "Oggi nel

Mondo" (The World Today), "Questa Sera in Italia" (This Evening in Italy).

Since April of this year transmitters in Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and East Germany have carried a total of seven transmissions of "Oggi in Italia" daily.

The Department of State appreciates your interest in this matter and hopes that the above has answered your questions fully.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

Mr. President, I believe this situation is most deplorable, and I think our attention should be focused upon how limited and ineffective our Voice of America program has turned out to be. The Communist radio is beaming 100 hours and 15 minutes of propaganda every week into Italy, whereas the combined radio time of the British Broadcasting Corp. and of the United States of America, in connection with programs for Italy, is 5 hours and 5 minutes.

The reports from Italy indicate that we may see there a rise of the Communist vote, as well as a rise of the vote of the extreme right. Of course, the extreme right and the extreme left have a strange way of joining in common purpose and attempting to tear democracy to pieces.

I mention the communication I have received from the State Department only because at the very time when one of the most crucial elections in the world is about to occur, our country seems to find itself relatively immobilized in the field of the dissemination of truthful information, particularly in reference to broadcasting by the Voice of America. Yet we stand before the world as the richest country and the most ingenious country in the world and apparently a country that knows a great deal about radio and the dissemination of information.

I believe it would be well for the appropriate committees of Congress to look into this matter in detail, not only as regards those who are connected with the Voice of America, but also as regards the failure of the Voice of America to have the money and the facilities which it must have if it is to beam a proper program into a country of approximately 50 million persons, which today is suffering under the whiplash of Communist propaganda and Communist infiltration. Surely we can do better than we are doing. Let us give the Voice of America a chance to do its job.

UNEXPENDED BALANCES OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD ON BEHALF OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by me on behalf of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, relating to unexpended balances of Federal appropriations.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Unexpended balances of \$11.9 billion in mutual-security programs as of March 31, 1953, and unobligated balances of \$4.2 billion as of the same date are reported over the signature of Harold E. Stassen, Mutual Security Director, in a communication published today by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

In the first 3 quarters, ending March 31, of the current fiscal year \$4 billion was actually spent out of funds available for Mutual Security programs and \$2.4 billion were obligated.

Mutual security figures, on which budget document estimates were based in January, indicated that as of the end of the fiscal year on the last day of this month unexpended balances in funds for the programs to be carried over into the new fiscal year, beginning July 1, would total \$10.3 billion and that practically all of the funds would be obligated by June 30.

It would appear from Mr. Stassen's March 31 figures that the unexpended-balance estimates will be close, but on the basis of these new figures obligations in the last 3 months of the fiscal year must nearly double those of the first 9 months if the estimates submitted for the budget were accurate.

The Stassen communication shows that since the Greek-Turk and the interim-aid

programs a total of \$32 billion has been appropriated for Mutual Security programs; that \$28 billion had been obligated through March 31; and that \$20 billion had been expended. (A summary of the mutual security figures is attached.)

This communication on mutual security programs is published, in part, by the committee as a supplement to its fifth monthly report of the status of Federal appropriations, expenditures, and unexpended balances. The main part of the report is based on actual Treasury accounts as of February 28, whereas the mutual security section is based on Mutual Security Agency figures as of March 31.

As of March 1, the total of all unexpended balances in all appropriation and authorization accounts for all agencies of the Federal Government were shown on the Treasury books to total \$130 billion.

Of this total remaining spending authority \$55.4 billion was in appropriations and other authorizations made during the calendar year 1952, and more than \$74.6 billion was in appropriations and other authorizations made in some previous year.

Within the military services the Air Force entered March with unexpended balances totaling \$34.1 billion; the Army, exclusive of civil functions, with balances of \$23.2 billion; the Navy with balances totaling \$21.3 billion; and the Office of the Secretary of Defense with balances totaling \$0.4 billion.

Summary of foreign assistance appropriations, obligations, and expenditures during fiscal year 1953¹ through Mar. 31, and cumulative since the Greek-Turk program; and unobligated and unexpended balances in available funds as of Mar. 31, 1953

[In millions]

Title and program	Funds available		Obligations		Expenditures		Unobligated (as of Mar. 31, 1953)	Unexpended (as of Mar. 31, 1953)
	(Fiscal year 1953, appropriations)	Cumulative through Mar. 31, 1953	(Fiscal year 1953, through Mar. 31, 1953)	Cumulative through Mar. 31, 1953	(Fiscal year 1953, through Mar. 31, 1953)	Cumulative through Mar. 31, 1953		
TITLE I—EUROPE								
Military.....	(\$3,090)	\$12,567	(\$826)	\$9,999	(\$2,235)	\$4,824	\$2,568	\$7,743
Economic and technical.....	(1,282)	14,502	(772)	13,988	(998)	13,242	513	1,260
Assistance to Spain.....		163	(10)	62	(8)	31	100	131
Total, title I.....	(4,373)	27,231	(1,608)	24,050	(3,241)	18,097	3,182	9,134
TITLE II—NEAR EAST AND AFRICA								
Military.....	(409)	1,444	(161)	1,072	(229)	538	372	906
Economical and technical.....	(181)	341	(99)	256	(82)	188	85	153
Total, title II.....	(680)	1,785	(260)	1,328	(311)	727	457	1,059
TITLE III—ASIA AND PACIFIC								
Military.....	(541)	1,803	(249)	1,427	(267)	673	376	1,130
Economic and technical.....	(271)	1,030	(188)	900	(152)	634	130	396
Total, title III.....	(811)	2,834	(437)	2,327	(419)	1,308	506	1,526
TITLE IV—AMERICAN REPUBLICS								
Military.....	(52)	90	(11)	39	(6)	6	51	83
Economic and technical.....	(20)	46	(12)	36	(16)	29	10	17
Total, title IV.....	(72)	136	(24)	75	(22)	35	61	101
TITLE V—INTERREGIONAL ACTIVITIES								
Economic and technical.....	(28)	28	(27)	27	(10)	10	1	
Total, all titles:—								
Military.....	(4,182)	15,905	(1,248)	12,537	(2,738)	6,042	3,367	9,863
Economic and technical.....	(1,782)	15,947	(1,098)	15,207	(1,259)	14,104	740	1,843
Assistance to Spain.....		163	(10)	62	(8)	31	100	131
Total, all titles:—	(5,964)	32,014	(2,356)	27,806	(4,004)	20,177	4,207	11,837
Administrative expenses.....	(39)	189	(29)	175	(32)	166	14	23
Grand total.....	(6,003)	32,203	(2,384)	27,981	(4,036)	20,343	4,221	11,860

¹NOTE.—1953 figures enclosed by parentheses are included in the corresponding cumulative totals.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit an additional report on civilian employment in the executive

branch of the Federal Government for the month of April 1953, and, in accordance with the practice of several years' standing, I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, together with a statement by me.

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

FEDERAL PERSONNEL IN EXECUTIVE BRANCH, MARCH—APRIL 1953, AND PAY, FEBRUARY—MARCH 1953

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY
(See table I)

According to monthly personnel reports for April 1953 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures:

Department or agency	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In April numbered—	In March numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	In March was—	In February was—	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Total	2,502,790	2,526,819	-24,029	\$897,785	\$836,739	+\$61,055
1. Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,221,674	1,223,285	-1,611	477,605	459,022	+\$18,592
2. Department of Defense	1,281,116	1,303,534	-22,418	420,180	377,717	+\$42,463
Within the Department of Defense:						
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,214	2,267	-53	1,113	1,022	+\$91
Department of the Army	514,987	523,836	-8,919	152,210	138,456	+\$13,754
Department of the Air Force	305,177	310,449	-5,272	99,309	90,127	+\$9,182
Department of the Navy	458,808	466,982	-8,174	167,548	148,112	+\$19,436

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agency.

Tables II, III, and IV break down the above employment figures to show the number im-

side continental United States, outside continental United States, and the number in the so-called industrial categories. This further breakdown in tables II, III, and IV does

not include pay figures because payroll reports submitted to the committee by some agencies are inadequate for this purpose.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1953, and comparison with March 1953, and pay for March 1953, and comparison with February 1953

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	February	March	Increase	Decrease	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	20,632	22,295	1,663		71,266	73,065	1,799	
Commerce ^{1,2}	18,764	20,270	1,506		50,117	49,364		753
Health, Education, and Welfare ^{1,3}	12,259	13,151	892		37,726	37,608		118
Interior	18,798	20,306	1,508		56,204	56,689	485	
Justice	11,483	12,352	869		36,231	30,317	86	
Labor	2,312	2,534	222		6,020	5,945		75
Post Office ⁴	231,470	231,470			520,803	520,803		
State	10,493	11,170	677		32,329	32,145		184
Treasury	29,904	32,871	2,967		88,147	87,169		978
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	134	140	6		244	248	4	
Bureau of the Budget	250	277	27		420	465		5
Council of Economic Advisers	19	32	13		7			6
Executive Mansion and Grounds	22	25	3		91	89		2
National Security Council	12	12			22	21		1
National Security Resources Board	30	38		12	38	24		14
Office of Defense Mobilization	221	278	57		516	469		56
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	60	68	8		174	120		56
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	1	2	1		7	8	1	
Emergency agencies:								
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	79	87	8		133	101		32
Defense Production Administration ⁵	17			17				
Defense Transport Administration	67	69	2		120	112		8
Economic Stabilization Agency	3,631	3,558	73		5,046	2,980		2,066
Federal Civil Defense Administration	387	423	36		769	780	11	
Mutual Security Agency	1,885	2,017	132		4,888	4,793		99
National Security Training Commission	3	3			1	1		
Renegotiation Board	347	398	51		726	749	23	
Small Defense Plants Administration	222	245	23		448	450	2	
Subversive Activities Central Board	14	15	1		26	25		1
Postwar agencies:								
War Claims Commission	69	74	5		219	212		7
Independent agencies:								
American Battle Monuments Commission	81	90	9		468	469	1	
Atomic Energy Commission	2,813	3,090	277		6,843	6,823		20
Civil Aeronautics Board	251	274	23		552	554	2	
Civil Service Commission	1,711	1,920	209		5,082	5,037		45
Export-Import Bank of Washington	69	75	6		138	140	2	
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	3	3			8	8		
Federal Communications Commission	470	524	54		1,084	1,085	1	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	401	449	48		1,039	1,041	2	
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	216	243	27		395	381		14
Federal Power Commission	202	312	20		647	637		10
Federal Trade Commission	303	332	29		645	643		2
General Accounting Office	2,270	2,497	227		6,247	6,233		14
General Services Administration	8,443	9,010	567		29,166	29,080		86
Government Printing Office	2,583	2,830	247		7,638	7,580		58
Housing and Home Finance Agency	4,655	5,122	467		12,270	12,192		78

¹ Revised on basis of later information.

² March and April report figures not available. See letter from Postmaster General.

³ January report figures used for comparison.

⁴ Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency.

⁵ Under Executive Order 10433, dated Feb. 4, 1953, the Defense Production Administration was transferred to the Office of Defense Mobilization.

¹ April figure includes 1,683 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 709 from the March figure of 2,482.

² April figure is exclusive of 6,756 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration and their pay.

³ Includes personnel and pay of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.

⁴ April figure includes 2,593 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, an increase of 3 from the March figure of 2,586.

TABLE I.—Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1953, and comparison with March 1953, and pay for March 1953, and comparison with February 1953—Continued

Department or agency	Pay (in thousands of dollars)				Personnel			
	February	March	Increase	Decrease	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Independent agencies—Continued								
Indian Claims Commission	7	7			11	11		
Interstate Commerce Commission	837	919	82		1,969	1,946		23
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	2,661	1,726	—	935	7,201	7,150	51	
National Capital Housing Authority	104	116	12		359	355	4	
National Capital Planning Commission	2	2			6	4	2	
National Gallery of Art	88	92	4		306	312	6	
National Labor Relations Board	577	634	57		1,361	1,373	12	
National Mediation Board	66	71	5		107	104	—	
National Science Foundation	57	59	2		169	170	1	
Panama Canal	3,624	3,543	—	81	19,402	19,072	—	330
Railroad Retirement Board	710	783	73		2,227	2,246	19	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation	993	1,076	83		2,207	2,176	—	31
Securities and Exchange Commission	370	407	37		779	783	4	
Selective Service System	1,646	1,786	140		7,931	7,870	—	61
Smithsonian Institution	167	183	16		521	541	20	
Soldiers' Home	132	142	10		748	749	1	
Tariff Commission	93	102	9		193	196	3	
Tax Court of the United States	63	68	5		132	132	—	
Tennessee Valley Authority	7,915	9,405	1,490		21,311	21,943	632	
Veterans' Administration	50,735	55,533	4,798		177,335	177,889	554	
Total, excluding Department of Defense	450,013	477,605	19,710	1,118	1,223,285	1,221,674	3,671	5,282
Net change, excluding Department of Defense			18,592				1,611	
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense ¹⁰					2,267	2,214		53
Department of the Army:								
Inside continental United States	1,022	1,113	91					
Outside continental United States	125,870	138,077	12,207		471,787	463,224		8,563
Department of the Air Force:					52,049	51,603		356
Inside continental United States	12,586	14,133	1,547					
Outside continental United States	82,356	90,854	8,498		273,745	269,002		4,743
Department of the Navy:					7,771	8,455	684	529
Inside continental United States	139,164	157,756	18,592		433,394	426,367		7,027
Outside continental United States	8,948	9,792	844			33,588	32,441	1,147
Total, Department of Defense	377,717	420,180	42,463			1,303,534	1,281,116	22,418
Net change, Department of Defense			42,463					22,418
Grand total, including Department of Defense	836,730	897,785	62,173	1,118	2,526,819	2,502,790	3,671	127,700
Net change, including Department of Defense			61,055					24,029

⁸ Includes retroactive pay increases.¹⁰ Includes 260 employees assigned to Defense Supply Management Agency and 44 employees assigned to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1953, and comparison with March 1953

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):									
Agriculture	69,745	71,560	1,815		Expert Import Bank of Washington	138	140	2	
Commerce ¹¹	46,943	46,147	—		Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	8	8		
Health, Education, and Welfare ¹²	37,147	37,036	—		Federal Communications Commission	1,058	1,059	1	
Interior	49,619	49,942	323		Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,038	1,040	2	
Justice	29,601	29,783	92		Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	395	381	14	
Labor	5,895	5,811	—		Federal Power Commission	647	637	10	
Post Office ¹³	518,520	518,520	—		Federal Trade Commission	645	643	2	
State	10,888	10,772	—		General Accounting Office	6,218	6,201	17	
Treasury	87,118	86,144	—		General Services Administration	29,059	28,973	86	
Executive Office of the President:					Government Printing Office	7,638	7,580	58	
White House Office	244	248	4		Housing and Home Finance Agency	12,116	12,040	76	
Bureau of the Budget	470	465	—		Indian Claims Commission	11	11		
Council of Economic Advisers	7	—	7		Interstate Commerce Commission	1,969	1,946	23	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	91	89	—		National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	7,201	7,150	51	
National Security Council ¹⁴	22	21	—		National Capital Housing Authority	359	355	4	
National Security Resources Board	38	24	—		National Capital Planning Commission	6	4	2	
Office of Defense Mobilization	516	460	—		National Gallery of Art	306	312	6	
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	174	120	—		National Labor Relations Board	1,333	1,347	14	
President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization	7	8	1		National Mediation Board	107	104	3	
Emergency agencies:					National Science Foundation	169	170	1	
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	129	97	—		Panama Canal	529	529		
Defense Transport Administration	120	112	—		Railroad Retirement Board	2,227	2,246	19	
Economic Stabilization Agency	4,989	2,953	—		Reconstruction Finance Corporation	2,200	2,169	31	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	769	780	11		Securities and Exchange Commission	779	783	4	
Mutual Security Agency	1,073	1,064	—		Selective Service System	7,713	7,654	59	
National Security Training Commission	1	1	—		Smithsonian Institution	519	539	20	
Renegotiation Board	726	749	23		Soldiers' Home	748	749	1	
Small Defense Plants Administration	448	450	2		Tariff Commission	193	196	3	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	25	—		Tax Court of the United States	132	132		
Postwar agencies:					Tennessee Valley Authority	21,311	21,943	632	
War Claims Commission	181	179	—		Veterans' Administration	176,091	176,658	567	
Independent agencies:					Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,160,926	1,159,659	3,545	4,812
American Battle Monuments Commission	16	16	—		Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense				1,267
Atomic Energy Commission	6,832	6,812	—						
Civil Aeronautics Board	543	545	2						
Civil Service Commission	5,075	5,027	—						
			48						

¹ April figure includes 1,683 employees of the National Production Authority, a decrease of 799 from the March figure of 2,482.² April figure is exclusive of 6,756 seamen on the rolls of the Maritime Administration.³ Includes personnel of Howard University and Columbia Institution for the Deaf.⁴ April figure includes 2,370 commissioned officers of the Public Health Service, an increase of 9 from the March figure of 2,361.⁵ March and April report figures not available. See letter from Postmaster General, p. 11, January report figures used for comparison.⁶ Exclusive of personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency.

TABLE II.—Federal personnel inside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1953, and comparison with March 1953—Continued

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:					Department of Defense—Continued				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,215	2,162		53	Net decrease, Department of Defense				20,386
Department of the Army	471,787	463,224		8,563	Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,342,067	2,320,414	3,545	25,198
Department of the Air Force	273,745	269,002		4,743	Net decrease, including Department of Defense				21,653
Department of the Navy	433,394	426,367		7,027					
Total, Department of Defense	1,181,141	1,160,755		20,386					

TABLE III.—Federal personnel outside continental United States employed by the executive agencies during April 1953, and comparison with March 1953

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Independent agencies—Continued				
Agriculture	1,521	1,505		16	Housing and Home Finance Agency	154	152		2
Commerce	3,174	3,217	43		National Labor Relations Board	28	26		2
Health, Education, and Welfare	579	572		7	Panama Canal	18,873	18,543		330
Interior	6,585	6,747	162		Reconstruction Finance Corporation	7	7		
Justice	540	534		6	Selective Service System	218	216		2
Labor	125	134	9		Smithsonian Institution	2	2		
Post Office ¹	2,283	2,283			Veterans' Administration	1,244	1,231		13
State	21,441	21,373		68	Total, excluding Department of Defense	62,359	62,015	221	565
Treasury	1,029	1,025		4	Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense				344
Emergency agencies:					Department of Defense:				
Defense Materials Procurement Agency	4	4			Office of the Secretary of Defense	52	52		
Economic Stabilization Agency	57	27		30	Department of the Army	52,049	51,693		356
Mutual Security Agency	3,815	3,735		80	Department of the Air Force	36,704	36,175		529
Postwar agencies:					Department of the Navy	33,588	32,441		1,147
War Claims Commission	38	33		5	Total, Department of Defense	122,393	120,361		2,032
Independent agencies:					Net decrease, Department of Defense				2,032
American Battle Monuments Commission	452	453	1		Grand total, including Department of Defense	184,752	182,376	221	2,597
Atomic Energy Commission	11	11			Net decrease, including Department of Defense				2,376
Civil Aeronautics Board	9	9							
Civil Service Commission	7	10	3						
Federal Communications Commission	26	26							
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	1							
General Accounting Office	29	32	3						
General Services Administration	107	107							

¹ March and April report figures not available. See letter from Postmaster General, p. 11. January report figures used for comparison.

TABLE IV.—Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside continental United States employed by executive agencies during April 1953, and comparison with March 1953

Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease	Department or agency	March	April	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):					Department of Defense:				
Commerce	435	399		36	Department of the Army:				
Interior	2,515	2,785	270		Inside continental United States	241,659	236,316		5,343
State	168	152		16	Outside continental United States	32,274	32,036		238
Treasury	9,101	9,009		92	Department of the Air Force:				
Independent agencies:					Inside continental United States	159,384	155,825		3,559
Atomic Energy Commission	97	99	2		Outside continental United States	21,194	20,822		372
General Services Administration	168	151		17	Department of the Navy:				
Panama Canal	1,485	1,436		49	Inside continental United States	288,472	282,803		5,669
Tennessee Valley Authority	12,805	13,280	475		Outside continental United States	25,197	24,040		1,157
Total, excluding Department of Defense	26,774	27,311	747	210	Total, Department of Defense	768,180	751,842		16,338
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			537		Net decrease, Department of Defense				16,338
					Grand total, including Department of Defense	794,954	779,153	747	16,548
					Net decrease, including Department of Defense				15,801

TABLE V.—Federal employees assigned to Mutual Defense Assistance Program

Department or agency	Payroll (in thousands)			Civilian personnel		
	In February was—	In March was—	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	In March numbered—	In April numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (-)
Total	\$9,711	\$11,539	+\$1,828	34,077	30,155	-3,922
State Department	115	123	+8	88	87	-1
Office of the Director for Mutual Security	12	11	-1	21	22	+1
Mutual Security Agency	9	9		17	18	+1
Office of the Secretary of Defense	76	91	+15	170	167	-3
Department of the Army	6,681	7,713	+1,032	24,981	21,824	-3,057
Department of the Air Force	1,406	1,611	+205	4,857	4,096	-761
Department of the Navy	1,412	1,981	+569	4,043	3,941	-102

LETTER FROM THE POSTMASTER GENERAL, RELATIVE TO EMPLOYMENT IN THE POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
May 27, 1953.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF
NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Reference is made to my letter of April 3, 1953, concerning the personnel report covering departmental and field employees which the Post Office Department has been submitting to your committee each month.

Inasmuch as factual data have not been compiled for the month of April it is requested that you use for the April report the same number of employees as were listed on the January report.

Let me again assure you that concerted effort is being made to develop accurate data for these reports and that your committee will be furnished the information as soon as it has been tabulated.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES R. HOOK, Jr.,
Deputy Postmaster General.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Reports to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures compiled today show that civilian employment by executive agencies of the Federal Government during April was reduced by 24,029, bringing the total to 2,502,790.

As in March, this reduction again was the largest monthly cut since the Korean war began. It brought the total reduction for 10 months of the fiscal year, which began last July 1, to 96,568. This reduction, by months, follows:

Month	Total employment	Increase	Decrease
June 1952	2,599,358		
July	2,601,803	2,445	
August	2,592,769		9,034
September	2,574,203		18,566
October	2,569,054		5,149
November	2,565,607		3,447
December	2,560,479		5,128
January 1953	2,554,824		5,655
February	2,546,954		7,870
March	2,526,819		20,135
April	2,502,790		24,029

Again in April, as in each month since January, the total reported employment is subject to revision upon receipt of actual figures by the Post Office Department which has not submitted a personnel report since that time pending development of more accurate reporting. During reorganization of its personnel reporting procedures, the Post Office Department is reporting January employment figures.

INCREASES

The April reduction figure is net, after taking into account substantial increases during the month reported by the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and the Veterans' Administration, along with lesser increases reported by the Department of Justice, the White House, the President's Advisory Committee on Government Organization, the Federal Civil Defense Administration, Renegotiation Board, Small Defense Plants Administration, American Battle Monuments Commission, Civil Aeronautics Board, Export-Import Bank, Federal Communications Commission, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, National Gallery of Art, National Labor Relations Board, National Science Foundation, Railroad Retirement Board, Se-

curities and Exchange Commission, Smithsonian Institution, Soldiers Home, and Tariff Commission.

DECREASES

Increases in these agencies totaling 3,671 were offset by decreases totaling 5,282 in civilian agencies and 22,418 in civilian employment by the Department of Defense. All of the component agencies within the Department of Defense showed substantial reductions both inside and outside continental United States, and in both white-collar and industrial employment.

Substantial decreases, among the civilian agencies were reported by the Departments of Commerce, Health, Education and Welfare, State and Treasury, the Economic Stabilization Agency, and Panama Canal, along with lesser decreases by 29 other agencies.

April employment by civilian agencies totaled 1,221,674, and civilian employment by the Military Establishment during the month totaled 1,281,116.

April employment inside continental United States totaled 2,320,414, a reduction of 21,653 under March, and outside continental United States Federal civilian employment totaled 182,376, a reduction of 2,376 under March.

CONTINUATION OF AUTHORITY FOR REGULATION OF EXPORTS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1739) to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 12 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 7), as amended by Public Law 33, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 43), is hereby amended by striking out "1953" and inserting in lieu thereof "1956."

Mr. CAPEHART. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FLOOD CONTROL ACT OF 1941, RELATING TO APPORTIONMENT OF CERTAIN MONEYS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 117) to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 7 of the act entitled "An act authorizing the construction of certain public works on rivers and harbors for flood control, and for other purposes," approved August 18, 1941, as amended (33 U. S. C. 701c-3), is amended by striking out "situated;" and inserting in lieu thereof "situated, or for defraining any of the expenses of county government in such county or counties, including public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements."

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Public Works explain the nature of the House amendment?

Mr. MARTIN. The House amendment simply makes clear that the bill would apply to public obligations of levee and drainage districts for flood control and drainage improvements.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Is the House amendment agreeable to all members of the Senator's committee?

Mr. MARTIN. It is agreeable to all members of the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania, that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

WEARING OF UNIFORM OF ARMED FORCES BY CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, last week the Senate agreed to the House amendments to the bill (S. 1550) to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the armed forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom.

On June 2 the Senate agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, providing that the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives in signing Senate bill 1550 be rescinded, and that the House be requested to return to the Senate its message announcing its agreement to the House amendment.

The House of Representatives has now agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, and has returned the papers.

The House amendments were faulty, in that they referred to the President, rather than to the Secretary of Defense.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the vote by which it agreed to the House amendments on May 28, last.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw the motion to agree to the House amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I now move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House of Representatives, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. RUSSELL conferees on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading

clerk, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 35) to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. HARRIS had been appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of United States wall maps for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on the amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL].

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

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

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

Aiken	Griswold	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Mundt
Beall	Hendrickson	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Pastore
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bridges	Hill	Potter
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Purtell
Byrd	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Humphrey	Russell
Carlson	Jackson	Saltonstall
Case	Jenner	Schoeppe
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Daniel	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworshak	Kuchel	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Tobey
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Mansfield	Welker
Fulbright	Martin	Wiley
George	Maybank	Williams
Goldwater	McClellan	Young
Gore	Millikin	
Green	Monroney	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

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

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

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURLER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the two amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas, which are being considered en bloc, the first amendment being on page 50, line 12; the second on page 50, lines 19 and 20.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I do not know how many Senators presently on the floor were here last night when I presented my two amendments. Briefly, the two amendments seek to restore the amount originally requested by the Bureau of the Budget for the National Bureau of Standards when the matter was presented to it by the Department of Commerce. The two amendments seek to increase the appropriations to the extent of \$1,613,000.

Yesterday questions were asked of the Senator from Kansas relative to the use of the funds for certain purposes. First, I desire to make it perfectly clear that the amendments do not propose to increase the amounts allowed by the Bureau of the Budget for this item, which I think relates to an important function and an important adjunct of the Bureau of Standards.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, yesterday evening, I, myself, raised certain questions with the Senator from Kansas, along the line of inquiry as to whether the granting of the increase in the appropriations as proposed in his amendments would be in the nature of furthering certain expanding activities of the Bureau of Standards in its contractual field. The Senator assured me that in his opinion it would not be, that the proposed increase in appropriations was, he believed, for the normal, ordinary functions of the Bureau of Standards, and that without the increase, those operating functions would be curtailed.

I have checked with the Senator from Kansas and with other sources, and I am now thoroughly convinced that the increase in the appropriation which he proposes is very important to the normal, current operations of the Bureau of Standards, and that it does not apply to the subject matter which I raised in my questions on yesterday.

I wish to say to the Senator from Kansas that I am convinced that his amendments are worthy amendments, and that they are very important for the continuation of some important work of the Bureau of Standards in its normal operating functions. I assure the Senator further that, as a result of my discussions with him later, and as a result of inquiries, I am convinced that he is justified in requesting the adoption of the amendments.

Mr. President, I desire to make that correction, in case anyone thought my remarks of yesterday might continue to be construed as an objection in some way to the amendments of the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I desire to say to the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa that I appreciate very much his remarks with reference to his inquiries of yesterday.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I wish to join with the able Senator from Kansas in recommending that the appropriation for the Bureau of Standards be increased. I know quite a little about the operations of the Bureau. I know what it means to employment in America, and what it means to business; and business, of course, is the segment of our economy which furnishes the jobs, and which gives employment.

In my opinion, we would be making a very serious mistake if we were to hinder laboratory research and development in our Nation, because it is through research and the development of new ideas that we are able to maintain and to increase employment. It seems to me that the recommended increase of appropriations for the Bureau of Standards is good insurance of continued employment. We make a mistake when we do anything which would in any way reduce or limit research and the development of new ideas, the testing of new ideas, and the testing of products.

I hope the appropriation for the Bureau of Standards will not be reduced to such a point that the Bureau cannot continue to function properly, because, if one reviews the history of this Nation, he will learn that it is as a result of research and development and engineering that we have been able to develop new products, such as the automobile, the tractor, the radio, television, the washing machine, and all of the many other things the people have, the production of which results in employment to millions and millions of our people. In other words, we have full employment today, in my personal opinion, by reason of the fact that there has been research, development, and engineering. To limit or to impair the means of research, development, and engineering would, I believe, tend to destroy employment in America, and would eventually result in a great deal of unemployment. I urge the Senate to support the amendments of the able Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I appreciate the contribution of the Senator from Indiana, and his understand-

ing of the seriousness of the situation, and of the disastrous results which would result through a failure to maintain the Bureau of Standards in its work of making possible high standards of efficiency from the scientific standpoint.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. I wish to associate myself with the efforts of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], this morning. I desire to read a telegram which I have received from Mr. R. E. Sanders, Jr., president of Sanders Associates, Inc., a powerful research agency in the State of New Hampshire. The telegram reads:

Strongly urge you reconsider restoring Bureau of Standards budget to 4 million for next fiscal year. Despite the need for budget economy the basis work of Bureau of Standards with which I am familiar is invaluable to both commercial and defense work alike. Furthermore the specialists employed by Bureau of Standards are underpaid by commercial values and their absorption by commercial concerns will not be to the best interest of the Government.

Mr. President, our Bureau of Standards is a great research agency. The most beneficial research is that which is conducive to extending the borders of knowledge, and it is that type of research the Bureau of Standards is doing. Let us not hamper it, but let us make it possible for the Bureau to go ahead. I am glad to endorse the effort of the distinguished Senator from Kansas this morning.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. As I understand, the Senator from Kansas has stated that the increase in appropriation which he is advocating was originally approved by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator from New Jersey is correct.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is very important, because, I may say, for the information of my colleagues, that in view of my interest in the research work of the National Science Foundation, I have had conferences with the Bureau of the Budget regarding the coordination of all the research work that is being done in the various departments of the Government to the end that our scientific work may be concentrated as far as possible in the National Science Foundation. Therefore, it was arranged with the Bureau of the Budget that in certain areas the previous appropriations for scientific research would be reduced and would be concentrated in the National Bureau of Standards.

I understand from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that the program which the Senator from Kansas is advocating has been considered definitely and approved as part of the major, overall research program. Therefore, the question of economy is not involved, but rather the question of efficiency in

the matter of allocations for research in the different bureaus.

Therefore, as a result of my study last night, after the distinguished Senator from Kansas had raised his point, I am entirely satisfied that the Senator's proposal is in line with the policy on which we have been working for some months, and regarding which the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Dodge, wrote me a letter, giving full approval. So I am glad to join with the Senator from Kansas in support of his amendments. I believe they will restore the figures which the Bureau of the Budget worked out very carefully, so that the Bureau of Standards would not be handicapped by any uncalled for and unjustified reductions in the research allocation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I thank the distinguished Senator from New Jersey. He has put his finger upon a most important subject, that of scientific research. The questions the distinguished Senator has asked me have indicated his understanding to be exactly that of the Senator from Kansas.

I may say to the distinguished Senator that only last night, and again this morning, I received a telephone call from Dr. Kelly in Albuquerque, N. Mex. I know that there are those present today, particularly the senior Senator from New Jersey, who are very well acquainted with the notable work of Dr. Kelly. I am glad to say for the record that Dr. Kelly, in response to questions I asked him, stated that the proposed cut in the budget which was made by the House, and which is indicated by the bill as it is now before the Senate, would be a most serious blow to the normal activities of the Bureau of Standards. Dr. Kelly said, "I cannot say too strongly that the cut should not be allowed."

I know that certain questions were raised on the Senate floor yesterday, and earnestly so, relative to the military phase of the Bureau's activities. I am sorry I did not have all the data on that point last night, but I do have a breakdown.

There was some suggestion that possibly the Bureau of Standards was going outside of its regular routine work and arrogating unto itself additional functions. I find that is not the case. I find that the Ordnance Bureau has come to the Bureau of Standards requesting it to do specific things with reference to scientific military exploration work and detailed implementation of highly technical classified work. I find the same thing has been done with reference to certain contracts. For instance, one phase of the work of the Bureau of Standards ties in very closely to atomic energy and the work connected with that great scientific defense organizational activity. I find, also, that the amount which the Department of Defense, directly or indirectly, has allocated to be handled through the National Bureau of Standards in connection with its very important work in connection with fuses was \$11,575,000. I shall not go further into this item, because certain phases of it are of a highly classified nature.

The sum of approximately \$11,360,000 was allocated in connection with a supplementary program to assist industry which had defense contracts approved

by the highest echelon of our Military Establishment.

The sum of \$15,793,000 was allocated for guided-missile work which the Bureau has been doing.

One specific thing which I wish to make crystal clear is that the work which the Bureau of Standards is doing and for which it is receiving certain allocated sums of money from different departments of the Defense Establishment is mandatory work; it is not discretionary work on the part of the Bureau of Standards. It fits very importantly into the defense of our country.

Mr. President, I could go on and enumerate some of the other important vital matters which tie into defense.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I understand the Senator's amendments would merely restore the figures to the amount of the Budget recommendation.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator from Mississippi is correct.

Mr. STENNIS. I further understand that if these figures are not restored to the budget recommendation, a 25-percent reduction in the basic technical research program would result.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. That is exactly the information upon which I am relying, which has been relayed to me by high officials of the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. STENNIS. That is the way the Senator from Mississippi understands the situation. I do not have much personal knowledge of this particular item, but I am acquainted generally with agricultural research. I know that there has been such a demand for top men in industry and defense research, especially within the past 10 or 12 years, that it has been difficult to secure the high type of research men, the better level of research men, required to go into these various Government programs.

I think it is highly important that we not reduce the modest programs which are already in progress. I think the Senate should vote for the amendments, to restore the budget figure. If there is any change in policy, that is another question to be considered on another occasion.

I thank the Senator from Kansas for permitting me to make this statement.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I very much appreciate the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

I should like to point out one other thing which I think is most important. There may be in the minds of some the thoughts that the work of the Bureau of Standards is not available to all categories of business, but I desire to make clear that a segment of business known as small business constantly calls upon the Bureau for assistance. Several Members of the Senate are serving on the Small Business Committee of the Senate. We have been relatively free from too much difficulty in channeling defense contracts—slowly, to be sure—into many of the small-business concerns of the country. The contracts which have been allocated to small business have been performed according to

detailed specifications. I have been informed that the Bureau of Standards has worked out, under the guidance of the Defense Department and with the close precision work which must attach to some of the defense contracts, detailed information and background material that can be utilized by small businesses all over the country in the performance of defense contracts.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Can the Senator tell us, offhand, whether the increase asked for makes the amount larger or smaller than that which was used last year by the Bureau of Standards?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I believe it is a smaller amount than was requested last year. I think I am absolutely correct in that statement.

Last year, if my information is correct, the amount was \$7,779,000. In 1953 it is \$7,943,000. If my amendments are adopted the amount for 1954 will be \$7,613,000. I think I am relatively correct.

Mr. President, I wish to point out one other thing before I close. When the difficulty in which we now find ourselves began to accelerate—and I am speaking of the attitude of the communistic nations, and particularly with reference to Russia—following World War II we found that the Russian authorities, who were in responsible positions, reached out into Germany and into other European areas, as quickly as they could, and laid their hands upon scientific men to build up their scientific staffs for the production of scientific materials to meet the challenge of the rest of the world. If we stifle research, if we stifle an activity upon which so much of our defense is predicated, I think it will be a shortsighted policy. I say that most earnestly. I get rather tired at times of hearing that this or that is tied to the national defense, and that we should do thus and so. But here is something on which I do not want my country to be short. We are in a gadget age.

Believe me, Mr. President, unless we keep abreast of scientific defense we shall be outdistanced. I am offering no criticism of those who want to reduce expenses, but let us look to some other place than in the scientific field. Guided missiles, guided planes, proximity fuses—all those things to which we are so closely tied for our defense and protection—are closely related to the work of the Bureau of Standards.

When Dr. Kelly spoke to me about the importance of the work of the Bureau of Standards I felt constrained, despite the fact that I have stood on this floor many times and voted against increases in the interest of economy, to think that this is one place and one time when I should vote for an increase, and that is the reason why I favor the pending amendments.

Finally, before closing, I wish to say that many Senators know that recently the Secretary of Commerce has taken action which has resulted in the appointment to the National Academy of Sci-

ences of the head of this country's largest scientific engineering laboratory, as chairman of a committee to make a complete study of the functions of the National Bureau of Standards in relation to present national needs. I believe that is a fine contribution.

Dr. Marvin Kelly, whose name I mentioned a while ago, and with whom I spoke again this morning, the president of the Bell Telephone Laboratories, who is chairman of the committee, has strongly urged that the Bureau's capabilities for its basic functions should not be decreased at this time. Since preparing this statement, he has talked to me and urged me to do everything I could to ensure an adequate appropriation. He said, "Senator, I am sure you know my position. My position is a realistic one. I believe we should not cripple this department."

Under Dr. Kelly's leadership, I am certain that by the utilization of these funds we shall get a determination as to the goals toward which the work of the Bureau of Standards and the other technical help shall be directed in the future.

In the light of these circumstances, I naturally feel that the amendments should prevail. I know the increase has not been recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. I regret very much that I did not have the information I now possess at the time the matter was before the committee. If I had had it, and if I had had an opportunity, as I now have, to go to men in whom I have confidence on the scientific side, I assure the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, in whom I have the greatest confidence, that I would have been before the committee to present the matter in my own way, which would not have been a scientific approach. There are Senators who could have presented the subject much better than I could have, but I would have asked for a restoration of the funds the Bureau of the Budget allotted to the Bureau of Standards.

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

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Kansas for the information he has brought to us. Great things have been accomplished by the Bureau of Standards, particularly in relation to the defense program, and also with respect to independent enterprise. I think it fair to say that some of the Government research that is done at the Bureau of Standards finds its way into many more economic enterprises than that which is done by some of the larger private institutions. There is a large place for both types of research. Under no circumstances would I wish to see the Government usurp the field. On the contrary, I like to look upon the research and scientific inquiries of the Bureau of Standards as supplementary and complementary to the work which is being done in the private areas of our economy. I think it is well that we protect the integrity and scientific standards of the Bureau of Standards, and I am of the

opinion that the proposal of the Senator from Kansas will do just that. As I understand, the amount of money which is proposed by the Senator's amendment is very modest, it is not beyond the amount requested by the Bureau of the Budget, and it is not as large as the amount appropriated in previous years.

On that basis, I think the amount can surely be justified, in view of the very definite need for increased scientific analysis and scientific study. We are confronted these days with real competition from all over the world. The Senator from Kansas has properly made note of the contest and competition between the areas of scientific inquiry in the free world as compared to that of the Soviet Union and its satellite countries. Regardless of the questions of communism or freedom, it is still good business to keep the Bureau of Standards on a high level of performance.

I wish to join with the Senator from Kansas in the offering of the amendments, and to express personally my gratitude for his leadership in the matter.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I have listened to the able and distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] discuss this matter. I have great affection for and confidence in him. I know that basically he is for economy, in spite of the effort on his part for an increase in funds in this instance.

This subject was considered by the committee. Both the subcommittee and the full committee heard testimony on it. The Senate Committee on Appropriations arrived at the same decision as did the House of Representatives, namely, that \$3 million for this item was sufficient.

The Senator from Kansas, in so ably stating his case for an increase, has said that the Bureau of Standards has made a great contribution to national defense. I agree that it has, but it has also been paid for its work. The Bureau is paid for whatever it does. Whenever the Bureau performs services for another commission or department it is paid for that work by a transfer of funds. Therefore, despite the fact that, as far as I know, an assembly of talented and experienced personnel is available to do the work required, a transfer of funds is made, because that certainly has been testified to in the hearings.

I think the Senator from Kansas could have made a pretty good case for this item before the committee. I will not argue with him along that line. He has presented a case for his amendments. I believe that the agency should have presented a more forceful and better case for the committee. Based upon the evidence which we had, I think we were justified in taking the position we took.

Since the hearings, like the Senator from Kansas, the Senator from New Hampshire has talked with the various persons about this appropriation. Having in mind the idea that there might be some way of reaching a compromise figure to take to conference, the Senator from New Hampshire talked with various members of the committee yester-

day to see what latitude of discretion the Senator from New Hampshire might exercise. I spoke with several Senators yesterday, both in and out of the Chamber. With two or three exceptions, they were opposed to any increase in the figures for these items. So in the light of the action of the subcommittee and the full committee, followed by an informal poll of members of the committee, the Senator from New Hampshire can do nothing else than oppose the request of the distinguished and able Senator from Kansas, which I admit he very eloquently supported. It is the feeling of the committee that the funds allowed in the bill will be adequate, and that whenever the Bureau of Standards does any work for other agencies or for the farmers, it will be adequately paid.

I ask the Senator from Kansas if he expects to ask for a record vote on his amendments. What is his pleasure?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I should like to have the Senate pass upon this question, but I am not particularly concerned about a record vote. I know that several Senators are absent from the Chamber today for various reasons. However, I feel that this is such an important matter that we ought to have a better attendance of Senators before a vote is taken.

I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, as to the first amendment, I will say to the Senator from Kansas that, in view of his expression of interest, and in view of the fact that many Senators are unavailable at the moment, and also because I do not wish to delay action on the bill, I should be willing to take to conference a figure of \$3,500,000 instead of \$3,000,000, if the Senator from Kansas will agree to that. I may say frankly that I am speaking on my own authority, without the concurrence or approval of other members of the committee; I wish to make that very clear. I am willing to split the difference and take to conference the sum of \$3,500,000 instead of \$3,000,000. That would place the subject in conference, where the facts could be determined, and any later information or evidence that might become available could be offered before the conference committee.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I should like to see the subject go to conference on that basis, especially in view of what the Senator has just said, to the effect that in the light of other circumstances additional evidence may be presented to the conference committee.

Let me ask the distinguished chairman of the committee what he would be willing to do as to the second item of \$2,613,000. I think that is a very important matter.

Mr. BRIDGES. With respect to that item, if we could reach an agreement, I would be willing to take to conference a similar split. The Senator from Kansas is asking for \$2,613,000. I am willing to take to conference a figure of \$2,306,500, which represents a similar split with respect to this item.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I had hoped that the distinguished Senator might be a little more generous with respect to the

second item. I had hoped he might be willing to take to conference the figure of \$2,400,000. This item represents a very important program in the electronic field.

Mr. BRIDGES. I know that the Senator from Kansas is a distinguished mid-western trader. I think it is a very fine thing to be a good trader. However, I am a New Englander, and have some roots in the soil so far as trading is concerned. I think if I go halfway with the Senator that is about as good a trade as anyone could make.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am willing to have the distinguished Senator take the items to conference on the basis suggested. However, I am sure that when he goes into the subject earnestly he will be inclined to be a little more generous than he has indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to modify his amendments accordingly?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to modify the amendments accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 50, line 12, it is proposed to strike out "\$3,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,500,000."

On page 50, lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,306,500."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments offered by the Senator from Kansas, as modified.

The amendments, as modified, were agreed to.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, last night the Senate, after a trying day, found itself confronted with a motion to reconsider the vote by which we had previously saved \$4 million from the funds recommended for the State Department palace-purchase program. The move succeeded, and thereby the taxpayers lost \$4 million. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall move to reconsider the vote by which this increase was inserted. I wish to make a statement at this point to indicate the reasons for my action.

FOREIGN CREDITS CAN BE USED FOR MANY PURPOSES

This money was voted, as we all know, because the majority of the Senate thought that the purchase of buildings was the only way we could use our available foreign credits. This notion—and I say this deliberately—is absolutely and unequivocally incorrect, and I shall prove it without question.

Let us trace very briefly the development of this amendment. When the subject was being considered by the Appropriations Committee, the committee was led to believe that these foreign credits would be lost if they were not spent for buildings or for education.

In a letter dated May 1, 1953, from the Under Secretary of State, Donald B. Lourie, to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, he stated:

It is debatable as to whether we should retain millions in paper credits or convert a reasonable amount to physical property which collaterally reduces our national out-

lay for rented space. In my judgment, we should not permit unused credits to deteriorate or be defaulted (as in the recent case of Czechoslovakia) where land or building titles might more readily assure ultimate settlement and reduce our recurring annual expense.

I do not question the good faith of Mr. Lourie, but I submit that the evidence will show that he was taken in by the gentlemen of the State Department, who naturally want elaborate quarters. However, this being the information before the committee, they approved \$4 million for this program. I wish to make it clear that I do not blame the committee. I do not blame the chairman of the subcommittee, or the committee as a whole.

On the floor of the Senate, in the debate on this amendment, I pointed out, as did the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other Senators, that these funds could be used for a variety of purposes to alleviate the taxpayers' burden. We stated that they could be used not only for the so-called Fulbright educational exchange program, but also for strategic materials; for pay of foreign nationals working for the Departments of State and Defense abroad, and for various supplies needed by our Government abroad.

The taxpayers must foot the bill for these purposes; and, to the extent that foreign credits can be used, the taxpayers will gain. To the extent that they are used for sumptuous offices and quarters the State Department will gain at the expense of the taxpayers. It was on this basis that the Senate, by a roll-call vote on Monday voted to eliminate the item.

On Tuesday a motion to reconsider this action was entered. Yesterday the motion was voted upon. It was asserted by certain of our colleagues—and I wish to say that I am sure they, too, were acting in good faith—that the Senate had been misled by me and by other Senators, and that it was really a move for economy to spend the \$4 million, because if we did not spend it we would lose it. A list of agreements with respect to these credits was produced on the floor, and as a result of cross-examination certain details were elicited, but the full information with respect to the credits was not available until this morning, when the details appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 5979 and 5980.

AGREEMENTS SHOW THAT CREDITS NEED NOT BE SPENT FOR BUILDING

The agreements with Great Britain and France were cited in the debate yesterday, allegedly to show that the credits could be used only for the acquisition of real estate and for education. The only trouble with the list, as it is printed in the RECORD, when used to support the \$4 million item, is that it bears out my contention rather than that of the State Department. That is true because the credits can be used for any purpose—any purpose, I repeat—in the eight countries in which the State Department palaces are sought to be constructed, with one single exception, namely, France. I refer to the list which is

printed in the RECORD beginning at page 5979. I read from page 5981:

Asuncion—

Which is in Paraguay—

Office building and principal officers' residence, \$315,000.

Tangiers—

The same type of construction—

\$500,000.

Mexico: Office building and staff housing, \$650,000.

Helsinki—

That is in Finland—

Office building, \$600,000.

The Hague: Office building, \$525,000.

New Delhi: Office building and staff housing, \$1 million.

Bangkok: Officer housing, \$60,000.

Djakarta: Office building, \$350,000.

The total is \$4 million.

I ask Members of this body to read what the actual agreements are with the respective countries concerned. The list of agreements was placed in the RECORD by the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and can be found at pages 5979 and 5980. I invite the attention of the Members of the Senate on the floor and their staffs to look at the RECORD at that point, and to check my remarks as I go along.

I refer to pages 5979 and 5980 in the RECORD of yesterday.

The first country in which buildings are to be erected is Paraguay. There is no agreement listed for Paraguay. Therefore there are no restrictions. Two hundred thousand dollars of the \$315,000 is to come from dollar reserves, according to the footnote on page 5981. No credits whatever are listed in the table of outstanding balances under credit agreements available for payments in foreign countries, as shown in the table on page 5981 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Let us next take France.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As was stated 2 days ago, credits in Italy can be used to purchase marble and other materials, which can be transported and used in Paraguay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes. Italy, however, is not included in the list of countries in which buildings are to be erected.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand, but as I have indicated, credits in other countries can be used with which to purchase materials for use in such countries as Paraguay.

Mr. DOUGLAS. There is an item for France—Tangier—\$500,000. I wish to say that there are restrictions in force so far as France is concerned, but that is the only country where there are such restrictions in effect. Moreover, credits even here can be used for acquisition of property for airstrips and other purposes. They need not be spent for the State Department exclusively.

Let us take Mexico, which is listed in the first column on page 5979 of the RECORD. I ask Senators to read the last sentence:

Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses in Mexico.

The next office building to be erected is in Helsinki, Finland. I ask Senators to refer to the Finland item. I read from page 5979:

The Finland agreement has no annual limitation and funds received thereunder are available for any United States expenses.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I refer to the item which the Senator from Illinois has read with respect to Mexico. The language which I should like to read is the sentence before the one read by the Senator from Illinois:

A new settlement arrangement will be worked out at that time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to point out that under the existing agreement the funds can be spent for any purpose.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. The point is they cannot be spent until an arrangement is worked out with Mexico.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. If Mexico is not willing to work out an agreement, what then?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The State Department naturally wants to work out an arrangement to restrict the use of funds to acquire the buildings. But an agreement could be reached to spend the credits on something beneficial to the taxpayers.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. That is not the point at all. The point is: If and when a new settlement is worked out these funds may be used for any United States expenses. However, if Mexico is unwilling to work out a new arrangement or a new agreement, those funds cannot be used for any United States expenses. I think I am correct in my interpretation of the language.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from North Carolina contend that under the existing agreement these funds are restricted in use, and can be used only for acquiring real estate or erecting buildings?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I do not know. I asked the question yesterday, because it seemed to me we were not getting the facts. I am asking for the facts. However, the language certainly does not, in my opinion, bear out the statement of the Senator from Illinois that the funds can be used for any expenses. The Senator from Louisiana knows more about it than I.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from North Carolina asking me a question?

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. I did ask the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I point out that the source of the funds obviously was a lend-lease agreement with Mexico, as is stated. There had to be an agreement under which the lend-lease arrangement could be made. The description of that agreement is that funds acquired under the agreement are available for any United States expenses in Mexico.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Does not the Senator from Illinois understand that when he speaks of "funds acquired under this agreement," he is referring to an agreement which is proposed to be entered into?

Mr. DOUGLAS. How can it refer to something in the future, which has not been entered into, as being binding? The presumption is that the statement refers to an existing agreement, not a future agreement.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Does the Senator believe it represents a presently existing agreement?

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I continue on this point? I read from page 5979 of the RECORD:

The Finland agreement has no annual limitation and funds received thereunder are available for any United States expenses.

Let us take the Netherlands, because it is proposed to erect a building in The Hague costing \$525,000. The statement on the Netherlands reads:

This agreement is available for any United States expenses and has no annual limitation on the amount that may be drawn.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. May I inquire as to which paragraph the Senator is referring. In other words, what is meant by "this agreement"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The surplus property agreement.

Mr. SMITH of North Carolina. Does the Senator from Illinois have before him a copy of that agreement, so we may look at it?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I must go on the basis of the evidence introduced by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] in support of the contention that these funds could be used only for building. I am using the evidence he presented. Of course, it is not his evidence. He had no intent to deceive in this matter. Undoubtedly it was material which was given to him by Government agencies. I am merely taking the material and showing that according to the evidence which was advanced in support of these expenditures, the conclusion is exactly opposite to what was stated yesterday.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Illinois permit me to repeat what I said yesterday, namely, that before any of these funds can be expended for buildings in the host country or to buy material to be used in some other country, an agreement must be entered into between our country and the country in which we have the credit balance—for instance, in this case, between Finland and the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the point made yesterday was that agreements existed restricting the use of these credits. If we are talking about future agreements, that leaves the whole question open. The summary statement for this material reads as follows, as it appears near the top of page 5979 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the first column on that page: "Statement of Limitations and Restrictions Against Use of Foreign Currencies Made Available Under Credit Agreements, as of December 31, 1952."

In other words, it is a statement of conditions existing as of December 31, 1952, and it does not refer to any potential agreements in the future. The statement covers the agreements which were in force. We have seen that in the case of Mexico, Finland, and the Netherlands, thus far there have been no restrictions upon the use of the funds.

Now let us refer in this connection to India. If we examine the second column on page 5980 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 3, 1953, we find that paragraphs A, B, and C do not give any statement of restrictions. If there were restrictions and limitations, presumably they would be included. However, we do not find in these three paragraphs any statement of restrictions or limitations.

Now let us consider Bangkok which is located in Thailand, as referred in the third column on page 5980 of the RECORD, I ask my colleagues to notice the first sentence of that paragraph, which reads as follows:

A. Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses.

If we consider the situation regarding Djakarta, Indonesia, as shown near the top of the third column on page 5980, we find the following:

Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses and without annual limitation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator from Illinois read the next sentence?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It reads as follows:

The agreement provides that \$7 million may be used for an educational program and \$1.3 million for buildings both subject to change by negotiations.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of that demonstrates what I have stated.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am not accusing the Senator from Louisiana of having any desire to mislead the Senate. I simply say that unintentionally he was misled by the material which was furnished to him; and I point out that this material states that \$7 million "may" be spent for educational purposes and \$1.3 million "may" be spent for buildings; but there is no statement that the money "must" be spent for those purposes. In fact, I point out that the money can be spent for virtually any purpose. This analysis shows that, in practice, there are no restrictions upon the use of any of these credits, in cases where buildings are desired to be constructed, except in the case of France. For instance, the credits could be spent for the Air Force; they do not have to be spent for the State Department.

I wish to say in all charity that yesterday the Senate acted under a misapprehension as to the real facts. I wish to make clear that I do not blame any Senator for that.

But I presume the gentleman in the State Department who prepared this data, gave to someone a false impression regarding what the data actually indicated, if analyzed. Upon analysis, it is seen that the funds really were available for other purposes in every country, and that in France the funds could certainly be used for the Air Force or for other branches of our Armed Forces.

I believe we should return to the right track; and now that we have the true facts, I believe we should save this \$4 million for our taxpayers.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now enter a motion that the vote by which this item was approved yesterday be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHOEPPEL in the chair). The motion will be entered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will state it.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe the Senate considered this matter yesterday.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in line with the point of order raised by the Senator from Louisiana, I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry, in order to state the matter in a somewhat more formal way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BRIDGES. Is it in order for a Senator to move for reconsideration of a reconsidered motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first vote was on the question of agreeing to the committee amendment, and the committee amendment was rejected by a vote of 34 to 38.

Yesterday, that vote was reconsidered, and the amendment was agreed to. Therefore, the Senate did not affirm its first decision. A motion to reconsider, such as the one now submitted by the Senator from Illinois, would therefore be in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oregon for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am not sure that I can put what I have in mind in the form of a question, so I shall wait until I can obtain the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will not the Senator from Louisiana modify his motion? The effect of his motion, as he well knows, is to shut off debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has moved to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	George	Millikin
Barrett	Gore	Morse
Bridges	Hennings	Mundt
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Case	Hill	Russell
Cooper	Hoey	Schoeppel
Cordon	Holland	Smathers
Douglas	Jackson	Sparkman
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Taft
Eastland	Knowland	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Tobey
Ferguson	Maybank	Watkins
Flanders	McClellan	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. BEALL, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LANGER, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SMITH of North Carolina, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. WELKER, Mr. WILEY, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is my understanding correct that with the motion to table of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] debate on this issue is shut off?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for reconsideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent —

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President —

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that, before debate is shut off, I may be permitted to speak for about 5 minutes, in order to explain the reasons why I have asked for a reconsideration of the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to speak for 5 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I temporarily withdraw my motion to lay on the table.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President —

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOUGLAS. With the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, and with the understanding that the time used by the Senator from Oregon is not subtracted from the time which is assigned to me —

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time is allocated to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] for his courtesy in withdrawing the motion to table, which, if it had been persisted in, would have shut off debate on the issue before the Senate.

I think I should explain why I have asked for reconsideration of the vote by which an expenditure of \$4 million for buildings for the Department of State

was approved yesterday. In order to do so, I should like to state the history of this matter and make clear what has happened.

I preface my statement by saying that there has been complete good faith in this matter on the part of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], and by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. However, I think the Senate acted yesterday under a misapprehension as to what the facts are, and I now ask the attention of the Senate, in order that I may discuss the issue.

I invite the attention of Senators to pages 5979 and 5980 of the RECORD of yesterday, which is on their desks. Last night, after a trying day, the Senate found itself confronted with a move to reconsider the vote by which it had previously saved \$4 million from funds recommended for the State Department's palace-purchase program. The move succeeded, and thereby the taxpayers lost \$4 million.

This money was voted because a majority of the Senate felt that the purchase of buildings was the only way in which we could use our foreign credits. The notion that this is the only way in which we can spend our credits is not true, and I think I can prove it without any question.

When the matter was first under consideration by the Committee on Appropriations, the committee was led to believe that foreign credits would be lost if they were not spent for buildings. In a speech several minutes ago, I referred to a letter from Under Secretary of State Donald B. Lourie to the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], chairman of the committee. I am sure Mr. Lourie's letter also was written in good faith, but was based on incorrect information. It was on the basis of the incorrect information that the committee, acting in perfect good faith, approved \$4 million for the program.

In the debate on Monday, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and other Senators, including myself, pointed out that these funds could be used for a variety of purposes in order to reduce the burden upon taxpayers. We said then that foreign-dollar credits could be used for strategic materials, for the pay of foreign nationals working for the Departments of State and Defense abroad, and for various supplies needed by our Government abroad.

On Monday a motion to reconsider this action was entered, and it was asserted by certain Senators—and again I wish to say that their statements were made in good faith—that the Senate had been misled by other Senators and by myself; that it was really a move for economy to spend the \$4 million, because if it were not spent, it would be lost.

A list of agreements with respect to these credits was produced. However, it was not available to the majority of the Members of the Senate. Agreements with Great Britain and France were cited to show that the credits could be used only for the acquisition of real estate and education.

The only trouble with this list, which has now been printed on pages 5979 and 5980 of the RECORD of yesterday, which I hope Senators will examine, is that it bears out my contention rather than that of the State Department. This is true, because in all the countries where it is proposed to erect buildings, with the single exception of France, the credits can be used for any purpose whatsoever.

I wish to read a list of the proposed expenditures, which was placed in the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. According to the RECORD of yesterday, at page 5981, the first building was to be erected at Asuncion, Paraguay, and was to cost \$315,000.

The next building was to be built at Tangier, which is a French possession, at a cost of \$500,000.

A building was to be erected in Mexico City at a cost of \$650,000.

A building was to be constructed at Helsinki, Finland, for \$600,000. Another building was to be constructed at The Hague, the Netherlands, at a cost of \$525,000.

An office building was to be constructed in New Delhi, India, at a cost of \$1 million.

At Bangkok, Thailand, a building was to be constructed for \$60,000.

At Djakarta, Indonesia, a building was to be constructed at a cost of \$350,000.

The total cost of construction would have been \$4 million.

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

MR. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question.

MR. MORSE. In order to clear up a matter in my own mind, I wonder if the Senator would answer two or three questions.

First, do I correctly understand the Senator's position to be that when the Senate voted yesterday, and a majority of the Senate voted to restore the \$4 million item, we did so on the basis of a false assumption that the money could not be used for any other purpose than for building construction?

MR. DOUGLAS. I should say that our action was based on a mistaken assumption. I wish to be very careful about this. I am certain that no Senator gave information with any intent to deceive; it was simply mistaken information.

MR. MORSE. I also wish to make that very clear. In my judgment, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], made their statements on the basis of their good-faith belief, as I am satisfied the Senator from Illinois now is making his statement on the basis of his good-faith belief. However, since the Senator from Illinois objects to my phrase "false assumption," let me rephrase my question.

Is it the Senator's position that he believes the Senate acted on mistaken information, namely, that the Senate acted under the mistaken belief that the \$4 million could be used only for buildings?

MR. DOUGLAS. Senators who were present at the time will remember that

that was the point which was made—that the use of dollar credits was restricted to buildings.

MR. MORSE. Second, am I correct in my understanding that it is the argument of the Senator from Illinois that the Department of State failed to make clear to the Senate that in all these countries, save and except France, the money could be used for so-called general purposes, and that even in France the money could be used for the purpose of construction of air strips and other Air Force needs? Is that the position of the Senator from Illinois?

MR. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Let me put it this way. The letter of Under Secretary Lourie to the Committee on Appropriations undoubtedly contains misleading information. I presume that what operated on the Senate between Monday, when it rejected the expenditure, and yesterday, when it approved it, undoubtedly came from the State Department. But I did not hear any conversations between officials of the State Department and other Senators.

MR. MORSE. Third, is it the argument of the Senator from Illinois that in the references in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to which he alluded, setting forth the so-called arrangements with these countries, there is no such restriction as a restriction limiting the funds to buildings, but there is a general restriction, already referred to, in respect to France.

MR. DOUGLAS. That is correct; and I invite the attention of the Senator from Oregon to the title of the memorandum which the able Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] inserted in the RECORD. It is headed:

Statement of Limitations and Restrictions Against Use of Foreign Currencies Made Available Under Credit Agreements, as of December 31, 1952.

Therefore, presumably, it refers to the situation existing as of the time the expenditures were authorized.

MR. MORSE. Does the Senator from Illinois agree, as represented by the Senator from Louisiana—and it seems to me his position is correct—that there is the requirement in regard to these funds, as there is with respect to other funds, that an agreement must be entered into as to how they shall be spent?

MR. DOUGLAS. In the basic controlling agreement there are no such restrictions.

MR. MORSE. That is correct.

MR. DOUGLAS. Individual agreements can be made with respect to specific expenditures. If our State Department is willing to enter into such agreements, undoubtedly they will be made.

MR. MORSE. However, as I understand it, is the position of the Senator from Illinois that the fact that in the expenditure of funds there must be an understanding or agreement entered into is no argument for our taking the position that, therefore, we should not require the State Department to enter into certain agreements for expenditures of funds which we think would be more in the interest of the American people than the building of what the Senator refers to as more luxurious quarters for

employees of the State Department abroad.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is completely correct. I have always thought of the State Department as the instrument of national policy, but not as the creator of national policy. Certainly it is the function of Congress to govern the expenditure of money.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the argument get down to this point, so far as the economy feature is concerned: The Senator from Illinois seeks to point out to the Senate that when we come to spend these funds we ought to propose what he considers to be a more economical expenditure of the funds than an expenditure for these particular purposes, because the needs of those countries are such that we could strengthen our relationship with those countries by spending the money for other purposes—purposes of greater benefit to us and to them than the building of luxurious quarters for State Department employees abroad. Is not that the position of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is exactly correct. The Senator from Illinois argued, both Monday and yesterday, first, that the money could be expended for better purposes—for strategic materials, for example. That is particularly true in Indonesia and India, where copper, tin, and manganese could be purchased. It could also be used for the payment of foreign nationals who work for our Defense Department and for the State Department in those countries, thereby reducing the burden on the American taxpayer. There are possible uses in connection with air bases, which could be covered as well. So the money could be used to better purpose.

Furthermore, I tried to make the point that it is actually a national disservice to build extravagant quarters for State Department personnel in countries where the standard of living is low. It excites envy, jealousy, and hostility, and plays into the hands of our enemies. It breeds hatred instead of friendship. In my judgment, the State Department is following a very selfish policy in this connection.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I gladly yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator agree with me that if we do not earmark this money, as it was earmarked by the action which has already been taken by the Senate, for expenditure in the erection of buildings which he and I agree may not be necessary, we might conceivably work out an agreement with those countries whereby the money could be spent, for example, to pay for manpower in taking care of and manning some of our bases abroad, which would make it unnecessary to keep so many American boys abroad?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Exactly so.

Mr. MORSE. In other words, the Senator from Illinois is taking the position that with all the possibilities we have open to us for the expenditure of such funds by agreement, this proposal is one of the most uneconomic, one of

the most unnecessary, one of the most wasteful, and one that will serve our national interest the least. Is not that the position of the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Oregon is correct.

Mr. MORSE. To that extent there is involved the issue of economy. To reverse ourselves would, in effect, amount to at least a better expenditure of the funds, which is, in and of itself, a form of economy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

I now invite Senators to examine pages 5979 and 5980 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and check with me on the eight countries where it is proposed to erect buildings. I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is no mention, on pages 5979 and 5980, of the country of Paraguay, where the Asuncion building is to be erected. Since the memorandum is headed "Limitations and Restrictions Against Use of Foreign Currencies," I presume, since Paraguay is not included, that there are no such restrictions in Paraguay.

Skipping over France for a moment, I wish to take the case of Mexico, which is listed as the fifth country in column 1. I call the attention of the Senate to the last sentence:

Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses in Mexico.

Under Finland, which is the next to the last item in column 2, the statement is:

Funds received thereunder are available for any United States expenses.

In the case of the Netherlands, paragraph A reads:

This agreement is available for any United States expenses and has no annual limitation on the amount that may be drawn.

In the case of India, which is covered in the second column on page 5980, there is no restriction stated in paragraphs A, B, and C.

In the case of Indonesia, the first sentence reads:

Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses and without annual limitation.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. What the Senator is bringing out in this discussion disturbs me very much, because of this question: Does the Senator think this all adds up to what appears to be the fact, namely, that the State Department did not make a full disclosure to the Congress of the true facts in regard to the possibilities for the expenditure of these funds?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am afraid that is so. I wish to say that I am one who has not attacked the State Department in the past. I think a great many of the criticisms of the State Department have been ungenerous and unjust, and I do not wish to reflect upon the patriotism or loyalty of any member of the State Department. However, I do think that in this case—and I am afraid also in certain other cases which I have detected—the State Department did not tell the Congress all the truth. It failed to make full disclosure, and therefore,

by inference, it deceived the Congress. Those are harsh things to say, but I think they are true.

That makes it very difficult for us to trust the State Department on those matters with respect to which the Department enters a specific denial. We have been deluded so many times that we begin to wonder when we are getting the truth. I urge the State Department to come clean in these matters. I speak as one who has been a defender of the State Department. We cannot be expected to trust the State Department if the State Department will not trust us with the facts.

I wish to go back to the case of France, because that is one country where we are putting up buildings. I call attention to Tangier, French Morocco, where there is a restriction. There is a restriction with respect to France. I wish to call attention to the last sentence of paragraph A, which reads:

One surplus property credit agreement in the total amount of \$300 million provides that \$15 million thereof may be used for the acquisition of property and that \$10 million thereof may be paid in French currency that may be used for buildings or an educational program.

I should like to point out that buildings need not necessarily be State Department buildings. They could be buildings for our defense forces, and to that degree they would reduce the outlay which we must make in credits to foreign countries.

It is because of these facts that I entered my motion to reconsider the vote, and I believe the Chair has upheld it.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Does not the Senator agree with me that it should be made clear in the Record that the only purpose for making the motion to reconsider, after we had had one reconsideration—so the matter will not go on ad infinitum—is because the Senator in good faith feels new facts are now available to the Senate which were not available yesterday, and therefore the Senate may now take a final vote on the question on the basis of all the facts?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. The Senator from Illinois feels that he has now discharged his duty and that he has laid the information before the Senate. He now yields the floor and submits the matter to the Senate.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that 2 or 3 days ago, the Senate decided to throw out this appropriation for \$4 million for the acquisition and construction of new buildings, which it considered unnecessary under present circumstances?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New York say we threw out the appropriation?

Mr. LEHMAN. Yes, but yesterday the Senate voted to reconsider its action of the previous day. The Senate took that action under the mistaken notion that this \$4 million appropriation to be paid

out of counterpart funds was quite different from the usual appropriation, and that it involved no cash or use of funds of the United States Government, whereas, as a matter of fact, it was merely a camouflaged appropriation. It permitted the use of the \$4 million in credits, or counterpart funds which, were the equivalent of a cash expenditure, since those credits or counterpart funds can be used for other purposes by our Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the action of yesterday was based on misinformation.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Certainly when the Senate voted to reconsider the action which it had previously taken, it did so under the mistaken belief that these credits, if not used, would become entirely valueless to the United States Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We were told, I am sure in good faith, that these were frozen credits, which, if not used for buildings, could not be used at all.

Mr. LEHMAN. I should like to refresh the recollection of the distinguished Senator from Illinois by quoting one of many similar remarks which were made on the floor of the Senate yesterday. The remark I am about to quote was made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. It reads:

I earnestly urge Members of the Senate to consider that the amendment does not involve the expenditure of money out of the Treasury of the United States. It is derived from credits which we already have in foreign nations and which will eventually go down the drain if we do not use them.

That is unwittingly, of course, an incorrect statement. Those funds would not go down the drain.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to yield later. First I should like to say that, just as the Senator from New York has recognized, so has the Senator from Illinois recognized that this statement of the Senator from Iowa was made in perfectly good faith. I have tried again and again, in the course of the discussion, to make clear that I do not question the good faith of any Member of the Senate. On the contrary, I affirm it. I merely say that incorrect information was furnished to Senators, which, in the pressure of work, made them think that the circumstances were other than what they actually are.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I believe I should first yield to the Senator from Iowa, to reply.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I should like to reply to the uninformed statement of the Senator from New York.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from New York did not impugn the good faith of the Senator from Iowa, nor did I.

Mr. LEHMAN. The Senator from New York characterized the Senator's statement as having been made unwittingly, and he quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at page 5978. I shall be

glad to repeat the statement for the benefit of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I heard the statement read. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield very gladly.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I made that statement yesterday, and I did not make it unwittingly. I made it on the basis of what I believed to be ample evidence which has accumulated over a number of years from experience with our foreign operations. These funds are in blocked currency. They can be destroyed, and, in my judgment, they will be destroyed. They will be destroyed by one device or another, perhaps by the manipulation of these foreign currencies, if we do not use them. They can be destroyed by the device of currency inflation or currency deflation, or they will remain there until the pressures on us get so great that we will abandon the currencies to those countries.

I said that we had better get some use out of the money while we could, because, in my judgment, if we do not use them that money will go down the drain eventually, either by donation from us or by currency manipulation by the countries involved.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not the contention of the Senator from Illinois that these sums should be unused. It is my intention that they be used for better purposes. That is all.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield gladly.

Mr. LEHMAN. I again wish to say that the Senator from New York certainly was very careful not to impute any wrong motive or conscious inaccuracy to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. LEHMAN. I merely quoted from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I should like to draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that there is no indication that these credits will be allowed to pass down the drain. Some of them are being repaid. Many are being used for useful purposes in the countries of their origin. Right now, I should like to say to the Senator from Illinois and my other colleagues on the floor that such is the situation with respect to Mexico. I read from page 5979 of the RECORD:

5. MEXICO

(Source: Lend-lease)

A. The balance due under this settlement arrangement, \$3,250,000, is payable \$1 million in January 1953 (payment has been made) and \$750,000 each January 1954, 1955, and 1956. The Government of Mexico will still owe a balance of \$6,750,000 after the above payments are made. A new settlement arrangement will be worked out at that time. Funds acquired under this agreement are available for any United States expenses in Mexico.

These repayments would seem to me clearly to indicate that we would be using the equivalent of cash if we were to erect the proposed buildings, which are not necessary at all, in view of the effort which is being made to economize and save our resources for defense and for health and research and welfare and education, all of which are so greatly

necessary for the security and welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say, in reply to my colleague, we have been carrying on an extensive program, as the Senate knows, for the eradication of the hoof and mouth disease in Mexico, so that contaminated cattle in Mexico will not spread the disease in the United States. The fund could be used for that purpose, and I think to much better advantage than for the construction of a \$650,000 palace for the State Department people in Mexico City.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yesterday the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] stated that the amount of money involved is one-half of one percent of the total credits owed to us. That statement is to be found on page 5978 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

However, as the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] pointed out, as shown on page 5979 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, some of these credits would not become available to us until the year 2000.

Therefore, in the case of the total amount now owed to us—which is slightly more than \$42 million—that means that the amount under discussion today is not one-half of one percent of what is owed to us, but is 10 percent of the credits we have today; is not that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I renew my motion to lay on the table the motion of the Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment on page 5, after line 11, was agreed to.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Green	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Mundt
Beall	Hendrickson	Neely
Bennett	Hennings	Pastore
Bricker	Hickenlooper	Payne
Bridges	Hill	Potter
Butler, Md.	Hoey	Purtell
Byrd	Holland	Robertson
Capehart	Humphrey	Russell
Carlson	Jackson	Saltonstall
Case	Jenner	Schoeppel
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Daniel	Kennedy	Sparkman
Douglas	Kilgore	Stennis
Duff	Knowland	Symington
Dworschak	Kuchel	Taft
Eastland	Langer	Thye
Ellender	Lehman	Tobey
Ferguson	Malone	Watkins
Flanders	Martin	Welker
Fulbright	Maybank	Wiley
George	McClellan	Williams
Goldwater	Millikin	Young
Gore	Monroney	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] is absent on official business at the Pentagon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOPER in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the senior Senator from Louisiana to lay on the table the motion of the senior Senator from Illinois to reconsider the vote by which the committee amendment beginning on page 5, line 12, and extending through line 4 on page 6, was agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] is absent by leave of the Senate.

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

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

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. GRISWOLD] is absent on official business at the Pentagon.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HUNT], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. FEARL] is absent by leave of the Senate because of a death in his family.

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

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is absent on official business.

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

I announce further that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 16, as follows:

YEAS—64

Aiken	Gore	Mundt
Barrett	Green	Payne
Beall	Hayden	Purtell
Bennett	Hendrickson	Robertson
Bricker	Hennings	Russell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Butler, Md.	Hill	Schoepel
Byrd	Hoey	Smathers
Capehart	Holland	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Case	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, N. C.
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Cooper	Kefauver	Symington
Cordon	Kilgore	Taft
Daniel	Knowland	Thye
Duff	Kuchel	Tobey
Dworschak	Langer	Watkins
Eastland	Malone	Welker
Ellender	Martin	Wiley
Ferguson	Maybank	Young
Flanders	McClellan	
George	Millikin	

NAYS—16		
Clements	Jenner	Pastore
Douglas	Kennedy	Potter
Fulbright	Lehman	Sparkman
Goldwater	Monroney	Williams
Humphrey	Morse	
Jackson	Neely	

NOT VOTING—16		
Anderson	Griswold	Mansfield
Bush	Hunt	McCarran
Butler, Nebr.	Ives	McCarthy
Dirksen	Kerr	Murray
Frear	Long	
Gillette	Magnuson	

So Mr. ELLENDER'S motion to lay Mr. DOUGLAS' motion on the table was agreed to.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated as "6-3-53-B" and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed, on page 48, to strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this amendment seeks to strike from the bill, on page 48, lines 3 to 7, inclusive, which lines read as follows:

Rama Road, Nicaragua: For necessary expenses for the survey and construction of the Rama Road, Nicaragua, in accordance with the provisions of section 5 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1952 (66 Stat. 160), \$1,000,000, to remain available until expended.

A number of years ago, Mr. President, when I was a member of the War Investigating Committee known as the Truman committee, I was sent by that committee to make an investigation of the Pan-American Highway. I discovered that there was a Rama Road being constructed, running east and west, which was no part at all of the Inter-American Highway.

After looking into the facts, I discovered that the President of the United States had, without authority of Congress, allotted \$4 million for the construction of a highway known as the Rama Road, which was to be some 165 miles long. The money was taken from the emergency fund of the President. That is the only money which the United States has given for that purpose, and it was spent in 1942.

Some money on the road has been spent by Nicaragua. I feel that when we are going into the red on our budget, and it is impossible for the United States to balance its budget and still provide for its national defense, the time has come when we should, if possible, save a million dollars on this item. There are many, many places in America where there is more urgent need for funds for highway purposes. The Inter-American Highway is being constructed, and Congress is appropriating money for that purpose. There is an opportunity to save a million dollars on this item.

On page 48 of the bill is an item of \$1 million for the Inter-American Highway. I have no objection to that, but I feel at this time that even though the money was authorized in 1952, there is a need for economy in America, and this

is one item on which we can save a million dollars.

The question has previously been debated on the floor of the Senate, and I hope we may eliminate this appropriation from the bill so that the question can be in conference, and we can discuss it with the House in order to be in a position to save a million dollars.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. FERGUSON. I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. COOPER. I was not a Member of the Senate in 1952, when the authorization was made, and I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan if it is not true that the United States, through its representative, the President, or whoever it might be, made an agreement with Nicaragua through which we received a quid pro quo, and in return agreed to construct the highway, or, at least, to supply funds for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. There was no consideration whatever. A treaty had been entered into between the United States and Nicaragua allowing the United States to construct a canal across Nicaragua, but there was no agreement whatever to build the canal. In 1942, the President of the United States gave Nicaragua \$4 million, at a time when Nicaragua needed some economic support. That was one means of providing economic support. There was no agreement to give Nicaragua any further money. The money was a gift from the United States. I know of no commitment, other than the statement of the State Department that Nicaragua would like to build this highway.

Mr. COOPER. I should like to make it clear that I have not talked to anyone in the State Department about the matter. I do have some independent knowledge of it, and I want the subject clarified. I should like to ask the Senator if, at the time the treaty was entered into, this country made any representations to Nicaragua that a highway would be constructed?

Mr. FERGUSON. None whatever. The highway was not even considered. The treaty involved the construction of a canal, and that treaty is still in existence.

Mr. COOPER. Then, I ask the Senator, if it is not the fact that at the time the later arrangement was made by the President of the United States, and, in further consideration of our right to build the canal, if need should ever develop, that it was agreed to appropriate or to make available funds to Nicaragua for the highway?

Mr. FERGUSON. No; because the treaty remained in effect.

Mr. COOPER. What was the basis, then, of the original appropriation for the highway?

Mr. FERGUSON. We never appropriated for it. The President of the United States had an emergency fund, and out of that emergency fund he took \$4 million, unknown to the Congress of the United States or to the people of the United States, and gave it to the Government of Nicaragua to help to survey and

build the highway. That \$4 million was used on the construction of the highway.

Mr. COOPER. What was the basis of the act in 1952?

Mr. FERGUSON. It was an authorization act.

Mr. COOPER. What was the basis of making the authorization? Was it not to carry out the moral obligation, entered into in our interest, in time of war?

Mr. FERGUSON. Congress decided that it would provide more money to complete the highway, but the House first authorized it, and I believe that is how the matter came to the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Was not the proposal connected with the availability of a route which might be needed for the construction of a canal helpful to the defense of the United States? And for a coast-to-coast road between the oceans also helpful to our defense?

Mr. FERGUSON. At present I know of no question of defense involved. I feel that if ever there was an item in a bill where we could save a million dollars in cash, it is the item in the bill now pending for the construction of this highway.

Mr. COOPER. I realize that a million dollars could be saved. But the question goes to our moral obligations to a sister American country.

Mr. FERGUSON. The fact that Congress has authorized an appropriation is no reason why, when we are trying to avoid an unbalanced budget and a deficit, and are unable to reduce our own taxes, we should include in the bill an item of a million dollars of the taxpayers' money to build this highway. I want the Senator to understand that the proposed road is not a part of the inter-American highway.

Mr. COOPER. Certainly I agree that a million dollars could be saved. That is not the question. It is a question of our representations and agreements. A question of good faith on the part of the United States toward a sister nation, one of the Latin American countries. We must keep faith with our promises and toward our friends.

Mr. FERGUSON. I have in mind keeping our legitimate legal agreements, but we have no legal agreement with respect to this road. The President had a right, by means of the emergency fund, and without the consent of Congress, to allocate \$4 million. That is not disputed. He could have given it to anyone, for any reason whatsoever. But at this critical time, in the economic conditions with which we are faced, I know of no reason why we should appropriate in this bill a million dollars for this road.

When the Bureau of the Budget has halted all construction programs in America so that they can be resurveyed in order to determine whether or not the budget can be balanced and taxes reduced, I see no reason why we should include a million dollars for a highway in Nicaragua. No work has been done on that highway since the appropriation in 1942, and again in 1943, when the money was expended.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator believe that his analogy is correct? I do not think it is. The freezing of some public works is one thing. But that has nothing to do with the matter of our

agreements and good faith toward Nicaragua. That is most important to our relations with our Latin American friends. I will vote for the appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. In my opinion, we ought to consider our moral obligation to American taxpayers. Every day we are considering what people call moral obligations to other nations, but I believe the time has come when the taxpayers of the United States, with the heavy burdens that are upon them, must be considered. The United States Congress owes a moral obligation to the taxpayers of our country.

When projects in the United States are being deferred, why cannot a project in Nicaragua be deferred? Under another agreement, pertaining to the Inter-American Highway, we are giving Nicaragua, in this bill, another million dollars. I do not believe there is any economic condition which indicates that we owe the obligation to Nicaragua to build this Rama Road at the present time. Therefore, I ask the Senate to vote to strike this item from the bill.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sorry I am not able to agree in any aspect of this issue with the distinguished Senator from Michigan. In the first place, I believe there is a moral obligation involved. In the second place, I think that Congress had an actual understanding, made in wartime, and only last year agreed to again in Congress by the action which was taken last year.

Let me state the facts in brief. During the Second World War, Nicaragua declared war against our enemies. I believe her declaration was made almost on the identical day when the United States declared war. Nicaragua offered the United States naval bases, both on the Caribbean and the Pacific coasts. We established wartime naval bases in Nicaragua.

There is no road across Central America, except in the Canal Zone, so at that time it was thought to be desirable, and it still is desirable, to have a highway from the Caribbean to the Pacific.

Aside from that, an argument arose at that time because Nicaragua interpreted our earlier treaty differently from the interpretation which the United States placed upon it. We regarded the treaty as simply giving the United States an option to be taken up at some future time, if we decided to build a second interoceanic canal through Nicaragua. Nicaragua, to the contrary, felt that we were under obligation to build such a canal, and at that time there was a real argument between the President of Nicaragua and our own President.

The President of the United States, under war conditions—and it makes no difference whether he was a Democrat, a Republican, or a member of any other party, he was a wartime President of the United States—entered into an agreement with the President of Nicaragua, under which Nicaragua would drop its claim that the United States was obligated to build a canal, but, instead, would allow us, in exchange for the building of a road, which is relatively in-

expensive as compared to a canal, to put the canal treaty on the basis which we had insisted it ought to occupy, namely, as an option to build a canal at some time in the future, at our discretion.

The President of the United States entered into that agreement, and he applied, as the first construction funds, some of the war emergency funds which were given to him by Congress for spending, because in time of war such a course of action is regarded as reasonable in order to hold up the lands of our Commander in Chief and the Chief Executive of the Nation.

Mr. President, this road is not the most important in the world, but it runs from the Inter-American Highway near Managua, on or near the Pacific Coast, to El Bluff, which is at the head of navigation on a navigable river on the Caribbean. It is more than half constructed.

My recollection is that this subject was debated in the Senate at great length last year, and the Senate, by a decided majority, finally added its approval to the approval which had already been given in the House to the completion of the highway, by authorizing \$4 million, \$2 million of which was to be spent this year and \$2 million next year.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. In just a moment, after I have completed this part of my statement.

I am not speaking from second-hand information as to what the documents prescribed, because I served on the committee which saw the documents only last year. Those documents were mentioned and quoted upon the floor of the Senate last year.

In addition, I had the responsibility, which was also a privilege, to represent the Congress at the Pan-American Highway Congress in Mexico City last fall. I wish to say to the Senate that not just from one of those countries, but from numerous countries, there came expressions of gratification that Congress had recognized an obligation entered into during wartime between our Chief Executive and the President of Nicaragua, and had proposed to see this project through.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I merely wish to invite the attention of the Senator to the vote on the Ferguson-Bridges amendment, which sought to eliminate section 6 of the authorization bill, which authorized \$8,000,000 for completion of the Rama Road in Nicaragua. The language was stricken out in the Senate and restored in conference. Then the conference report was agreed to. As we all know, a conference report must be voted up or down. The Senate cannot strike out any particular item. It must accept or reject a conference report as a whole.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct, of course. However, the fact of the matter is, as I have stated, that the Senate joined the House in the passage of that measure; and, to the degree that the authorization of the money needed to build this highway would serve as a recognition of the obligation made in wartime, we did just that last year.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. If the Senator from Florida will be kind enough to indulge me for just a moment, I should like to make one or two observations.

Mr. HOLLAND. I gladly yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Aside from the saving of the terrific expense which would have to be incurred in order to construct a canal, the authorization by Congress of a comparatively small amount is the law. That is recognized. Whether the President was a Democratic President or a Republican President, the authorization by Congress is the law.

Let me say to my good friend from Michigan that, of course, I wish to save money. I think a great deal more money could be saved by eliminating some of the foolishness in the Voice of America broadcasts to South America. Many millions of dollars could be saved in that field. The appropriation involved in this case really represents a saving, in addition to the fact that it is an investment in good will so far as Latin America is concerned.

If we fail to carry out our solemn obligation we shall be saying, in effect, "We who have the power of might say that we will not fulfill our solemn obligation." We can do so. But are we trying to teach the world that that is our intention? Is that what we are trying to impress upon the so-called free countries? Are we to say, in the case of a small country which cannot defend itself, that we do not propose to carry out an obligation after we have entered into it?

Let us consider the subject from the economic standpoint. What kind of automobiles do Senators suppose would roll on the Rama Road? They would be automobiles built in the State of my good friend from Michigan—in Lansing, Detroit, and other places.

I know that money has been wasted throughout the world, as well as in Latin America. Not only would this appropriation not be wasted, but it would be in keeping with the dignity of a powerful nation. That is the point I wish to make. Of course we can fail to make an appropriation for this purpose. We do not have to provide one penny. But should we take such a course? That is the question.

I thank the Senator from Florida for yielding.

Mr. HOLLAND. I appreciate the contribution of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico. He has placed the argument on the proper basis. There is an obligation on the Congress to support our solemn action taken last year, after this question had been argued ever since World War II. The present Bureau of the Budget has not been too generous this year in approving projects. It did not approve this project for the full \$2 million authorization. It recommended an appropriation of \$1 million, to show that we intend to carry out the obligation, an obligation into which we entered last year.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that the original budget recommendation was for \$2 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am unable to say. All I know is that the present Budget Bureau recommended and the House approved an appropriation of \$1 million, and that the authorization was for \$2 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not also true that the present administration recommended \$1 million?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The House, following not the Truman recommendation of \$2 million, or the authorization of \$2 million, accepted the recommendation of the present administration, made through the Budget Bureau.

Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a further observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield further.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana [MR. ELLENDER] if it is not true that the present President of the United States, at the time when he was Assistant Chief of Staff, back in 1942 or 1943—

Mr. ELLENDER. In 1942.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not a fact that in 1942 he recommended this particular project?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; and I intend in a few moments to document that statement for the benefit of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a very brief question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Florida will remember that this subject was rather thoroughly discussed and debated after the hearings were held in the Public Works Committee.

If the Senator will permit a statement, I was not originally in favor of this project, in view of the facts as I understood them. After going into all the proof, however, I became fully convinced that the United States has a moral obligation with reference to the agreement and understanding entered into. I think we are fortunate in being able to meet that obligation with such a relatively small expenditure. For these reasons I think we are bound to support this appropriation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for an observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont would like to associate himself with what the Senator from Florida has said. We all know that during the past 10 years or so our country has made many unwise commitments. However, it is even more unwise to fail to meet a commitment, particularly to one of our Latin-American neighbors, than it is to make a bad commitment in the first place. I presume this is one of our good commitments. I feel that it is quite essential, having once entered into an understanding that we would go through with this project, for the Congress to make provision for continuing it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator. I agree entirely with his comment.

Mr. President, this relatively small neighbor of ours is recognized as one of the best neighbors we have in this entire area, because of her continued loyalty to this country. The obligation involved is relatively small from the financial standpoint. Only last year we authorized this project. Countless millions are being spent on intangibles, which vanish and dissolve quickly, without leaving a good, tangible asset. The pending proposal involves completing the construction of what is really a transcontinental highway for 165 miles across the Central American area, from the Caribbean to the Pacific. It will be the only such highway in existence, except at the Panama Canal. It has real importance from many points of view.

Furthermore, we are looked upon daily with concern by our small neighbors, some of whom are wondering whether or not we intend to fulfill our obligations, and whether we intend to do for those who are close to us things which are at least in some small degree comparable to what we are doing for people much farther away, and in such an intangible and extravagant manner in some cases.

I think this is an obligation which we should continue to recognize, and which we should live up to.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

OUR STRATEGIC TRADE AREA

Mr. MALONE. Does the distinguished Senator from Florida agree with the junior Senator from Nevada that if we are to have a trade future it will be with South America and Asia, and not with Europe?

Mr. HOLLAND. I certainly agree with the distinguished Senator that one of our greatest opportunities for trade in the future, and for peaceful living and development in the future, will be through our associations with South America and Central America.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. It may be that this Nation will at some future time reassess its danger and its need for strategic and critical minerals and materials, including fuels, which we must have in time of war. It may be possible that at some future time such strategic and critical minerals and materials can be obtained only where land transportation is available.

Mr. HOLLAND. That might become the case.

SELF-SUFFICIENT

Mr. MALONE. If the distinguished Senator from Florida will allow me to make a statement, I should like to say that in the opinion of many distinguished engineers in this country the United States can be made self-sufficient in the production of strategic and critical minerals, materials, and fuels which are needed to support the economy of this country in order to fight a war in the event it should have to be done.

TRADE BETWEEN MANUFACTURING AREAS

Trying to promote trade between old Europe, a processing and manufacturing group of countries, and a manufacturing and processing country such as the

United States, has always reminded the junior Senator from Nevada of two barbers in the same block trying to make a living shaving each other. On the other hand, the countries of South America, have products to sell which we need.

VITAL RAW MATERIALS IN SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nevada will permit me to compliment him on his colorful illustration of the situation.

Mr. MALONE. The countries of South America produce what we can use, and we produce what they will be able to buy during the next 50 years before they reach the point of mass production in manufacturing.

EUROPE AND UNITED STATES BOTH MANUFACTURING AREAS

In the case of Europe, we must proportionately reduce our production here in an amount equal to what we buy from them, and everything they buy from us which they also manufacture requires that they reduce their volume of production proportionately.

BILLIONS TO INCREASE EUROPE'S PRODUCTION

Still we will send perhaps six or seven billion dollars over there this year with which they can build plants to produce in competition with us and sell their products to Russia and the other Iron Curtain countries.

I believe the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the junior Senator from Nevada took a trip through Nicaragua in 1950.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Yes; with the Senator from Missouri.

SPEND SOME MONEY IN CENTRAL AND SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. MALONE. We spent some time in Nicaragua. It is time that we spent some money in some places where it will be of benefit to us. If we are to spend some money abroad, let us spend some of it in Central and South America.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In my opinion, this is the kind of obligation that we should meet, because it will save more millions of dollars than all the point 4 programs and the Voice of America put together.

EUROPE AND IRON CURTAIN LINKED BY TREATIES

Mr. MALONE. The point 4 and Voice of America programs in Europe will merely further arm our potential enemies.

Mr. President, what is being disclosed before the McCarthy investigating committee is evidence with which all of us on the floor of the Senate were familiar 4 years ago.

The junior Senator from Nevada debated with the distinguished Senator from Michigan, Mr. Vandenberg, on the floor of the Senate and showed him that the treaty which England had with Russia, dated May 26, 1942, provided in article VI that the high contracting parties agree to render one another all possible economic assistance after the war and revealed to the Senate that the North Atlantic Treaty which we were then about to ratify contained a similar provision. That treaty between Great Britain and Russia is still in good standing, as anyone can see for himself, if he will read it. France has a similar treaty with Russia on mutual security, signed December 10, 1944. These trea-

ties are similar to the treaty that Communist China has with Russia. England, of course, recognizes Communist China. Yet, in spite of these alliances, we will send \$6 billion overseas, I suppose, this time in cash, and perhaps even more in offshore purchases. That fact could be brought out by investigation.

Mr. President, we are being taken advantage of with respect to contracts and as to the repairs for which we are letting contracts abroad. Investigation would show that to be the fact, if the Committee on Armed Services saw fit to investigate it.

WE SUPPORT THE COUNTRIES OF EUROPE

Nevertheless, we are supporting every one of those nations, each one of them with either a king or a queen. They will not trade among themselves. For example, it is impossible to sell Italian oranges in Belgium, or Belgian steel in Italy. They all look to us to furnish them the markets.

A bill is now before the House of Representatives and is being studied in committee which proposes to extend for another year the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; in other words, to extend free trade. Eventually it will come to the Senate.

If the Senator from Florida will yield for a statement—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

TWO WAYS TO DESTROY THIS NATION

Mr. MALONE. There are two ways to destroy this Nation. One of them is by political means. It can be done with communism or any other ism. There is no doubt that the final objective of socialism and communism is complete government ownership. The only difference is the method. A Communist shoots a person, and a Socialist spends him into government ownership. We have been doing that for 20 years. Communism is merely impatient socialism.

We have identified communism, but we have not identified the economic approach to destroy this Nation. This economic approach is the sending of billions of dollars to Europe to build their production capacity far beyond their ability to consume and then succumb to their free-trade plan to give them the American markets and destroy the workingmen of America. The free-trade conspiracy is designed to do exactly that.

Therefore, I say that if we are to spend money, let us spend a little of it where it will still accomplish some good.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I did not intend to speak at such length. Before closing, I may say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that if I had not already been of the conviction that the proposal to build the Rama Road was a good program, my visit in Mexico City and the Pan-American Road Congress last fall certainly would have led me to that conclusion.

To me it was an inspiring sight to see 500 delegates from 20 friendly Republics, including our own, speaking 4 different languages, yet being able to speak and understand the same language on the subject of road development and road construction.

In deference to the Senator from Nevada, who happens to be a member of the great engineering profession, I will say that as I saw these engineers, gathered together from various countries, putting through enterprises which are of great importance to all countries, including our own, it seemed to me that there was more common understanding, more mutuality, and a greater ability to understand and speak the same language—than in any other group of men I had ever observed in my life.

I think it would be a great mistake not to go through with this Government's obligation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Florida has covered most of the ground that I had intended to cover. However, I should like briefly to document the various steps that were taken by our Government and the Government of Nicaragua which finally led to the proposal by our Government to build the Rama Road.

There is no doubt that the reason why the Nicaraguan Government agreed to grant to us in perpetuity the right to build another canal across the isthmus was because of the expected trade that would flow and which would benefit Nicaragua, which extends from the Pacific to the Atlantic.

Having acquired the right to build the canal in 1916, the project seems to have been pushed into the background, the Panama Canal having been completed in the meantime and put into successful operation. Except for a survey and report by an Inter-Ocean Canal Board, authorized by Congress in 1929 and completed in 1931, nothing more was done until 1938, when apparently the President of Nicaragua made inquiries as to whether or not the Government of the United States intended to build the new canal. On a visit to Washington in 1939, conversations were had between President Roosevelt and President Somoza of Nicaragua, and there was discussed at that meeting the feasibility of building a barge canal, instead of the deep-water channel originally proposed. Following those conversations there was an exchange of notes between the two Governments. I should like to read at this point the proposal that was submitted to our President by the President of Nicaragua, under date of May 22, 1939:

Adequate transportation facilities are a prime requisite to the development of the production and trade of a nation. It is the opinion of the Government of Nicaragua that it is of paramount importance to link together the productive regions of the east coast of Nicaragua with the more densely populated productive regions of the interior and the Pacific coast, and to provide a more direct channel of communication for commerce between Nicaragua and the United States. This objective could effectively be attained by the canalization of the San Juan River for vessels of moderate draft and, if possible, by a complementary waterway from Lake Nicaragua to the Pacific. I desire to inquire whether the assistance of the Government of the United States might be extended to assist my Government in the realization of this project. Specifically it would be necessary in any event as a first step to have precise surveys and estimates, and I am hopeful that it will be feasible for the Government of the United States to send

engineers of the United States Engineer Corps for this purpose.

President Roosevelt answered President Somoza's inquiry on the same day, May 22, 1939, as follows:

Regarding your suggestion for the canalization of the San Juan River for vessels of moderate draft, I have been pleased to instruct the United States Army Engineer Corps to make the necessary studies and surveys of a canalization and highway project to link the eastern and western regions of Nicaragua. I am impressed with the thought that such a project would very greatly facilitate and expedite communications between your country and mine, and by opening new areas to the production of complementary non-competitive products, would provide new bases for an increase in commerce between those areas and the United States. Moreover, it is obvious that should occasion arise, the existence of such a waterway would have a very important bearing upon the defense of the hemisphere.

As soon as the necessary financial arrangements can be made in this country, a board of four officers of the Corps of Engineers, accompanied by an official of the United States Engineer Department and an officer of the Army Medical Corps will be sent to Nicaragua. It is expected that the board would leave for Nicaragua next July and would be able to carry out the studies of the project within a few months. Upon the basis of their reports we can take such further action as seems in the common interest of our two countries.

Mr. President, following the exchange of those notes, the President of the United States sent to Nicaragua several engineers from the Corps of Engineers; and a survey was made to determine whether it was feasible to build the barge canal under discussion.

In 1942 a report was submitted by the Corps of Engineers, in which the conclusion was reached that the building of the barge canal was not feasible.

Our Secretary of State communicated this information to the Nicaraguan Government, under date of April 8, 1942, and in the same document recommended that instead of the barge canal, a road be built; our Government to construct the road between San Benito and Rama, at our cost, and also furnish the survey for a highway from Rama to El Bluff.

I shall quote from the document which was sent by our Government to the Government of Nicaragua, in which we indicated the impracticality of building the barge canal, and offered instead to build a road from San Benito to Rama:

APRIL 8, 1942.

His Excellency Dr. MARIANO ARGUELLO,
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua.

EXCELLENCY: With reference to conversations which Your Excellency has held with officials of this Government and to conversations held by His Excellency President Somoza during his visit to Washington in 1939, I have the honor to inform you that careful and sympathetic consideration has been given by the appropriate officials of this Government to the matter of developing communications between the eastern and western sections of Nicaragua. In this connection I refer particularly to the Nicaraguan Legation's memoranda of November 30, 1938, and August 10, 1940, and to the exchanges of views with regard to the possible canalization of the San Juan River.

I regret to inform Your Excellency that these studies have clearly shown that the construction of the proposed barge canal is economically impracticable and that, there-

fore, I consider the project to be one to which the two Governments will wish to give no further consideration. However, my Government is fully aware of the importance of linking the east coast regions of Nicaragua with the regions of the interior and the Pacific coast. The matter is one which has been frequently discussed by representatives of our two Governments. It has now been agreed that the most promising method of achieving the objective would be the construction of a road from San Benito on the Inter-American Highway north of Managua to Rama on the Escondido River, from which point river communication to El Bluff and Bluefields on the Atlantic is available.

It is the opinion of my Government that the existence of the road mentioned would have, under present circumstances, a very important bearing upon the defense of the hemisphere.

Therefore, taking into account the spirit of the communications which were exchanged on May 22, 1939, between President Somoza, of Nicaragua, and President Roosevelt, of the United States, my Government is willing, at its own expense, to carry out the following:

(a) The construction of a highway between San Benito and Rama.

(b) The survey and recommendation of the route of a highway from Rama to El Bluff; the construction and financing of such a road being a matter for the decision of the Nicaraguan Government in the light of the survey, and no obligation in regard thereto being contemplated by this Government.

The construction of the road from San Benito to Rama and the survey from Rama to El Bluff will, in the opinion of my Government, constitute a complete execution by my Government of any obligation which it may have incurred particularly under numbered paragraph "I" of the aforesaid exchange of letters of May 22, 1939.

From the technical and administrative point of view, it would seem desirable that the construction of the proposed highway from San Benito to Rama and the survey from Rama to El Bluff be carried out in the manner contemplated in the subsidiary agreement to be reached between the pertinent Nicaraguan authorities and the United States Public Roads Administration for the completion of the Inter-American Highway.

Accept, Excellency, the assurances of my most distinguished consideration.

SUMNER WELLES,
Acting Secretary of State of the
United States of America.

Mr. President, that was the proposal which was made by our Government and was transmitted by our then Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles. That proposal, made by our Government to the Government of Nicaragua, was accepted by the Nicaraguan Government, and pursuant to it, the President allocated \$4 million out of a special fund to survey and construct the highway. This allocation of funds was made available in August 1942.

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the document of acceptance by the Government of Nicaragua.

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

LEGATION OF NICARAGUA,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1942.
No. 693.
His Excellency BENJAMIN SUMNER WELLES,
Acting Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

EXCELLENCY: I have the high honor to acknowledge the receipt of your courteous note

of the 8th instant, in which Your Excellency is pleased to advise—

(a) That in connection with the conversations held by President Somoza during his visit to Washington in 1939 and recently by myself with officials of the Government of the United States, the latter have carefully studied the question relative to the development of communications between the eastern and western parts of Nicaragua; and in that connection, Your Excellency refers particularly to the memoranda of the Legation of Nicaragua in Washington of November 30, 1938, and August 10, 1940, and to the exchange of opinions between the two Governments concerning the possible canalization of the San Juan River;

(b) that Your Excellency regrets to inform me that the studies made with regard to the said canalization show that the work is economically impracticable and that, for that reason, Your Excellency considers that the Governments of the United States and of Nicaragua will not desire to give new consideration to this project;

(c) that, notwithstanding, Your Excellency's Government is fully convinced of the importance of connecting the regions of the east coast of Nicaragua with those of the interior and with the Pacific coast, and that now it has been considered that the best means of accomplishing this objective would be the construction of a highway from San Benito, in the section of the Inter-American Highway to the north of Managua, to Rama, on the Escondido River, from which river communication to Bluefields and to El Bluff on the Atlantic is possible;

(d) that, in the judgment of Your Excellency's Government, the said highway would have great importance for the defense of this hemisphere in the present circumstances; and

(e) that, as a consequence, taking into consideration the spirit of the communications exchanged on May 22, 1939, between President Roosevelt of the United States and President Somoza of Nicaragua, Your Excellency's Government is prepared to carry out at its own expense the construction of the highway between the said points, San Benito and Rama, as well as the study and recommendations for a highway from Rama to El Bluff, with the construction and financing of the latter highway a matter to be determined by the Government of Nicaragua without any obligation in this respect on the part of the Government of the United States of America.

Your Excellency adds, in the courteous note to which I have the honor to refer, that the construction of the San Benito-Rama highway and the study of the route from Rama to El Bluff will constitute, in the judgment of your Government, the complete performance of any obligation which it may have incurred, particularly in accordance with paragraph I of the said letters of May 22, 1939; and that from a technical and administrative point of view it would be desirable that the construction of the proposed highway and the study in question be performed in the way contemplated in the supplementary agreement to be concluded between the Government of Nicaragua and the United States Bureau of Public Roads with regard to the Inter-American Highway.

In reply I am much pleased to advise Your Excellency that my Government accepts the valued offer made to it in the communication to which I am replying and expresses its appreciation to the Government of the United States which, upon this occasion, reveals once more its good will and high spirit of cooperation in solving the highly important problem of joining the Atlantic and Pacific regions of Nicaragua.

At the same time, I am pleased to advise Your Excellency that my Government, consistently with its international policy, and

deeming, like Your Excellency's Government, that this route toward the Atlantic side of Nicaragua will have great strategic importance, is immediately offering it for the use of the defense of the United States of America in the conflict in which our countries now find themselves engaged.

I avail myself [etc.]

MARIANO ARGUELLO,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the building of the road was commenced in 1942 by the Government of Nicaragua. By October of 1946 it became evident that the estimates which previously had been made of the amount necessary for the building of the road were inadequate and the Government of Nicaragua made attempts to obtain more funds from our Government. However, those attempts failed, and when the United States funds were exhausted the Government of Nicaragua spent considerable funds of its own.

At the time when the road was being built and at the time when our President made the offer to Nicaragua we were engaged in World War II, and the question was whether it would be beneficial to us from a standpoint of national defense to build the road. The Department of Defense was brought into the picture, and took the position that the road was necessary for our defense.

At this time I should like to read a letter which was sent to the Acting Secretary of State. The date of the letter is April 2, 1942, which was before President Roosevelt allocated the \$4 million; but it was at about the same time that we agreed to build the Rama Road. It was submitted by the War Department to the Secretary of State, and bears the signature of our present Chief Executive, General Eisenhower, in his capacity at that time as Assistant Chief of Staff.

I now read the letter:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
WAR DEPARTMENT GENERAL STAFF,
OPERATIONS DIVISION,
Washington, April 2, 1942.

The honorable the ACTING SECRETARY OF STATE.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During a recent conversation which I had with Ambassador Boal and Mr. Bonsal, of your Department, I was requested by the latter to forward to you the War Department's opinion as to the desirability, from a military point of view, of building the Rama Road in Nicaragua.

The subject of munitions of war under lend-lease for Nicaragua and certain other military questions were also discussed.

With respect to the building of the Rama Road, it is the opinion of the Operations Section that the execution of this project will tend to increase the stability of the country, and so minimize the possibility of trouble which disaffected elements. The road would have a decided tactical value, should it become necessary for United States troops to intervene, either because of attempted uprising by the enemy nationals along the western coast, or because of an attempted hostile raid.

Sincerely yours,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
Major General,
Assistant Chief of Staff.

Mr. President, the appropriation that we are now being asked to make was recommended in the so-called Truman budget, and it was recommended in the Eisenhower budget. The House has al-

ready passed upon the issue, and it has recommended an appropriation of \$1 million. Aside from the documents to which I have just referred, this Congress is on record as having authorized completion of the project. As pointed out by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Florida, a bill was enacted, Public Law 413, 82d Congress, chapter 462, 2d session. In that bill, in section 5, there is included this language:

SEC. 5. Recognizing the mutual benefits that will accrue to the Republic of Nicaragua and to the United States from the completion of the road from San Benito to Rama in said Republic of Nicaragua, the construction of which road was begun and partially completed pursuant to an agreement between said Republic and the United States, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated \$2 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, for the construction of such road, to be available until expended. No expenditure shall be made hereunder for the construction of said road until a request therefor shall have been received by the Secretary of State from the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua nor until an agreement shall have been entered into by said Republic with the Secretary of State which shall provide, in part, that said Republic—

There are then quoted certain provisions which shall be included in the agreement before the money is made available. Mr. President, I ask that the remainder of section 5, as well as all of section 6 of said act, be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

There being no objection, the remainder of section 5 and all of section 6 were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(1) will provide, without participation of funds herein authorized, all necessary right-of-way for the construction of said highway, which right-of-way shall be of a minimum width where practicable of 100 meters in rural areas and 50 meters in municipalities and shall forever be held inviolate as a part of the highway for public use;

(2) will not impose any highway toll, or permit any such toll to be charged for the use of said highway by vehicles or persons;

(3) will not levy or assess, directly or indirectly, any fee, tax, or other charge for the use of said road by vehicles or persons from the United States that does not apply equally to vehicles or persons of such Republic;

(4) will continue to grant reciprocal recognition of vehicle registration and drivers' licenses in accordance with the provisions of the Convention for the Regulation of Inter-American Automotive Traffic, which was opened for signature at the Pan American Union in Washington on December 15, 1943, and to which such Republic and the United States are parties; or any other treaty or international convention establishing similar reciprocal recognition; and

(5) will maintain said road after its completion in proper condition adequately to serve the needs of present and future traffic.

(b) The funds appropriated pursuant to this authorization shall be available for expenditure in accordance with the terms of this act for the survey and construction of the said road from San Benito to Rama and for the survey but not for the construction of a road from Rama to El Bluff in the Republic of Nicaragua without being matched by said Republic, and all expenditures made under the provisions of this act for materials, equipment, and supplies, shall, when-

ever practicable, be made for products of the United States or of the Republic of Nicaragua.

SEC. 6. For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for cooperation with Central American Republics in the construction of the Inter-American Highway" approved December 26, 1941 (55 Stat. 860), as amended by section 11 of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1950, approved September 7, 1950 (64 Stat. 785), there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to the sums heretofore authorized, the sum of \$8 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1953, and a like sum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, to be available until expended, to enable the United States to cooperate with the Governments of the American Republics situated in Central America—that is, with the Governments of the Republics of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama—in the survey and construction of the Inter-American highway within the borders of the aforesaid Republics, respectively. Not to exceed one-third of the appropriation authorized for each fiscal year may be expended without requiring the country or countries in which such sums may be expended to match any part thereof, if the Secretary of State shall find that the cost of constructing said highway in such country or countries will be beyond their reasonable capacity to bear.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, there is no doubt that we are under both legal and moral obligation either to furnish the money to the Nicaraguan Government for completing the Rama Road or to complete it ourselves. I hope that the Congress will again vote in favor of upholding the good faith of our great country by the appropriation of \$1,000,000 for the Rama Road as provided in the pending bill. From an economic standpoint alone it will pay big dividends, and there is no way by which we can measure the returns in friendship and good will that will accrue to our Nation if we carry out our bargain with our southern neighbor.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I am ready to yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Before yielding the floor, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Does not the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that, apart from the legal and moral obligation we have, in my opinion, to follow through on this matter, the very fact that we are a powerful Nation should impel us at least to keep our obligations with the smaller country?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no question about that. It was my privilege to visit all of the countries of South America, during November and December of last year. I was really and truly impressed by the vast developments which had taken place in those countries, made possible by American capital. It is my sincere belief that we should work very closely with the countries to the south of us. I can visualize a time not too far distant when we shall be in need of natural resources, in order that we may continue the great industrial development that is now taking

place in our own country. If we are to replenish materials that will be needed in order to enable us to carry on that development in the future, we shall have to look to the countries to the south of us for them. And, Mr. President, let me say that not only does this apply to mineral resources, but as our population increases it will also apply to food and fiber.

The Senator well knows that our population is increasing today at the rate of over 6,000 per day. Our land resources in the United States are very limited. It is estimated that by 1975 our population will have increased to approximately 190,000,000. In order to provide the American people, 25 years hence, with the same standard of living which our people of today are enjoying, we not only will have to produce more food on the acreage we now have under cultivation, but we shall probably have to import some of our food requirements. I know of no better place for us to look than to the countries to the south of us for supplies of food to meet such shortages as may face us 25 or 30 years hence. It occurs to me that what we ought to do is to try now, if possible, to enmesh our economy with the economies of the countries of South America.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is not this also true, that we have developed our country through industrialization and through the construction of good roads? I have always been under the impression, and I have been convinced, that good roads have been more toward the economic development of the country and for the obtaining and maintaining of the standards about which we now talk, than anything else that we may have done heretofore. In the visit to Latin America by the Senator from Louisiana, what automobiles, other than American-made automobiles, did he see rolling along the streets and roads?

Mr. ELLENDER. Very few.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Is it not true that, in Nicaragua, Argentina, or Brazil, and in every part of South America, if there is a road, one may observe American cars rolling along on the streets and highways?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. There is no doubt about it. And you will also find that American products of almost every kind are in great demand. The quantities of American products sold in these countries is limited only by the level of purchasing power of the peoples of those countries.

Mr. CHAVEZ. And will there not be American trucks rolling along with oil, generally from an American refinery?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that the thing which contented me was the fact that investments of American capital were in plentiful evidence in those areas.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I want to see our friendly relations with the people of the countries to the south of us maintained; and I am deeply apprehensive that if we were to fail to appropriate the small sum about which we are talking, it would go far toward disturbing that relationship.

Mr. CHAVEZ. It would disturb the peace of mind of our friendly neighbors in those countries, would it not?

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it. We have made a solemn promise to the Government and people of Nicaragua, and we should live up to it.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Millions of dollars have been spent by the Voice of America upon radio programs, including speeches, instrumental and vocal music, plays, and so forth. Does not the Senator from Louisiana agree with me that the place at which to economize is in connection with a program of that kind, devoting our efforts to the development of industry both in our country and in the countries to the south of us.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator.

CIVIL-SERVICE RETIREMENT LAW

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a major loophole in our civil-service retirement law whereby citizens of foreign countries are being given full benefits under our retirement system as a result of their employment by the United States Government under some program in their respective countries.

It was never the intention of the Congress when enacting the civil-service retirement law that its benefits be extended to anyone who was not an American citizen, and unless this situation is corrected it will mean that in the years to come United States Government checks will be flowing all over the world.

To determine how far this movement has expanded toward bringing aliens under our retirement system I requested the Civil Service Commission to make a sample check of the new annuitants for the month of December 1952. As a result they have identified 30 employees who were being added to the annuity rolls for that month as not being citizens of the United States.

The Commission points out that in view of the fact that United States citizenship is not now a requirement for membership in the Civil Service Retirement System, the employees are therefore not so classified and there is a possibility that the list of 30 furnished would not comprise all the aliens retiring for that month.

Before inserting this report in the RECORD I call attention to the first listed case and point out that this employee, who is not an American citizen, gained advantage not only of the loophole in our retirement law allowing aliens to acquire the retirement benefits but also of the loophole to which I have called the attention of the Congress on repeated occasions and one which I have attempted to have corrected through legislation; namely, those instances whereby an employee who has not contributed anything to the fund can qualify for the benefits at a slightly reduced rate.

In this instance, through what is described by the Commission as an admin-

istrative error the employing department failed to make retirement deductions from his salary through his period of employment.

After his final separation when it was discovered that he had not made any contributions to the retirement fund he was given the option of first, making a deposit retroactively covering his service, or second, receiving an annuity of 90 percent of what he would have received had he made the normal contributions to the fund.

This individual elected not to pay the back assessments and is therefore drawing a lifetime pension of \$29 per month with the compliments of the American taxpayers.

While some of these monthly pensions may seem small to us in this country, nevertheless we must remember that the cost of living in other countries of the world is often much less than here and that these pensions which are being paid in American dollars represent a substantial monthly income.

Likewise, it should be noted that this 1-month sample check lists many employees who are residents of the Philippines and the most of whom have a record of many years of service.

It is understandable how since the Philippines were once a dependency of the United States that these employees would have been given the same classification as employees in this country. However, the Philippines at their request were given their independence, and with independence goes responsibility. The American Government certainly should have stopped qualifying these employees as of that date.

I point out that some of those qualified received full employment after the Philippines gained their independence.

I was unable to obtain an estimate as to the total number or percentage of annuitants who are now on the rolls and who are not citizens of this country; however, for the month of December 1952, according to the Civil Service Commission records, there were 30 such additions.

I have been advised that new legislation will be necessary in order to correct the loophole, and I have already discussed the problem with the chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, who has promised to promptly call this to the attention of his committee.

Unquestionably it is necessary that the United States Government at times employ citizens of other countries in the same manner in which perhaps Americans are employed by other countries; however, it is not necessary that we extend to that group the same liberal retirement benefits as provided for our citizenry.

It certainly would be the height of folly for the United States Government, at a time when we can barely meet expenses, to adopt a worldwide pension system at the expense of the already overburdened American taxpayers.

This is another loose practice of the former administration which should be immediately corrected.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a list

by case numbers of the 30 cases identified as aliens who went on the retirement rolls during the month of December 1952.

Annuitants who are not citizens of the United States

Claim No. CSA	Residence	Title of last position	Period of service			Total contribu- tions	Monthly pension	Date of birth
			Years	Months	Days			
317172	Canal Zone	Laborer	9	1	11	0	\$29	Apr. 17, 1887
317294	Turkey	Clerk	31	10	16	\$2,217.38	135	Oct. 7, 1899
317891	Canal Zone	Rigger	26	5	10	199.53	65	Feb. 19, 1895
318060	Germany	Foreign Service clerk	8	6	26	744.07	34	Dec. 19, 1885
318656	do	Research assistant	24	10	23	800.65	93	Dec. 18, 1881
319719	Cuba	Cement worker	9	0	28	317.11	26	Aug. 13, 1907
320174	British West Indies	Carpenter	10	3	29	706.00	33	Apr. 6, 1890
321500	Canal Zone	Quartermaster laborer	11	0	14	238.06	31	Nov. 16, 1886
321508	do	Janitor	15	7	8	266.37	41	Feb. 5, 1882
219944	Philippines	Molder	18	4	10	28.00	35	Apr. 13, 1890
227407	do	Sheet metal worker	1 15	18	17	102.53	22	Aug. 28, 1897
240022	do	Patternmaker	20	2	26	224.47	54	Nov. 17, 1890
260689	do	Flatwork iron operator	29	6	27	107.00	21	Mar. 28, 1896
265163	do	Carpenter	13	11	7	93.08	39	Feb. 25, 1888
297514	do	Guard	10	5	19	72.82	32	Dec. 8, 1899
302632	do	Painter	7	9	9	60.64	17	Feb. 5, 1889
303249	do	Plumber	14	0	25	108.00	56	Feb. 15, 1880
308270	do	Crater and packer	28	3	16	310.09	51	Aug. 16, 1896
308291	do	do	27	5	28	356.71	51	Feb. 22, 1896
310296	do	Firefighter	1 31	19	18	198.91	69	June 24, 1882
310901	do	Senior auto mechanic	6	0	23	107.33	19	Nov. 7, 1917
313531	do	Fire chief	6	1	4	188.25	19	Jan. 10, 1899
314565	do	Quartermaster electrician	6	0	4	82.58	17	Nov. 22, 1890
314719	do	Diesel-equipment mechanic	24	11	21	323.23	21	Dec. 3, 1905
314721	do	Electrician	8	0	18	191.82	17	Nov. 24, 1911
315249	do	Warehouseman	25	11	26	106.98	46	Aug. 7, 1897
315260	do	Armory keeper	6	4	0	136.17	16	June 21, 1926
316553	do	Claims examiner	6	8	13	195.11	19	Nov. 25, 1922
317731	do	Training officer	30	6	3	988.66	118	Feb. 27, 1886
317795	do	Guard	1 32	15	17	259.33	47	Dec. 30, 1896

¹ Includes military service.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senator from Delaware has opened up and disclosed a very startling loophole in our civil-service retirement legislation, if I understand the purport of the Senator's remarks. Does the Senator mean that the aliens who are employed in many parts of the world are receiving the full benefit of all the retirement legislation which is on the statute books, insofar as it applies to Federal employees? Do they receive the benefit of all the retirement privileges available to civil-service employees?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct. Mr. Young, in a letter dated May 18, 1953, stated that American citizenship is not a requirement for membership in the civil-service retirement system.

Mr. MUNDT. Would that apply as well to the widow of a deceased civil-service employee?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Under the ruling these aliens are entitled to all the benefits now accorded to American citizens. Therefore, they are entitled to the survivorship benefits.

Mr. MUNDT. How about the offspring, the alien children of these alien parents? Would they also be entitled to these benefits?

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is my understanding. I asked the same question of the Commission and was answered in the affirmative.

Mr. MUNDT. May I inquire, then, whether the marriage laws of this country or the marriage laws of the foreign nation would apply in such a case?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think I know what the Senator is driving at. I had the same question in mind, and I asked that particular question of an official of the Civil Service Commission and was advised that

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

less the loophole is plugged, the poor American taxpayer who is being called upon to build hydroelectric plants in the Po Valley in Italy, to build rubber plants for Russia, and to engage in the point 4 program in many countries of the world, may well find himself called upon to pay pensions to literally tens of thousands of aliens scattered in every country under the canopy of heaven.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator is correct, because there is no limit. If we are going to embrace foreign employees under the system, there certainly is no limit, in view of our widespread commitments throughout the world. As time goes on we shall continue to add to them at a rapid rate. In view of that fact I have taken this occasion to invite the attention of the Senate promptly to the situation and to the extent to which it can go.

Mr. MUNDT. The Republican orators in the last campaign, it seems to me, the present speaker included, should be subjected to rather severe criticism because of the fact that we so understated the difficulties the New Deal had presented to the American taxpayer. We talked about the possibilities of the welfare state, the great step toward socialism, and the fact that we had accumulated in America the greatest national debt that any organized government in the world had ever seen. But, what pikers we actually were. The New Dealers were not establishing a welfare state but a welfare world and asking the nations of the world simply to send the bill to Uncle Sam for providing them with pensions, retirement privileges, tutelage for their children, and taking care of all their needs because some bright-eyed young men in the New Deal had dreamed up this trick legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no doubt about it. The longer we allow the law to remain on the books the more complicated the situation will become, because those people are going to feel that they have a commitment from the United States Government. The only thing to do is to stop it immediately.

Mr. CARLSON and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield to the Senator from Kansas first, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I want to commend the Senator from Delaware for inviting our attention to what I consider to be a very dangerous loophole in the civil-service retirement legislation.

In checking the record, I find that this goes back to the act of January 24, 1942, when Congress amended the Retirement Act to cover most people generally.

I may state that the Treasury Department has stopped the issuance of checks to persons who live behind the Iron Curtain. As a matter of fact, some persons living behind the Iron Curtain are eligible for these payments and have received these checks, and that practice has been stopped.

The 82d Congress passed Public Law 855, which authorized the appointment of a Committee on Retirement Policy for Federal Personnel. President Truman appointed Mr. H. Eliot Kaplan, of New York, to be chairman of that committee. He, with other members of Federal

they would recognize the marriage laws of the country in which the persons were employed. That meant even to the extent that if they were employed in a country in which the laws recognized polygamy.

Mr. MUNDT. Would that apply to the man's children?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I asked that same question of a representative of the Civil Service Commission, and he said, "We only hope and pray that we never have to answer that question."

Mr. MUNDT. May I ask whether, since a Mohammedan may take 4 wives, and, consequently, a Mohammedan family frequently numbers from 35 to 60 or 70 children, in the opinion of the Senator from Delaware, under this strange loophole, we may find the American taxpayer forced to take care of 40 to 60 surviving children of some Mohammedan civil-service employee who was qualified under our program?

Mr. WILLIAMS. There may be some who think that is a rather ridiculous question, but I framed that same question to the Civil Service Commission, and the answer to it was in the affirmative. They feel, since it has been ruled that United States citizenship is not a requirement for benefits under the retirement system, they would have to recognize the legitimate offspring as they are recognized in their respective countries.

That is all the more reason, Mr. President, why we should correct this defect before we go too far afield.

Mr. MUNDT. There are hundreds of Mohammedans working in various missions overseas who are qualifying under this strange interpretation of retirement rights and who properly, under the religious teachings of Mohammed and under the guidance of the Koran, can have 4 wives and frequently have 50 or 60 children in the course of a lifetime. Un-

agencies who were appointed on the board, was asked to serve under President Eisenhower.

Last week the Senate voted to extend the time in which this committee may make its report to June 30, 1954. I am hopeful that they can make their report by December 31, 1953. This is action that should be taken to preserve and protect retirement rights that have been built up under civil service. Certainly as a nation we cannot be expected to furnish retirement for foreigners who are not United States citizens, and whose only claim to such rights is that they were hired by this Government to do work in foreign countries.

As chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I may say that the committee expects to take up this matter and discuss it at our meeting next Tuesday and, if necessary, to take immediate action. If the committee deems that action is necessary then action will be taken.

Again I say to the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that we are indebted to him for calling this matter to our attention.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Kansas. I may say that in discussing the matter with the Civil Service Commission, corrective legislation was recommended. I thank the chairman of the committee for promising immediate attention to this problem.

While it is true that a committee is making an overall study of our retirement system I think the matter is so important that it cannot await the results of the study in 1954. I believe prompt action should be taken to amend the present law.

Mr. CARLSON. Our committee will look into the matter promptly, and if legislation is deemed to be necessary, it will be but a very short time before a bill will be introduced in the Senate to correct the situation if the situation is as the distinguished Senator from Delaware has called to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has injected a partisan note into the discussion by charging the Democrats with establishing a welfare state for the world, would not the Senator from Delaware admit, with his characteristic honesty, that his party has very frequently fostered, by tariffs and subsidies, a welfare state for the wealthy?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not wish to get into your private argument, but unquestionably the truth is that the law having this loophole was passed under a Democratic Congress. To the extent that the Republican Party was in Congress at the time, we accept our share of the responsibility.

In discussing the matter with the Civil Service Commission 2 or 3 top officials have told me that they are, and have been for many months, very much concerned about the dangerous implications behind this procedure, but as yet they have failed to explain why they did

not call it to the attention of Congress, so that Congress could have corrected it. I am confident that had the matter been called to the attention of Congress, either when the Republicans or the Democrats were in control, it would have been corrected immediately. To the extent that there was negligence on the part of the last administration in not calling the matter to our attention, the Democrats will have to accept responsibility.

Should we fail to correct this loophole now that it has been called to our attention, then the responsibility will be ours.

Mr. CARLSON. I think the law should be amended. A former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Robert Ramspeck, has suggested that our present retirement system, which is comprised of about 13 different staff systems, should be studied with a view to corrective action. I believe it is the obligation of the Senate to look into the matter, to see if we cannot legislate to correct some of the injustices and inequities, and protect the retirement of the civil-service workers of the Nation.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator from Kansas is correct. I think so too. I have had my differences with the former Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, but in that particular I say he has been rather insistent that Congress should make an overall study of the retirement system because, as many Senators know, many inequities exist.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Ferguson amendment be deferred, because the author of the amendment, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Armed Services of the Committee on Appropriations, is detained in the holding of hearings.

I have consulted with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who desires to offer several amendments, to ascertain if we might defer action on the Ferguson amendment and allow the Senator from Illinois to offer his amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we have been on this appropriation bill for four long days, including yesterday from noon until well after 8 o'clock in the evening. It seems to me that we could speed up the consideration of the bill and have it passed today. I see no reason why we should not.

With respect to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota, if we can rapidly take up the Douglas amendments and vote on them, certainly I shall not raise any objection, because I know that the Senator is carrying out the wishes of his colleague.

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

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from New Hampshire imply that the Senator from Illinois is holding up the proceedings?

Mr. BRIDGES. No.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the Senator from New Hampshire has that understanding, I shall be glad to facilitate matters by taking up the amendments.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from Illinois does not need to get on his high horse.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am not doing so.

Mr. BRIDGES. My statement was made in the interest of the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators will please address the Chair.

Mr. BRIDGES. The Senator from New Hampshire was not addressing himself to the Senator from Illinois. If the Senator from Illinois feels at all guilty about the delay—

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not feel guilty.

Mr. BRIDGES. I certainly was not addressing myself to the Senator from Illinois. I was simply making general remarks to the Senate as a whole, and they still stand. I do not see any reason why we should not speed up action and finish with the bill this afternoon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In order to speed up action, I suggest that the Senator take up the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, that will not facilitate matters at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in the face of the desire of the majority leadership to speed up the proceedings, it is the duty of the Senate to take up the pending matter, which is the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. MUNDT. I seriously suggest that that would not speed up the procedure; it would only necessitate a quorum call, which would break up a committee meeting.

Mr. DOUGLAS. According to the rules of the Senate, committee meetings may not be held during the sessions of the Senate.

Mr. MUNDT. If the Senator from Illinois would not object to a unanimous-consent request to proceed to the consideration of his amendments, I feel certain that we could proceed with greater dispatch and everybody would be happy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may say also to my good friends, the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from South Dakota, collectively, that if they would stop trying to legislate on appropriation bills, that, too, would speed up the process very markedly.

Mr. MUNDT. I was under the impression that that was what the Senator from Illinois was about to do in the amendments he proposes to offer.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I am indulging in that practice, it is simply in reprisal for the legislation on appropriation bills that has been indulged in by the majority leadership.

Mr. MUNDT. Would the Senator from Illinois be willing to proceed with that practice at this time?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senate should consider the Ferguson amendment. I do not believe the unanimous-consent request has been granted.

Mr. MUNDT. It has not.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was about to give unanimous consent when the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], with his somewhat sly remarks, rose. Now I think I am inclined to refuse consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the request of the Senator from South Dakota that consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] be deferred temporarily until the Senator from Michigan can return. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Green	Monroney
Barrett	Griswold	Morse
Beall	Hayden	Mundt
Bennett	Hendrickson	Neely
Bricker	Hennings	Pastore
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Payne
Butler, Md.	Hill	Potter
Byrd	Hoey	Purtell
Capehart	Holland	Robertson
Carlson	Humphrey	Russell
Case	Jackson	Saltonstall
Chavez	Jenner	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kefauver	Smith, N. C.
Douglas	Kennedy	Sparkman
Duff	Kilgore	Stennis
Dworschak	Knowland	Symington
Eastland	Kuchel	Taft
Ellender	Langer	Thye
Ferguson	Lehman	Tobey
Flanders	Malone	Watkins
Fulbright	Martin	Welker
George	Maybank	Wiley
Goldwater	McClellan	Williams
Gore	Millikin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to strike out lines 3 to 7, inclusive, on page 48.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota regrets he was not present during the debate on the pending amendment. However, with the permission of the Senate, the Committee on the District of Columbia has been in session during the session of the Senate.

When I return to the floor I find that a motion was made to strike out a million dollars appropriated by the House for the construction of the Rama Road. The Senator from South Dakota was not aware that the issue was coming up this afternoon or he would have brought with him data available to the Committee on Public Works. As chairman of a sub-committee of the Committee on Public Works, the Senator from South Dakota feels it would be a very grave mistake, from the standpoint of our relations with Latin American countries, to strike out the million-dollar appropriation.

It is true that the project for building the so-called Rama Road cannot be said to have been written down in an express agreement, and it is true, probably, that the original arrangement for it was the

result of a conversation between the late President Roosevelt and a representative of Nicaragua as a sort of peace offering for the abandonment of what Nicaragua thought was an agreement on our part to build the Nicaraguan canal. But the fact is that the road has been started. It is a fact that it serves as an auxiliary to the inter-American highway, and will, when completed, mean an outlet from the inter-American highway to the gulf, and that it could serve, in an emergency, as an alternative to the water passage through the Panama Canal.

A considerable amount of money has already been spent on the road. To deny an appropriation of even \$1 million, which is far less than was expected to be allowed, would be regarded as a breach of faith, and would have repercussions not merely in Nicaragua, but through several other Latin American countries, Mexico and Guatemala among them, and on down to the Panama Canal. I think it would be a serious mistake to abandon the project at this time. Cutting the million-dollar appropriation out of the bill would be regarded as an abandonment of the project. The original plan certainly contemplated the expenditure of more than a million dollars. The reduction to a million dollars is regarded as a serious enough breach of what had been expected.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. CASE. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. About 10 days ago the Ambassador from the United States to Nicaragua was at the Capitol. One of the reasons for his coming was to bring to the attention of some of us the very important matter about which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota is now speaking. Ambassador Thomas Whelan, who is perhaps the outstanding American Ambassador to South American countries, impressed upon a large number of those of us that the people of Nicaragua are counting on the continuation of the building of this road. He stated that it would result in ill feeling if we did not appropriate the \$1 million to complete the project. As a matter of fact, he said he thought the amount was too small. I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from South Dakota had opportunity to speak to Ambassador Whelan when he was at the Capitol.

Mr. CASE. I am sorry I did not have the opportunity to talk with Mr. Whelan at that time. I conferred with him about a year ago. I am sure that what the Senator from South Dakota has stated is entirely correct, that the Ambassador feels very strongly about it. I received a notice the other day of a forthcoming meeting of some people who are interested in the Inter-American Highway. I think it would be a very serious courtesy, in face of the forthcoming meeting, if, without notice, we were to toss this appropriation out the window.

The Senator from South Dakota regrets that he does not have on the floor of the Senate the figures bearing on the road, but his recollection is that the information was placed in the RECORD last

year, and that the total cost of the road is something like \$8 million—about half of which has been provided. We should not abandon it as this time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words with relation to this subject. I know how difficult it is to balance the budget and to cut taxes. I realize we ought to keep our promises, but I find no promise, outside of the statute authorizing the expenditure, that was ever made that we would provide \$8 million more to complete the Rama Road.

I feel that the people of the United States have received from Senators on this side of the aisle promises to balance the budget and to reduce taxes. The item now under consideration presents one avenue by which we can keep our promise to the people of the United States, who pay the taxes. They are the ones who have to provide not only for the security of the United States, but also for the security of South America and of Central America. Senators speak of the importance of keeping our promises. I feel that the time has come when we should keep the promises which have been made to the American taxpayers.

Mr. President, the Ambassador from the United States to Nicaragua came before the committee and lobbied in behalf of the appropriation of \$1 million. I think the time has come when our Ambassadors should represent the United States and American taxpayers, instead of representing other countries.

Let us keep our promise to the American taxpayers.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the facts are not at all as the distinguished Senator from Michigan has stated. The Ambassador did not come before the committee to lobby at all. He is one of the most loyal Americans in the entire country. He is one of the legislative heads of the American Legion and one of the most distinguished leaders of the American Legion, and he has been such for many years. The distinguished Ambassador told us how the people of Nicaragua feel about this road.

The distinguished Senator from Michigan has voted, and will continue to vote, he says, for appropriations of billions and billions and billions of dollars for Asia and Europe. I say it is time that we spend some money on our own continent, and it is time that we make friends in Mexico and in the South American countries. Certainly money can be spent with much more benefit in this case than in China or in some other countries in which the distinguished Senator from Michigan has voted that large amounts of the funds of the United States taxpayers be spent.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this bill contains an appropriation of \$1 million for the Inter-American Highway, which we have agreed to build.

Mr. LANGER. But the Senator from Michigan knows that that is not sufficient, and he knows that the people of Nicaragua have been relying for a long, long time upon the building of the Rama Road.

Mr. President, I believe our promise to Nicaragua should be kept, and that the representations made by this Govern-

ment, through its duly authorized agents, should be scrupulously, honestly, and expeditiously carried out. By voting for this appropriation we will back up our distinguished Ambassador and help him in his unparalleled efforts to establish goodwill with Nicaragua. He already has done an outstanding job, as witness the continued support of the United States by Nicaragua in the United Nations.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield to me?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. CASE. I should like to call attention to page 29 of the committee report. Senators will note that the budget estimate for this item is \$2 million. The committee has recommended an appropriation of only \$1 million, which is a 50-percent reduction in the amount of the budget recommendation.

With all due respect to what the Senator from Michigan has said about balancing the budget, let me say that the Bureau of the Budget has requested the appropriation of \$2 million for this item, and the committee has recommended that that amount be cut in half.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield, to permit me to make a statement in reply to the statement made by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. The revised estimate of the Bureau of the Budget is for \$1 million.

Mr. CASE. The committee report shows that the amount of the budget estimate is the same as the amount voted by the House of Representatives and is \$1 million below the 1954 budget estimate.

Mr. FERGUSON. That is the Truman budget estimate.

Mr. CASE. Very well. Then the revised budget estimate is \$1 million; is that correct?

Mr. FERGUSON. That is correct.

Mr. CASE. And the Senator from Michigan proposes that we do not provide a single cent, although the revised budget estimate calls for \$1 million and the Truman budget estimate called for \$2 million.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wish my good friend, the Senator from Michigan, would not insist on this amendment.

The United States, a very large country, has made an agreement with a smaller country. We are sermonizing to the entire world about justice and equality for free peoples everywhere. What will Nicaragua think of us if we go back on the promise we have made? It seems to me that the present proposal is tantamount to saying that because we are large and strong, we should decide not to keep a moral obligation we have to a smaller country.

So far as balancing the budget is concerned, let me say to the Senator from Michigan that as far back as 1942 this project was approved by the head of the present administration, President Eisenhower, who at that time was Assistant Chief of Staff, with the rank of major general. As was stated earlier today by the Senator from Louisiana, in 1942 Major General Eisenhower stated that this project was desirable for the national

defense of the United States. The letter to that effect, written in 1942 by Major General Eisenhower, was inserted in today's RECORD by the Senator from Louisiana.

Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that instead of spending millions of dollars for songs to be sung over Voice of America programs and instead of spending millions of dollars for plays to be produced on Voice of America programs, we would accomplish more by spending the \$1 million recommended for this road. The expenditure of that \$1 million would accomplish more for our country than the expenditure of \$10 million or \$20 million on programs for the Voice of America.

Furthermore, let me point out that the cars that will roll on that road will come from Cleveland or Detroit, and the trucks that will roll on that road will come from the United States, and will create jobs for the people of the United States.

Mr. LANGER. They will help create jobs for the people of Michigan, who work in their truck and automobile plants—so we are killing 2 birds with 1 stone, and helping Ambassador Whelan besides.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. President, I am ready to have the vote taken on this amendment. In the interest of the dignity of our country, I believe we are compelled to vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan on page 48, to strike out lines 3 to 7.

The amendment was rejected.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I desire to make an announcement for the information of the Senate.

Assuming that the Senate completes action this evening on the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill, it will be the purpose of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate take a recess from this evening until Monday, after making as the unfinished business House bill 1730, Calendar No. 317, an act to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation. That measure would then succeed the State, Justice, and Commerce appropriation bill as the unfinished business.

On Monday of next week we propose to have the calendar called, from the beginning of the calendar, instead of beginning at the point where the last calendar call ended.

In addition, if Senate Resolution 106, Calendar No. 159, increasing the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 333, 82d Congress, for the Committee on Rules and Administration, and if Senate bill 690, Calendar No. 321, amending the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease purchase agreements to provide for the lease to

the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years, but not in excess of 25 years, and for acquisition of title to such property and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes, are not adopted or passed, respectively, during the call of the calendar, we would propose to have them taken up later in the week.

We hope by that time to have the Agricultural Appropriation bill before the Senate. There is also a possibility that some other measures, including some coming to the Senate from the House of Representatives, will be before the Senate next week.

The Appropriations Committee has been meeting in connection with its consideration of the armed services appropriation bill, and during the last several days it has been necessary for the members of the committee to go back and forth between the committee room and the Senate Chamber; the Foreign Relations Committee wishes to have time to mark up the Mutual Security bill; and the Judiciary Committee and a number of other committees have very heavy schedules, and if the agricultural appropriation bill is not read for Senate consideration by Tuesday, I would probably move, although we wish to maintain some flexibility, to have the Senate take a recess from Monday evening to Wednesday; and if the Agricultural appropriations bill is ready for consideration on Wednesday, we could proceed to consider it then.

I wish the Senate to be advised of the program as far in advance as possible; and the minority leader has asked me to announce the program, inasmuch as he has received a number of inquiries regarding the program for the remainder of this week and for next week.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE APPROPRIATIONS, 1954

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

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

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

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39, in line 18, it is proposed to strike out "sixteen hundred" and insert in lieu thereof "fourteen hundred and forty."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment would reduce the operating differential subsidy by 10 percent.

The bill as it now stands authorizes 1,600 trips. The average subsidy per trip is approximately \$31,000. So the appropriation thus proposed by the committee would mean a total expenditure of approximately \$50 million.

As I pointed out on Monday, this type of subsidy has been increasing very rapidly. The subsidy amounted to less

than \$200,000 in 1947, but during the current year it has increased to 250 times that amount.

If we examine the report of the committee hearings, on page 580 we find that the total voyages in 1952 upon which subsidies were paid amounted to 1,327. The total number of voyages in 1953 or projected for 1953 is 1,504. So that the committee, by permitting the limitation or maximum of 1,600 trips, is making it possible for a subsidy of around \$50 million to be paid.

I had originally intended to take the ax to this appropriation, and to propose a cut in the number of voyages to 500, which would have saved approximately \$34 million. But I can see that the Senate is in no mood for economy, and that we rather exhausted our moral energy when we dealt with and eliminated the subsidy for ship construction; so my proposal, now, is for a much more modest limitation. It is a proposal for a limitation on the total number of trips to 1,440, of which 100 are to be given to new lines and small operators, so that the right of the small operator to enter would be preserved; but the total liability is restricted to \$45 million instead of \$50 million.

This represents a very handy saving of \$5 million, which I think we should make, in a period in which it is said that the country is in such bad financial condition that we have to reduce the air security of the country. Rather than reduce the number of airplanes, I submit it would be better slightly to reduce the number of subsidized ship voyages. My proposal of 1,440 trips, as a matter of fact, is higher compared to the actual voyages in 1952, and lower than the number of voyages which have been authorized in fiscal 1953. It is about midway between the two.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRISWOLD in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under section 601 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, the Maritime Administration has entered into contracts for operating subsidies with 15 steamship lines. The contracts are based on determinations by the Administration that operation of the vessels of these lines in foreign commerce is required to meet foreign-flag competition and to promote the foreign commerce of the United States.

The contracts between the Maritime Administration and the shipping companies make it mandatory for the companies to furnish vessels for a specified number of sailings over specified foreign-trade routes. Six of the 15 companies whose sailings are now provided for in operating-subsidy contracts have applied for additional routes. Two companies not now under contracts have applied for routes.

The maximum number of voyages provided for by contracts or applied for is 1,907. Of this total, the Administration has estimated 1,807 as the number of voyages required in order to assure that this country will be furnished with enough regularly scheduled sailings to move a substantial part of the passenger

and goods requiring ocean transportation between the United States and foreign countries.

The bill as reported would reduce this figure to 1,600. A further cut would not only imperil the ability of our shipping lines to carry out the purposes of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, but would involve serious breaches of contract.

With respect to the purpose of the act, the importance of regularly scheduled sailings between the United States ports and foreign ports has been of vast importance in promoting our commerce with foreign countries concerned. To insure the most effective implementation of the act, the Maritime Administration should have a degree of discretion in determining how many voyages between given points are justified by the business available.

If the business is available, an increase in the number of authorized voyages can bring into the black an operation otherwise in the red. This in turn can bring into play the recapture provisions by which the Government is enabled to get back its subsidy payments. For this reason, the Administration's contracts provide for maximum and minimum numbers of voyages on the routes which the contracting companies are required to serve. The maximum number of voyages provided for by contracts in effect prior to July 1, 1952, is 1,637. The committee in reducing this number to 1,500 has gone as far as it seems safely possible to go in restricting the discretion of the Administration. I refer to 1,500, although the bill provides for 1,600, because there are 100 voyages included which are left for contracts entered into after July 1, 1952; so that today a leeway is provided by law for new companies not now under contract. That was first done 2 years ago in order to make it possible for new companies to come in under the terms of the operating-subsidy acts. For contracts in effect before July 1, 1952, the committee has authorized only 1,500 voyages, whereas 1,637 are now provided for by contract.

To reduce the total to 1,340, which would be the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, would be poor economy, in that it would defeat the effort of many lines to bring their year-round operations to a level at which the Government's right to recapture 50 percent of the profits above 10 percent could be invoked. It would, moreover, breach the Maritime Administration's contracts with the companies.

This is the opinion of the acting general counsel of the Maritime Administration, Mr. Elmer E. Metz, as shown by his letter, dated June 4, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF COMMERCE,
MARITIME ADMINISTRATION,
June 4, 1953.

Hon. STYLES BRIDGES,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: In response to your inquiry as to the effect of arbitrarily im-

posing limitations on the number of voyages for which subsidy can be paid, you are advised as follows:

In return for the operating subsidy the operator must agree to make at least a minimum number of sailings with the best available vessels on the ocean trade route which the Department of Commerce, in carrying out the duty imposed by section 211 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, has determined to be essential for the promotion, development, expansion and maintenance of the foreign commerce of the United States. By section 211 this determination must take into account specifically, among other things, the necessary number of sailings and types of vessels. The subsidy contract binds the operator to make at least the minimum number of sailings determined to be essential, and, if required to properly service the route, up to the maximum. The operator would be in default if it performed less than the service required. An arbitrary reduction by the Government in the number of sailings eligible for subsidy would be unilateral violation of the Government's contract with the operator, which under section 611 may entitle the operator to transfer its vessels to foreign flag.

Very truly yours,

ELMER E. METZ,
Acting General Counsel.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If my colleague will permit, I have 1 or 2 more thoughts I should like to present before I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to wait.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The opinion of Mr. Metz calls into question even the effect of previous bills, which have imposed ceilings on the number of voyages which could be authorized by the Maritime Administration. But more than that, it makes clear beyond doubt that the proposed amendment would force upon the Administration breaches of contract now in effect. The proposed amendment would reduce the authorized number of voyages by lines, under contract prior to July 1, 1952, to 1,340. This is even below the minimum number of voyages provided for by contracts with these lines.

As a matter of economics, the effect of the proposed restrictions will in time inevitably be to eliminate American ships from foreign trade routes. In concrete terms, it would eliminate 30 freighters. It would throw 1,500 seamen out of work. And as a result of forcing operating companies to distribute overhead over fewer voyages, it would force some of them out of business.

For the reason I have stated, I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will my good friend, the Senator from Massachusetts, be willing to yield now?

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I may ask my much beloved friend whether the United States Government has ever been able to recapture the profits from ship-operating lines; and, if so, in what cases have profits been recaptured from the shipping lines?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. One example is that of \$5,300,000 recaptured from, I believe, American Export Lines.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And is it not true that the sum total of subsidies thus far obligated has been approximately \$200 million?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The amount is very substantial. I cannot verify the figure. I know that \$20 million is provided for in the bill this year. The Secretary of Commerce stated that we should pay \$65 million this year, and approximately the same next year and the year after.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I invite attention to page 579 of the hearings, on which it is stated that the total of subsidy accrued payable through the fiscal year 1953-54 amount to \$374,283,000.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would not question that figure.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true, therefore, that in view of past subsidies, if we recapture \$5 million it amounts to approximately 1½ percent of the subsidies paid out? Is not that something of a carrot which is dangled before the donkey but which the donkey is never able to reach and eat?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to my friend that that is the same argument he and I engaged in yesterday.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope we shall have as happy a conclusion to it as we had yesterday.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That statement of my colleague gives me opportunity to say that while I was not successful yesterday, my efforts were not exerted on behalf of a floating pork barrel. I did not know yesterday where the new construction business would go, but what I wanted to do was to safeguard the future of the merchant marine. That is why I am on my feet at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are all very fond of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The Senator from Massachusetts says the contracts which have been made are binding. Since when can administrative bodies assume the appropriating function?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That is required by the Merchant Marine Act. We cannot ask a private company to make its plans for a route and carry them out unless it first has a contract with the Government.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I point out that whatever may be the business exigencies, the practical result has been that the Maritime Commission makes contracts without regard to the decisions of Congress, and then Congress is called upon to make good the contracts of the Maritime Commission. This is a complete perversion of the separation of powers under which the elected representatives of the people make appropriations, and then, after they are made, executive authorities carry them out. Here we have the argument—and I am surprised that it comes from the Senator from Massachusetts—that we, as a representative body, are bound by administrative decisions of persons who have never been elected by the voters of the United States.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Congress looked forward to that type of contract when it passed the act of 1936. When Congress amended that act a few years ago, I believe it looked forward to improving the act. It adhered to the policy of

helping our merchant marine and keeping certain routes open so we would have American shipping carrying American goods in American bottoms and bringing back commerce from abroad over the years.

Besides, under the committee bill Congress has placed a limitation of 1,600 voyages on the discretion of the Maritime Commission. That is a limitation, as I see it, on the authority of the act. It is presumably a good limitation, in view of the deficits which are existing. But I do not think we should pin the limitation down below what the contracts now call for.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We have somewhat strayed away from the constitutional point which I raised. Does the Senator from Massachusetts believe it is a wise policy to say that administrative officials can make contracts which are then binding for future years so that Congress is required to appropriate for them? If that be the case, is there not a complete usurpation of the appropriating and legislative functions of the Congress?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That course is followed in connection with Federal aid to roads, in connection with Federal aid to hospitals, and in connection with a number of other things, including Federal aid to airports.

Mr. POTTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If the Senator from Illinois has no further questions, I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. POTTER. I asked the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts to yield because I should like to speak on the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

In the appropriation bill before the Senate, at page 39, it is provided as follows:

That nothing contained in this act, or in any prior appropriations act, shall be construed to affect the authority provided in section 603 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, (1) to grant operating-differential subsidies on a long-term basis, and (2) to obligate the United States to—

The appropriation bill itself certainly will not violate the legislative provisions of the 1936 act.

If the Senator from Massachusetts will yield further, I think it may be well to note that I contacted the Military Sea Transportation Service this morning to inquire what would be the result with reference to our national defense if the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Illinois were to become effective. I shall not take the time of the Senate to read the entire memorandum which I received, but I should like to read one paragraph:

A restriction in the number of subsidized sailings might eventually result in a reduction in the number of United States-flag merchant marine vessels in operation because of high operating costs which would prevent certain lines from continuing operation in competition with foreign-flag shipping. Such a reduction would have an adverse effect from the standpoint of national defense and would, in my opinion, be against the national interest.

That is signed by Vice Adm. F. C. Denebrink, commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Michigan for his helpful comments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield so that I may ask a question of the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The letter which the Senator from Michigan just read referred, did it not, to the original amendment which I offered, namely, providing for a reduction to 500 trips?

Mr. POTTER. I made a telephone call this morning based upon the 10-percent reduction which the Senator from Illinois had in mind.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that in 1952 the total number of voyages subsidized was 1,327, and that in 1953 the total number was 1,507, so that the figure of 1,440 is between those two figures, and, therefore, if the American flag continued on the seas in 1952 with 1,327 voyages, it seems logical that it will continue with a 10-percent accretion?

Mr. POTTER. The reason for the increase at this time is that our defense needs have been increased over past years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thought the new administration was reducing the number of personnel in the Armed Forces.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to my colleague from Illinois that approximately 40 percent of the capacity of the subsidized lines is used in the consignment of cargo for our Armed Forces in the Far East and other areas.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Illinois will not press his amendment at this time. The House committee, with which the Senate committee agreed, cut the voyages down to a level which, I believe, is economical and proper in view of the conditions in the Far East and the conditions of shipping throughout the world as a whole.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, to strike out "1,600" and insert "1,440."

The amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment "6-1-53-F," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 46, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof a colon and the following: "Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for disbursement to any State which submits programs to the Bureau of Public Roads for Federal-aid highways in excess of 80 percent of the amounts apportioned to that State by the Bureau of Public Roads for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954."

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may modify my amendment by substituting the figure "95" for the figure "80."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois has the right to modify his amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my original amendment would have made reductions of \$115 million in the Federal-aid highway program; namely, a reduction of 20 percent for the fiscal year 1954-55, not for the current year.

The amendment in its present form would make a reduction of 5 percent, or \$27,500,000. I wish to make it clear that this amendment does not affect appropriations in the current bill.

We have heard much comment on the backlog of spending authorizations left by the previous administration. Here is where we can reduce that backlog by \$27,500,000.

This amendment, by means of a limitation, prevents States from spending more than 95 percent of the amounts which Congress authorized for Federal-aid highways for the year 1954-55.

The amendment is not subject to a point of order, since a similar amendment, which I submitted on April 21, 1952, was declared by the Vice President to be in order. I refer to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 98, part 3, page 4163.

One of the most difficult problems I have faced in the past with respect to appropriations for Federal-aid highways has been the argument that the authorizing legislation effectively commits Congress to whatever level of appropriations is required to carry out the authorizations, just as the very able Senator from Massachusetts has argued that Congress is bound to carry out authorizations which the Maritime Administration makes to private ship operators.

I have never accepted this premise, and I do not now accept it, but I must certainly admit that Congress seems to operate on that basis, and I have never been able to get to make any headway in proposing reductions in actual appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year.

In the past, when reductions have been made in this appropriation, the Bureau of Public Roads, instead of restricting State applications for money, has merely come to Congress with requests for supplemental appropriations to make good the authorizations which they have previously issued. In reality, this has not been a breach of good faith on the part of the Bureau of Public Roads. They have even been encouraged by Congress to follow that course, although I believe they have taken sharp advantage of the letter of the law. So I am not attempting to cut appropriations for the fiscal year 1953-54 with respect to the highway program.

However, my amendment will save \$27,500,000. In effect, it will do so by telling the States not to submit programs in excess of 95 percent of the apportionment paid by the Bureau of Public Roads for the fiscal year 1954-55. In other words, we will control the requests by States in 1954-55 by the amounts which they will ask for 1953-54, and we will cut them by 5 percent.

I cannot emphasize too strongly that there will not be, in any possible sense, any breach of good faith by agreeing to this amendment. The Bureau of Public Roads has not yet even made its apportionment for the fiscal year 1954-55, and will not do so until November of this year. Following the apportionment, the

second step is for the States to submit programs. At this stage, if my amendment is agreed to, the States will submit programs totalling only 95 percent of their allocations. The amendment provides an effective way by which we can save \$27,500,000.

It will be remembered that in the authorization bill the House had approved a \$600 million authorization annually, but on motion of the Senator from Illinois this amount was reduced in the Senate to \$550 million, and a mid-figure of \$575 million was reached in conference. So my proposal is that we return to the figure which the Senate authorized for 1954-55.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator from Illinois inform the Chair if the change in his amendment was to insert the figure "95"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The figure "80" was changed to the figure "95."

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, with respect to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, I reaffirm that there is no provision in the appropriation bill for 1954-55 allotments to States. The amount provided, \$475 million, covers the fiscal year 1952-53.

Further, the amendment proposed amends the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1952, because the 95-percent limitation applies to the fiscal year 1955.

I understand what the Senator from Illinois is attempting to do, and I have no doubt that he is very sincere in his attempt in this manner to reach out and get control of the situation. However, the Senate committee considered this problem, and felt that it had gone as far as it could. We felt that we would be reaching out beyond the confines of appropriate action if we reached into a field in an act where no appropriation item is concerned.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Unless the Committee on Appropriations reaches out beyond the ensuing fiscal year in connection with highway appropriations, it never will be able to reduce the figure once it has been authorized. Is not that correct?

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe this is something that should be handled by the Committee on Public Works. It should be provided for by way of a basic act, rather than in an appropriation bill. I see perfectly well what the Senator from Illinois is attempting to do, and there may be reasonable justification for it, but I believe he is reaching out too far by suggesting action in this manner.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do I understand that the Senator from New Hampshire now takes the position that Congress never should appropriate sums less than those which have been authorized? In the past, I have heard the Senator from New Hampshire, on the floor of the Senate, assert that Congress was not bound to appropriate all sums which had been previously authorized.

Mr. BRIDGES. I believe the Senator from Illinois correctly recalls my remarks. I believe very definitely that that is true, and I still take that view. But I believe this particular matter should be approached in a little different manner from that the Senator from Illinois has proposed. Personally, I am not too much concerned about it. It in-

volves only a method of procedure. I think the committee acted in the regular manner.

I have examined into what the Senator is attempting to do. I understand his objective, and I think he is sincere in what he is attempting to accomplish. However, personally, representing the committee, I simply cannot agree to accept the Senator's amendment in this instance. Therefore, I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Illinois will be rejected.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, upon the suggestion of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, after a discussion with the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who suggested the absence of a quorum, and with his approval, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded and that further proceedings under the call be dispensed with.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, while officially there is no quorum present, more Members of the Senate are in the Chamber now than were present when I originally explained the amendment. In view of that fact I think perhaps it would not be inappropriate for me to take a few minutes to explain again what the amendment is intended to accomplish. I hope those of my colleagues who were present when I made my original statement will bear with me, because of the changed circumstances.

I have always felt that the Congress was not legally bound to appropriate sums for an ensuing fiscal year merely because they had been authorized. I have always thought that the appropriating function was not necessarily bound by authorizations, because conditions might change between the time an appropriation was authorized and the time the appropriation was made. In this case, of course, conditions have changed. There is now a greater awareness of the need for economy, and there is pressure for national defense.

When I have advanced this position in the past I have always been defeated; but, like Margaret Fuller, I have learned to accept the inevitable. I no longer intend to break my head against that stone wall.

What I am trying to do by the pending amendment is to control expenditures for 1954-55, by providing that the sums appropriated in 1953-54 shall not be distributed to the States unless the States reduced by 5 percent the amounts which have been authorized and for which they will otherwise make requests for 1954-55.

In other words, we are using the appropriation for the ensuing year as a lever by which to scale down the requests and the appropriations for 1954-55. It

is the only effective way in which we can break through the knot into which we have tied ourselves on the highway grants.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I would appreciate it if I could finish my argument. Then I shall be very happy to yield.

Mr. President, all of us remember Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. On the first of these travels Gulliver found himself in Lilliput, the country of the dwarfs. He went to sleep, and when he woke up he found that he was bound by a series of small strings, which had been tied around his fingers and toes and legs and arms, and the rest of his body, and that these strings in their entirety prevented him from moving.

In a similar way Congress has allowed strings to tie down its appropriating function. We are held down and prevented from making economies. We have given to administrative agencies the power which belongs to the legislative body. If we acquiesce in this matter it means the end of representative government and control over appropriations. Only by some action such as I am proposing, can we control, if not during the ensuing year, then during the year after the ensuing year.

I should like to point out that the reduction of 5 percent, which I have proposed for fiscal 1954-55, is equal approximately to the \$25 million lower figure which the Senate approved in 1952. At that time the House authorized \$600 million for each of 2 successive years. The Senate Public Works Committee also recommended \$600 million. On motion of the Senator from Illinois the amount was reduced by the Senate to \$550 million. When the bill went to conference a midway figure was arrived at of \$575 million. We will pay out for the ensuing year on that basis.

I merely ask that for the next year, 1954-55, we be not forced to pay out in that way, but, in view of the national situation, we save \$27½ million, or approximately the amount which the Senate tried to save last year.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes; I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understood the Senator from Illinois to state that what he is proposing is the only opportunity we have to take care of the situation in 1953-54. If so, I would remind the Senator that there will be another authorization bill before the Senate just like the bill that was before it last year, which the Senator will have a right to offer to amend. If the Senate agrees with him, the situation will be changed. The change should not be made on an appropriation bill.

Last year the Senator from Illinois offered a similar amendment to an appropriation bill and the Vice President stated:

The Chair is of the opinion that, notwithstanding the 2-year apportionment, and notwithstanding that the law provided for it, Congress, if it should see fit to do so, might deny appropriations entirely. It would be a breach of good faith on the part of the Con-

gress to do so, but it does not present itself to the Chair as a parliamentary question.

Therefore his amendment was ruled in order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Arizona contending that my motion is subject to a point of order?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; I am not contending that it is subject to a point of order, because the Chair ruled on that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Chair ruled in favor of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HAYDEN. But the Chair was careful to state that it would be a breach of good faith. When the time comes for the Senate to make a pledge, if the Senator from Illinois can persuade the Senate not to make the pledge, there will be no breach of good faith.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the great Senator from Arizona, who is the craftiest man in the Senate—and that is not uttered in any derogatory sense, perhaps I should say the most subtle man in the Senate—whether he is saying that *obiter* dictum of a presiding officer has the force of legislative law? That seems to be what he is contending.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is an extraordinary thing to say that the Presiding Officer or the Vice President can make legislative policy. It would be a delegation of legislative power which I have never heard advanced before, and I am surprised to have it come from the lips of the Nestor of the Senate, to whom we all look for enlightenment.

Mr. HAYDEN. All I am saying is that a man of much more experience than I was presiding in the chair, namely, Alben Barkley. It was his judgment, as Vice President and as a former Senator, that it would be a breach of good faith; and I am glad to quote his authority.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is the Senator from Arizona contending that we have a Senate of only the Vice President, and that the Vice President determines what is legislation?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the Senate will make the determination, just as it did last year. However, I wish to point out to the Senator from Illinois that in the judgment of the Vice President it would be a breach of good faith, which we as Senators should not engage in.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I protest vigorously against the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], not only because it strikes at the heart of a program which I think is very vital to our Nation and to all of our States, but particularly because of the way in which the distinguished Senator from Illinois proposes to strike at the highway program.

If Senators will look at the provision which is sought to be amended, which is the provision relating to Federal-aid highways, appearing at the bottom of page 45 and the top of page 46 of the printed bill, they will find that the appropriation carried by the bill for distribution among the several States consists of \$475 million, which is composed of two principal items, \$387,500,000 against the authorization for fiscal 1952, and \$84,500,000 against the authorization for fiscal 1953.

The distinguished Senator from Illinois does not propose to cut off either of those items, or anything from those two items. Instead, by his amendment, he seeks to coerce the several States through his amendment, which reads as follows: "Provided, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be available for disbursement to any State which submits programs to the Bureau of Public Roads for Federal-aid highways in excess of 95 percent of the amounts apportioned to that State by the Bureau of Public Roads for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1954."

That is a mandate to the States that they dare not ask for their full appropriation for this year, without at the same time coming forward with a request for the succeeding year, fiscal 1955, reduced by 5 percent from the amount heretofore authorized by Congress by the passage of the last Federal-aid bill in 1952.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does the Senator from Florida believe that we should spend in excess of \$550 million for fiscal 1954-55?

Mr. HOLLAND. I believe we should stand on the amount which has been authorized.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That was \$575 million, was it not?

Mr. HOLLAND. It was \$575 million; that is the amount which was authorized after action by both Houses and after action by the conference committee, representing both Houses, and after the previous careful action by the Public Works Committees of both Houses, which have not been consulted at all about the proposed cut which the Senator from Illinois now tries to provide in this bill, by way of an amendment to an appropriation bill, although the effect of his amendment would be to reduce the authorization made by an authorization bill which was carefully worked out by the two committees and by the two Houses, and by the conference committee. Since the enactment of that bill, the States have been making their plans in accordance with that solemn authorization.

Notwithstanding the fact that that work has been going on for a year, and that plans have been well laid and that machinery has been set up to use the authorization, the Senator from Illinois now proposes to reduce the authorization, not by introducing at the beginning of the session a bill in the nature of an amendment, which could have been cleared through the two committees and could have been before the Senate by this time, and not by taking the matter before the Appropriations Committees when they were passing upon this matter, but by coming to the floor of the Senate with an amendment which does not in any respect affect the sums covered by the appropriation bill, as it relates to this particular field, but an amendment which proposes, instead, to reduce in the future the amount of the authorization; and the Senator from Illinois has proceeded in that way by

means of an argument which is peculiarly characteristic of him.

If more Senators had been on the floor a few minutes ago when the Senator from Illinois was making his opening statement, they would have found that he justified his amendment by reminding his colleagues that last year the Senate first authorized \$550 million, but the House of Representatives insisted upon an authorization of \$600 million, and then the authorization bill went to conference, and the conferees returned with a proposed authorization of \$575 million. The Senator from Illinois said, in effect, that the Members of the Senate knew all the time that \$550 million was the proper amount of the authorization, and thus it is that today he argues that the Senate should adopt his amendment, and should permit the Senate at long last to have its own way.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois is an able and resourceful advocate. One of his finest qualities is his memory. I have always thought that his memory is more characteristic of the animal which is the emblem of the party of the Senators who sit on the other side of the aisle than of any other animal of which I can think.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now that reference is being made to the zoo, I should like to ask some questions.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, remembering what the Senator from Illinois stood for about a year ago on the floor of the Senate, I point out that the Senator from Illinois insists that he was right all the time, and that the Senate had no business to depart from the argument he made at that time. Notwithstanding the fact that a year ago this matter was decided, and thereafter the States were informed about the decision and their plans have been made, and they have proceeded on the basis of those plans, and that the good faith of the Nation is involved, the Senator now insists that we must go back to the precise amount for which the distinguished Senator from Illinois argued unsuccessfully more than a year ago, and that we must, by means of an amendment to this appropriation bill, carry out our original intention.

I congratulate the Senator from Illinois upon his memory and his perseverance; but I do not believe we can have an orderly road program or any other orderly program which depends upon carefully developed authorizations, if, following the making of the authorizations—which in this case were based upon real study by the appropriate legislative committees and the practice of normal parliamentary procedure, as a result of which the two Houses ultimately agreed, following the action taken in the conference committee, we insist upon our original judgment, and do so more than a year after we have agreed to a settlement of the matter in a more or less compromise form, as between the preference of the Senate and the preference of the House of Representatives.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First, let me deal with the zoological question, before we proceed to the substantive matters.

I willingly admit that my manners probably are modeled upon the habits of the totemesque animal—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have referred to the memory of the Senator from Illinois, not to his manners.

Mr. DOUGLAS. As I was saying, Mr. President, I willingly admit that my manners probably are modeled upon the habits of the totemic animal of the Democratic Party; I am willing to admit that probably in most affairs of life I am a jackass. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I made no such implication.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I realize that the Senator from Florida did not make such a statement. I am simply trying, in good humor, to indicate that I took no offense when I was accused of having the memory of an elephant. I say that although I may have the memory of an elephant, I do not cherish grudges in the way that is said to characterize an elephant. At the end of each day, I wipe the slate clean; and I begin the next day with a clean slate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I wish to endorse the statement the Senator from Illinois has just made. I have never known a Senator or a citizen who more cheerfully abides by what is done one day, and goes about the business of the next day, with the single exception that back in the recesses of his memory, the Senator from Illinois still retains a recollection of something that happens, and years later, when opportunity arises, he reasserts his original position, and asks the Senate to sustain his thinking of last year or the year before that, or perhaps even farther back than that.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure I do not have the good memory the Senator from Florida has credited me with having, but I think I am correct in saying that one of the strongest advocates last year for an authorization of only \$550 million was the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and at that time I felt joined to him in loving union. So I thought that this afternoon he would most certainly help us maintain the position which he so ably defended last year. I am now pained to the quick to find that his memory is not very good or his sense of consistency is not very strong, in that he goes back on the position he then took.

I would not have mentioned this matter or would not have had it brought forth from the recesses of my mind, had not the Senator from Florida touched upon that point. I had intended to ignore that situation, or not to mention it.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to point out that although I did join the Senator from Illinois in support of the amendment by which the authorization bill, as first passed by the Senate, provided an authorization of \$550 million, I also served on the conference committee, and in representing the Senate on the conference committee, I did my very best to effect the will of the Senate.

However, Mr. President, unlike some other Senators, I never expect to make my will prevail over the wills of the other 95 Members of the Senate or over the

wills of the 435 Members of the House of Representatives. So, when I finally returned from the conference committee with the best I could secure from the conferees, and after I explained in humility to my Senate colleagues that that was the best we had been able to obtain, under the leadership of my distinguished friend, the Senator from New Mexico, and with other able Senators, and when I explained that in the conference the conferees on the part of the House of Representatives were very persuasive and insistent, and that finally we had to split the difference between the two Houses; and after the Senate voted in favor of the compromise amount of authorization, and after that amount of authorization was enacted into law, I thought the Senate was obligated and bound to stand for that amount of authorization, and I thought the States had a right to act on the basis of that authorization action, as taken by the two Houses of Congress and approved by the President.

Let me say that last winter I attended the meeting, at Kansas City, of the representatives of the road departments of the various States; and there I heard the discussion of the plans on the basis of which those agencies were proceeding. I did not find that the members and engineers of the State road departments were pleased with the action which had been taken by Congress, for they had wanted a vastly larger authorization made; but they were proceeding with their programs and were coordinating them so as to bring about the best possible result.

I found there distinguished representatives of the executive branch of the Government, the representatives of the Bureau of Public Roads, working with the State agencies who handle this program.

I reflect not in the slightest upon my distinguished friend from Illinois, but I would not feel that I was practicing complete good faith with those whom I found out there, and with whom I discussed this program in some detail, if I came back now and, by way of a rider on an appropriation bill, agreed to rescind the solemn obligation taken here last year, and which was sent to the States as something upon which they could rely.

Mr. DOUGLAS and Mr. CHAVEZ addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico, after which I shall be pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I presume the Senator from Florida has reference to the fact that he attended a meeting of officials of the American State Highway Association in Kansas City.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. They were officials from the respective States who have had something to do with the programming, the letting of contracts, and the building, not only with respect to their own local roads, but also with respect to the Federal aid system.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is correct. The officials and the personnel of the Bureau of Public Roads are honorary members, or some kind of members, of the highway association, and they attend the planning sessions, which continue for several days.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct; and the planning must dovetail with what Congress does in the matter of Federal aid.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, correct.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Each of the State legislatures meets practically once every 2 years, so they must possess information as to what the Congress intends to do in the matter of Federal aid for highways, before they can even do their programming.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is correct. I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Does not the Senator from Florida know that no State has submitted plans for 1954-55?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida knows that the regular time for the submission of plans for that year will soon be upon us. It comes early in the fall.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But they have not yet submitted any plans for 1954-55.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is not entirely correct about that, because, to the contrary, the State road departments have just concluded arguing with their State legislatures, as has been the case in the State of Florida, where the legislature which will adjourn tomorrow, has just gotten through hearing the road department submit its program for the next 2 years and has passed the agreed-upon appropriations. The appropriation which we make here is not even a major part of the road program of the Nation, as the Senator well knows. Each State has gone through its part of the planning, appropriating and authorizing, and the give-and-take which characterizes a legislative session. Many of them are through already; and in the case of my own State, it will be through at noon tomorrow. So that I think the Senator from Illinois is not correct in his statement that there has been no planning, no action, and no preparation for what will be done in fiscal 1955.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The program has not been submitted to the Bureau of Public Roads.

Mr. HOLLAND. To the contrary, that program is very far advanced, as every Senator who has served in his State legislature, or who has served as the governor of his State, or who has served as a member of the cabinet of his State, knows full well. So that the distinguished Senator may not with complete accuracy make the claim that this program has not been acted upon, because it was acted upon in the making of the budget of the various States last fall and winter, budgets which they were preparing for submission to the legislatures this spring; and it has gone a long, long way toward completion so far as the States' parts of the program are concerned.

Mr. President, I shall not further take the time of the Senate. It seems to me so completely clear that there is here a

matter in which it is sought, through a side-door method and without reference to the appropriating or legislative committees, and without any chance at all for anyone to be heard, to reshape and in part to destroy, certainly largely to diminish, programs which are of great importance, and which are cooperative programs between the Nation and the respective States, that it would ill become the Senate of the United States to adopt such an amendment; and I hope we shall not adopt it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the fact that the present administration has complained about the outstanding volume of prior obligations which it has to meet, does not the Senator from Florida think it would be a very cooperative action on our part if we were to help our friends on the other side of the aisle in their efforts to balance the budget for 1954-55? I hope very much that my friends on the other side of the aisle will rise in large numbers to assist their President in balancing the budget for fiscal 1955.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in answering that question, I should like to say that, in the first place, I have not noted any lack of vocal qualities on the part of our friends on the other side of the aisle. I have found them well able to state their own position; and they frequently do so. I have heard none of them state any position in support of this ill-conceived amendment.

Furthermore, I have never found any lack of articulative qualities on the part of the head of the present national administration; and I did not note in his message, and I have not heard in his various radio broadcasts or in his various news interviews, any suggestion whatever that he thought the national road program which would be shaped in the first full fiscal year of his administration should be recast and diminished. To the contrary, there has been an utter absence of any such comment from any of the sources which I have indicated, and I would think that the able Senator from whom this amendment comes should not be regarded as being intimately representative of the wishes of the present administration—unless, indeed, the Senator from Illinois advises us that he has had such suggestion, or has had some such request from the President of the United States, of which, certainly I have no information, and of which the Senate, I believe, has received no information from any other source.

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

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

Mr. MAYBANK. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida, a former Governor of his State, whether the pending proposal does not come at an inopportune time, in view of the fact that the legislatures have adjourned, or recessed, in most of the States, and have made their arrangements with the Federal Government. Therefore, what is to happen to what the legislatures have done to cooperate with this program, since they have in most instances adjourned sine die?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is, of course, completely correct. I yield the floor.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, when it comes to the question of roads, we are not confronted with a political question. Roads are quite as necessary in Republican California and in Republican New Jersey as they are in Democratic Florida or in Democratic New Mexico. The subject of roads is not a political one. Roads are necessary. Roads have made the country great. I have made that statement before, and I make it again.

Of course, we have our Declaration of Independence, and we have the Constitution of the United States of America. Those were paper documents. But, Mr. President, if there is a question as to what actually united the States, let us consult history a bit.

The War Between the States, a sorry episode, but which nevertheless happened, and which is part of our history, divided the Nation. For a time the States were not united. We had our good friends on the one hand, who represented the Confederacy; and we had the so-called Yankees up North. One was cussing the other. The one from the South was isolated, he could go nowhere; the one from the North could go nowhere. Both of them were cussing the people from Colorado and New Mexico—people from the wild and woolly West—until Mr. Ford got his big idea, which resulted in his development of the jalopy, making it necessary that there be roads and streets upon which the jalopies could roll; as a further result of which, the idea was conceived of trying to drill for oil, of trying to refine gasoline, and of trying to build the rubber and the metal industries.

When that was done, Mr. President, the man or the girl who could not easily go from Mississippi to Maine was able to roll on those roads and find out that his or her neighbors and fellow citizens in Maine held exactly the same ideas, and had the same trials, tribulations, and hopes, as were found in the State of Mississippi and everywhere else in this free country. I have seen persons from Maine in California finding out that the California people were like the rest of the people of the Nation. What actually united the United States, in addition to the Constitution, was the highways of America.

I hope we shall not do anything this afternoon that will in any way interfere with the process of uniting the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois. [Putting the question.]

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

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have another amendment, identified as "6-1-53-E," which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "\$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$400,000: *Provided*, That no part of these funds may be used for the purchase of alcoholic beverages to be served at public functions in countries where the Mohammedan religion is practiced by a majority of the population of such country."

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, this amendment is an important item.

Complaints have been received, which I believe were well-founded, that members of the American diplomatic service use their representation funds to give parties in Mohammedan countries where alcohol is served. As we all know, the Koran says that the drinking of alcohol is a deadly sin, and one loses caste very rapidly in Mohammedan countries if he serves and drinks liquor.

I am not proposing that these diplomatic representatives shall be teetotalers in their private lives. They may drink as they wish in their private entertainments. I am merely saying that if they entertain publicly in countries which are violently opposed to the serving of liquor, they shall not use public funds to furnish liquor when the result is contrary to the interests of the Government.

I want to make it clear that I do not pose as a teetotaler, myself. I am not a teetotaler, and, therefore, I do not wish to sail under false colors, so far as this amendment is concerned. I merely assert that I do not think our representatives abroad should use public funds for the purchase and distribution of liquor in Mohammedan countries when it distinctly lowers the prestige of the United States of America. I know such an order should be put into effect by the State Department, and if the State Department were on to its job, it would do so, but, unfortunately, the appetites of members of the Foreign Service seem to be stronger than their realization of the proper course to pursue in Mohammedan countries, and it seems to me it has now become the function of Congress to lay down some standards of behavior.

I offer the amendment very reluctantly, and I hope it will be adopted.

MR. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the entertainment fund of which the Senator from Illinois speaks is used for many purposes, including furnishing representatives of the United States in foreign countries the facility to entertain and to do certain things in accordance with diplomatic customs or exchanges between nations. For instance, it is used to purchase flowers, wreaths, and other tokens for presentation in accordance with local customs. It is used to purchase and place a wreath on the monument of a great hero, or something of that sort. It is used in connection with the observance of the Fourth of July in England, and for other purposes.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois provides: "That no part of these funds may be used for the purchase of alcoholic beverages to be served at public functions in countries where the Mohammedan religion is practiced by a majority of the population of such country."

I wonder if the Senator would accept the following modification of his amendment: "Provided further, That the above

limitation shall not apply to any public function at which there are one or more individuals of the Mohammedan faith present who imbibe alcoholic beverages."

That is so that there would be no discrimination, so that there would be freedom of action. [Laughter.]

MR. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Hampshire is serious about it, I will accept his amendment, if he will push it. I hope he goes through with his end of the bargain.

MR. BRIDGES. I will not say that I will push it.

MR. DOUGLAS. Then it is an Indian gift the Senator offers.

MR. BRIDGES. I am opposed to the amendment of the Senator from Illinois, either as it is or as modified, and I hope it will be rejected.

I realize that I could make a point of order against the amendment, but let us settle it by a vote.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The amendment was rejected.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further amendment, 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 (H. R. 4974) was read the third time, and passed.

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

The motion was agreed to; and the Chair appointed Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HILL conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT TO SIGN ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION DURING RECESS

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign Senate Joint Resolution 80, requesting and authorizing the President of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as "Aid to Korea Week", during the coming recess.

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

FURNISHING OF TRANSPORTATION IN GOVERNMENT-OWNED VEHICLES FOR VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION EMPLOYEES AT FIELD STATIONS

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 1730, which is No. 317 on the calendar.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be reported by title.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1730) to provide for furnishing transportation in Government-owned automotive vehicles for employees of the

Veterans' Administration at field stations in the absence of adequate public or private transportation.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from California.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

MR. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

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

MR. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, am I correct in my understanding that when the Senate recesses tonight, it will recess until Monday?

MR. KNOWLAND. The Senate will adjourn until Monday, and on Monday the calendar will be called.

MR. HENDRICKSON. I thank the Senator.

INSECT AND RODENT INFESTATION OF WHEAT

MR. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, last year the Food and Drug Administration announced that it was about to embark upon a program of enforcement of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with the purpose of assuring that only wheat free from contamination by rodent excreta or insect infestation would reach the mills for grinding into flour. This program followed several years of intensive enforcement of the act against flour mills and their product, flour. It was said that the mills had been brought into thoroughly sanitary condition, but that some contamination still appeared in the flour which could not be avoided because it was in the wheat which the mills grind, and, that therefore, it was necessary to direct an enforcement program to the wheat itself. The aim was laudable and within the purpose of the act. The only difficulty was that so many and such difficult problems arose in dealing with the wheat that formidable obstacles were in the way of effective enforcement.

The program announced was in two distinct phases. The first phase involved measures to require elevator operators who store grain to bring their plants into thoroughly sanitary condition. The second phase provided for the seizure of grain in boxcars where rodent contamination or insect infestation was found by inspectors of the administration.

Regarding the first phase, there has never at any time been any controversy. The grain trade, and all others concerned, have accepted this part of the plan without question, and I am informed that the Administration has diligently proceeded to bring the elevators into compliance and to keep them in sanitary condition.

The second phase is in two parts. The first relates to contamination of wheat by rodents, the other to infestation by insects. I have at all times disclaimed any intention to make any representations concerning the contamination of grain by rodents. So far as I am con-

cerned, this part of the program can proceed at once. However, in saying this I do not overlook the fact that in some parts of the country conditions are such that a good case probably can be made for a postponement of the enforcement program relating to rodent contamination. I am only saying that I, personally, do not desire to offer anything in even temporary opposition to that plan.

However, the matter of insect infestation is an entirely different question, and on that point I am convinced the Administration is ill prepared to proceed, for reasons which I shall give.

This is a matter of large importance. Wheat is one of the vital foodstuffs of our people, and it is of the greatest consequence to the people of my State, which is the largest wheat-producing State in the Union.

The matter was first brought to congressional attention by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who directed hearings before the committee on this subject on March 10 and 11, 1953, as a result of information he had received from the Department of Agriculture that the proposed enforcement program of Food and Drug Administration jeopardized the handling of wheat which the Government then owned and which it expected to acquire upon the default of price-support loans on April 30, in all, some 500 million bushels of wheat, enough to feed the people of this country for a year.

The problem of weevil infestation, which, as I have said, is the only phase of this matter in which I have taken any interest at all, is one not easy of solution. Every farm boy knows that grain bins attract weevils, and studies of entomologists show that weevils are prevalent on farms everywhere in this country. While weevils have always been pests, it must be realized that Government price-support programs have encouraged the production of grain in excess of the country's needs, and, therefore, operate to build up large stocks of grain on farms, thus intensifying the weevil problem. Also, it is worthwhile to notice that fossilized weevils far antedate any known evidence of man himself. The weevil is not to be taken lightly.

The particular weevil problem presented is not one of destroying live weevils crawling on the surface of the grain, but one which requires the determination of internal infestation. The weevil bores a hole in the wheat kernel for the purpose of laying an egg, which in due time develops into a larva, which feeds on the wheat, finally emerging as an adult weevil. The infested wheat shows no outward sign whatever of the existence of the weevil, and no practical test has been devised to discover its presence. The hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry demonstrated that the Food and Drug Administration has not been able to devise any reliable, practical test, and it is upon this point that the discussion of the matter has largely proceeded.

The announced purpose of the Food and Drug Administration is to divert all insect-infested wheat to animal feed, a process which would result in a reduction of the price to the farmer of approximately 60 cents per bushel, and this is suggested as a means of forcing the farmer to install sanitary bins and keep them fumigated. This may be a commendable objective, given time within which the farmer can meet it, but on the basis of present-day conditions it appears distinctly unfair to the farmer and would mean a substantial economic loss to the people of my State. The practice of storing wheat is a very old one, and farmers have not heretofore been obliged to consider any enforcement of the Food and Drug Administration in this drastic manner. In my opinion, before they are called upon to meet such a plan, they should be given an opportunity to spend the necessary money to acquire proper bins and to plan the necessary substantial investment in fumigants. Moreover, it seems to me that the Department of Agriculture should be charged with the duty of educating farmers in that direction, a process which obviously would require a number of years. At this time the department is not ready with any program of the kind and has no funds with which to promote one.

In my State there are more than 1,700 country elevators which receive grain from farmers. Under the proposed plan of the Food and Drug Administration they would be expected to examine all wheat purchased for evidence of internal insect infestation. As I have said, no plan has yet been devised which will reveal this contamination. A tentative plan offered by Food and Drug Administration required the examination of a sample of 100 grams of wheat containing some 4,000 berries. The Administration said that if as many as three berries showed evidence of exit by weevils, the whole lot should be sold as livestock feed. This test requires upward of 30 minutes, is variable and uncertain, and is not regarded as practical, as the evidence before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry showed. One of the purposes of the requested postponement was to allow time within which to develop some means of determining the presence of insect infestation with reasonable certainty and with reasonable speed.

Upon inquiry the Food and Drug Administration said that the amount of wheat in the country which might be affected by internal insect infestation would not exceed 5 percent. The information presented to us was that far more than this amount would be involved. Whatever the amount might be, the effect would be to compel a large economic loss and to subject buyers and sellers to a high degree of uncertainty in their business operations.

I read from pages 30 and 31 of the hearings before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Senator SCHOEPPEL. Mr. McArthur, on that very point, I am just sure that you are right, and I have this fear: That unless we get a classification or a modification of the general

concept as it is prevailing over the country now in the grain trades, from the producers' angle, that in this next crop they are going to be rushing that wheat right on in, they are not going to take the chances, and I am afraid of gluts in the market and you people are the ones who are going to get additional burdens placed on you if we go through with this program.

That is the thing that I see as a serious impact on this. Again I say it goes primarily, of course, to phase 2, which would be the insect damage, and there would be a hesitancy on the part of farmers holding it any longer than possible, certainly on the country elevator operator who has got storage capacity—he is going to be a little skittish about it. That is the very thing that I am very seriously concerned about.

Mr. McARTHUR. Senator, I think you are absolutely right. We don't want to delay this program, but I think that in the long run we can reach the objective quicker. As I have stated, in the work that we have done through our inspections, both at the country and the terminal level, reinspection, handling of deliveries—we are growing in experience on that and we will be able to do a better job. You see we are dealing with nearly all the elevators that handle grain, whereas Food and Drug only spot checks.

We have done a great deal toward better farm storage, and we have some work in progress now in the matter of aeration of grain in bins, and so forth, which I think will help greatly in the future, and I think going on as we are we will certainly keep emphasis on the objectives of this program and get better storage at the farm level and help get the warehouses in better shape for handling it.

For those reasons we feel that the seizure feature of this insect infestation thing ought to be postponed until we can progress further along this line.

The Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act is so severe in its application that whatever the amount of insect-infested wheat might be, it could not legally be shipped out of the borders of my State, because the law forbids the interstate transportation of wheat which might be deemed filthy, and in the opinion of the Food and Drug Administration insect-infested wheat is filthy. Moreover, the law is such that the mere holding of such wheat is made an offense, so if the program of the Food and Drug Administration had been put in effect, everyone who shipped in interstate commerce or merely held insect-infested wheat would be in violation of the law. Any law as strict as this, making bootleggers of honest businessmen who happen to come in possession of this wheat, will not have the support of public sentiment.

In my opinion, the whole plan of the Food and Drug Administration with reference to wheat, proceeds upon a fundamentally sound basis. The purpose of the act is to assure the consumer wholesome foods, which are not in anywise deleterious to health. Actually, under present practice, the flour mills exercise a high degree of selectivity in buying the wheat they will grind. They have expert buyers of wheat, they have laboratory and X-ray equipment to examine the wheat, and they are far better situated to cull out and use proper wheat than anyone else along the chain of distribution from the farmer on. They have also the mechanical means to remove most of the relatively small amount of contamination in any wheat they buy.

Insect infestation of the kind I have described shows in flour as minute fragments, so small in size that they have passed through 30 siftings of silk in the milling process and can be found only with the aid of a microscope, and then only after washing the flour away from the fragments. It was conceded by the Deputy Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration at the hearing before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that any amount of such fragments in the flour would not be in any degree harmful to the health of the consumer. It is estimated that 10 such fragments which may be present after 30 siftings of silk would be of the magnitude of 1 to 7½ million parts of flour. Therefore, it is obvious that whatever small amount of contamination may possibly exist in flour is infinitesimally small, is not in any sense harmful to health and cannot be perceived by any human sense.

During the hearings, I asked Mr. Lerrick, Deputy Commissioner, Food and Drug Administration, whether the presence of insect infestation was detrimental to the health of the consumer. Mr. Lerrick's reply was:

I do not think so. I think it is an esthetic problem.

This is what Mr. William McArthur, Deputy Director of Grain Branch, PMA, Department of Agriculture, had to say:

Mr. Chairman, again personally speaking, I have been around this world about 66 years. I have never suffered any injurious effects from eating bread and I don't know of anybody else who has.

I surmise this program is based largely on esthetic reasons. I think \$25 million is a lot of money for CCC to lose carrying out such a program. I wonder if we do not kind of lose our perspective.

I might illustrate it this way: Two or three years ago, my wife and I went down to Hot Springs, Ark., for a week's vacation, enjoyed the baths and so forth until we went to a good-looking restaurant one night for dinner. My wife saw one of those beautiful lemon chiffon pies, or whatever it is, and had a piece of it. In less than 2 hours she was the sickest person you ever saw. I rushed down to the drugstore and told the druggist about what the trouble was. "Did she have some lemon chiffon pie?" I said, "Yes." He said, "That's not unusual. If one fly hits a pie, it really creates dynamite." He goes back and gets a bottle of medicine. He said, "We keep this in stock for this purpose. Take it home." It was effective.

Apparently one fly on a chiffon pie can create more distress than all the insects on a million bushels of wheat. That is my personal reaction to this program.

It is argued with much force by the grain trade that the purpose of the act can be better achieved by applying its enforcement at the mill level rather than by attempting to go back to the farmer and the small country elevator. This is particularly so in view of the very limited number of inspectors available to the Food and Drug Administration for all the purposes of the act. The most economical and most efficient method of enforcement would be to apply it at the mill level.

With these facts before us, members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry heard representations of the Department of Agriculture with refer-

ence to their problem in the handling of hundreds of millions of bushels of wheat which would be subject to examination and seizure by the Food and Drug Administration, and also representatives of the grain trade who had virtually the same problem, and concluded that consideration should be given to a more practical enforcement of the act than that adopted by Food and Drug Administration. Out of numerous conferences between these groups and Food and Drug Administration there was developed an understanding that enforcement of the act with reference to insect infestation of wheat should be set aside for the present, pending a more thorough study by all concerned of the problems involved, with a view to ascertaining a practicable test for infestation, and also a more workable plan of enforcement. To implement this understanding it was arranged that a committee of 15 be created, of which 2 members would represent the Department of Agriculture, 2 members the Food and Drug Administration, 2 would be nutrition experts, 4 would be entomologists from recognized agricultural colleges, and 5 would be representatives of the grain trade. Thus the thought was that by the cooperation of all concerned a practical and workable enforcement program could be developed.

This action does not mean that the purpose of the act will not be fulfilled. In the meantime, the Food and Drug Administration will proceed with the enforcement of phase one, directed to improving the sanitation of grain elevators and the enforcement of the act with reference to flour mills and with reference to the flour they produce, so that nothing will have been lost in the interests of the consumer.

In closing, I wish to say that Mrs. Hobby, Secretary of the new Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, is to be commended upon the practical, common-sense approach she has taken with respect to this difficult and complicated problem. The country is fortunate in having a Secretary with the vision and sound judgment she has displayed in working out this problem.

FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to Senate bill 690, a bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years, and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes, and ask to have it printed and lie on the table until such time as I call it up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AIRMAIL SUBSIDY SEPARATION—REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 10

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] made a statement concerning the airmail subsidy separation, Reorganization Plan No. 10. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by the Senator from Massachusetts be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR KENNEDY ON AIR MAIL SUBSIDY SEPARATION, REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 10

Reorganization Plan No. 10 does not accomplish an effective separation of the hidden airline subsidies from mail pay as called for by the Hoover Commission and other groups interested in governmental reform.

1. Cost standard: The Post Office and the taxpayers are not sufficiently protected from having to pay to the airlines more than the cost of mail services actually rendered. As President Eisenhower himself has noted, we need "an amendment of the Civil Aeronautics Act to provide specifically that compensatory rates for mail transportation should be based upon the cost of rendering mail service, plus a fair return." Such an amendment is not, and indeed cannot, be accomplished by an executive reorganization plan, and requires legislation by the Congress.

2. Congressional control of subsidies: Instead of transferring control of subsidies from CAB to the Congress, Reorganization Plan No. 10 simply transfers the payment of these subsidies from Post Office to CAB. In President Eisenhower's own words, the reorganization plan will not "change the aggregate amount of revenue" to be paid to the airlines. By leaving the CAB with some authority to continue to obligate money for subsidies for airlines without action directly by Congress, Reorganization Plan No. 10 fails to give the taxpayers, through their elected representatives in the Congress, an opportunity to exercise influence in the amount to be given to the airlines. By contrast, the Senate Appropriations Committee in its reports by Mr. CORDON (S. Rept. 1389, 80th Cong.) and by Mr. MAYBANK (S. Rept. 310, 81st Cong.) recommended that the CAB should be unable to obligate money for subsidizing airlines except after express appropriation by Congress, and therefore, under legislation now pending, the taxpayers would have a chance to reduce some of the \$80 million per year now being spent in subsidizing privately owned airlines.

True airmail subsidy separation requires legislation to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and this reform is not and cannot be done by Reorganization Plan No. 10.

There are now pending before Congress bills which would make an effective separation: S. 1360, introduced by myself and Senators AIKEN, CLEMENTS, COOPER, CORDON, DOUGLAS, FERGUSON, GILLETTE, HENNINGS, HUMPHREY, IVES, JACKSON, JOHNSTON of South Carolina, KEFAUVER, KILGORE, LANGER, LEHMAN, MANSFIELD, MAYBANK, MUNDT, MURRAY, SCHOEPPEL, SMITH of New Jersey, and SPARKMAN; and also companion bills H. R. 131 by Representative HESELTON, Republican, Massachusetts, and H. R. 4222 by Representative ROONEY, Democrat, New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I make note of the fact that I am a co-sponsor of the bill known as Senate bill 1360, introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts, along with many other cosponsors. The purpose of our bill is to separate, by legislative action, the air-

line subsidies from the Post Office Department and make them very obvious and visible, through direct payments, so that the public and the Congress may know exactly the amount of the subsidy. I believe the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts points up the weaknesses in the reorganization plan. It makes note of the fact that Reorganization Plan No. 10 is an attempt by the President, under his reorganization authority, to meet this very difficult problem.

WHAT RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP MEANS—ADDRESS BY CAROL ANN BJORNSTAB

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech entitled "What Responsible Citizenship Means to Me" by Carol Ann Bjornstab, Belview, Minn., be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Miss Bjornstab's speech won first prize in a 4-H speaking contest.

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

WHAT RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP MEANS TO ME
(By Carol Ann Bjornstad)

Responsible citizenship is a phrase which can embrace many meanings. It can mean a heavy burden of fear and distrust which demands from the individual every ounce of strength and every waking moment of thought for a state in which he has no part. This is its meaning to a Russian, or a Czechoslovakian, or a Hungarian citizen of today, and it is based upon only one, powerful element—fear!

But responsible American citizenship is characterized by many things. It finds its primary strength in the fact that it is conceived in the liberty of a free people, and is expressed in the lives and acts of its people. For responsible citizenship means more than merely living up to the stipulated duties of the law. It must be a part of each of us; a force which leads us to form within ourselves the standards of morals and conduct which correspond with the law and are in harmony with the median of public opinion. These standards are the ones which will not let us exceed the speed limit on a lonely road, or claim too many tax deductions, or claim a non-existent illness to avoid jury duty. They are the mores which lead a nation as a whole to respect the ancient laws of behavior preserved through religion—religion still unsullied by the purge of the Iron Curtain.

High among these standards should be a firm conviction against intolerance. Do you recall the time in the Christmas play when a colored boy played the part of one of the Three Kings? Those titters which filled the hall belied the Christmas spirit, as most people forgot that one of the Wise Men was indeed colored. What did you do then? And remember the rumor that spread like wildfire through town? You know the one I mean. The story that the new doctor was sponsoring wild parties and fed the teenagers narcotics. You really intended to investigate, I recall, but you were caught up in the action so quickly that by the time the stories were disproved a man's reputation was ruined and he had left to rebuild his life somewhere else. He was Jewish. In Russia just recently six Jewish doctors were accused of killing top Russian leaders in the course of practice. Other Jews have been persecuted unmercifully. A shocking parallel, isn't it? In a country such as ours, whose very foundation has been built on a mixture of people of many races, creeds,

colors, and nationalities, we cannot afford this type of injustice. In our responsibilities to our Nation we are dutybound to uphold the rights of all the people, for without any one minority group we would find ourselves weakened to such a point as to seriously endanger those remaining. Responsible citizenship—citizenship responsible to all the people.

The first, and all too often only, thought at the mention of a citizen's duty is of the importance of voting. But I seem to recall a certain election day on which it rained, and you sat peering from your window, pitying all those who had to brave the storm in order to vote. How silly, you thought, for it was only a town election, after all. When the bond issue was passed, however, contrary to the good of the town, many felt, you were the first to complain, weren't you? And didn't you feel a little foolish when, on looking over the ballot at the presidential election, you realized that you didn't even know who was running for Congress from your district, much less who to vote for. Perhaps you'll remember next time to read the newspapers and listen to those campaign speeches which replaced your favorite mystery program. How much easier it must be for the Russian peasant to vote. He has only to go to the polls; no decisions for him.

Voting is the most influential means we have of participating in our Government. We must exercise this responsibility. But voting without knowing what the issues are or which candidate most closely matches our own ideals in government is the surest way possible of someday being able to have the same convenience in voting as that of the Russian peasant.

Even intelligent voting, however, loses some of its effectiveness if it is not followed up with another vital duty. This is the exercising of the rights and powers we as individuals hold and prize: The petition circulated to improve the town sidewalk, the letter of protest or approval sent to your Congressman, the voice raised in disagreement at a meeting, the assertion of an opinion even though it may be in the minority—all these things so peculiar to the way of life we enjoy and must preserve.

This, then, is what responsible citizenship means to me: The facility of a free people to change the course of history through exercising the rights and duties of a citizenship which was born on the battlefields of protest against tyranny. It is life itself under our democracy, to be lived with kindness, charity, and understanding. It is pride. It is, ultimately, drawing together the threads of our ideals and actions toward the realization of one goal: "That this government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

RECOMMENDATIONS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN AID LEGISLATION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation testified before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations during our discussion and hearings on mutual aid and the mutual-security program.

I was very much impressed by the testimony of the American Farm Bureau Federation representatives. Fortunately I was able to obtain from them a summary of the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation relative to foreign-aid legislation. I point out that these recommendations are worthy of the fullest consideration of the Congress. I invite the attention

of Senators in particular to recommendation No. 5, which reads as follows:

Utilization of excessive United States stockpiles of farm products to further objectives of mutual security program. We recommend consideration be given to developing a sound program to utilize up to a billion dollars of CCC stockpiles of farm commodities to reinforce United States mutual security program, by authorizing sale of these commodities through private trade in cooperating countries at maximum prices the commodities will bring in the market. The proceeds of such sales in local currencies could be used to reinforce the mutual security program by providing capital for production and trade among all cooperating Nations. We emphasize that participation in this program would be entirely voluntary and by mutual agreement between participating countries and United States and would be administered through the regular process of this program. The Federation has consistently opposed the rigid high price supports without regard to demand, which lead to the accumulation of dangerously high agricultural stocks and we have also consistently opposed the use of foreign aid programs to unload farm surpluses created by unwise domestic policies. These surpluses which might have been avoided by a flexible price support program are a reality. They create a major problem which must be dealt with. We believe a sound program can be developed to utilize these stockpiles in a way that will reinforce the mutual security program.

Mr. President, I disagree with the American Farm Bureau Federation's comments on rigid high price supports. I support the high price support philosophy. However, I do feel that its efforts toward the utilization of our stockpiles of surplus commodities are very commendable. I have asked the Mutual Security Administrator, Mr. Stassen, to present to our committee some helpful suggestions as to how this might best be done. I am sure that if we devote our attention to the problem and apply our minds we can make a revision in the mutual security authorization which will provide ways and means for utilization of United States stockpiles of farm commodities.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary of the recommendations of the American Farm Bureau Federation be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS OF AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION ON FOREIGN AID LEGISLATION

LONG-RANGE RECOMMENDATION

1. Bipartisan Commission on Foreign Economic Policies, to be established by congressional joint resolution, to study and prepare overall recommendations concerning United States foreign economic policies, foreign-aid programs, foreign-trade policies, and other related programs, and to recommend policies and legislation to harmonize overall United States domestic and foreign economic policies with our national security objectives. We are gratified that the President has recommended such a commission and the Senate has passed Senate Joint Resolution 78 authorizing it. We hope the House will also give it early approval.

INTERIM RECOMMENDATIONS

Pending the completion of the work of this commission and the implementation of its recommendations, we believe many things

can be done to improve the effectiveness of the mutual security program and to cope with our foreign-trade problems.

The following interim recommendations have been proposed by the AFBF:

2. Military aid: Greater emphasis should be placed on offshore procurement and extending dollar aid to other countries to build up their own capacity to defend themselves instead of the United States furnishing most of its military aid in the form of equipment produced in the United States. This change will not only strengthen their ability to defend themselves, but the dollars supplied for this purpose will help relieve the shortage of dollars until more basic steps can be taken to close the dollar gap.

3. Mutually profitable trade, not aid: Mutual security program should be directed primarily to helping develop a free world economy; it should emphasize the expansion of mutually profitable trade instead of continued dependence on aid; and primary reliance should be placed on encouraging private capital and expanding trade to do this job.

4. Revision of policy on counterpart funds: Instead of present system, the United States should accept payment for goods made available through mutual security program in the most convertible currencies and use these currencies for—

(1) Loans to credit institutions in participating countries to increase production facilities and encourage international trade.

(2) Payment of United States obligations for cooperative defense establishments, maintenance of United States troops abroad, stockpiling of strategic materials, and other United States Government expenditures abroad. This would give much more flexibility than the present method of generating and utilizing counterpart funds and make it possible to focus aid on projects that will make maximum contribution to objectives of program.

5. Utilization of excessive United States stockpiles of farm products to further objectives of Mutual Security Program: We recommend consideration be given to developing a sound program to utilize up to a billion dollars of CCC stockpiles of farm commodities to reinforce United States Mutual Security Program by authorizing sale of these commodities through private trade in cooperating countries at maximum prices the commodities will bring in the market. The proceeds of such sales in local currencies could be used to reinforce the Mutual Security Program by providing capital for production and trade among all cooperating nations. We emphasize that participation in this program would be entirely voluntary and by mutual agreement between participating countries and United States and would be administered through the regular process of this program. The federation has consistently opposed the rigid high price supports without regard to demand, which lead to the accumulation of dangerously high agricultural stocks and we have also consistently opposed the use of foreign aid programs to unload farm surpluses created by unwise domestic policies. These surpluses which might have been avoided by a flexible price support program are a reality. They create a major problem which must be dealt with. We believe a sound program can be developed to utilize these stockpiles in a way that will reinforce the Mutual Security Program.

6. Extension of the Trade Agreements Act for another year, without amendments, pending recommendations of proposed bipartisan commission.

7. Enactment of legislation to simplify customs regulations and procedures.

8. Modification of "Buy American" legislation to enable friendly nations to increase their dollar earnings.

9. Immediate action to be taken to negotiate reductions reciprocally of United States

duties in excess of 25 percent ad valorem and to encourage further reductions in trade barriers among all cooperating nations.

10. Assistance through credit by the Export-Import Bank to promote the expansion of international private trade where private credit is not available at reasonable rates.

11. Ratification of the revised International Wheat Agreement.

12. Technical-assistance program can make important contributions to attaining the objectives of the mutual security program.

(a) It should be designed to offer underdeveloped and friendly nations technical training and demonstrational services. It should aid and facilitate economic development and should not be used as a vehicle for getting economic aid.

(b) Technical-assistance program should be administered by one agency with its own identity and funds. Placing it under general supervision of Director of Mutual Security will permit coordination of all technical-assistance programs, but this program should be kept separate from military aid programs.

(c) Policy should be continued and expanded of utilizing other qualified agencies such as the United States Department of Agriculture and its foreign agricultural service, the land-grant colleges, etc., in planning and carrying out the technical-assistance program in agriculture.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last week President Eisenhower took what must have been an interesting and enlightening tour of the great agricultural research center operated by the Department of Agriculture out at Beltsville, Md.

The New York Times, of Wednesday, May 27, carried a particularly interesting account of that visit, written by William M. Blair and headed "President Eisenhower Becomes a Farm Boy for a Day." I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT EISENHOWER BECOMES A FARM BOY FOR A DAY

(By William M. Blair)

BELTSVILLE, Md., May 26.—President Eisenhower went out to the American people's farm today, saw and ate some of the products of agricultural research, and recalled a campaign promise.

After partaking of a heaping plate of roast beef, ham, potato salad, peas, mushrooms, and carrot sticks, topped off with strawberry pie, he observed:

"I read in the papers of making a lot of promises that I did not make. But I did make one which shows I'm not as stupid as I sometimes appear. That was that we needed more research."

He went on to tell a small group of the country's top agricultural scientists and guests gathered at the Department of Agriculture's research center here that more work was needed in this field because it was better than direct help. Furthermore, he said, it brought developments that gave all the people a better standard of living and a better life.

"Keep up the good work," he urged the scientists. And, in a statement directed at Congress, he concluded: "Anybody who wants to limit the very modest appropriation for research better come out and see Beltsville before they vote."

HE GETS SOME INFORMATION

It was a rapid visit that the President made to the sprawling 12,000-acre agricultural research center 12 miles north of Wash-

ington, bordered on the west by United States Highway No. 1 and on the east by the Patuxent River. He was the first President to inspect the center, site of some of the major developments in all lines of farm products.

The President picked up a lot of information on insect and plant disease control, Holstein cow breeding and heat-resistant cattle and a new meat-type hog. He also picked up a smear of aluminum paint when he leaned against a freshly painted cow stanchion. He calmly wiped it off with a handkerchief.

Standing before an electronic device that sorted eggs by color, the President's eyes popped.

"It's amazing," he said to Ezra Taft Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, who accompanied him on the tour.

"I doubt if you could do better, Mr. President," Dr. T. C. Byerly of the Bureau of Animal Industry remarked.

"I'll bet he could do as well," Secretary Benson declared.

FISHING APPARENTLY BAD

His fishing luck last Saturday at Camp David, the Maryland retreat that President Roosevelt called Shangri-La, must have been bad. General Eisenhower, no mean hand with a fly rod, asked Dr. Avery S. Hoyt, Chief of the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, what was being done to control locusts. Cicadas, commonly called 17-year locusts, abound this year in the Washington area. Told that the locusts were not worth bothering with, the President smiled wryly and commented:

"It's getting bad when the trout are so full of locusts they won't bite."

Dr. Hoyt presented him with a small piece of shale from the Miocene period bearing the fossil remains of a grasshopper caught laying eggs. The shale, from Colorado, was about 20 million years old, Dr. Hoyt estimated.

Looking over the cattle, crossbreeds of Red Sindhi and Jersey to resist heat in tropical climates, the President asked, "When are you going to get one that resists hoof and mouth disease?" That reminded him, he said, that when "the doctors compliment me on my health I always ask, 'When are you going to cure the common cold?'"

Five Holsteins, which gave 22 tons of milk between January 1 and April 30, brought the rufous remark, "I had a heifer I paid \$3,500 for, and she died when she gave birth to a calf." That was a heifer for his farm near Gettysburg, Pa., which he owned with George E. Allen, often called the White House jester in the Truman administration. Mr. Allen now rents the farm from President Eisenhower, with their partnership dissolved.

Secretary Benson recalled he once had milked by machine 33 cows on his Utah farm. The President grimaced as he said that down on the farm "I hated milking cows most of all."

DRESSES MADE OF LARD

At the buffet-style luncheon in the center's Log Cabin, the cafeteria for employees, the President watched young women employees model dresses, coats, and raincoats made with inedible animal fats and corn, and flowered afternoon frocks made from cotton fertilizer sacks.

He fingered the fabrics and found out that 30 to 35 percent of the weight of the raincoats which sell for \$1.98 was lard.

He evoked laughter when he asked Frank Teuton, editor of the Bureau of Agriculture and Industrial Chemistry, if "we could make a raincoat out of butter." Butter is one of the administration's surplus headaches under the Federal farm price support system.

An offer of seconds on the food brought his hands up and an expression of mock horror as he said, "No, no, no." He also passed up the candy but slipped a piece of hot-weather chocolate fudge into his coat pocket.

On the way out, he paused to look at powdered eggs, recalling he was once cursing the

eggs of World War II when an Army quartermaster officer gave him some of the new products. "Tasted good," he said.

As Mr. Teuton recalled his joining the Agriculture Department when the President's brother, Milton, now president of the Pennsylvania State College, was in the Department, the President's eyes lit up.

"Milt comes down and holds my hand every once in a while," he remarked.

"I must tell you a story," he continued.

"A Congressman was telling me he was sorry Milton wasn't in the Government. I said, 'You don't need to sell Milton to me. If it wasn't for his name, he would have a high governmental position.' Well, the Congressman felt so strongly about it that later he wrote me a letter in which he said I had given such an inconsequential reason for keeping Milton out of the Government.

"Then he added at the end that 'Milton was a well-known authority in his field when you were nothing but a major in the Army.'"

Like any dutiful husband, the President picked up samples of various specialty foods, developed for the military forces and as new outlets for farm products, to take home to the White House for Mrs. Eisenhower.

Before he went home, however, the President stopped off for a round of golf at the Burning Tree Club.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a few of President Eisenhower's remarks quoted in the article. Mr. Blair quotes the President as saying:

I read in the papers of making a lot of promises that I did not make. But I did make one which shows I'm not as stupid as I sometimes appear. That was that we needed more research.

I quote further from the article:

He went on to tell a small group of the country's top agricultural scientists and guests gathered at the Department of Agriculture's research center here that more work was needed in this field because it was better than direct help.

"Keep up the good work," he urged the scientists. And, in a statement directed at Congress, he concluded: "Anybody who wants to limit the very modest appropriation for research better come out and see Beltsville before they vote."

I respectfully suggest to President Eisenhower that he might be better informed about what his own lieutenants are doing contrary to his publicly expressed views, both in the campaign and since.

I find it difficult to reconcile the President's observations with the cold, hard facts that his administration's revised budget estimates provided for a reduction of \$2,347,900 in funds for agricultural research below the level proposed by the original Democratic budget—a slash that has since been cut even further by the Republican-controlled House committee to a total reduction of \$3,636,563 in this important work of which the President says we need more, rather than less.

I find extremely interesting his inquiry to officials of the Bureau of Animal Industry about cattle research—"When are you going to get one that resists hoof and mouth disease?"—in view of his administration's recommendation that funds for animal research be slashed 4 percent, and funds for animal-disease control and eradication be slashed 6 percent below the Truman budget. I cannot help observing that the Republican-controlled House appropriation commit-

tee cut funds for animal research still further, to 10 percent below the original estimates. I am glad the House increased the amounts for animal-disease control and eradication above what the Eisenhower administration requested, until they are now only 5 percent below the Democratic budget, but still below the actual amounts allocated for this important work in 1953.

I am sure many farmers who have been trying to get rid of brucellosis will sympathize with the President's comment, "I had a heifer I paid \$3,500 for and she died when she gave birth to a calf." I do not think they will be so sympathetic, however, over Secretary of Agriculture Benson's recommendation for reduction in indemnity payments for brucellosis control.

I was interested in the concern the President is evidently feeling about butter, in view of his remarks in the article. I cannot help wondering if he has been fully apprised of the fact that this budget includes a sharp slash from original estimates for research on dairy products, work which would have included finding out about the chemical composition of milk, improving evaporated milk, developing usefulness of milk solids, and other steps which would keep butter from glutting the market by enabling farmers to sell it more cheaply without loss to themselves.

Mr. President, perhaps I should go on right down the line in the Department of Agriculture's new budget estimates for research. But instead I shall quote just very briefly from the statement of Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in the House, on March 26, when he said:

Recognizing the very important part research has played in the development of agriculture, and the contribution it can make in solving many of the immediate and long-range problems facing agriculture today, an attempt has been made to avoid any substantial reductions in this essential work.

That is quite an example of lip service to research in the same breath with an announcement of reductions ahead.

In view of the many public addresses and utterances of the Secretary of Agriculture about the importance of research, and the need for greater dependence upon research, I must say he has a rather unusual way of exemplifying his beliefs, if this is any example.

I hope the President will not have the joy taken out of his recent Beltsville visit, when he learns his administration is proposing to hold down much-needed research work, rather than expand it, as most of us, apparently including the President, desire.

I can understand the need of the President to have lieutenants prepare his agricultural campaign speeches, and I can understand his need now to have lieutenants carry out his agricultural policies. My only suggestion is that there might be less conflict and more uniformity of objectives if the same lieutenants were used for both.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its

clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bill and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 1307. An act to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as Aid to Korea Week.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, under the previous order of the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn to Monday, June 8.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 8, 1953, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4 (legislative day of May 28), 1953:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Samuel C. Waugh, of Nebraska, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Frank A. Southard, Jr., of New York, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Llewellyn E. Thompson, Jr., of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria, and to be also United States High Commissioner for Austria.

James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Syria.

Harold Shantz, of New York, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Rumania.

SMALL DEFENSE PLANTS ADMINISTRATION

William D. Mitchell, of Colorado, to be Administrator, Small Defense Plants Administration.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1953

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful and gracious God, we thank Thee for the privilege and power of prayer in these strange and disturbing days when we are encountering gigantic tasks which baffle our understanding.

We humbly confess that we cannot find the right answer to our many perplexing problems without the interpreting light and guidance of Thy divine spirit.

We rejoice that Thou art willing and able to gird us with strength to overcome all our fears and frustrations and to make our hearts the sanctuaries of Thy peace.

Give us wisdom and courage as we strive to emancipate our divided and distracted civilization from everything

that darkens its faith and obscures its hope.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NARCOTICS

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MR. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues again House Joint Resolution 240, introduced by me, which would close the Mexican border to unescorted minors. I do this because the epidemic of narcotics addiction among teen-agers, particularly in southern California, but in all of the States along the Mexican border, is serious. It needs the attention not only of the States who are doing all they possibly can, but also of the Federal Government in cooperating to close the border and cut off this source of illegal narcotics to our teen-agers. In making this statement and in introducing the legislation I wish to emphasize that in no way does it affect or cast aspersions on the Government of Mexico. It is a joint problem between the United States and Mexico, and we seek a joint cooperative solution of it.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

MR. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to address the House for 45 minutes on Monday next, following any special orders heretofore entered.

MRS. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House today for 15 minutes, following any special orders heretofore entered.

OREGON WILDCROSS BLACKBERRY JAM

MR. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

MR. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, my district, located in the heart of the Willamette Valley in Oregon, is noted for its wonderful climate and productive soil, which combine to make it a garden spot for the production of fruits, berries, and vegetables.

Two of my constituents, Mr. Harvey Clubb and Mr. A. W. O'Connell, are engaged in the operation of a berry farm and the production of a delicious berry known as the wildcross blackberry, which they and associated farmers are marketing through O'Connell's Berry Farm, Pleasant Valley, Gresham, Oreg., as wildcross blackberry jam. This delightful food product is made from a berry developed by Mr. O'Connell, which is a cross between the delicious wild Oregon

blackberry and the domestic boysenberry.

Mr. Clubb and Mr. O'Connell have sent to me a consignment of this delicious product and have asked me to deliver samples of this jam to my colleagues in Congress, which I am doing today. I have caused to be placed on the tables in the House Restaurant a sufficient quantity of this very delectable jam for every Member to have the opportunity to sample it.

Over 100 years ago my forebears migrated to this garden spot of America, the Willamette Valley, and down through the years they and their descendants have participated in the growth and development of this great area. I am indeed happy to be able to have all of you sample one of the many delightful products which we produce in the Pacific Northwest.

I am including as a part of these remarks a short description of the development of the wildcross blackberry jam, given in the story entitled "The Story of the Bees, the Bears, the Berries," which is as follows:

THE STORY OF THE BEES, THE BEARS, THE BERRIES

Kushnowaga, chief of the Mid Columbia Indians, sat on his mat in front of his teepee on the hillside, pondering speculatively on the movement of covered wagons that crossed the rocks of Wy-um far below. The year was 1855. Kushnowaga was 22 years old, precociously young for a medicine man of such great wisdom.

He thoughtfully inhaled the delicate fumes of Kini-kinick from the long amber-colored pipe. First, he gave the strange white visitors (a slight understatement) the Quinote salmon to give them strong bones. That was the greatest gift that Wantatonka (the Great Spirit) gave to man.

Wantatonka also gave love to the red man so that people could live in friendly fashion with each other but first he gave the symbolic fruit of love to the black-furred people which Yakimahs call De Yun, the white man's bear. Behind all this is a spirit of universal good will.

The fruit he gave the bears, the Yakimahs called Olallie De Yun, the blackberry of the bears, and the ancient Romans called it Rubus Ursinus, which means the same thing in Latin as any high-school student knows.

So the Great Spirit gave the berry to the bears who shared it with the Indians who shared it with Mr. O'Connell's granduncle, Mr. Clarence O'Connell, in 1872. Clarence shared it with his nephew Dennis O'Connell (Gresham Grower, of the 1890's) who shared it with Pleasant Valley's own Mr. A. W. O'Connell (no place else wants him).

Then the bees, and the birds as well, got into the act and an Italian bee flitted from a wild blackberry blossom, stung an outraged Mexican on the cheek. He lit on a boysenberry blossom on Mr. O'Connell's hillbilly patch on O'Connell Creek in Pleasant Valley. He sipped contentedly. He buzzed lazily. He fell asleep.

The pollen went to work, starting a chain reaction of atomic force.

A berry fruit formed. The seeds ripened and fell. Then the rains came, imbedding the seeds in the rich, warm earth, nurtured in the bosom of Mother Earth. The sun gave it life, and that is how O'Connell's wildcross blackberry was born in 1944 in Pleasant Valley.

The fruit of this glorious vine is reputedly delectable (good) on waffles or hotcakes and crisply fried ham with succulent mouthfuls of O'Connell's jam.

KUSHNOWAGA III.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

MR. DEANE asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

MR. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MR. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, having received unanimous consent of the House to extend and revise my remarks at this point, I want to correct what I am sure was an unintentional misstatement yesterday by my distinguished committee chairman of the House Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. In my remarks yesterday in support of my motion to discharge House Resolution 236, I clearly stated that I had requested my chairman to call our committee together for the purpose of acting on House Resolution 236, either favorably or unfavorably, and that he had refused to comply with my request. I reiterate my remarks on page 5999 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, Wednesday, June 3.

Following my argument yesterday on the motion, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], handling the debate across the aisle on the Republican side, in opposing the motion, said that since I was a member of the committee, if I wanted action, all I had to do was to make a motion that the committee report out my resolution or take action; that if I had done so, my motion would have been entertained and of course acted upon.

Surely, the gentleman from Michigan knows that I could not make a motion without a committee meeting and until yesterday, June 3, the date of my motion to discharge, the committee had not met since it concluded its hearings on House Resolution 236 on Monday, May 25. When the hearings were completed on May 25, Mr. RIEHLMAN, the acting chairman of the committee, and myself were the only members of the committee present. Obviously, without a quorum a motion for action on the resolution would have been useless. Not wanting to make a motion to discharge the committee unless it became absolutely necessary I waited patiently until Wednesday, May 27, for some notice from my chairman of a meeting of the committee to act on this resolution. During the House session that day my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] inquired on the floor of the House as to the status of House Resolution 236 before the Committee on Government Operations. He advised the Members of the House present, including my distinguished chairman, that if action was to be taken at all on the resolution affecting Reorganization Plan No. 2, it had to be taken not later than Wednesday, June 3. While the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]

did not direct his inquiry directly to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], I feel sure that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] heard same. Since he made no comment on the floor, I decided to confer with him personally. Consequently, just before adjournment that same day, Wednesday, May 27, 1 week before I made the motion to discharge, I crossed the aisle and asked the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] to call the committee together to report the resolution out. I explained to him that if our committee did not report the bill out, my only recourse naturally would be a motion to discharge the committee, in which event the Members of the House would have only 1 hour to debate that motion, whereas if the resolution were reported out, even though unfavorably, my motion would then be for consideration of the resolution on the floor, which would permit debate for an agreed upon period of time up to 10 hours. He refused to comply with my request.

On the following morning, Thursday, May 28, at about 10 a. m., I received a personal telephone call from my chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. He said he understood that I wanted the committee to meet to act upon House Resolution 236. I told him I did. He said, "Come over to my office and I will discuss it with you." I went to his office. We had a general discussion about the matter during which time I again asked him to call a committee meeting for action on the resolution. He said he was not going to call the committee together since the 10-day period had expired. I told him that, in my opinion, the fact that 10 days had expired made no difference since the hearings were begun before the 10 days had expired and since a motion to discharge the committee had not been made and that the committee could still report the resolution to the floor. He stated that he would not be here on Wednesday, June 3, and that if I would make my motion to discharge at that day's session, May 28, he would support my motion, but that he could not call the committee to act on the resolution.

Shortly after the session convened this same morning, May 28, I crossed the aisle again and advised the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that I did not think it would be fair to make a motion to discharge that day since so many Members on both sides of the aisle had left with the impression that it would not be made until the following Wednesday, June 3, the date suggested by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY]. He said, "Well, do what you want to. I might even make the motion myself today."

I am sure my distinguished chairman completely overlooked these conversations which I had with him in which I specifically requested that he call the committee together to take action on the resolution. I was in no position to be demanding, but I did humbly request such action.

Now the next meeting of the committee, following the closing of its hearings on House Resolution 236 on Monday, May 25, was yesterday, June 3, the day

I made my motion for discharge of the committee. That meeting was called for the purpose of considering H. R. 5228, introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER]. The entire morning was taken up in hearing testimony from the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER] and representatives from the General Accounting Office on H. R. 5228. Action on that resolution was completed just 2 or 3 minutes before the House session of yesterday convened. Obviously a motion at this particular meeting would have been useless and even if my chairman had changed his mind about acting on House Resolution 236, a report on the resolution could not have been filed early enough. Hence, my only alternative to enable the Members of the House to even consider the resolution indirectly was to move to discharge the committee from further consideration of it.

Mr. Speaker, I have given the facts. I have high regard for my distinguished chairman. I am sure, as I have already stated, that he must have overlooked the requests I made. I know he does not want to take advantage of a new Member by leaving an erroneous impression. I felt compelled to make this statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL INQUIRY

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the gentleman was talking about, because I was paying attention to something else, but if there is anything in the RECORD that I said which does not suit him or is inaccurate, I will be happy indeed to have him correct it, because I have the greatest admiration for him. I do not want to misquote him or make an inaccurate statement. I do not know what the gentleman was talking about.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

COSTS TO AMERICAN TAXPAYERS OF BUY-AMERICAN POLICY

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the competition between domestic and foreign firms on rebids to supply

the Chief Joseph Dam with generators reveals in no uncertain terms the cost to the American taxpayer over the last 20 years of the Buy American Act.

In its original bid December 3, 1952, Westinghouse Corp., the lowest domestic bidder, submitted a figure of \$4,966,363 as opposed to English Electric's low bid of \$4,406,493. The Defense Department called for rebids because of "variances in specifications." On the second round, after getting a good look at the competition, Westinghouse slashed its original price by \$666,541, and is the apparent low bidder with \$4,299,822. This very substantial cut of 14 percent is a fair measure of the subsidy that we, as taxpayers, have been granting domestic manufacturers under the Buy American Act.

There was comparatively little change in the rebids to supply transformers for Chief Joseph, with English Electric still the low bidder. If however, the Defense Department decides under the provisions of the Buy American Act to accept the bid of Maloney Electric Co., the lowest American bidder, it will have to pay more than 25 percent in excess of the low bid.

There is no question of quality having been reduced to permit a reduction in price on the rebids for generators. Because of the Defense Department's rejection of all original bids, the bidders obviously were more careful this time to meet specifications rigidly.

While the Buy American Act has been protecting the excessive profits of domestic manufacturers by imposing a superduty on top of the regular duty, it has deprived the consumer, that is the taxpayer, of the traditional benefits of competition that have made our economy strong. At a time when we seek economy in Government and the control of inflation, the Buy American Act is a luxury we cannot afford.

BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH] be given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 124th anniversary of the founding of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union and is the occasion for a display of faith by the members of all Protestant sects in Brooklyn which should be an inspiration to people all over the world. The day is marked by the closing of the public schools in Brooklyn and the event is most unique and without a counterpart anywhere in the world. Men, women, and children will proudly march in a parade marked by beautiful floats and banners with messages of good will. Thousands of children dressed in their Sunday best on a holiday of holiness and serious-minded men and women all in the line of march in a public display of their allegiance to God. The parade is reviewed by men and women prominent in local and national affairs. It is an

inspiring sight and a powerful force for good. Surely America and democracy will continue to flourish as long as such events occur.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question of the Speaker. I do not know whether it is a parliamentary inquiry, but I would like to ask if the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is going to make a 1-hour statement this afternoon particularly in regard to the so-called proposed cuts in veterans' hospitals. It is vital to all Members to know what is going to happen to the Veterans' Administration appropriation regarding hospitals, and everything else as a matter of fact. The cuts are very drastic.

Can the Speaker tell me if the gentleman is going to speak an hour on that subject this afternoon? I make that as a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentlewoman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the Speaker tell me if the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] will make a 1-hour speech this afternoon regarding increases for veterans' hospitals? According to the press this morning it is stated that the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] would talk for an hour.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no knowledge of what the gentleman from California is going to speak about. He has 1 hour to address the House. The Chair knows nothing about the newspaper comments.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But the Speaker perhaps would assume it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

REPAIR AND REHABILITATION OF PUBLIC AIRPORTS DAMAGED BY THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. WOLVERTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 35) to provide for the repair and rehabilitation of public airports damaged by the armed services during the present national emergency, to extend beyond June 30, 1953, the availability of previous appropriations for payment of claims under section 17 of the Federal Airport Act, and for other purposes, with amendments by the House, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. WOLVERTON, Mr. HINSHAW, Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. HARRIS.

OFFICIAL UNITED STATES MAPS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (S. Con. Res. 30) authorizing the printing of United States wall maps for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

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

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH W. LITTLE

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 253) for the relief of Mrs. Fay Little Boykin, daughter of Joseph W. Little, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives to Mrs. Fay Little Boykin, daughter of Joseph H. Little, late an employee of the House of Representatives, an amount equal to 6 months' salary at the rate he was receiving at the time of his death and an additional amount not to exceed \$350 toward defraying the funeral expenses of the said Joseph H. Little.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "Joseph H. Little" and insert "Joseph W. Little."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "Joseph H. Little" and insert "Joseph W. Little."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 266.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4406) to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on

the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], and yield myself such time as I may use.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, H. R. 4406 is based upon the request of the President in a state of the Union message—and more specifically requested in a special message to Congress on March 30, 1953—for legislation to provide for the creation of a commission to study and report on resolutions, solutions to many problems involving Federal relations with State and local governments, and the overlapping of jurisdictions and programs particularly in the fields of taxation and grants-in-aid.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on this side. I ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] if he has any requests for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have no requests for time. If the gentleman wishes to move the previous question I have no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question. The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the District of Columbia may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Allen, Calif.	Hart	Rains
Bailey	Heller	Regan
Barden	Herlong	Richards
Bolton,	Hollifield	Scott
Oliver P.	Jarman	Shafer
Brooks, La.	Jones, Mo.	Shelley
Burleson	Judd	Short
Bush	Kee	Shuford
Campbell	Kersten, Wis.	Sikes
Carlyle	Kilday	Small
Cederberg	Lovre	Sullivan
Chatham	Lucas	Teague
Chelf	Lyle	Thompson, La.
Chudoff	McCarthy	Tollefson
Clardy	McMillan	Tuck
Coudert	Martin, Iowa	Vinson
Dawson, Ill.	Mason	Vorys
Dempsey	Miller, N. Y.	Vursell
Dingell	Morrison	Wainwright
Durham	Mumma	Wampler
Fogarty	Nelson	Westland
Frelinghuysen	Passman	Wilson, Ind.
Gamble	Pelly	Yates
Gubser	Phillips	Zablocki
Gwinn	Poage	
Haley	Poulson	

THE SPEAKER. Three hundred and fifty-four Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 80. Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as Aid to Korea Week.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 117. An act to amend section 7 of the Flood Control Act of 1941 relating to the apportionment of moneys received on account of the leasing of lands acquired by the United States for flood-control purposes; and

S. 1739. An act to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had ordered that the Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. PASTORE, be appointed a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, vice the Senator from Texas, Mr. JOHNSON, resigned.

The message also announced that the Senate rescinded its action agreeing to House amendments to the bill (S. 1550) entitled "An act to authorize the President to prescribe the occasions upon which the uniform of any of the Armed Forces may be worn by persons honorably discharged therefrom."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the foregoing bill and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. RUSSELL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ESTABLISHING A COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4406) to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4406, with Mr. REECE of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

THE CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentlewoman from Indiana will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] for 30 minutes.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

THE CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Indiana is recognized.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to make a brief statement on the merits of H. R. 4406, which has as its purpose the establishment of a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I wish to congratulate our distinguished majority leader, my colleague from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] for his fine bill. I also wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of our full committee [Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan], who has introduced similar bills during the past several sessions. Many other Members who have introduced like proposals should also be complimented. These include former Member of Congress Mr. BOGGS of Delaware, Mr. COUDERT, Mr. SECREST, Mr. DAWSON, Mr. OSTERTAG, Mr. RAINS, Mr. MILLS, Mr. DONOHUE, and Mr. HARVEY.

No informed American will dispute the fact that we must be strong if we are to survive the long and trying struggle in which we are embroiled. We know that the strength of a democracy lies in the united strength of strong components, starting with the individual and including the city, the county, the State, and the Federal Government.

The development of strength stems from the exercise of initiative, freedom of action, and responsibility. It is best developed through self-reliance rather than dependence on others.

There has been a widespread misconception that actions to augment the general welfare necessarily stem from centralized Federal programs. The Federal Government now demands some 70 percent of all tax revenues. Only a few decades ago the States and local governments utilized the 70 percent and only 30 percent of total tax revenues was necessary for the Federal Government.

The widespread Federal programs, using the bulk of the tax money, have made the State and local governments dependent upon the Federal establishment.

For several years there has been a general nonpartisan move to realine Federal-State relationships. Congress recognized the need in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 when it provided for intergovernmental subcommittees in the Government Operations Committees. The Hoover Commission made specific recommendations on the subject. Numerous other bills have been introduced during the last few years with the same general objective in mind.

The President's splendid message of March 30, 1953, highlighted the need for action.

I wish to make a special point of the fact that there is a great waste when the Federal Government levies taxes on enterprises in the various States, counties, and municipalities, brings the tax money to Washington, so to speak, and then doles part of it back to the same States from whence it came. Undoubtedly more effective use could be made of the money if it were kept at the local level and spent for needs as seen by local officials. Necessary equipment and supplies could be purchased from the local industries, which, of course, must support the Federal Government in Washington.

During the hearings which were held by the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, we heard representatives from the American Municipal Association, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of County Officials, and the National Association of Manufacturers, and a representative of the mayor of San Francisco; also our colleagues, Mr. Halleck, Mr. Harvey, and Mr. Keating; our former colleague, Mr. O. K. Armstrong, and Senator Ferguson and Senator Hendrickson.

It is my opinion there is a genuine need for this Commission. This is a cooperative effort between the Federal Government and the State, county, and municipal governments. All interested segments will be represented on a Commission of 25 members. Each member will represent a genuinely interested constituency concerned with accomplishments. Some witnesses pointed out that it will be much easier to sell the final product if there has been genuine participation in the development of the recommendations by all parties concerned. The way to obtain real cooperation is to have real participation. This is the essence of representative government.

MR. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may need.

Mr. Chairman, it is with considerable reluctance and some trepidation that I come before you to oppose a measure which has been introduced by the distinguished majority leader of the House of Representatives, and, of course, which has been so ably presented to you by the distinguished chairman of my subcommittee. However, I think something must be said about the steps that we are starting to take with the passage of this type of legislation.

It seems to me that there is considerable danger in the entire approach to the legislative process of legislating by and through various commissions. At the hearing before our subcommittee, where the measure was originally considered, nearly every one of the members of that committee on both sides, majority as well as minority members, had some doubt as to the wisdom of this course. From the evidence presented and the statements that were made it occurred to me there were only two possible good reasons for the establishment of this Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The only reasons that struck me as having any particular merit were, first, that the Congress would be reluctant to appropriate sufficient funds to an appropriate committee or committees of Congress to make the type of study that is contemplated by this bill; and, secondly, it was felt a commission headed by distinguished persons throughout the United States might have more prestige in its findings and recommendations; that there might be more public support behind the findings and recommendations of such commission than there would be behind the findings and recommendations of any legislative committee of the House of Representatives or of the other body.

As to the first reason, that is, that we are more willing to appropriate money to

commissions which we cannot control, that, in my opinion, is really not a good reason at all. If a thoroughgoing study of this type is needed and is necessary, it seems to me we have appropriate committees already established in this Congress or if we do not feel that any one committee has complete jurisdiction over the entire subject matter we can establish a special committee to make this investigation and give it the funds that may be necessary to make the type of study that is apparently in the mind of the author.

As to the second reason, that is, the prestige that might be brought to recommendations by having very distinguished Americans serve on that Commission, it seems to me that is a two-edged sword. Some of the recommendations might be such that many of us in good conscience could not approve, but because of the prestige of the committee, because of the publicity that the Commission will receive in the press throughout the country, because of the public backing that it may get, we will find ourselves being subjected to pressures that may not be conducive to a proper consideration of the type of legislation that might come out of that Commission.

In addition, there are certain basic difficulties about the whole commission approach. I know many of the States, my own State of California, the State of New York, and other States, have adopted the philosophy of setting up special commissions to study legislative matters. Inevitably, because of the existence of the commission, there is the tendency not to consider legislation that should be considered and passed by the appropriate legislative committees. There is the tendency also to say, "Let us put it off until we get the report of the commission." There is the tendency also not to tackle the immediate problems that should be the concern of the Congress of the United States. I have a feeling that by the mere establishment of this Commission we are not going to be taking action on things that we should be considering at this and the next session of the Congress. Moreover, I think the Commission's findings, as I have already indicated, carry a disproportionate amount of weight.

Furthermore, where are we to stop? There are many other complicated problems that come before this House of Representatives. We have the problem of foreign trade. Are we to take that away from the appropriate committee of Congress, establish a commission, and go into the ramifications of that field? What other fields of study should we go into besides this one set up by the Inter-governmental Relations Committee we are contemplating establishing?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does the gentleman agree with me that if this trend continues Congress will not have anything to do except to O. K. the legislation sent down from the Commission and the Executive?

Mr. CONDON. Certainly, I think it is a step in that direction, because we are

turning problems over to these private citizens. We know how the commissions operate. They operate through a staff of paid professionals, and the Commissioners are not going to be able to devote much time to the work of the Commission. They are going to hire a professional staff who will do the spadework, get the records, assemble documents, draft reports, and draft proposed legislation. These experts could all be working for the appropriate committees of the Congress who feel this type of study should be made. Inevitably, these commissions tend to perpetuate themselves. The staff is not in civil service, and it naturally will want their jobs to last longer than the contemplated 9 months. This Commission is to report back in March 1954, but I think most of us will be naive if we do not expect to hear from them in 1954 asking for further appropriations and further legislation to continue this study for a longer period of time, because obviously the time is very short.

So, in short and in summary, I do not want to belabor this, because there are other colleagues who desire to speak. But, I think this step is full of danger and full of misgivings, and I intend to vote against the resolution.

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. WIER. I gather from the gentleman's presentation that this is a full-time commission and that it will be a salaried commission.

Mr. CONDON. No. It is my understanding from the bill itself, that the Commission will not draw anything but their subsistence and per diem when they are actually in session. There will be a staff, I assume, which is being hired; outside of civil service, incidentally.

Mr. WIER. Has the gentleman any idea what this Commission is going to cost per year?

Mr. CONDON. If anyone has made an estimate, it has not been brought to my attention. I have reviewed the transcript, and I do not know what they anticipate spending. The Hoover Commission, I understand, appropriated \$2 million.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONDON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is this Commission limited solely to States and their political subdivisions or may it go into grants-in-aid to foreign countries, and so forth?

Mr. CONDON. As I understand, the prime purpose is the relationship between the Federal, local, and State governments. I do not think there is anything in the bill relating to foreign programs.

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything to prohibit them going into grants-in-aid to foreign countries?

Mr. CONDON. I think that question could better be addressed to the author of the bill. I do not believe there is such a prohibition, but certain powers are specifically set forth which do not include foreign programs and by implication the Commission could not consider foreign programs.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, is it not true, in relation to the per diem allowance, that any Federal official, or any State or local official who is compensated by the Government will receive no per diem allowance?

Mr. CONDON. I understand there is a specific limitation that anyone on the Federal or State or local payrolls is not entitled to any per diem allowance.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to our distinguished majority leader [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues might be interested in knowing that this is rather a red-letter day for me. I have been in Congress, in the House of Representatives, going on 20 years, and this is the first time that a bill of public concern bearing my name as the author has ever been before the House. I have helped prepare a lot of bills and I have helped put a lot through, but I never was privileged to be the author. I am happy to be the author of this one.

It was introduced in the other body by the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, the measure has already passed the other body in substantially this form, I think, by almost a unanimous vote, if not a unanimous vote. As I say, I am happy to be the author of this bill because in my opinion it deals with one of the greatest problems before this Republic. It deals with the matter of the relationship between States and local governments on one side, and the Federal Government on the other. As I contemplate the problems that are involved, I sometimes think that between the Democrats on that side of the aisle and the Republicans on this side, on occasion it seems as if we have almost fought ourselves into one another's overcoats. It sometimes seems to me that my good friends on the right have been great proponents of greater centralization of power in Washington instead of on the side of the old States rights position that they used to hold, while many on our side who were very much in favor of more power in Washington, perhaps in an earlier day, are now probably more solicitous about the rights of the States and their responsibilities. My interest in this, as I say, has been a long, continuing one which resulted first from my observation here, when I came to the Congress in 1935, when there was a headlong rush of authority and power and of taxing and spending here in Washington, much of which I have no doubt was a matter of necessity because there were great vacuums, and into those vacuums somebody had to move. The Federal Government did move into those vacuums. As long ago as 1947, I joined in a discussion of this very problem in California, I say to my good friend, the gentleman from California, which was held before the California State Bar Association. At that time the people of California were tremendously interested in this problem. The discussion evoked a great deal of interest not only among the lawyers but among the people generally of the State of California and other places. I might say to my friend,

the gentleman from Iowa, who raised a question here—I do not see him on the floor at the moment—as recently as a couple of months ago I was in Des Moines, Iowa. I was invited to speak before the State Legislature of Iowa, and I used as my subject this very topic, which is now under consideration. I just want to say there was a tremendous interest there in the very concern which is now being evidenced here.

Many activities, of course, need to be Federal. They must be Federal. But many things can continue to be done better at the local and State level, and that is what we are trying to get at. Why, if you read the labor and Federal security bill, which was before us the other day, you saw there paragraph after paragraph of so-called grants-in-aid. On our side of the aisle, we have had an interest in this matter. We put it in the 1950 declaration of principles and policies that the Republicans got out. We said this:

We favor the establishment of a nonpartisan Commission to study and recommend a sensible redistribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue between the Federal, State, and local entities, to secure the sovereignty of the several States with as much decentralization as is compatible with the national welfare.

And we all subscribe to that. Then it was followed in our 1952 platform in almost those words.

Before some of you say, "Now wait a minute here, Mr. Congressman, you are getting this on a partisan basis," let me say to you that on three separate occasions, the Democratic candidate for President, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, made very, very strong statements about this very proposition. This is what he said on October 11 in Nashville, Tenn.:

But I can concede that big Government can be defended only as a necessity brought about by the complexity of our age and compounded by the external threat from our Communist enemies. * * *

I would not deny, indeed I have often asserted that there is an eternal threat to our liberties inherent in big Government. * * * The great task before the next President of the United States will be to maintain a balance—to see to it that neither internal nor external security is paid for in the coin of personal liberty. * * * My own service as Governor of Illinois has taught me the virtues of States rights as a bulwark against big Government.

As I have often had occasion to remind some of my more impatient compatriots, State and local government is and must always be the basic structure upon which the Federal Government is built.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. CONDON. The gentleman is not suggesting that Governor Stevenson suggested the creation of a commission to consider the pros and cons of this issue, is he? The issue exists and that is what we are considering here.

Mr. HALLECK. May I say to the gentleman there was no suggestion as that in what I said. What I am getting at is that this matter should be looked into. How we get at it is something about which we might differ. I hope now to explain why I think this is the best way to get at it.

We had a meeting at the White House with the President in pursuance of the declarations he made to implement this proposition. There present were four representatives of the Governors' Conference—Governor Shivers, of Texas, Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina, Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, and Governor Kohler, of Wisconsin. We had representatives of Congress there. We had representatives of the executive branch of the government. All morning we discussed the matter of working out this great problem. There was evidenced the highest degree of cooperation. There was evidenced on the part of the governors and on the part of the representatives there representing the Council of State Governments a desire to work with the Federal Government in solving the problem.

That is the first time to my mind that the representatives of State governments and of the Federal Government have sat down to consider this great overriding proposition.

You may say, "Why should we have a commission such as this instead of letting a committee of the Congress do it—either a regular committee or a special committee?"

First of all, let me say, in addition to the things that the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON] spoke of, this must be a matter of cooperation between the States and the local governments and the Federal Government. If it is deemed advisable, as a result of that cooperative action, that the Federal Government get out of a certain sphere of action, then the States and local governments must be ready to move into that sphere. And what better way could be found to assure that very desirable result than that the governors and the representatives of the subdivisions and the municipalities be in attendance as this progresses? Why, to me it is just incontrovertible.

In the course of the discussion at the White House, it was even suggested that the State Governments, coming into this on an equal basis, would find some way, through their council of State governments, to help finance the whole project.

Some reference was made to the fact that this might interfere with congressional action that might be had before the Commission reports. The bill itself specifically provides—and that was put in at the direct request of the governors themselves—that any interim reports of the Commission might be submitted ahead of the final report. And, of course, it is elementary that if the Congress of the United States, through any of its committees, wants to initiate action, it may do so. Perhaps it might have to do with what you are going to do about the gasoline tax; are you going to turn it all over to the States and get the Federal Government out of it, as the State governors seem to wish. There is no reason why any matter such as that could not be acted upon, if the Congress of the United States decided to act upon it. So, to my mind, there is nothing in that argument.

I might point this out to you as just one reason why I think this is so highly important. The governors who were there represented, after some very care-

ful study, had become convinced that many of the governmental services carried on at the Federal level, if given back to the States and local communities, could be carried on at a 25-percent saving, with just as efficient service rendered to the recipients. That, to me, means something. It ought to mean a lot to the overburdened taxpayers of this country. I, for one, want to get that job done as efficiently and as quickly as possible.

Some question was raised about the division of the appointing power on this Commission. There are to be 5 from the House, 5 from the Senate, and 15 appointed by the President. I realize that at first flush that would seem to be giving too many of the appointments to the executive branch. But let me point this out to you. Four or five governors should be on this Commission. The executive branch of the Government ought to be represented; and, in addition, I hope, while there was no ironclad arrangement about it, that a representative of the municipalities or of the State subdivisions may likewise participate in the work of this Commission. So it seems to me that the division of appointments is completely equitable.

Time is running out. I introduced this bill 2 months ago. There is a March 1, 1954, deadline to report. And that is as it should be, in order to give us a chance to go to work on some of these things.

I sincerely hope that we may proceed expeditiously to the passage of this resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CONDON. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, it so happens that in the last 3 or 4 years in former Congresses I was chairman of the subcommittee that is now so ably and graciously chairmaned by the lady from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN]. She served faithfully and efficiently and diligently on the subcommittee, and on the full committee, which was then the Committee on Expenditures, and which is now the Committee on Government Operations.

We held hearings on this proposal and there appeared before the committee a delegation of governors. We held a special session of the subcommittee to hear the governors. It was a nonpartisan delegation. It was a group selected by the governors of the United States who were then meeting here in Washington.

For the information of my Democratic friends, Governor Stevenson of Illinois appeared before the subcommittee with the delegation and sponsored this proposal.

I felt very sympathetic toward it, and I think it will be most advantageous for the Congress to establish this commission. I asked the governors what they would be willing to give up, as the chief executives of their States, to balance what they were asking the Federal Government to give up. We were specific on certain questions with respect to aids and grants from the Federal Treasury to the States in the light of the fact that the Federal Government was operating

in the red and the States were in very splendid condition financially at the time. They did not seem to want to give up many of the fine programs that the Federal Government is now so generously providing for the States, so under those conditions hearings were not continued, and I may be thoroughly frank in saying that there was nothing done about the Boggs resolution. But I do think—and I commend to my Democratic friends—the bills which have been offered here by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. HALLECK].

I think it is a fine thing for a commission to be set up to go into this subject. It is a burning issue. We hear in the States that the Federal Government is usurping the States in certain fields of taxation, and that certain fields should be reserved to the States. If the States want the Federal Government to do that, let us have this commission to find out what the States are willing to give up.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BONNER. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. Can the gentleman think of any more orderly way of doing this job than the establishment of such a commission?

Mr. BONNER. No, I cannot.

At first blush I thought it should be the responsibility of the Congress, but it is more or less along the line of the reorganization bill that we passed, or the bill that we passed setting up the Hoover Commission. Congress here for years and years and years tried to reorganize the Government as specific bills were brought to the floor of the House, but always there were so many friends of the agency affected that you just simply could not get any place with it. Then Congress set up the Hoover Commission, and the Hoover Commission sent down its recommendations, and so forth, and so on; and I believe the overwhelming majority of the Hoover Commission recommendations have been good for the Government and good for the Congress, and the majority of the Hoover Commission were adopted by a Democratic Congress. It is supposed to be a nonpartisan commission; it is supposed to be a commission to think of the first interests of the Federal Government and the States, and not of any political interests. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that when this bill passes, and I believe it will, that the commission will be set up along that line.

I have great confidence in the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], and I have great confidence in the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and I believe these gentlemen will see to it—and I know the Speaker of this House, than whom there is no finer or fairer gentleman anywhere, will see to it that the commission is set up nonpartisan and for no political purpose, and that the work of this commission will be fair and just both to the Federal Government and to the States; and I hope that the Democratic membership of this House will go along on this proposal and pass the bill as it is presented to us. It must be remembered that many functions of the Federal Government come into being due to petition and personal intercession from governors and other State representatives

and was not originated by Congress itself.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina for his kind remarks, and wish to commend him for the splendid service he rendered as a former member of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, since I did have some comments to make at the time the President sent his message to the House recommending the commission, I would like to make a brief statement agreeing in general with the remarks just made by the gentleman from North Carolina and by the majority leader, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. At first I had some reservations about the composition of the commission.

I believe that as a matter of policy the Congress should confine membership for studies of this kind to Members of the House and Senate. We get a much neater legislative record when we confine the membership of such study commissions to our own Members. I feel rather strongly about that. At the same time, I agree that the President has done a fine thing in urging a comprehensive study. Whatever our views as to the general problem that the gentleman from Indiana has so well defined, that is whether one is critical of the developments of the last few years or feels that in the main Federal-State relations have been well directed; nevertheless, all might agree that the time has come for a complete study and that we should take a fresh look at the situation to determine just how Federal policies can be improved.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to add that I am impressed by the argument that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] has made that in this special kind of study there may be some justification for inviting those outside the Congress to participate, but I hope to see the practice abandoned. Congress can profit by the study and while I have this objection to going outside congressional membership I shall support the bill.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG].

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, what we are seeking to do in H. R. 4406 is to establish orderly machinery for the restoration of our Federal system of government—that is, for reestablishment of a strong union of strong States.

For the past 20 years the States have been merely the tail to the National Government's kite. Their functions have been progressively invaded; their tax resources have been progressively preempted; their sovereignty has been progressively chipped away. The trend has been reflected, in turn, in the relation of the States to their localities, until the citizens today exercises a steadily diminishing degree of control over the Government he supports.

The founders of this Republic were well aware that this might happen. They warned against it, and they wrote

two safeguards against it in amendments to the Bill of Rights. The first of these was amendment IX, which specifies that ours is a government of enumerated powers—all others are retained by the people; the second is the 10th and last amendment in the Bill of Rights, which says:

The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, or prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

Jefferson took occasion, in 1823, to underscore the necessity for a proper balance of functions and responsibilities between the States and Federal Government.

I believe—

He said—
the States can best govern over home concerns and the general Government over foreign ones. I wish, therefore, to see maintained that wholesome distribution of powers established by the Constitution for the limitation of both, and never to see all offices transferred to Washington.

And the Supreme Court, called upon in 1911 to adjudicate the problem, specifically emphasized the responsibility of the States for many of the programs which the Federal Government now controls.

Among the power of the State not surrendered—which power therefore remains with the State—

Said the Court—
is the power to so regulate the relative rights and duties of all within its jurisdiction as to guard the public morals, the public safety, and the public health, as well as to promote the public convenience and the common good.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OSTERTAG. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Chairman, with all due respect now to the criticism that has come to the Federal Government from beyond the area of Washington, there should be some consideration given to it. All these agencies and all these grants and all this aid that flow from the Federal Government were brought about by pressure that came from the States and their delegations coming to Washington and asking the Federal Government to do this, that, and the other, and pressure in Congress to take up functions in the States that should have been the State's own responsibility in the beginning. By so doing the Congress had then to raise taxes to take care of these things that the Federal Government had so graciously given to the States by both the House of Representatives and the Senate, and Republicans and Democrats alike have been building up these aids and grants that now flow to the States. So I hope when the commission is created that the governors will take into consideration that fact.

Mr. OSTERTAG. In response to the gentleman from North Carolina, may I say there have been weaknesses on all sides so far as this question is concerned. The States, too, are guilty of coming to the Federal Government for further handouts.

Mr. BONNER. There were many things that the States asked the Federal

Government to do which the States were in a better position to do than the Federal Government.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Chairman, we have indeed wandered far from that doctrine, which was designed to insure our Federal system and our individual liberties. In fact, in the 1930's, the trend in the opposite direction took on the proportions of a stampede, and there was even, at one time, extensive talk of abolishing the States entirely, and replacing them with regional entities. Here surely was a pattern for dictatorship.

Fortunately, the States stood fast against this assault. They found their voice in the Council of State Governments, an organization of, for, and by the States, and through it they have been assisted in putting their own houses in order, and in assaying their strength, their rights, and their responsibilities.

Repeatedly the council has warned against the deadly virus of overcentralization. Its studies have shown the steady encroachment of the Federal Government on the powers, the functions, and the resources of the States. In co-operation with the Hoover Commission, it has made a monumental analysis of Federal-State relations, with particular reference to fiscal relations, which clearly sets forth the steady shift of financial and administrative responsibility for government, away from the grassroots, to a remote and often uncontrollable Central Government here in Washington.

As one who was instrumental in the organization of the Council of State Governments, who served with it as a State legislator over the better part of two decades, and who is still a member of its board of directors, I have traveled from ocean to ocean in this country arousing State legislators and administrators to this problem. Today they are aroused; they are interested; they are ready to cooperate in an orderly restoration of the balance of powers in our Government.

When I came to Congress 3 years ago, one of the first measures I introduced was a bill to create a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, similar to the one we are considering today. Like other bills of that nature, however, it gathered dust in committee. The former administration was not interested in such measures.

Fortunately, we have an administration today which understands the problem and has taken the lead in reaching for a solution. Long before he became President—indeed, long before he became a candidate for the Presidency—General Eisenhower pointed to the danger of an overcentralized government, and asserted that those who called for greater and greater centralization of authority and increasing dependence on the Federal Treasury “are really more dangerous to our form of government than any external force.” One of his first acts, after his inauguration, was to set in motion a program looking toward decentralization of government.

Fortunately, also, we have a Congress today which shares those views. The legislation which is before us is designed to lay the groundwork for a restoration

of our historic pattern of functions and responsibilities. In approving it, we are acting to protect liberty itself. I hope this bill will be speedily enacted into law, and that the Commission which it envisages will be speedily named.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Mr. WIER. Mr. Chairman, I approach this legislation with a bit of caution. I cast no reflections upon the author of the bill or the subcommittee that brought the bill to the House floor. I think most of the Members of the House here have, like myself, served at one time or another as members of their State assemblies or their State legislatures. Before I came to Congress I had served 6 years, 6 great years, in the Minnesota House of Representatives. I owe to my district and my State a loyalty in preserving many of the things that have been brought into the lime-light here in connection with this legislation.

I am equally cognizant of the dual capacity of taxation, as to who should have a prior right in several fields of tax matters. I am aware of the controversy existing over the right of the State or the Federal Government to the gasoline tax. Likewise I am aware of the difficulty in connection with the State and Federal income tax. So there are a number of questions involved. If the Congress itself wanted to clarify the picture of taxation and privileges, to certain areas of taxation, with the exception of those times when the Government is engaged in war or engaged in a threatened situation as we are in today. I think the field ought to be defined at least to some degree, and not take for granted, in time of emergency, that the Federal Government, in spite of any commission or any understanding that they have on taxation, with the States cannot move in when that means the perpetuation of our way of life. I am not willing to sit here and sacrifice my representation of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota to many more commissions. I think the people sent me here knowing that I had some knowledge, at least, of what the State of Minnesota and my district want to get in my service here in Congress. I think I can fulfill that position here in this Congress with complete loyalty to my State and local governments.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIER. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. The gentleman knows that this bill does not legislate; that it only provides for establishing a commission to make recommendations, and that he is going to have an opportunity to vote on any legislation that it recommends ought to be adopted.

Mr. WIER. I am glad the gentleman brought that up, because I was just coming to the commission.

Aside from the real-property tax, the income tax, the gasoline tax, and a hundred other taxes that are in conflict between the Federal Government and local and State organizations, we likewise have a great campaign on in this Nation for the sales tax. Now my State

happens to be one of those that has not yet found it necessary to institute a sales tax, and a number of other States have not, but there is a movement on foot and has been for some time not only to invade this field of the sales tax of the States, but also by the local government. If I have any suspicion in my mind—and I must be brutally frank—if I have any suspicion in mind about this measure, as the result of the present discussion and the authority of the commission, it is based on the fact that there will be, as I heard the author of this bill say, 5 from the House, 5 from the Senate, and 15 appointed by the President. The composition of those 15 appointed by the President are going to be mighty important to me and the many people I speak for from my district.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. WIER. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. There will be 5 from the House and 5 from the Senate. There will be 3 from the majority side of each body and 2 from the minority side of each body, not 6.

Mr. WIER. I have no quarrel with the congressional appointments, but I do have a rather grave doubt about the 15 appointed by the President. Now, I do not want to see sitting on this question of a reviewing and recommending body 15 more bankers indicating and making recommendations upon what is good or bad taxation as between the States and the Federal Government.

Mr. MORANO. But the gentleman will have the right to vote against any recommendation they make and so will I, and so will every Member of the House.

Mr. WIER. But I will have a better right to vote against it here today.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support this measure. The Hoover Commission, when it was in existence, found the most difficult problem confronting it was what to do about Federal-State relations. The Commission had requests from State and local officials to take up such matters and investigate them thoroughly, but the Commission had no power to do so. When the establishment of this new commission was recommended by the President, I very happily agreed immediately to amend and change the legislation which I had introduced for the reestablishment of a new so-called Hoover Commission so as to eliminate the power written into that legislation for the study of intergovernmental relations. I feel this whole problem of Federal, State, and local relationships is so important that a special commission should be named to consider it. Of course, I realize, and hope every Member of the House realizes, in order to get the cooperation that is necessary you must have representatives of the States, municipalities, and other divisions of Government, as well as a representative from the Federal Government on such a commission, which in turn will report back to both the States and the Federal Government for appropriate legislative action by the Congress and the

State legislatures later on. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I support this bill.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, it never hurts or handicaps us to obtain all possible information and material that is available. I just wish to urge one point which I feel is not clear about this bill. It does not specify that the Commission shall set forth the facts upon which its findings are made. It may be presumed, I suppose that a survey or a study by the proposed Commission will be so complete as to the facts gathered thereby, that when the report comes back to the Congress, we Members of Congress will then have before us a fairly substantial statement of all the material facts upon which different recommendations of the Commission are based. If such is not done it will be a serious and fatal omission. In no place in the bill do I find such a provision; there is no express provision that the report shall set forth the facts upon which any recommendations of the commission is based. I am sure you find no such specification. Yet the facts in each case will determine the wisdom of each recommendation. Because I will later have the responsibility of considering and acting upon this Commission's recommendations, I wish the RECORD to very clearly show that this Commission shall report such material facts. I wish to urge as this study proceeds that enough money be given to the Commission and also enough time be taken, in the study so that this Commission will be expected to be meticulous in obtaining the basic facts in every area wherein they undertake to make any conclusion or report to the President or to us. That is the point I wish to presently urge. Surely no one can find disagreement with me. Without reporting the facts also to us, we cannot act intelligently. I assume some amendments may be made to the bill. I will not offer one to include the words making necessary a return of the facts. It should not be necessary. The sense and soundness of my position can have no opposition I am sure.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOYLE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad that the gentleman raised that point. I am happy to join with him in having the RECORD show that it is just that sort of comprehensive report which we expect from the Commission. We want not alone bare recommendations on this or that, but we want the facts behind it and the reasoning for the recommendation, and possibly some brief of the testimony or evidence or whatever it may be in support of the recommendation.

Mr. DOYLE. I appreciate the gentleman making that remark because that is the sole purpose of my rising at this time and taking these few minutes. I wish to urge again, that never should Congress be afraid of spending sufficient money and taking time to get the basic facts upon which our governmental structure functions, with a view to econ-

omy and efficiency. Only by knowing the facts can we act wisely when the report comes back to us.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman for his approbation. I think the point he has raised is well taken, and I believe what he has said adds to a better understanding of what we are trying to do.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in March 1951, and again in January 1953, a bill somewhat similar to this was introduced by me. Approximately at the same time a similar bill was introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DAWSON] and, as I understand, his bill, as well as the one which was introduced by me, was introduced by request.

The bill which I introduced met with the recommendation—in fact it was prepared by the attorney for the Hoover Commission. I yielded to the request to introduce it because it has always been my policy, if there was a proposition or proposal which seemed to be worthwhile, to bring it up for discussion, both in committee and in the House.

I cannot go along with this bill and vote for or support it, not because it does not comply with some of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission or with the provisions of the bill which it was my privilege to introduce, but because none of these bills, in my judgment, deserve support. The very first 15 words of the Constitution tell us that the legislative power is vested in the Congress of the United States.

Just a moment ago it was argued that ultimately the Congress would have an opportunity to decide upon the recommendations of any commission which was appointed. That is true. But some of us who were here through what the press and some others were pleased to term "the yes men" or "rubberstamp Congress," do not want any more of it. We refused then to be just figureheads. Why become such now?

This bill, and H. R. 992 which was also reported out today, are new proposals that Congress abdicate still more of the functions that the Constitution imposes on it.

This bill delegates the investigative powers of Congress regarding Federal-State relations. H. R. 992 would give away the investigative powers of Congress relating to the organization of the executive branch of the Government.

Investigation is an essential part of the legislative process. Congress cannot intelligently legislate without investigating. For Congress to abdicate its investigative functions constitutes an abdication of an essential part of the legislative process.

We have already given away a large part of the duties which the Constitution places upon us. The executive department now can abolish many functions of the Government. It can send down plans to reorganize all or any part of the Government. All Congress retains is an ineffective veto power.

This bill, H. R. 992, and the Reorganization Act of 1949 have a cumulative effect.

H. R. 992 will establish a commission to take over that part of the legislative powers of Congress that relates to investigation preparatory to the consideration of bills regarding the organization of the executive branch.

It is clear, of course, that the President and his advisers already conduct investigations and studies preparatory to reorganization plans. The majority report on H. R. 992 states that there need be no conflict between the authority to be granted to the Commission established by that bill, and that which the President already has in connection with Reorganization Act of 1949.

The report says:

It would be entirely proper for the President to continue to improve executive branch organization and operation under the authority of Reorganization Act of 1949 as extended in Public Law 3. The Commission should be able to complement the work of the President and in addition to make recommendations in those fields of reorganization in which the powers of the President have been specifically limited in the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

No effort is made to deny that the powers of the Commission to be set up by H. R. 992 duplicate those already delegated to the President under the Reorganization Act of 1949. The argument is made that certain limitations which the Congress saw fit to apply to the President's powers will not apply to the new Commissions.

In any event, it seems to be conceded that Congress will have successfully delegated its power to investigate Federal-State relations and its power to investigate and legislate regarding the organization and functions of the executive branch of the Government when these two bills become law.

In enacting this legislation, Congress will have adopted the major premise of those who contend that the investigative powers of Congress should be transferred to the executive branch of the Government. Congress will be conceding that investigations of the Government can better be conducted by the Executive Department itself.

That premise is false. The real reason that certain groups contend for a curtailment of the investigative powers of Congress is not that those investigations have been unproductive, but rather that they have been too productive.

These groups feel that Congress is outmoded; that all governmental powers should be vested in the Executive.

Congress, by enacting these two bills to delegate to the executive branch the power to investigate its own relations with the States and its own operations, will be taking a major step in that direction.

The Constitution places all power to legislate in the Congress. We have no right to abdicate any part of that function, either investigation preparatory to legislating or the enactment of legislation.

Investigation of Federal-State relations is a large part of the legislative duties of Congress. Most of the stand-

ing committees of Congress from time to time investigate these matters as a part of the legislative process.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 and the Rules of the House specifically charge the Government Operations Committee with the overall function of investigating Federal-State relations.

This bill, however, proposes to transfer those functions from the committee and from the Congress to a Commission, in effect to the executive department of the Government.

One reason for the proposed transfer is, in effect, that the Commission will have enough prestige to attract big names to the staff, while the Congress would not. The acceptance of that kind of reason for legislation does not add to the prestige of Congress.

Another argument for the proposed transfer is contained in this quotation from the majority report on H. R. 992:

Several members of the subcommittee questioned witnesses as to the necessity of establishing a Commission to do the job, indicating that congressional committees have the authority, are responsible, and, with appropriate staff assistance, should be able to do the job more effectively. However, it was the general consensus of witnesses that as a practical matter a Commission should be established since it was not likely that Congress would provide adequate funds for such an investigation by a committee of Congress although it would do so for a Commission.

In effect this means that Congress in conducting its investigations will have consideration for economy. This is all the more reason for Congress to do the job. An investigative body which does not have consideration for economy in its own operations is not likely to detect a lack of economy in other agencies.

But, we are told, the congressional committees can continue to investigate the same subject matter as the new Commission.

Just where would the economy be in continuing to appropriate sums for congressional investigations of Federal-State relations when we have already appropriated for this Commission to do the same thing? Why do we need to duplicate staffs?

The answer is, of course, that in the future we will be met with the arguments that further appropriations for these investigations by congressional committees are not warranted.

Sooner or later, that will be the result. Further, Congress is delegating its powers so fast that the time has come for us to ask whether we are justified in appropriating for our own salaries. Presumably we are paid for doing our job. Here we already delegated so much of our job that perhaps our salaries could be saved by abolishing our jobs.

In my judgment—and it is only my judgment of course—support for this bill is an admission that the House is either indolent, lazy, if you want to use the common word—yes, I mean it—or incompetent, because after complaining over the years about the executive departments taking over our functions, we now go ahead and authorize the appointment of a commission consisting of 25 members, 15 to be appointed by the President, 5 from the House, and 5 from the Senate, to do what? To take over

the functions of the committees of the House and to recommend to us, without hearings—and when you have a bill come in here, you are supposed to have hearings—without the production of the hearings held by the Commission before the House. Without production of the facts on which the Commission based its opinion, we will be called upon to accept those recommendations. If a regular standing committee of the House should ask us to act on a report without the hearings, just how indignant would we be?

We have a legislative Reorganization Act, and under it we have 19 standing committees of the House. Then we always have in every session special committees to investigate this, that, and the other.

What are the duties of those 19 committees? We have legislative committees, and legislative proposals which come before the House are divided up and sent to those committees, according to the jurisdiction of each. Those committees are presumed to hold hearings. The hearings are printed and put before the Members. As a rule we refuse to act without them.

Yet this Commission will ask us to act without knowing the facts on which it bases its recommendations. Time and time again the membership of this House has complained most bitterly because the Executive would not give a committee the information which was desirable and which was necessary to enable it to act.

Finally, the Supreme Court itself, in *McGrain v. Dougherty* (273 U. S. 135-174), not only stated it was the prerogative of the House to ask for information, but that it was the duty of the House to hold investigations, swear witnesses, ascertain the facts, and then put its recommendations before the House, together with the hearings on which the recommendations were based.

Now, what are we doing today? We are transferring like authority to investigate—hold hearings—surely they say we still have the right—but we all know that when we appoint this Commission and when we give to this Commission, as this bill does, authority to hold hearings, to subpoena witnesses, believe it or not, require the executive department to give to this Commission all the information which they may ask, something that was denied for a long, long time to the committee which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Dies] headed, the Committee on Un-American Activities, something which today only two committees of this House have, the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Government Operations, to go into tax returns—we are creating a Commission and giving it authority equal to that of our regular committees—telling it to think for us. A sorry spectacle.

Do you see what we are doing? What is the matter with us, anyway? Do we not have the courage, do we not have the ability, are we too lazy to perform our duties? What is going to be left to the Congress in the years to come? The privilege of drawing and spending our checks. Is that all?

Now, I ask, how can a man go before his constituents and say, Well, we have

transferred all the power, or power equal to that given to the 19 standing committees of the House and given to the special committees of the House, and then ask to have this Commission—and the President appoints 15, while the House and Senate together have 10—ask them to reelect us when we are attempting to dodge a part of our duties?

Now, yesterday my colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], whom I admire so greatly, came in here. He is new to this body. He has within him a desire to serve his people. He wants to perform his duty, and he tried yesterday; but, as a matter of fact, he discovered that he could not get a vote. The reason was because of the legislation which we have passed, the reorganization bill, which gives the President authority to send up a plan and which the House is required to take as it comes up unless one House vetoes it. The gentleman was grieved—rightly complained because he could not act as a Congressman should.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes, briefly.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that the resolution of disapproval could have been brought up in the regular way?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Oh, yes. Mr. HOLIFIELD. And we have been given the opportunity to vote on it?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Seldom do I agree with my distinguished colleague from California or his associate from California [Mr. CONDON], but I am happy now to say that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] has always stood up here in the well and fought for the jurisdiction of his committee and for the jurisdiction of the House.

I am under no illusions; I realize this bill is going through; it has the leadership on our side, practically no opposition on the other side; it is going through, but I want to warn you now—and I am not talking to you so much as I am to some who may follow us later—someday perhaps my great-great-great-grandson will come along after me and say that the old man was right, Congress gave away its authority.

We are giving away here the authority of the Congress to investigate and bring in reports; you are transferring that power to the other end of the avenue, and when their recommendations come up you will have to swallow those recommendations.

Then again we will have rubberstamp Congressmen. I want no part of a rubberstamp. One may often be wrong but no thinking individual criticizes a mistaken man just because he is in error. But what about the poor stick who refuses to think or insists that someone else do his thinking?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I find it impossible to support this legislation for a number of reasons.

I am convinced it is a wholly unnecessary delegation of power on the part of the House of Representatives. The House should be engaged in recapturing delegated powers rather than extending them.

It gives power of subpoena and administration of oaths to some 15 persons

whose identity at this time is completely unknown; persons who will be appointed to serve, perhaps temporarily, on the proposed Commission.

Any one of these persons may be constituted a subcommittee of one to require that anyone in this country must testify under oath and produce books, records, papers, and documents for scrutiny. This is a far too broad and vast delegation of power to a Commission for the alleged purposes provided in this bill.

There is almost no restraint placed upon the amount of money this Commission could expend. This is not in keeping with efforts to economize, balance the budget and reduce taxes.

For these and other reasons which have previously been stated, I cannot support this legislation although I do not oppose a study of intergovernmental relations. This can be accomplished without a capricious grant of power and unnecessary burden of expense upon already overburdened taxpayers.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. Because existing confusion and wasteful duplication of functions and administration pose a threat to the objectives of programs of the Federal Government shared in by the States, including their political subdivisions, because the activity of the Federal Government has been extended into many fields which, under our constitutional system, are the primary interest and obligation of the several States and the subdivisions thereof, and because of the resulting complexity of intergovernmental relations, it is necessary to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions, with respect to such fields, to the end that these relations may be clearly defined and the functions concerned may be allocated to their proper jurisdiction. It is further necessary that intergovernmental fiscal relations be so adjusted that each level of Government discharges the functions which belong within its jurisdiction in a sound and effective manner.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "because" insert the word "any."

Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "are" and insert the words "may be."

Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "of" and insert the word "to."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I favor this legislation. I concur in the views expressed by members of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, so ably chairmanned by the gentlewoman from Indiana [Mrs. HARDEN], that the committees of Congress should themselves have the power to find the facts necessary as a proper foundation for wise legislation.

I concur with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan that the Congress ought not to give away its legislative authority. It is my belief that the

facts should be found by the legislative agency which has the responsibility for making the decision, because only upon that basis can wise legislation result.

Let me state where I part with the gentleman from California and the gentleman from Michigan in their opposition to this legislation.

As a practical matter, the Congress has not financed, and so far as I can see will not, for the moment, finance its committees so that they may acquire the sizable and able staffs which are necessary to make a penetrating study of important and complicated subjects such as this. We are confronted not with a theory but with a situation. We have been generous to commissions, giving the Hoover Commission something on the order of \$2 million. By comparison, the subcommittee of which the gentlewoman from Indiana is chairman has an annual appropriation of about \$65,000.

I believe the Congress ought to expand and strengthen its committees' staffs so they can go into these subjects more adequately; then it will not be necessary to have commissions of this character.

There is an additional reason, in my judgment, for establishing this Commission, perhaps more than some others. We are dealing here not alone with the field of Federal jurisdiction and activities but also with those of State and local governments. It is only proper that in any study in that field there should be representation from cities, from school districts, from States, from counties and other units of government, the activities and functions of which will be affected by any study made by this Commission.

Let me say that I also agree with those who deplore the gravitation of political power away from the people and local governments closely under their scrutiny to the Central Government in Washington. Let me go one step further. I deplore the gravitation of that power away from the Congress into the hands of the executive branch of the Government. That trend is in the direction of totalitarianism.

Because of the importance in this modern age of preserving the principle of self-government by keeping government close to the people, it is most important that this study be made.

We must find effective ways of opposing the trend toward taking everything to Washington. We must restrain the Federal Government's tendency to preempt all of the tax sources possible. We must effectively and intelligently counteract the tendency of the National Government to engage in one activity after another which affects the lives and livelihoods of our people, which could be handled more economically by locally elected officials.

Situations have developed in my own district where the Federal Government's activities were adversely affecting local government activities. In the city of Adrian, Mich., there is an aluminum extrusion plant which cost about \$2½ million. The title to this plant until recently was held by the RFC. It has now been transferred to the Air Force. The General Accounting Office has ruled that title being in the United States Govern-

ment, local taxes to the city of Adrian and to the county of Lenawee, and to the school district can no longer be paid. This year for the first time, without warning, that community has suffered a loss of approximately \$90,000 in its revenues. I know there are hundreds, if not thousands, of communities similarly affected.

This is only one type of effect of Federal activity on State and local units of government.

The solution to these problems is not easy. I hope the Commission we are creating will make a real and substantial contribution toward such solution.

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe I should address the Committee very briefly concerning this proposed legislation because I happen to be chairman of a committee to which have already been referred some 15 or 20 bills introduced by Members of the House concerning payment in lieu of taxes. Some of you have come and asked me for hearings on those bills. Representatives of State governments are coming to me asking for hearings, representatives of county governments and representatives of municipalities alike, asking that we hold hearings on the several bills that have been referred to the Subcommittee on Public Lands concerning payment in lieu of taxes.

In past years we have held some hearings on these bills. All you have to do is to turn over the first page and note the multiplicity of questions that immediately arise which are pretty nearly overwhelming. The gentleman from Michigan has just stated that we should handle these things in the ordinary course of our committee affairs, but a problem such as this is so far reaching that it is not easy for us to solve it. All the forests of the country pay 25 percent of their revenues to the county governments for use of schools and roads. Public lands pay certain revenues to the county governments. In the ordinary State about one-third of the revenue of the State comes from the Federal Government in one form or another—social security, aids of one kind or another, and so forth. Now, if we provide for payment in lieu of taxes, what part of those revenues should be stopped and what part should be continued?

The other day a representative of the Municipal League was in my office and asked that we hold hearings on a bill involving payment in lieu of taxes. In order to explore his mind and his knowledge of this subject, I raised the question that ordinarily we should not pay in lieu of taxes because of a post office, a post office serving the local community and being there only for the local community. He said, "Perhaps I agree with you and perhaps I do not, but if we do not collect taxes because of that post office, then suppose we provide that post office with water and sewage, are we entitled to payment because of that service?"

There you have a difficult question to answer if you are going to consider making payments in lieu of taxes. I cite that as one instance of many difficulties that are presented to you when you consider where you will stop in payments in lieu

of taxes and where you will go forward with the present payments. That is only one aspect involved in the bill that is now before us today, the matter of payment in lieu of taxes. Therefore I believe we need a commission that has the time, the money, and the personnel to explore this subject in its entirety, not just one feature that may be referred to the committee of which I happen to be chairman, but the whole subject of payment for services in lieu of taxes that the present governments render and where there is duplication and how it should be worked out.

Mr. Chairman, I therefore hope that this measure will be passed, and I ask you Members who had bills referred to my committee, some 15 or 20 of you, concerning payment in lieu of taxes, to be patient until we have a policy established in regard to this matter, because it is almost impossible for our committee to go forward without a basic policy. I believe the legislation and the services that this Commission can render will be of great help in this matter of Federal-State relations.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENTAL FUNCTIONS AND FISCAL RESOURCES

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this act there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission."

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 25 members, as follows:

(1) Fifteen members appointed by the President of the United States, from among whom the President shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(2) Five members appointed by the President of the Senate, three from the majority party, and two from the minority party; and

(3) Five members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, three from the majority party, and two from the minority party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Thirteen members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall study and investigate all of the present activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments. The Commission shall determine and report whether there is justification for Federal aid in the various fields in which Federal aid is extended; whether there are other fields in which Federal aid should be extended; whether Federal control with respect to these activities should be limited, and, if so, to what extent; whether Federal aid should be limited to cases of need; and all other matters incident to such Federal aid, including the

ability of the Federal Government and the States to finance activities of this nature.

(b) The Commission, not later than March 1, 1954, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate.

HEARINGS: OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 4. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENSES, AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member, to any member who is receiving other compensation from the Federal Government, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the classification laws.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

(f) Without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director, who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 3 of this act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 13, strike out all after the word "on" down to

and including line 14, and insert "Intergovernmental Relations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 17, strike out "Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources" and insert "Intergovernmental Relations."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments in the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 22, insert: "Sec. 4. (a) The Commission shall carry out the purposes of section 1 hereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 3, line 24, strike out "Sec. 3. (a)" and insert "(b)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 1, after the comma, insert "the interrelationships of the financing of this aid, and the sources of the financing of governmental programs."

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONDON: On page 3, line 24, after "(b)" strike out the remainder of the line and line 25, and on page 4 strike out lines 1 to 12, inclusive, and insert "Intergovernmental relationships between the Federal and State Governments."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Does that amendment come before the one I offered on page 2?

Mr. CONDON. The purpose of my amendment is to clarify the language which I think is too broad by stating the function of this Commission is merely to study all relationships between the Federal and State Governments rather than of attempting to enumerate certain studies to be made which by implication would prevent the Commission from studying other matters that they might well go into.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair will state that his amendment will be in order after the pending amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The amendment I have is on page 2, and the other is on pages 3 and 4; that is all right?

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, would it be in order for me to offer a substitute amendment for the amendment which the gentleman from California has just offered?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan may offer an amendment to the substitute amendment.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MEADER as an amendment to the substitute offered by Mr. CONDON: On page 3, line 24, strike out all of section 3b down to and including line 12, page 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) The Commission shall study and investigate all relationships between the Federal Government and between the State and local governments where there is competition, uncertainty, duplication, conflict or mutual participation in functions or activities with the purpose of establishing appropriate demarcation and relations between Federal jurisdiction, functions, and activities and State and local jurisdictions, functions and activities including but not limited to taxation, proprietary activities, grants-in-aid, contractual relations, regulatory, welfare and other public services and functions. The Commission shall make full reports and recommendations in the premises."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is a substitute amendment and is not an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California. Under the parliamentary rules, there cannot be two substitute amendments pending at the same time. I am only raising this point of order in the interest of orderly parliamentary procedure, otherwise we will get into a chaotic position. What the gentleman from Michigan is offering is in fact a substitute for the substitute already offered by the gentleman from California.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. HALLECK. May I point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts my understanding is that a committee amendment was pending to which a substitute amendment was offered by the gentleman from California. If that is the situation, then this is an amendment to the substitute amendment, and it seems to me it must be in order because if it were not, then if the substitute amendment were adopted, it would preclude consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand the parliamentary rules, and if I am mistaken, I will be glad to be corrected, there can be only one amendment to the committee amendment and a substitute amendment, and one amendment to the substitute pending at the same time. There cannot be a second substitute amendment pending. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is in lieu of the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California, and therefore it is a substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is impressed that the Condon substitute is in reality an amendment to the committee amendment, and the Meader amendment is a substitute for the committee amendment, and if that is the situation

as the Chair so understands it, it would be in order.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Chair desires to interpret it that way, it is perfectly all right with me because then the parliamentary procedure is protected. I am only desirous of protecting parliamentary procedure. All I know is that the gentleman from California offered a substitute for the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In reality the Chair feels that the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from California is an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I am not in disagreement with that. My only purpose is to see to it that orderly parliamentary procedure is protected, and I am not making a point of order against the amendment itself. I am trying to protect the parliamentary situation because if we get into an amendment in the third degree, we would be getting into a chaotic position. I hope the gentleman from California will have the RECORD corrected so that it will appear that instead of offering a substitute, he will be recorded as saying that he offered an amendment to the committee amendment.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, if that is the proper parliamentary procedure, may I state that the amendment I offered is an amendment to the committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is obviously correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the information of the committee that during the hearings of the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, the language of section 3 (b) describing the mandate and the duties of the Commission was given considerable thought.

If you will notice, the committee reinserted language which had been deleted in the Senate. At that time I had not worked out a substitute statement of the mandate of this Commission. I subsequently contacted Mr. McCormick, the executive director of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report, and asked him if he was familiar with the language describing the mandate of this Intergovernmental Relations Commission. He said that he was, and he did not think it expressed all that the Commission ought to be responsible for investigating. I subsequently conferred with Mr. Leonard Calhoun, the counsel for the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report. We spent 2 or 3 hours working out very carefully the language I have offered to describe the mandate of the Commission.

Section 3 (b) of the original bill seems to deal mainly with Federal grants-in-aid. There are many other activities and relationships and functions in which there is duplication, conflict, or participation between the Federal Government and State and local governments.

Once we create this Commission, there ought not to be any doubt that it has the

right to go into the whole field of Federal-State relationships, make a thorough study, and come up with some concrete recommendations.

It is solely for the purpose of strengthening the Commission that I offer this language as an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. I rise in opposition to the amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, if I understand it correctly, the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON] thinks the language contained in the bill is too broad. And if I understand the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] he thinks the language is not broad enough.

Probably we are confronted with one of those circumstances where any one of us, if he were delegated to write this language on his own responsibility, would write it a little differently.

Let me say this to you first of all: That the committee itself by its amendment on page 3 has directed the Commission to carry out the purpose of section 1.

I think if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] would read section 1 he would find very much of the broadening that he seeks by his amendment.

Secondly, in respect to the amendment offered originally by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON], often have I heard it said that we are not specific enough in the authorizations which we enact; that we just write, so to speak, a blank check of authority. His amendment would simply direct the Commission to do the things that its title would indicate that it is expected to do, because the language is just the language of the title.

To my mind, that is not a sufficient delegation.

Let me say further, it was not contemplated in the beginning that every possible matter of conflict or of controversy, or jurisdiction as between States and the Federal Government, should be put upon this Commission. Certainly, they should not be required to inquire into the application of the interstate-commerce clause of the Constitution, which has caused so much discussion and concern in some quarters. That is not contemplated. There are many things that are not contemplated.

The fact of the business is that the language as contained in this bill, except for the language in an amendment adopted by our committee—I understand put in in the other body—was very carefully discussed, considered, and talked about by the group at the White House, which included not only people from the Congress but from the executive branch of the Government, representatives of the Council of State Governments, and representatives of governors conference.

It does seem to me that while, as I say, any one of us if we were charged with putting in our own words would do this a little differently and might get down to crossing i's and dotting t's, so to speak, this language just did not happen; it is the result of a great deal of careful study, the result of a lot of cooperative effort which started this whole operation; so it does seem to me that we should stick with the language adopted by the com-

mittee where, I understand, considerable thought and study was given to it, and go along with the measure as it was reported to the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. CONDON] to the committee amendment.

Mr. CONDON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CONDON. Should not the vote come first on the Meader amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No; as the Chair understands the parliamentary situation the Meader amendment is offered as a substitute for the committee amendment. The vote comes first on the Condon amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California, Mr. CONDON.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. MEADER.

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 13, renumber subsection (b) as subsection "(c)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 4, line 24, after the word "places", strike out the balance of line 24 and all of line 25, and insert the following: "administer such oaths, and require, by subpna or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpnes may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpna or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 6, line 13, after the word "advisable", strike out the balance of line 13, all of line 14 to and including the word "laws" in line 15, and insert in lieu thereof "without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dodd: On page 2, line 25, after the word "Commission", insert "Provided, That 9 members shall be from

the majority party and 6 members shall be from the minority party."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to change the figures in my amendment "9" and "6" to "8" and "7."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Ever since the reading of the bill commenced I have had an amendment at the desk to page 2, line 20. I would like to know how we get to line 25 before we get to line 20.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill was considered as read and open to amendment. The gentleman's amendment, of course, will be next in order and the Chair will be glad to recognize the gentleman when this amendment is disposed of.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, does not the Chair recognize members of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand that the gentleman was seeking recognition.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is a member of the committee.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. And the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as revised.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dodd: Page 2, line 25, after "Commission", insert "provided that 8 members shall be from the majority party and 7 members shall be from the minority party."

Mr. DODD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for several reasons.

First of all, the language of this amendment is in keeping with the spirit of this legislation.

I notice that the Members to be appointed to this Commission from the Congress are to be selected from both political parties. The bill specifically provides that the Speaker of the House shall select 3 Republicans and 2 Democrats. And it further specifically provides that the President of the Senate shall select 3 Republicans and 2 Democrats.

In my opinion this is good.

But this bill needs something more. As the language of the bill now stands, the President is authorized to name 15 members of this Commission, but no direction is given him as is given the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate that the 15 members whom the President appoints shall represent both major political parties of this country. My amendment will make it mandatory for the President to divide his 15 appointees between Democrats and Republicans.

This is not a partisan matter, and I completely agree with the distinguished majority leader [Mr. HALLECK] in his observations to that effect. If this great task is to be successfully conducted by this Commission, the help of Republicans and Democrats is required.

If we accept this amendment we will be demonstrating conclusively that this is indeed a bipartisan matter. Strictly speaking, there is no Republican way to do this job and there is no Democratic way to do this job.

Besides these important considerations, this amendment which I offer will help the President of the United States. And let me point out that I have no doubt that he will select the best men he can get and I have full confidence in him to make such selections. And thus I say that my amendment is not offered because I have any doubt about his good intentions. Rather, I want to help him. The addition of this amendment will take pressure off the President of the United States, for he may very well be pressured by members of his own party, now in power after having been out of power for many years, to make political appointments to this Commission. Now I say this in no mean, cruel, or over-critical sense, but if this amendment is adopted, when political pressure is applied, the President can say, "I am sorry. Under the law I have to appoint so many Democrats as well as so many Republicans."

To make this Commission completely bipartisan is in keeping with our practice generally in the Federal Government. Most of our Commissions are bipartisan and are such by law. Why should not this one be bipartisan as well, and if it is going to have the color of bipartisanship, it should not be partly bipartisan, but rather, it should be completely and wholly bipartisan. This means that the Executive appointees should stand on the same level with the legislative appointees.

Now this is why I have offered this amendment. It is not intended to hinder or to delay the passage of this bill or to impede the legislation, for I think this is a good bill and I am for it and I intend to vote for it, but I want to get it wider acceptance on the floor of the House today and I want to get this program better acceptance for this Commission when it gets to work.

Let us get both Republicans and Democrats to put their shoulders to this wheel.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for favorable consideration of my amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan to the amendment offered by Mr. Dodd: After the first word "party" insert "that 5 of these 9 shall be from the Midwest."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Connecticut so far as the purpose of his amendment is concerned. If we are going to have a commission it should be divorced from politics. I will ask the gentleman if that is the purpose of his amendment?

Mr. DODD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I will go along with that. In order that the 8 may accurately represent the majority party, 4 of them of the Republican 8 should come from the Midwest because

there is such a wide difference of opinion between the factions, if I may so indicate, in the Republican Party, and I say that with regret. There is more of a difference of opinion between some Republicans than there is between some Republicans and some Democrats. So it seems to me that if we are going to get into politics in the appointment of the members of the Commission, let us have the great Midwest represented.

I appeal to the author of the bill. He comes from the Midwest, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. HALLECK]. I appeal to the author of the next bill, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] also to leave that provision inserted in his bill. I think our section of the country, where the Republican thinking is so different from that on the eastern seaboard, should safeguard our interests because there is no telling what a Commission the members of which come from the East might do, and if you will read this bill there is much danger in it. We do not know what a hand-picked Commission might recommend. Suppose they come along and recommended that the Midwest shall feed those people who come in, say to New York from Puerto Rico, where would you be? You of the Midwest working to support people who insist upon living in a city. As followers of the administration, we would have to take it lock, stock, and barrel, hook, line, and sinker because the President recommended it, you know, the line it will be his Commission that tells us what to do, and they, having made a great study and spent a lot of money getting the facts, we would have to swallow it—swallow it because the President's Commission recommended it—an easy way to shirk our duty.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it the intent of the gentleman's amendment to say that 5 Taft Republicans and 4 Eisenhower Democrats are to be appointed? Is that the intent of the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No, No; you do not have the amendment right. There are 8 Republicans.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Yes, 9 Republicans. Five of them shall be Taft Republicans and four Eisenhower Republicans?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, now, I do not know at the moment what the present differences between the Taft and Eisenhower Republicans may be. Only an expert politician can tell.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I was merely seeking clarification.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I am talking for my constituents.

Mr. CONDON. The amendment before us is 8 for the majority party and 7 for the minority party, and not 6.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, whatever it is. I would like to have the Midwest represented on this commission, because they pay a lot of the taxes and they do not have very much to say about how that money is spent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to both amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the sincerity of the gentleman from Connecticut and likewise the gentleman from Michigan in the amendments they have offered. The gentleman from Connecticut and some of his colleagues who are interested with him, I assume, discussed with me the matter of the 15 and what ought to be done about it. Now, may I say again to some of my friends on this side of the aisle who perhaps were not here when I spoke before, that back in 1950 we worked hard on what we called the statement of Republican principles and objectives. It subsequently was adopted and endorsed by the Republican National Committee. It was the beginning of the provision in the national platform in 1952 that had to do with this study.

Let me read it to you now, and I want my friends on the right to pay particular attention to this, because it is something that has to do with the matter of this amendment; this is the Republican declaration:

We urge the establishment of a nonpartisan Commission to study and recommend a sensible redistribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue between the Federal, State, and local entities, to secure the sovereignty of the several States with as much decentralization as is compatible with the national welfare.

Now, for those of us on our side of the aisle who subscribed to that, and those of us who were here in the last Congress did subscribe to it, I think we crossed the bridge as far as the creation of this Commission is concerned.

Now, as to the 8 to 7, originally it started out about a 9 to 6 division. Let me point out to my friends on the right that as far as we are concerned, and I know that this is what the President believes in, because he has said so to us, we do not want a partisan Commission; we want a nonpartisan Commission. I cannot think of anything that could be calculated to more quickly destroy the effectiveness of this Commission which again, may I say, if it does a good job, may be one of the greatest contributions to many of the difficulties confronting this Republic that we could possibly have—

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think this is the proper point where my question should come to the gentleman, especially in view of his statement that this was to be a nonpartisan proposition. I agree with him it should be nonpartisan. Do we have his word for it that in making it nonpartisan the President is to select people of known political views who will devote themselves to this task on a non-political basis, or is it going to be packed with just one group of men of like thinking?

Mr. HALLECK. I am glad the gentleman asked that, because that is what I was coming to. In respect to the Members from the House and the Senate, this follows the practice of time immemorial. I have no doubt, if we had left out the 3-2 division, that Speaker MARTIN, as far as we are concerned, would have made it 3 to 2 and would have taken the

recommendation of the distinguished minority leader from Texas about who should serve on the Democratic side.

Now as to the 15, there is where we get into a different situation. As I undertook to point out originally, this bill started with a conference at the White House attended by certain representatives of the governors' conference. They have become increasingly vigorous in their demands that something along this line be done, and I might say to the gentleman that the great Committee on Ways and Means has undertaken certain studies along this very line. However, I think he would agree with me that the field to be covered is broader than that of taxation, hence this arrangement. Now, it is understood, because I was there when it was discussed, that the Governors themselves will recommend such of their number as they think should be on this Commission, and as there were two Democrats and two Republicans at the White House, then certainly I would assume that from that segment of the representation we would have a clear division. Now, then, the gentleman asks about the public members.

Mr. FORAND. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman said there were two Democratic governors at the White House.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. FORAND. Those two Democrats that the gentleman named before do not represent the viewpoint of the majority of the Democratic Party, and that is just the point that I was trying to bring out before.

Mr. HALLECK. All right. Let me say this to the gentleman: It just so happens, as I understand, may I say to the gentleman, that those representatives were chosen by the governors' conference. As I remember it, they were not chosen for this particular assignment but they, as I understand, have been dealing with this whole problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Who were the alleged Democratic governors who were there?

Mr. FORAND. The gentleman named the two earlier this afternoon, and I can repeat them if he does not care to.

Mr. HALLECK. I will be glad to name them. I have no allergy for them, and I think a lot of good Americans have no allergy for them. They were Governor Shivers, of Texas, and Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina.

Mr. FORAND. They both bolted the Democratic Party and voted for Eisenhower. They were Governor Shivers and Governor Byrnes.

Mr. HALLECK. That is right.

Mr. FORAND. They certainly have no allergy for Eisenhower.

Mr. HALLECK. No, apparently not—apparently not—and I am not complaining about that, the gentleman can well understand. I am sorry—I am deeply sorry this issue has arisen because again may I point out, and I am quite certain my information about it at that time was correct, and my recollection now is correct, that these gentleman had been working on some sort of a committee representing the governors' conference, and that they were just the people to be there. May I say to the gentlemen, since he brought it up, that I quoted your candidate for President, Mr. Stevenson, who has spoken time and again for the very things that are here advocated; and was it not before your committee that he appeared in support of this very sort of proposition?

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes.

Mr. FORAND. Yes, that is true, but this is a new commission that is going to be set up. I would like to have Adlai Stevenson and men of his type on the commission, but if you leave it to the governors to select a group of governors to represent them there, and if the President is just going to take their recommendations, you may well have a group of so-called Democrats who believe in the Republican philosophy, and I say that is not giving us a fair break.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not know who the governors are going to recommend. It might well be in view of what the gentleman has said that they might hesitate to recommend the ones who were there at the White House conference. I do not know. If the gentleman will permit me to be just a little facetious because this is getting to be just a little too serious—

Mr. FORAND. This is serious business.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course it is. Some operations in the political field, believe me, are occasionally a little confusing. I am not altogether sure about them. Let us get away from that and get back to the matter about who the 15 are going to be. As I said earlier, there was some criticism earlier that the 15 to 10 between the President's appointments and the Congressional appointments, seems to be out of line. But I think that is easily explainable on the basis that among the Presidential appointments there must be representatives of the Governors' Council of State Governments, and we hope of municipal governments or subdivisions, to get all of the various attitudes in operation. In addition, I think it is necessary that some distinguished, outstanding American citizens of no particular political operation one way or the other be called to serve. Not that politics would bar anybody, because to my mind if a man is to be a good American he ought to be in some measure in politics—at least he ought to vote—but you are going to need a considerable number of people in that category if the Commission is to do the job that should be done.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, let us assume that my friend was in the minority and had 213 members of his party elected to the Congress. First let me say that I am for this bill. I voted for it in committee.

Mr. HALLECK. I appreciate that. I understand that.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not going to try to disturb the 15 for the President because I realize there is an exceptional situation which justifies it here. Suppose we were offering a resolution which is bipartisan—it will be 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans. If my friend was in the minority and this came before the House, would not my friend offer an amendment to try to assure a division of 8 and 7 with a representation in the House of 221 and 213 as between the political parties?

Mr. HALLECK. I may say honestly to the gentleman I do not think so.

The next resolution that is to come along is in effect a continuation of the Hoover Commission.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. HALLECK was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. When the Hoover Commission was created, the gentleman will recall that we had a Republican Congress and a Democratic President. To my mind, as far as I can recall, when there has been any distribution fixed, that was the only time when it was even on both sides. I think that was the reason for it, because it was a situation that does not exist today.

Just let me point this out again: I do not think it is desirable. I do not think it is necessary that as the President seeks some high-grade, patriotic American, who is willing to work night and day on this job, that he put him on the green carpet and say, "Now, just which side of the political fence are you on?" or "Which side of the Democratic fence are you on?" Then certainly we would be getting into a lot of trouble.

As I say, I think the language here included is sufficient, and I hope the amendments are defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. RAYBURN) the gentleman from Indiana was granted 1 additional minute.)

Mr. RAYBURN. Does not the gentleman think that both parties should be represented on this committee of 15?

Mr. HALLECK. I am sure they should be and they will be.

Mr. RAYBURN. Will the gentleman undertake to try to see, with the influence that he has, that that is done?

Mr. HALLECK. I certainly shall.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], did right in withdrawing that, because it was clearly out of order in that it referred to the No. 9 in the amendment, and the No. 9 has been changed to 8. Therefore, from a mathematical standpoint, if not from a parliamentary standpoint, it was out of order.

I was somewhat interested—I will put it that way—in the reading of one of the objectives of the Republican Party, by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], which was to set up nonpartisan commissions to do this type of work.

Let us not be fooled by the objective that happened to be in the Republican campaign platform, because we know they had many objectives which they are not carrying out, which they are twisting, which they are using in a quite different manner from their campaign platform pledges.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman allow me to just continue for a moment?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will you be specific about the things we have not done?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I will be specific in regard to the legislation that is now before us.

This is not a nonpartisan commission. That is proven by the fact that on page 3, paragraphs 2 and 3, a very definitive distinction is made that 3 shall be from the majority party and 2 from the minority party. So that proves that it is not a nonpartisan commission, or it would have been changed and would have been 2 from the majority and 2 from the minority.

It does not follow the nonpartisan pattern of the Hoover Commission. So let us not be under any illusion about that. It is not a nonpartisan commission. If it is not a nonpartisan commission, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut, which seeks to establish a fair ratio between the 15 members, as well as the 5 members appointed by the President of the Senate and the 5 appointed by the Speaker of the House, is clearly in order. It is consistent with the balance of the bill. It seeks to maintain proportionately the difference between the Democratic and Republican membership in the House of Representatives. That would be what I would call a fair division in regard to representation on a partisan commission. Still it is not nonpartisan.

I think we have a right, as a minority party, to seek proportionate representation among the 15, as well as among the other 10 members. That proportionate representation happens to be, as close as we can figure it, 8 to 7. So I think the gentleman's amendment is in line with the rest of the bill. It is in line with the objectives of the bill, which is to set up a partisan commission, controlled by the Republican Party, and I have no quarrel with that if that is the way they want to work. They have the power and therefore they are entitled to the majority. But let us be very clear.

This is a partisan commission and therefore let us make it as fairly partisan as possible.

I therefore support the gentleman's amendment that the Members be divided as nearly as possible 8 and 7, among the 2 parties. Thereby we will give the President protection against hungry job seekers in his own party that will want these 15 memberships. It will also give to the people of the country a little more proportionate representation between the two parties. I am sure it will carry out the objective of this bill, which is to set up a partisan commission to do certain things.

Mr. BROWNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I shall be pleased to.

Mr. BROWNSON. If this is made a partisan commission with the division indicated, how will you get a city manager who is appointed on a strictly non-political basis to serve on this Commission when he has to declare his politics?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is a problem, of course, that the gentleman will have to solve as a member of the majority. I have no concern about that.

Mr. BROWNSON. There is no problem with the bill as it is presently written.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. If the gentleman will not tell whether he is registered as a Democrat or a Republican he has no right to be appointed to the Commission.

Mr. BROWNSON. But there are many city managers who do not do that.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. According to the wording of the bill on page 3, a man has to be a member of either the majority or minority party; they have to make that known. I see no reason why these 15 members should not make known their party affiliation.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think this matter is going to be a bipartisan matter or it will be a partisan matter. I think if I were in control I would be willing to divide this membership of 15 somewhat along the lines of 5 from the Senate and 5 from the House appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and if that kind of arrangement is made I do not see why it would not be reasonable to say—and everybody would feel better, I know I would if it were a bipartisan thing, if we could divide this committee, say 9 and 6. Of course, if it were a committee of the House of Representatives I could not agree to that because of the closeness of the majority and the minority in the House; but I do think that way, and I am sure that the gentleman from Connecticut will be very willing to ask consent to modify his amendment to provide a ratio of 9 to 6; and I was just wondering if those in charge would not be willing for the sake of good feeling on this—we are all for this thing and we all want it to succeed, every Member of the House, we Democrats as much as those on the majority side—I was just wondering if those in charge would not be willing

ing to accept a modification of the amendment to that effect? That is all I have to say.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the gentleman knows my high regard for him, and when he presents to me a proposition like he has, it is a difficult matter for me to reject it. As I said originally, we have gone over this matter carefully. I know as well as I know anything in the world, that the President in the appointment of these 15 people is going to see to it that the Democratic Party is represented. As to just what adverse effect there might be, possibly it is a little hard to spell out, because you have to determine the politics of some great public-spirited man who might be willing to go on this Commission and as a condition precedent to his going onto the Commission you have to catalog him. I do not know whether such a situation as that might arise. I do not know whether it will complicate matters. As I said, the gentleman from Texas knows of my high regard for him. He and I have cooperated here in minority and majority affairs many, many times, and we are going to continue to cooperate. I am going to continue to cooperate. But at the moment I am not prepared to say just what the solution ought to be.

May I say to the gentleman that if the amendment were revised to read 9 to 6 it might be satisfactory. This matter has to go to conference. If it should develop there that it would interfere with the creation of the Commission and the functioning of that Commission, I take it the matter can and will be adjusted. I am the author of the bill, and the bill is reported by the Committee on Government Operations.

As the gentleman knows, this whole matter had its inception in a broad understanding around the country that has been finding expression time after time by both Democrats and Republicans that here is something that must be done. We are trying to do it.

Mr. RAYBURN. If the Senate leaves the bill as it is and the Senate passes it, there is nothing to go to conference on.

Mr. HALLECK. That is true.

Mr. RAYBURN. The gentleman talks about consultation. I certainly was never consulted about this bill or any of its provisions up to now, either by anyone in the majority or in the minority. I had no idea that something like this was coming along. I am just talking about what would make everybody feel a little better. I think these things ought to be bipartisan, not partisan. It is either bipartisan or partisan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I agree with what the gentleman has said. But I would think you ought to take care of the Midwest Republicans, too.

Mr. RAYBURN. That is exactly the idea I have in mind.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Fine.

Mr. RAYBURN. I want to take care of all elements of the Republican Party, all 3 or 4 of them.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] and I do this with his approval, be modified so that where "8" appears in the amendment it be changed to "9" and that where "7" appears it be changed to "6."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Dodd: Page 2, line 25, after "Commission", insert "Provided, That 9 members shall be from the majority party and 6 members shall be from the minority party."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I accept the amendment. If it is found this is going to have a serious effect, or there is objection, the matter can be adjusted either in the other body or in conference. I want this matter to proceed and I hope we can get on with it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 2, line 20, strike out the word "twenty-five" and insert "fifteen"; and in line 22 strike out the word "fifteen" and insert "five" and on page 3, line 10, strike out "thirteen" and insert "ten."

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, the vote that was just had was on an amendment. Was there an amendment to the amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the amendment to the amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was on the Clerk's desk and discussion of it should have preceded the other amendment because this is an amendment to reduce the number of the Commission. I am trying to change the membership of the Commission from 25 to 15. The other two sections further on provide that the President of the Senate shall appoint 5 and the Speaker of the House shall appoint 5.

My question is, Why, if this is to be a sort of a cooperative body, should the Executive Office appoint 15, 5 more than the Senate and House, as members of that Commission? Cooperation should be a two-way street. Should not the House and Senate have the same equality in expressing their views in making investigations? I can only repeat here what was said before earlier in the day, that the House should be a little more

jealous of its authority, of its prerogatives. It is bad enough to appoint a commission which will assume our duties, the duties of all the committees, but it is far worse to let the House and the Senate have but 10 and the President 15 members of the Commission.

Now, this argument we just had here about whether they would be Democrats or Republicans—that does not appeal to me very much, because I have noticed since January 3 that there does not seem to be, in the making of appointments, too much difference of opinion as to those who were appointed. I have had some difficulty in recognizing a Republican as an appointee, or recognizing an appointee as a Republican. I remember when a Democratic Member here, who was a member of our committee, the Committee on Government Operations, who was defeated in one of the States out here, was appointed to an office downtown. Apparently they thought he was a Republican, but he was not. He had been voting with the Democrats, the New Deal boys and the Fair Deal boys for 2 or 3 years here on the Hill, and yet the appointing forces down there in the White House never realized he was not a Republican. Now it is all right to disregard politics on a commission, perhaps, but what is the use of arguing about whether he is a Republican or a Democrat when sometimes the folks that appoint him cannot tell the difference?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I agree with the gentleman there is confusion in some parts of the Capital. However, the gentleman that my chairman refers to, as I understand, secured that position on his own merit, on a civil service basis, his qualifications as an administrator and as an educated man, and it was in a nonpartisan type of work in one of the agencies of the Government, which is strictly known to be nonpartisan, and passed the civil service examination and all that sort of thing—

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I cannot yield any more on that. I do not question the gentleman's ability. I never did question the gentleman's ability. He was a man of outstanding ability, outstanding service, but what you are trying to do, you are trying to fix it so that they must pin a label on a fellow naming him a Republican or a Democrat before he is appointed and until we get a better judge of political complexion—will you get the point?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. That is done in the bill here on page 3, in two categories, and, of course, I am just trying to make the other category consistent with two that are labeled 3 to 2, Republican and Democrat. I am trying to straighten out the legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Now, let me talk a little bit. My point is, as long as they have so much difficulty in determining whether the prospective appointee is a Republican or a Democrat, what is the use of going to the bother about trying to pin a label on him?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; I yield to my distinguished friend, the former chairman of the Committee on Immigration, who wrote such a wonderful bill here, in conjunction of course with our friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [MR. GRAHAM]. You did a fine job, and I hope it is not amended. It was the result of a long and thorough study of the issues involved. The gentleman's committee held extended impartial hearings, had them printed, reached sound conclusions and came up with a bill which both Houses accepted. It was a fine technical job, a just bill and I hope the gentlemen who wrote it receive credit for their work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, what amendment did we vote upon just then?

The CHAIRMAN. That was the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the committee.

Mr. RAYBURN. I thought I heard most of the Republicans vote "no."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the gentleman from Michigan how many amendments he has?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have five more. As long as I am taking your figure, I do not see why you will not let me talk.

Mr. HALLECK. I guess that is a good deal.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I think so.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 4, line 21, strike out the words "or member thereof."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, now if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Texas, our former Speaker, the gentleman made the comment after I had finished my argument on the last amendment that he noticed most of the Republicans voted against it. Well, after 20 years under your rule from the Speaker's desk, do you not think that even they have learned that it is a good thing to keep Republicans in Executive offices, if they can? The party of the gentleman has been doing just that for so these many years.

Mr. Chairman, now back to this amendment. If you get the bill, on page 4 you will find these words:

The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses—

And so forth. My amendment proposes to strike out the words "or member thereof."

Now think of writing into a bill which gives the commission authority to subpena witnesses, administer oaths, and if witnesses refuse to answer or answer falsely, power to institute prosecutions

for perjury or contempt, the authority to permit any member of a 25-member committee to go off by himself and hold hearings. Is not that something? That shows you how the House sometimes will get ready to accept legislation which is extremely dangerous. Here you are giving this commission, or other provisions of the bill propose to give this commission, an unlimited sum of money. I will try to correct that by another amendment. There is no limitation on the funds we voted to them. There is no limitation on the authority. If you will look on page 5, you will see that certain statutes punishing criminal acts are applicable here, and those who are called by this commission or any one member of the commission are subject to those statutes. In fairness I ask you—time and time again this House has objected to investigations by one man, and sometimes by committees. Here you are authorizing a commission to send one member out any place in the continental United States and snoop into your books, and if you refuse to meet his demands, or if you make a false statement, you may be prosecuted for perjury. That is not all of it. You all recall the Christoffel case. The Committee on Labor and Education reported that case. The man was convicted and the case was reversed because it did not affirmatively appear that a quorum was present. How can 1 man be a quorum of a 25-man commission, especially when in another section of the bill, which I will point out later, it expressly states that 13 is a quorum? Have you ever seen a bill that was as full of holes as this one and as inconsistent as this bill is? I know the gentleman from Indiana never drew this bill; he is too good a lawyer to draw a bill like this.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, what words will the gentleman strike out?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I would strike out the words "or member thereof."

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe there is a Member of the House, when you stop to think about it, who wants 1 man of a 25-man commission to go around clothed with all the legislative power of the Congress of the United States to subpena and interrogate witnesses.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the amendment.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment, and I do so in all sincerity. Two or three years ago, by the authority of the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, I accompanied counsel of our staff and the director of our staff to California to take some depositions. I did take those depositions, and I was subsequently criticized, and I believe there was some basis in criticizing that basis of procedure.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I did not have that in mind when I was talking.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; but I want to say this. That the gentleman who is

now chairman of the committee criticized me for taking those depositions. At the time I took them, I was acting in good faith under the authority of the chairman of the committee, and I certainly intended no wrong doing. But I have come to the conclusion since that time that it is unwise for any Member of the House to sit as a subcommittee or to put himself in the position of exercising alone the authority of the Congress, particularly in regard to the issuance of subpoenas without the sanction of a quorum of his subcommittee or of a quorum of the full committee as the rules of the House may prescribe.

So, in all sincerity, I support the gentleman's amendment, because I believe it is fundamentally sound.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I think, in the first place, it ought to be pointed out, where reference has been made to the subpoena power and administering of the oath, that is contained in a committee amendment. I was consulted about that before it went in, by the action of the committee. I pointed out that, in my opinion, I could not conceive of any circumstance where by subpoena you could get any information that would help this committee that you could not get without a subpoena.

This is not the investigatory sort of an operation that is contemplated by some committees. This is a matter of obtaining information from people who are going to testify voluntarily. So I cannot conceive of any circumstance under which a subpoena would be required.

This Commission has only a short time in which to report, to get its work done. It is going to take some time to get it organized. I can well understand how in getting information in one city or another, the Commission could well designate a member of the Commission to go out and conduct hearings and to make the record and have the record written up, and bring it back for the consideration of the Commission itself.

I cannot see how any violence is going to be done here. Of course, if you worry about one person taking a hearing, that is something else. Why, all through the administrative branch of the Government there are quasi-judicial or quasi-legislative commissions in which they designate hearing examiners who go out and take testimony. Of course, if you go into a court of law, generally you are before just one judge.

I hold with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], that in the ordinary investigative work of a committee of Congress, where it is contemplated that subpoenas would be utilized, it might well be that you would not want to have just one person as the representative of the body. But I do not conceive this to be that sort of an operation.

I do not want to have anything written in here that will interfere with the expeditious, orderly, and efficient working of the Commission. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 4, line 24, strike out the word "administer"; and on page 5, strike out lines 1 to 13, inclusive.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, seldom have I seen an argument equal to that just given by my own leadership in an effort to impose its will upon the House. I hate to say that, but it is the absurdity of the argument of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]—the utter absurdity of it that forces me to speak. I dislike to be personal, I will not be personal, but I do not propose to be characterized as one who does not know what he is doing. The gist of the gentleman's argument was that "any member thereof" meaning a member of the Commission was not given the power of subpoena.

Let me read this to you:

The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof—

Now the gentleman said that "or member thereof" had nothing to do with a subpoena—

or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence—

And so on—

as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

What is the use of standing here and arguing to a group of supposedly intelligent people that that little group of words on page 4—"subcommittee or member thereof"—does not apply to the powers granted on page 5, when it expressly says—and I will read it again: "the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member"—I repeat, or any member—"may deem advisable."

Let us not be under any false impression as to what is going on here. That bill, if adopted, if enacted into law, authorizes any member of that Commission to go by subpoena into your office or home or my home and search for these papers, and require you to appear at a place designated, and bring those papers with you and submit yourselves to interrogation.

I say that that is a grant of power which I have heard the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] and many other Members of this House bitterly condemn here from the well of the House. As I said before, the Ways and Means Committee, the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate and the House, the latter were only recently granted authority by the Executive to look at income-tax returns with the understanding that its power would be most sparingly used and never unless there were some apparent open justification

for it; yet, here the House is granting authority to a Commission of 25 members, 15 appointed by the President, to go into all sorts of places, including your home, your office, your safe-deposit box, your pocket, even, and ask you to produce papers, come before one member and bare your soul, or stand in fear of contempt proceedings. I say it is an outrage. The amendment should be adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it is quite evident that the gentleman from Michigan has a lesser regard for me than I do for him.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No; that is not so.

Mr. HALLECK. I think it is quite true. If he had paid a little more attention to the amendment I do not think he would have offered it because it seeks to strike out an amendment the committee just wrote into the bill, so it is clearly out of order; and if I had been paying a little more attention at the time it was offered I would have made a point of order against it. The amendment was put in the bill as a committee amendment providing the subpoena power. I did not object strenuously to its going in because I could not conceive of any circumstance in the case of a commission of this kind where you could get anything of any value by a subpoena that you could not get by asking for it, and all this talk of going into peoples' homes and grabbing papers is groundless.

The committee has acted on the amendment; they have written it in the bill, and I say that action ought to stand.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 5, lines 14 through 21, strike our subsection (b).

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] thinks I have not the proper regard for him; I assure him I have. I respect his ability his integrity. But even mutual respect does not require either of us to cease thinking or forming conclusions. There is not a thing personal in my remarks. He is a lawyer and so am I; and as a lawyer I am accustomed—and I assume he is—to fighting battles in the courtroom and then going out to dinner with my opponent afterwards; and I hope that is true of our congressional battles also. If each of us cannot follow and voice his own sincere convictions then we better devise a system of giving all promises to a leader or spokesman.

I call your attention to the language on page 5 that this amendment deals with, subsection (b)—and I am very sorry my colleague gets disturbed just because I criticize a little bit—not him personally but the way a bill of which he says he is the author is drafted. A lawyer ought to be disbarred if he cannot take a little criticism. I have had a lot of it in my time and it was not all pleas-

ant—but, then, I did not believe it all, either.

Listen to this language:

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

That is a grant of authority which is denied every one of the standing and special committees of the House except two. I do not care particularly to argue it. It is another grant of arbitrary power to this Commission to secure information from any executive department. That power is not given to some standing committees of Senate and House.

We have a statute that protects tax returns. If this becomes a law, having been passed subsequent to that statute what would you think? Would this Commission have the right to go in and get your tax returns? Read it for yourself and make answer. This amendment should be adopted; the section should be rewritten.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: Page 5, line 24, after the word "amounts", insert: "not exceeding \$100,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this is supposed to be an economy Congress. My distinguished colleague from Indiana, our majority leader for whom I have the highest respect, read from the party platform a little while ago. I do not recall that he read anything that is there about economy or about balancing the budget. I do not know that it is there because frankly I have never read it. Someone said that platforms were a collection of promises devised to get votes. The longer I live, the more truth I see in that statement.

I noticed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the debate from the other side of the Capitol that there was inserted the words "applause" and "laughter." As I understand it, the Speaker of the House has ruled that those expressions in the RECORD are not in order and you cannot, therefore, get them printed. I am sorry I cannot on this occasion get that applause in the RECORD. It might indicate that I had some support.

Mr. Chairman, under this section it is stated:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Did you ever see anything like that before? The amendment I have offered would make it read:

There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts not exceeding \$100,000

as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Should there not be some limitation? I do not remember what the Hoover Commission had but there should be something in there along that line. When we gave President Roosevelt that blank check for I think it was a billion dollars or whatever it was, we at least put a limitation on it though it was close to the sky.

The majority leader has said that this is the first bill with his name on it that he ever got through. I would like to get through an amendment some time and this seems close to the proper time and I think in fairness the gentleman from Indiana, our majority leader, if he does not want to accept \$100,000 will let me amend it to provide for, oh, \$500,000 and then accept that amendment. I would like to offer that amendment if the gentleman will accept it. If not, I will have to ask you to vote on the one I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan) there were—ayes 31, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan: On page 7, line 1, after the word "Director", insert the words "not exceeding \$15,000."

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, these amendments have been offered not with any expectation that they would be adopted but just to have a record on the matter so that hereafter in some debate that may arise I will be able to follow the party line and quote the party position.

This amendment applies to a section beginning line 23, page 6, reading:

Without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe.

My amendment would place after the word "Director" the words "not to exceed \$15,000." It would fix his compensation at not to exceed that amount. The top which a committee may pay its chief of staff, its chief investigator, is \$11,646. A Congressman gets \$15,000 and pays his own expenses. There is no limit on what the Commission may pay its Director—and he draws his expenses. I am not so much concerned about the \$15,000. I would like to have some sort of limitation on what the Director shall be paid. This being an economy administration, one devoted to balancing the budget, it seems a little out of line to permit a commission to appoint a director and to fix his compensation without any limitation. If there is a member of this committee who ever voted for legislation which permitted a commission or any other group or agency or department of Government to fix the compensation of the head of it without any limitation as to amount, I would like to be advised when it was and what it was all about.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Now I challenge the membership of this House to point out now or subsequently in the RECORD to point out where such procedure was followed. How will it sound and how will it appear to our constituents if we vote here to let a Commission—to let a Commission, not the Committee on Appropriations, not the House, not a committee of the House, but a Commission entirely outside, not only appoint but fix, leaving to us, of course, to comply with it as well, the salary of the man it appoints and over whom we have no control. Did you ever hear of anything like that? This bill and the action of the House on it shows how far the House of Representatives will go in abdicating its authority so that it may go along with an administration. Now I am for the President and his administration but that does not mean and it does not follow that I surrender all of my principles or all of my common sense or that I do not reserve the right to disagree when to me an act appears to be wrong. This amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan) there were—ayes 56, noes 40.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments? If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. REECE of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4406) to establish a Commission on Governmental Functions and Fiscal Resources, pursuant to House Resolution 266, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1514) to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. Because existing confusion and wasteful duplication of functions and administration pose a threat to the objectives of programs of the Federal Government shared in by the States including their political subdivisions, because the activity of the Federal Government has been extended into many fields which, under our constitutional system, are the primary interest and obligation of the several States and the subdivisions thereof, and because of the resulting complexity of intergovernmental relations, it is necessary to study the proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States and their political subdivisions, with respect to such fields, to the end that these relations may be clearly defined and the functions concerned may be allocated to their proper jurisdiction. It is further necessary that intergovernmental fiscal relations be so adjusted that each level of Government discharges the functions which belong within its jurisdiction in a sound and effective manner.

COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out this act there is hereby established a Commission to be known as the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission."

(b) The Commission shall be composed of 25 members, as follows:

(1) Fifteen members appointed by the President of the United States, from among whom the President shall designate the Chairman and the Vice Chairman of the Commission;

(2) Five members appointed by the President of the Senate, 3 from the majority party, and 2 from the minority party; and

(3) Five members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 3 from the majority party, and 2 from the minority party.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) Thirteen members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number may conduct hearings.

(e) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) The Commission shall carry out the purposes of section 1 hereof.

(b) The Commission shall study and investigate all of the present activities in which Federal aid is extended to State and local governments, the interrelationships of the financing of this aid, and the sources of the financing of governmental programs. The Commission shall determine and report whether there is justification for Federal aid in the various fields in which Federal aid is extended; whether there are other fields in which Federal aid should be extended; whether Federal control with respect to these activities should be limited, and, if so, to what extent; whether Federal aid should be limited to cases of need; and all other matters incident to such Federal aid, including the ability of the Federal Government and the States to finance activities of this nature.

(c) The Commission, not later than March 1, 1954, shall submit to the President for transmittal to the Congress its final report, including recommendations for legislative action; and the Commission may also from time to time make to the President such earlier reports as the President may request or as the Commission deems appropriate.

HEARINGS; OBTAINING INFORMATION

SEC. 4. The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or independent instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this act; and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or by the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

APPROPRIATIONS, EXPENSES, AND PERSONNEL

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Commission, except that no compensation shall be paid by the United States, by reason of service as a member, to any member who is receiving other compensation from the Federal Government, or to any member who is receiving compensation from any State or local government.

(c) Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(d) The Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of such employees as it deems advisable in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the classification laws.

(e) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

(f) Without regard to the civil-service and classification laws, the Commission may appoint and fix the compensation of a Director who shall perform such duties as the Commission shall prescribe.

TERMINATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. Six months after the transmittal to the Congress of the final report provided for in section 3 of this act, the Commission shall cease to exist.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HALLECK: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 4406, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 4406 was passed

were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

MONDAY HOLIDAYS

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, may I call to the attention of the House the resolution which I introduced on January 6 of this year, which was thereupon referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. It is House Concurrent Resolution 14, which reads as follows:

House Concurrent Resolution 14

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that the several States should take action, wherever it is appropriate, to bring about the observance of holidays on the Monday nearest to the day on which each such holiday actually occurs, in order that the people may derive the greatest possible benefit from their observance. The President is authorized to communicate this declaration to the governors of the several States and to request them to take appropriate action to bring about such observance.

This resolution does not apply to religious holidays.

In the last Congress I introduced a bill with a similar purpose, which provided for direct congressional action, but I began to have doubts as to the constitutional rights of Congress to legislate on the subject and, therefore, concluded that the present bill declaring the sense of Congress might be helpful.

It has always seemed to me to be unreasonable that both business and labor should be the victims of holidays falling haphazardly and on inconvenient days. A holiday in the middle of the week is of little use to the workingman, and, of course, it is notorious that it is very disruptive of business and production. I see no reason why we should not control holidays for our convenience.

You will note that my bill excludes religious observances.

The Philadelphia Bulletin has recently published an editorial on this subject which is worth noting, and is herewith included:

SUMMER'S LONG WEEKEND

It happens every few years that two of summer's important holidays, Memorial Day and the Fourth of July, fall on Saturdays or Sundays, as they do this year. In tougher times than these this usually meant that a lot of people lost a holiday from their daily labors.

But by increasing custom the collision of a holiday with Saturday or Sunday is compensated by an extra day off, either the preceding Friday or the following Monday. This year, in some big offices and factories, half shifts are working today, and the other half will be on the job on Monday, while many organizations close down completely on one day or the other.

This means a long holiday, of which there will be four this year, including the Labor Day and Christmas weekends. This occasional coincidence of the calendar gives support and encouragement to the idea that all the important anniversaries of the year, with

possible exception of Thanksgiving, might be profitably celebrated on Mondays.

Today and until Monday evening the highways are likely to be crowded with people going places or hurrying home, some of them taking chances on ruining the weekend with a traffic accident. But a far greater number will happily stay at home, which is by no means the worst place to spend a long weekend at summer's beginning.

I have discussed this bill with the committee, and it is my understanding that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], who is the chairman of the subcommittee, plans an eventual hearing. I hope the bill will receive the support of the committee and membership of the House.

H. R. 3770

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I take this occasion to ask a question of the majority leader. What has become of the bill (H. R. 3770) to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes. My understanding of it was that the bill was to be disposed of today because the authority was needed by the Armed Services and others before the expiration of this month. As I understand it, there is no controversy about it.

Mr. HALLECK. 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 Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this minute so that I may answer the inquiry of the gentleman from Michigan. I did not know there was such a bill until a rule was reported on it, I believe, yesterday. The report was filed under the unanimous-consent agreement. The program according to the whip notice was that the bill we have just concluded was to be followed by the bill introduced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], the bill from the Banking and Currency Committee having to do with the creation of a Small Business Administration. I said to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] that I hoped we could dispose of these other three matters and take up that matter to which he has referred this afternoon because I recognize the situation. I hope we can do that. I do not know how expeditiously we can move. Subject to developments about which I am not sure yet, it was thought we might adjourn over until Monday, after concluding our business, but whether or not other things will intervene to prevent that, I do not know. Unless, after consultation with our colleagues, it is decided that that ought to be placed ahead of the next order of business, we ought to dispose of the

matters covered in the whip notice, and according to the program as announced last week.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have no personal interest in the matter at all, but I know that these matters were placed on the whip notice before the committee ever reported them out. On this particular bill there is no controversy at all.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield.

Mr. MCCORMACK. The bill was reported out unanimously. Its purpose is to extend an expiring law which enables those in the service of our country abroad to get checks cashed by agencies of the Government, including those who might be working for American contractors.

Mr. HALLECK. If that is the situation, and if there is no objection on that side, and I see no objection indicated by the members of the committee on this side, may I suggest that the gentleman from Michigan ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill, H. R. 3770, with this one amendment which is in the Senate bill. They added a new section, section 4, which reads:

The provisions of this act shall terminate on June 30, 1954.

There was no termination date in the other bill. If that amendment is put in, it will go through in time for the armed services to proceed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I suggest there is a Senate bill on the Speaker's desk, S. 1307, that is slightly different from the House bill, but rather than offer an amendment to the House bill, why not ask unanimous consent to take up the Senate bill and pass it, and then it will all be over.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1307) to amend the act of December 23, 1944, authorizing certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to authorize certain transactions by disbursing officers of the United States, and for other purposes," approved December 23, 1944 (ch. 716, 58 Stat. 921; U. S. C., 1946 edition, title 50 App., secs. 1705-1707), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. Subject to regulations promulgated pursuant to this act, disbursing officers of the United States are authorized, for official purposes, or for the accommodation of members of the Armed Forces and civilian personnel of the United States Government, veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States hospitalized or domiciled in institutions operated by the Veterans' Administration and other institutions operated by agen-

cies of the United States Government, contractors engaged in United States Government projects and the personnel of such contractors, and personnel of authorized nongovernmental agencies operating with agencies of the United States, to cash and negotiate checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and other instruments payable in United States and foreign currencies, and to conduct exchange transactions involving United States and foreign currency and coin, checks, drafts, bills of exchange, and other instruments; and when satisfactory banking facilities are not available, disbursing officers of the United States in foreign countries are also authorized, for the accommodation of any person who is a United States citizen, to cash checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States: *Provided*, That such checks are presented by the person to whose order they are drawn. Any official funds which are held by disbursing officers of the United States and which are available for expenditure may, with the approval of the head of the agency having jurisdiction over such funds, be utilized for these purposes.

"SEC. 2. Any gains in the accounts of disbursing officers of the United States resulting from operations permitted by this act shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as may be necessary to adjust any deficiencies in the accounts of disbursing officers of the United States which may result from such operations. For the purposes of this section, the heads of agencies having jurisdiction over disbursing officers of the United States are authorized, on a fiscal year basis, to apply gains to offset deficiencies in the accounts of such disbursing officers.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of the Treasury, the heads of other agencies having jurisdiction over disbursing officers of the United States are hereby authorized respectively to issue such rules and regulations, governing the disbursing officers under their respective jurisdictions, as may be deemed necessary or proper to carry out the purposes of this act: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury may delegate to the head of any agency, subject to such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, authority to issue such rules and regulations governing disbursing officers who are officers or employees of such agency and exercise the function of disbursement pursuant to a delegation by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall terminate on June 30, 1954."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

H. R. 3770 was laid on the table.

House Resolution 269 was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 267, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 992) for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. I reserve 30 minutes for myself.

I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I take this time to discuss another matter of reorganization that I had not intended to discuss today but I think this is a very opportune time to discuss it.

We have had a large number of resolutions setting up investigating committees, setting up commissions, setting up this and that, in order to streamline the various departments of Government, to cut out waste and duplication, to balance the budget, and to save the taxpayers' money. I think these are all fine, and generally I am in accord with them. I am in accord with the bill that was just passed, and I approve of the one that is now coming up for consideration.

But if I may have the attention of the Members, and particularly the attention of the leadership of the House and members of the Appropriations Committee, I would like to call to your attention another matter of reorganization that I am very much interested in.

If I could get you to understand what I am trying to say, and the problem involved, I think you would go along with this.

Last year the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and I jointly sponsored a bill that would provide the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate with the necessary tools to do away with duplication in the legislative body, and to save untold billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. The bill would set up a joint committee on the budget within the Appropriations Committees of the two Houses. That bill passed the Senate by an enormous majority. In the dying hours of the session the bill was lost in the House by 16 votes. In fact, we lost consideration of the bill by 16 votes. There was a reason for that, of course. It was apparent that there was jealousy of the prerogatives of one body as against the other and of one individual as against another. This was most unfortunate.

I make the bold statement that up until this year your Appropriations Committee, and therefore your Congress, have been at the mercy of the other branches of the Government. Take any

one branch of it, the military, for instance: They come before the Appropriations Committee and present an array of experts; and those experts know what they are talking about. And while the members of the Appropriations Committee, I grant you, are better versed about these matters than the average Member of Congress, yet they are almost completely at the mercy of these experts. They cannot cope with these experts in the military department or any other department they are considering. What they need is an independent staff of their own experts to advise the committee.

As a result of the fight that we made last year, at the last minute, the gentleman from Missouri who was opposed to this setup, the chairman of the committee [Mr. CANNON], came in and offered an amendment to an appropriation bill to give \$250,000 to the House Committee on Appropriations and a like sum to the Senate Committee on Appropriations to do this work, as a subterfuge for the bill of which I have been speaking.

Our bill would have set up a joint committee which would do away with the duplication that is now resulting from the \$250,000 the Senate got and the \$250,000 the House got; in other words, the House has its few experts going in one direction and the Senate has its experts going in another direction; there is no coordination, and at best there is duplication of effort. But it does not go far enough.

This bill would set up a joint committee on the budget of the Appropriations Committee in the House and in the Senate; it would have given them an unlimited number of experts so that they could cope with the situation, so they could do away with all of this waste and extravagance in Government. But we lost because it was argued that maybe the other body would take advantage of this body.

In the House version of the bill which I have reintroduced, H. R. 1710, provision is made for a disparity of membership to give the House more representation than the Senate on that committee and to make the chairmanship permanent in the House. I have reason to believe that the Senate would go along with it if the House would pass its version. The other day the Senate unanimously passed its bill again.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am very happy to yield to my friend from Michigan, who is a very able and conscientious member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RABAUT. I just want to say that this bill the gentleman speaks about was brought before Congress by Members other than those on the Committee on Appropriations; that is objection No. 1. So they are proceeding in a field with which they are not familiar, advising the Committee on Appropriations on matters properly within the Committee's jurisdiction.

The other thing is that the men who know the most about appropriations, the present able chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr.

TABER] and the distinguished ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], both are vigorously opposed to the idea of the bill.

The Members of the House of Representatives, as my colleague well knows, are elected every 2 years by the people. Appropriations have always been originated in the House. The House is responsible for bringing the matter up and it jealously has regarded the prerogative as its own to bring appropriations before the Congress of the United States. Under the bill presented the last time, there was a division of responsibility between the House and Senate. We thought it was a step on the part of the other body to get the camel's nose under the tent. To sugar-coat the pill, a provision is now added to place the chairmanship of the proposed committee in the House. Well, the entire matter belongs in the House and there is where it should remain.

As to the gentleman's statement that we do not have the experts, we do have experts available to us. We have them available to us from every department of the Government, we may call them in from one department of the Government to study the activities of another. We have the services of lawyers, accountants, and technicians in every field. We have had that help from time to time and we have had the best experts that we could get.

Last year, it is true, the amount of money that the gentleman referred to was finally agreed to at the end, but it was done simply to quiet the matter. I do not know what has been done about it this year because I have not been on the floor much due to sickness. With my long experience on the Appropriations Committee, which started almost 20 years ago, the appropriations and the study of appropriations and the initiation of appropriations should be in this body. For that reason the House should jealously guard its prerogative in that respect. That is the opinion of one who has been on the committee a long time. I speak today because I notice that neither the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] nor the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] are present. As the gentleman knows, I was chairman of the central subcommittee on appropriations the one time it existed, and I notice now there is support for it in the other body. It had its origin here, the central committee on appropriations at which time the greatest single cut in appropriations was made, namely in the sum of \$580 million. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to yield myself 4 additional minutes in order to reply to my very good friend. I appreciate very much that he did ask me to yield to him so that we could get his views. There is no man for whom I have a warmer feeling than I do for my friend from Michigan and I am very glad that he told you very candidly and frankly just what I got through telling you a moment ago that it is a matter of jealousy between one body and the other. But the taxpayers are

not interested in matters of prerogatives. They are interested in saving money.

Appropriations should originate in this body because the Members of the House are elected every 2 years. With that, of course, I am in accord. The Constitution provides that, and very wisely so. But there is nothing in this proposed legislation that would in any wise interfere with such legislation originating in the House. It would still originate in the House. But you would have a joint staff that would study it and report to the two bodies, the Appropriations Committees of the two bodies. You would get the same information, you would get it without duplication, and the committees would be better informed, they could legislate more intelligently, and then they could come back and tell the House and Senate how to legislate more intelligently. Of course, my friend would not contend for a moment, as wise and as diligent as he is, and he is a diligent member of the committee and of the House, that any man without an adequate investigating staff can intelligently pass upon all of these appropriations.

Next, so far as the chairmanship is concerned, under my bill we would have 9 as against 7 members, 9 members from the Appropriations Committee of the House and 7 members from the other body. It has been argued to me privately and otherwise that if we had such a joint study made, the other body would move in and take over. Well, I just want to say to my friend and those who are jealous of the prerogatives of the House, and certainly I am one of them, that if you have a 9-to-7 majority on a committee and the chairmanship of the committee in the House, I cannot go along with the proposition of an inferiority-complex nature that the House could not hold its own, particularly with the appropriations originating over here.

Mr. Speaker, let me say in conclusion that this is something I am very much interested in. I wish some member of the Appropriations Committee would take it up. I waited a long time for someone on the House Appropriations Committee to take it up, but no one on the committee has seen fit to sponsor it. I wish they would sponsor it. I do not have any pride in the matter. I am merely interested in results. I might add, however, that the Rules Committee, of which I am a humble member, has jurisdiction in the subject matter.

I talked to 1 or 2 members of the Committee on Appropriations and asked them to sponsor it, but again the taxpayers are not interested in that. They are interested in getting \$250,000 worth of results out of that staff rather than getting \$250,000 worth out of \$500,000 of their money in that staff. Of course, if time permitted we could go a little further into that, too. There ought to be something done about it, and I merely want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the matter because, again, the bill has passed the other body unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, it might be well for the Congress to get its own house in order while trying to get everything else in order.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 992) for the establishment of a Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government, be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government;

(5) defining and limiting executive functions, services, and activities;

(6) eliminating services, functions, and activities more properly within the jurisdiction of State and local governments;

(7) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise;

(8) postponing expenditures during periods of heavy defense commitments where deferral will not impair essential functioning of government;

(9) defining responsibilities of officials; and

(10) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 2. For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Qualifications of members: Of each class of four members appointed under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a), respectively, one member, if available, shall have served on the Commission established pursuant to the act entitled "An act for the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," approved July 7, 1947.

(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive \$75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the classification act of 1923, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EXPIRATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. Ninety days after the submission to the Congress of the report provided for in section 10 (b), the Commission shall cease to exist.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: The Commission shall make a report of its findings and recommendations to the Congress not later than February 1, 1954.

SEC. 11. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency,

board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, paragraph (1) strike out "limiting" and insert in lieu thereof "recommending methods and procedures for reducing."

On page 2, strike out all of paragraphs (5), (6), and (8), and renumber paragraphs (7), (9), and (10) as (5), (6), and (7), respectively.

On page 2, line 24, number the existing paragraph as "(a)."

On page 3, insert under section 2, the following paragraph (b):

"(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99)."

On page 3, line 10, strike "pro tempore."

On page 3, line 16 to 22, strike subsection 3 (b).

On page 3, line 23, renumber as subsection (b).

On page 4, line 23, change "\$75" to "\$50."

On page 5, line 4, number the paragraph "(a)."

On page 5, line 6, after the word "advisable", strike ", in accordance with" and insert the words "without regard to."

On page 5, line 7, change "1923" to "1949."

On page 5, section 7, add as paragraph "(b)", the following:

"The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1948 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals."

On page 5, lines 13 to 16, inclusive, strike out heading "Expiration of the Commission" and entire section 9.

On page 5, line 18, change "section 10" to "section 9."

On page 5, line 22, delete "of the executive branch", change "government" to "Government", and insert after "Government", "except the Judiciary and the Congress of the United States."

On page 5, line 25, strike all of paragraph "(b)" and include a new paragraph "(b)" as follows:

"(b) Report: The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time or times, as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, and shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1955, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations."

On page 6, substitute the following section 10 (a) for section 11 (a):

HEARINGS AND SESSIONS

"SEC. 10. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the

purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpenea or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpeneas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 2, secs. 192-194), shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpenea or to testify when summoned under authority of this section."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1947 the Congress created what has become known as the Hoover Commission, to study and investigate ways of reorganizing the executive branch of the Government to make it more effective and efficient. A national debt of \$265 billion annually augmented by an unbalanced budget is pushing us perilously close to the brink of the statutory limit of \$275 billion.

There is a proverb that "Economy is a great source of revenue." This we do believe. This we need to practice, first through organization and then through administration.

Everyone is acquainted with the progress made by the Hoover Commission, and gratifying though that progress has been, there is much remaining to be done. For this reason there is a general movement and need to continue the basic long-term studies on reorganization that we started under the Hoover Commission.

The bill to create the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government is a necessary companion to the bill to establish a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The best possible way to aid the States, counties, and cities is to reduce Federal expenditures. When this is done some tax revenues will be left at the local levels. In order to do this every possible means must be taken to reduce the cost of the Federal Government. We have learned that it is not easy to reduce Federal expenditures. The only safe way to do it is through better management; that is, reorganizing, merging, eliminating, consolidating, standardizing unnecessary and wasteful operations, practices, and procedures in the vast Federal establishment. The numerous hearings and investigations which have been conducted convince us that the field for greater economy and efficiency is unlimited. It must, however, be attacked in a scientific and skillful way. Great as the accomplishments were of the Hoover Commission, the job has only been partly done. Now is the time to continue that work while the background material is still available and the need

is so great. I sincerely hope that this body will adopt Mr. Brown's proposal, H. R. 992.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 106) for the establishment of a Commission on Governmental Operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress to promote economy, efficiency, and improved service in the transaction of the public business in the departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government by—

(1) recommending methods and procedures for reducing expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services, activities, and functions;

(2) eliminating duplication and overlapping of services, activities, and functions;

(3) consolidating services, activities, and functions of a similar nature;

(4) abolishing services, activities, and functions not necessary to the efficient conduct of government;

(5) eliminating nonessential services, functions, and activities which are competitive with private enterprise;

(6) defining responsibilities of officials; and

(7) relocating agencies now responsible directly to the President in departments or other agencies.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy set forth in section 1 of this act, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Governmental Operations (in this act referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) Number and appointment: The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, two from the executive branch of the Government and two from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, two from the Senate and two from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, two from the House of Representatives and two from private life.

(b) Political affiliation: Of each class of two members appointed in subsection (a), not more than one member shall be from each of the two major political parties.

(c) Vacancies: Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) Members of Congress: Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the executive branch: The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life: The members from private life shall each receive \$50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1948 (60 Stat. 810), but at rates not to exceed \$50 per diem for individuals.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) Investigation: The Commission shall study and investigate the present organization and methods of operation of all departments, bureaus, agencies, boards, commissions, offices, independent establishments, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government to determine what changes therein are necessary in their opinion to accomplish the purposes set forth in section 1 of this act.

(b) Report: The Commission shall submit interim reports at such time, or times, as the Commission deems necessary, shall submit a comprehensive report of its activities and the results of its studies to the Congress on or before December 31, 1954, and shall submit its final report not later than May 31, 1955, at which date the Commission shall cease to exist. The final report of the Commission may propose such constitutional amendments, legislative enactments and administrative actions as in its judgment are necessary to carry out its recommendations.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) Hearings and sessions: The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or

such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

(b) Obtaining official data: The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Brown of Ohio: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the provisions of the bill H. R. 992, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings whereby the bill H. R. 992 was passed were vacated, and the bill was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

CREATION OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 265) providing for the consideration of H. R. 5141, a bill to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5141) to create the Small Business Administration and to preserve small business institutions and free, competitive enterprise, and all points of order against such bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the

5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] and I now yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 265, makes in order the bill H. R. 5141, which was reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It provides for 2 hours of general debate and waives points of order. This bill is for the purpose of creating a Small Business Administration and to preserve small-business institutions and free, competitive enterprise.

Mr. Speaker, I have no request for time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, both the majority and minority members of the Committee on Banking and Currency concurred in asking for this rule. However, the bill itself, and I have no objection to the rule—

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Just a moment, I wish the gentleman would not take me off my feet so quickly.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understood the gentleman had concluded. I apologize to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I accept the apology. I know the gentleman is in a hurry and that was the subject I was coming to right now. We sometimes do things around here in a hurry when, perhaps, we ought to give them a little more careful consideration.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. There have been times here when we have given so much consideration to certain legislation that we have not acted wisely and well, and perhaps at times if we had acted on our first impulses, we might have enacted better legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I have never found that to be a good rule, but perhaps the gentleman from Ohio has.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman from Virginia, being a banker, I know is very conservative.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, what I want to say about this bill is that I do think it is a matter of considerable importance, and needs some quite careful consideration. I am in favor of the principle of the bill. I think it is not wise to handle it as rapidly, and I might say as carelessly, as we are about to handle it this afternoon. For instance, let us take the bill itself. I call your attention to this provision. I do not

know whether the gentleman from Ohio has explained to you what this bill is for. This is a bill to create a little RFC for small business. It says "small business." It provides in the bill what a small business is. I am just wondering whether the Congress wants to pass it with this definition contained in the bill without at least some discussion that might point the way to the administrator who is going to administer the act as to just what is meant by small business. Look at the vagueness of this language in section 3. "For the purposes of this act, a small business concern shall be deemed to be one which is independently owned and operated and which is not dominant in its field of operation.

I just wonder what that language means. Who can they loan money to? Who are to be denied the use of these facilities? That is just one thing.

Another example is the provision in the bill which says that nobody can borrow any money from this Agency unless they have been turned down by a bank. I wonder what that means. Does that mean that we are opening the door for a whole parade of unsound loans?

I said in the Rules Committee yesterday that this sounded to me a good deal like a Fair Deal bill. It looks like we are going to spread this money around to anybody who cannot borrow it anywhere else. That is a very eleemosynary sort of institution you are creating. I just wonder whether you intend to go as far as the implications of this bill would seem to indicate. Certainly, if a loan cannot be made at a commercial bank and all the bankers in an area say, "No. It is no good. Therefore, we won't loan it to you," I wonder whether it is good sound business for the Government to make this kind of loan.

I do not care to go into any further discussion of it at this time. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Will the gentleman withdraw his point of order until after the adoption of the rule?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has just advised me that members of his delegation have left, thinking that this matter would not come up today. Of course, it was on the whip notice, but the proceedings have been delayed so long that they thought it would not come up, and they were supposed to be notified. The only way he knows to notify them—and I am in the same position—is to have a point of no quorum. Tomorrow is Friday and we will have all day for the discussion of this matter. I do not think it is a good time to bring it up, and I hope the leadership will not bring it up at 4:15 in the afternoon. There will be a great many amendments. The bill is entitled to more consideration. I think it is belittling to the bill to bring it up at this hour.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The question is on the point of order, but having made the motion previous to that, I was asking the gentleman whether he had any objection to adopting the rule first.

Mr. PATMAN. Would the gentleman be willing to put the bill over after the rule is adopted?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am asking the gentleman who made the point of order first, if there is any objection to the adoption of the rule.

Mr. GREEN. No. I do not have any objection to the adoption of the rule, although I would like to have it held over until next week.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has permitted this colloquy to go on because he was hopeful that things could be straightened out.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me 1 minute?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman speaks of letting the bill go over until Monday. If this is not disposed of this afternoon we will have to meet tomorrow and dispose of it. I do not want any misunderstanding about that. Of course, if the gentleman insists on the point of order at this hour, I would not think it would be advisable to call the roll and try to go on with it. I suppose we could expect there would be other points of order. I had hoped we could dispose of these matters, and I agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] that there is no inclination on my part to rush anything. I thought I showed a rather patient disposition in permitting matters to go on this afternoon. But if the rule is adopted, if it is insisted on that side that a point of no quorum is going to be made—

Mr. GREEN. I will withdraw my point of order.

Mr. PATMAN. I will have to insist on it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws the point of order for the time being.

Mr. HALLECK. Will the gentleman yield me 1 additional minute?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HALLECK. I heard what the gentleman from Texas had said about how people had left and they did not know this was going to come up, but it has been on the whip notice on both sides. I did not tell anyone who asked me that we were not going to try to reach it. On the contrary, I told them that we would try to reach it.

Mr. PATMAN. I told them the same thing, but at the same time the gentleman knows how Members will see the proceedings drag on and on and on and they begin to think it will not come up. Here is a bill that takes the place of the RFC, Small Business Plants Administration. It is the only agency that small concerns of America will have, and it occurs to me that the gentleman would not want to belittle the importance of the proposal by bringing it up at this late hour in the day.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move the previous question so that we can adopt the rule.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not want to go into committee before making a point of order. If the gentleman will agree to put it over, I do not care when he puts it over to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. I take it the gentleman could make a point of order after we adopted the rule, which would require 218 Members to be present, any time before we go into the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PATMAN. I thought the gentleman would agree to put it over after the rule is adopted.

I hope the gentleman will agree to putting it over.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to make the point of order that a quorum is not present, but if the gentleman from Ohio will agree to putting consideration of the bill over after the rule is adopted, I have no objection at all to the adoption of the rule, but I want the agreement first.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio yield me a minute?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman from Texas will listen to me, I said that if the point of order were insisted upon on that side I would feel it would be useless to call the roll and try to go on with this bill tonight. That is just a straight statement of fact, and I make it so that the gentleman may understand exactly how I feel about it.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman who has charge of the rule will agree to that, if the rule is adopted he will not insist on bringing the bill up tonight I will not press my point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Ohio has no control over the legislation after the rule is adopted.

Mr. HALLECK. The gentleman may make his point of order after the rule is adopted.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PATMAN. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will agree to put the bill over.

Mr. HALLECK. There are several special orders on the calendar. I do not want to foreclose them. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, and I understand he does, it is obvious there is not a quorum here, so consideration of this measure will be put off until tomorrow.

AUTHORIZING PROCLAMATION OF AID-TO-KOREA WEEK

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 80, requesting and authorizing the President

of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as Aid-to-Korea Week.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 80

Joint resolution requesting and authorizing the President of the United States to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953 as "Aid to Korea Week"

Whereas the people of the United States feel a strong bond of friendship toward the people of the Republic of Korea in our common fight in defense of freedom; and

Whereas Korean women, children, aged, and maimed have been subject to the ravages of war for almost 3 years; and

Whereas the facilities of the Government of the Republic of Korea and the magnanimous aid of private relief agencies have not to date been nearly adequate for the monumental task of rehabilitation of the millions of injured, destitute, and homeless Koreans; and

Whereas the American military forces in Korea have been so moved by the suffering of the civilians there that they have contributed millions of dollars of their own money to help these stricken people; and

Whereas recent reports estimate there are 9 million dislocated persons, 100,000 orphans, 300,000 war widows, and 15,000 amputees in desperate need in that land which has borne such sacrifice to retain its freedom and independence and to resist Communist aggression; and

Whereas the practice of assistance through private relief agencies is in the best American tradition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc. That the President of the United States is requested and authorized to officially proclaim the week of June 7-14, 1953, as "Aid to Korea Week"; And be it further

Resolved, That the President shall by this proclamation call upon the American people, by their observance of this week, to demonstrate their friendship and affection for the distressed people of the Republic of Korea.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

COMPENSATION FOR OUR KOREAN WAR PRISONERS

MR. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

MR. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which is intended to correct an oversight with reference to those members of our armed services who have unfortunately fallen into the hands of the enemy since the Korean onslaught.

We have always made special provision for Americans who have been interned or captured by the enemy. The existing statutes, however, do not cover a situation such as the police action or undeclared war in Korea. My bill corrects that oversight and provides that any member of our Armed Forces who has been captured in Korea by a hostile force, when thereafter honorably dis-

charged, shall be discharged at the next higher grade and shall be compensated in addition to his regular compensation at the rate of \$2 a day, for every day that he remained in the hands of the hostile force.

I urge the early enactment of this bill.

IMPORTATION OF RESIDUAL FUEL OIL

MR. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.)

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

MR. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

MR. PATMAN. Tomorrow is Friday and all Members would like to be here to answer a rollcall, and I feel reasonably certain there will be one on the bill made in order by the rule just adopted. I wonder if the majority leader—and it is all right with the leaders on this side—would agree that any rollcall be put over until Monday. Would the gentleman agree to that?

MR. HALLECK. No; the answer is "No."

MR. PATMAN. We would be willing if the gentleman would.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL PROGRAM

MR. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

MR. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, I will not take very much time other than I will at this point in the RECORD place a statement giving the viewpoint of the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration on the veterans' hospital program. I will base that upon a New York Times news story of May 23. The information, I trust, will be of value to the Members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER and Members of the House, I am reading from the New York Times of Sunday, May 24 a news story with this heading: "VA Fears Closing of Six Hospitals—Officials Say 279 Million Trim in Funds May Force Them To Yield 4,809 Beds."

The article goes on to say:

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Veterans' Administration medical experts estimated today that they would have to close 6 or 7 veterans' hospitals as a result of cuts in their budget for the 1954 fiscal year, starting July 1. They were not ready to talk for the record, but their private calculations showed that 4,809 beds would have to be closed. These are in addition to 2,288 beds already held inactive for a lack of funds.

The article goes on to say that the VA medical officials are supposed to support the Budget Bureau when the appropriation hearings start. These same officials however "are concerned, though, about how to do that and still say what they feel they must—that the cut will mean reduced medical care."

The news story continues referring to the Veterans' Administration.

They figure it this way:

The proposed medical and hospital allowance, totaling \$657,600,000 is \$13,779,467 less than they had for the same purpose in the current fiscal year; yet 10 new hospitals will be completed during the year, adding 6,187 beds to the load they must handle.

The agency wanted money to hire about 6,000 extra persons to staff the beds in the hospitals to be opened next year. They received an allowance for only 1,383. To get the rest, the officials feel, they will have to "rob" older, less efficient and less desirable hospitals and that could mean closing some of the older ones.

Among those on the list to be considered for this purpose, it was learned are VA general medical and surgical hospitals in Fayetteville, Ark.; Fort Logan, Colo.; Lake City, Fla.; Fort Thomas, Ky.; Fayetteville, N. C.; Amarillo, Tex.; White River Junction, Vt.; Kecoughtan, Va.; Iron Mountain, Mich.; Vancouver, Wash.; Dublin, Ga.; Poplar Bluff, Mo.; Miles City, Mont.; Beckley, W. Va.; and Minot, N. Dak.

Records showed 24,837 veterans on waiting lists for admission to VA hospitals as of April 30. The agency's medical men say this list will be further lengthened by any closing of additional beds.

Another factor is that only about 3 in 10 of those on the waiting list have ailments classed as due to military service. Representative PHILLIPS has charged that care of such patients has been abused by veterans able to pay their own way.

NEW YORK TIMES AUTHORITATIVE NEWS SOURCE

Mr Speaker and Members of the House, I look upon the New York Times as an authoritative news source and if this news account of the plans to reduce VA hospitals is correct the situation is most disturbing. In view of the many letters that I have received from key veteran leaders in North Carolina, I have tried to make an exhaustive study of this veterans' hospital program in the light of the New York Times story.

POSITION OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET ON THE VETERANS' HOSPITAL PROGRAM

Today, I advised with the Veterans' Administration budget examiner of the Bureau of the Budget, and in passing I wish to commend the straightforward facts that were given me. I pointed out that the information received would be used in these remarks. I was advised that as of the end of December 1952 the Veterans' Administration had advised the Bureau of the Budget that there were 2,288 vacant beds due to the lack of funds. The budget officer called to my attention a fact which I knew to be true; that the Congress in its wisdom last year cut the VA program by \$31 million because these funds were not needed in view of the hospital-construction program which I will outline later in these remarks. It is the position of the Bureau of the Budget that the Veterans' Administration did not project its thinking far enough in advance in view of this heavy cut by the reduction of personnel and other administrative costs to absorb this \$31 million budget reduction.

It is the feeling of the Budget Bureau that had the necessary reductions in force taken place, these vacant beds would not exist. It was the opinion of the Budget Bureau also that even if funds were made available there was serious doubt that the required personnel would be available to man these hospitals.

POSITION TAKEN BY THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

I then advised today with the assistant budget officer of the Veterans' Administration to determine their position on the story in the New York Times. Here, again, I was advised that they did not know where this story originated and they would not assume any responsibility for same. I requested that I be advised of the status of vacancies in the hospitals mentioned in the New York Times story. That information follows with Oteen, N. C., included. I give here, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the location of these general medical and surgical hospitals, the bed capacity, and the vacant beds as of April 30, 1953, the latest available date on vacancies:

Veterans' hospitals now in operation involved because of lack of funds and/or personnel

Location	Bed capacity	Vacant beds, Apr. 30, 1953
GENERAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL		
Fayetteville, Ark.	254	35
Lake City, Fla.	378	70
Dublin, Ga.	500	40
Fort Thomas, Ky.	395	20
Iron Mountain, Mich.	250	32
Poplar Bluff, Mo.	201	43
Miles City, Mont.	100	56
Fayetteville, N. C.	416	49
Oteen, N. C.	1,500	137
Minot, N. Dak.	162	20
Amarillo, Tex.	156	33
White River Junction, Vt.	188	17
Kecoughton, Va.:		
Hospital	604	90
Domesticiliary	1,621	—
Vancouver, Wash.	575	79
Beckley, W. Va.	200	71
Total	7,500	792

VA AND BUDGET BUREAU DIFFER ON ESSENTIAL SERVICES

Mr. Speaker, I called to the attention of the VA officials the \$31 million cut in funds for last year. It was agreed that there were 2,288 vacant beds as of December 1952. I was advised that the medical people in the VA hold a different opinion on the number, type, and kind of technical and administrative services needed by the patients, and one would assume that if the patients receive the services needed, the necessary funds must be made available, and in this case they simply did not have the funds to carry on the services, and vacant beds resulted.

VETERANS' BUDGET NEEDS

Continuing, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is the position of the Veterans' official that if the sum of \$555 million requested by the VA is granted, they will be able to fill the vacant beds. When I questioned them on the availability of the necessary professional, technical, and administrative people to do this job, the VA felt assured that they could secure such personnel, which as indicated above, the Bureau of the Budget questions.

THE HOUSE IS ENTITLED TO KNOW THE FACTS

Not only is the House entitled to know the facts, but the veteran groups throughout the country should be informed. My mail is heavy from veterans' groups who are concerned, as I am, with the number of vacant beds. I ask these questions: Are these beds needed? Are sufficient funds being appropriated? If funds are appropriated, can the necessary professional, technical, and other required personnel be obtained in the respective areas?

I want the veterans in North Carolina to know that I have diligently sought answers to these questions and will continue to do so. The House will soon have an opportunity, I trust, to know the thinking of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with VA appropriations.

We must meet this subject in complete honesty. From what I have pointed out, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, there is a difference of opinion between two important branches of the Government, the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration. Who is right? We must maintain an open mind, but we are certainly entitled to have all the facts, and that is why, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor to bring this important matter to the subject of the House.

THE FUTURE NEEDS OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION IF WE ARE TO MEET THE DEMANDS OF NEW HOSPITALS

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I feel that we must project our thinking on this hospital program on the basis of the new hospitals that are now under construction and are practically ready to be occupied.

I am especially interested in the new 973-bed neuropsychiatric hospital at Salisbury, N. C. As of March 31, 1953, this hospital was 93 percent completed, and from all information that I can find it is now ready for occupancy. I want to know from the Appropriations Committee will funds for this hospital be made available in the new appropriation bill. From all that I can determine, there are not now such funds available and the scheduled opening for October 1953 of the Salisbury Hospital has been carried over into 1954, and no definite date for such opening has been set.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that it is time that we really came to grips with our VA hospital program in a way that will clear up the fog and we will know the full and complete story. What I am saying about this Salisbury, N. C., hospital is likewise true, in my opinion, of the following new hospitals under construction:

Hospitals under construction but the openings of which have been postponed due to proposed budget cut					
Location	Bed capacity	Percent completed Mar. 31, 1953	Expected date of completion	Latest estimated opening date	Construction costs
GENERAL MEDICAL AND SURGICAL					
Ann Arbor, Mich.	496	98	July 1953	October 1953	\$8,505,600
St. Louis, Mo.	496	84	December 1953	March 1954	7,968,000
Chicago, Ill.:					
Cancer research hospital	516	91	August 1953	November 1953	13,694,000
General hospital	496	99	May 1953	August 1953	8,448,300
Oklahoma City, Okla.	496	93	June 1953	September 1953	7,909,600
Pittsburgh, Pa.	742	81	December 1953	March 1954	14,001,500
Cincinnati, Ohio	496	77	do	do	8,162,800
New York, N. Y.	1,252	68	February 1954	May 1954	20,665,700
NEUROPSYCHIATRIC					
Salisbury, N. C.	973	93	July 1953	October 1953	16,417,800
Pittsburgh, Pa.	956	95	June 1953	September 1953	17,602,500
Brockton, Mass.	958	89	do	do	20,030,850
Los Angeles, Calif. ¹	1,000	19	May 1954	August 1954	20,014,000
Total	8,877				162,420,650

¹ Not scheduled to open until after fiscal 1954.

The question I want to know is this: Does the appropriations contemplated include not only sufficient funds to carry on the present load in the old VA hospitals above mentioned and any others not described, but also will we be able to open and run the hospital in Salisbury and the ones indicated below?

SENATOR TAFT SPEAKS FOR THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal said about "going it alone" referring, of course, to the remarks by the Senator from Ohio, Mr. ROBERT A. TAFT.

What I have to say at this time is not meant to be carping criticism but only to affirm some facts regarding foreign policy that must be obvious to all who are interested. It cannot be said, I believe, that there has been a great change in foreign policy since the Republican Party has come into power. It may well be that a new direction will become obvious as time goes on. It was my impression that the election of President Eisenhower was a result of widespread dissatisfaction with foreign policy under the previous administration.

As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the senior Senator from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, has again spoken out in the interests of these United States. In his latest foreign-policy speech last week in Cincinnati, he has expressed the deep concern of his countrymen about our involvement in foreign affairs. His is the lone voice that

dares to challenge a policy of draft and equivocation in the State Department. Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has the overwhelming support of the people of this country behind him because he expresses their thoughts.

Recently Secretary Dulles and Mr. Stassen have returned from a personal trip to the Near East and southeast Asia. Upon their return they have informed the American people of the results of their trip. I think it is encouraging to note that they feel confident that these important areas of the world which are in crisis can be made to feel that the United States is on a friendly basis with them. This is good news and may be evidence of a change in foreign policy as applied to that part of the world.

Those who have criticized Senator TAFT are playing the old ostrich game with their heads buried in the proverbial sands; they refuse to face the facts of foreign policy; they are chained to a visionary concept that has failed to bring peace in Korea or to provide an effective organization for collective security in the United Nations.

It has been charged, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Ohio seeks to divide us from our allies and that he is blind to the consequences of his act. Such a charge cannot be supported by the facts.

On the record, Mr. Speaker, where is the division between the allies and who is it that advocates a go-it-alone policy? Is anybody fooling the American people as to who is fighting the war in Korea? The people are far out in front of those who are making foreign policy. Our erstwhile allies have been content on the one hand to have the United States finance them militarily and economically and at the same time fight a war thousands of miles from home.

It is our allies, Mr. Speaker, who appear willing to accept peace at any price, contrary to the best interests of the United Nations, the United States, and the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Speaker, who is trying to divide our allies? The record is abundantly clear that they are prepared to appease the Communists by voting Red China a seat in the Security Council of the U. N. The American people are shocked at this suggestion. It is an insult to the sacred memories of the men who have been killed in action, to their loved ones left behind, and to the thousands of others who have been injured for life.

Is there any doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations as an avowed agency to prevent aggression, has failed since 1950 to prevent war? It has missed the boat completely. The record is clear.

Is there any doubt of the fact that the defense of Europe is the primary responsibility of the people who live there? Yet 160 million people in the United States are expected to fight and die to defend 225 million Europeans. Unfortunately our propaganda has been such as to lead our friends to believe that our security is involved in the defense of Europe and Asia. It is an untenable position as history will eventually show.

Was not the Senator right when he said, and I quote:

It seems clear that Mr. Churchill and the French administration would be willing to assign that zone of influence—

The Iron Curtain countries—gladly and abandon the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarians, and Romanians to the tender mercies of Soviet Russia in return for some cutting of armaments, free trade, and promises to behave in the future.

Of course, we know, Mr. Speaker, that a shifting of policies to meet expedient situations is a standard Churchill practice. The world has not forgotten King Peter and that great Yugoslavian patriot Mihailovich who was double-crossed by the British. Nor has it forgotten the double-cross of the patriotic Poles who fought by our side in World War II upon a promise that with victory would come a free and independent Poland. But at Yalta it was expedient to sell the Poles down the river.

The criticism of the Ohio Senator is unfortunate in view of his statement. It must be read thoroughly to understand it fully. The charge that his remarks were an attack upon the President is baseless. And further the Senator was speaking as a friend of the United Nations yet with full recognition of its patent and inherent weaknesses.

As to the President, his friend, what did he say? He urged tolerance of those who are conducting our foreign affairs. He said they know more now than did their predecessors and that they are inspired by the best of good will toward all nations at a time when they are faced with problems never before presented to the United States in all its history.

Let those who have unfairly criticized the gentleman from Ohio face the facts realistically as he has done, honestly, forthrightly, in the primary interest of the United States. Do those who have been unfair approve of a truce that will surrender the Republic of Korea to the Communist wolves? Do they approve of the Churchill effort to give Red China a seat in the Security Council? It is fair, I believe, to assume that they do approve.

It was Mr. David Lawrence, who in the current issue of U. S. News & World Report, sums up this situation better than I can. He said:

It would be a grave mistake if any Europeans or Americans, because of hasty or superficial reading of what Mr. TAFT said, should misrepresent his position as isolationism. He states that he believes in the U. N. as a means of persuasion and for other useful purposes. He has voted for the support of NATO. But he doesn't believe in sitting by and letting America get buffeted about by allies who now propose to abandon the objectives for which the troops in Korea have been making their sacrifices.

Though there will rightly be differences with Senator TAFT on certain points, especially as to the military defense of Europe, his main thesis—that we should face the realism of our times—is wholesome and will be helpful in forging a strong alliance. For our allies must inevitably perceive that their failure to support wholeheartedly the American effort and purpose in the Far East can be as fatal to the principle of collective security in Europe as it has been in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, let every American who has the interest of this great country at

heart stand up and thank the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. TAFT, for the fearless contribution he has made to an issue that is paramount in the hearts and minds of all the people in this country.

THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1954

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANFIELD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say, as a preliminary statement to the Members that there was delivered to every office this afternoon as quickly as it was mimeographed, a draft of the statement I am about to make. There will be minor changes and a few additional figures, which were not available last night.

The revised budget figures for the budget request for fiscal year 1954, for the Veterans' Administration were received by the Committee on Appropriations, and handed to the Subcommittee on Independent Offices late on the afternoon of May 21. I call your particular attention, Mr. Speaker, to that date, and I ask you to compare it with the dates on the telegrams and the letters which many Members received on this subject, many of them speaking of cuts which had been made, and some giving specific figures. Actually, we had not yet received the revised budget requests.

The subcommittee held hearings on this budget item on May 25, 26, 27, and 28, and then recessed so the staff could work over the resulting figures. We met to markup the bill on June 1 and 2, just 2 days ago, Mr. Speaker. With the exception of a possible final polishing, we are ready to take the bill to the full committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has this set for the 12th, and the leadership has, I understand, scheduled the bill for the floor on the 16th and 17th.

A PERSONAL STATEMENT

It is the custom, Mr. Speaker, not to release figures, which are expected to appear in appropriation bills, until after the bills have been acted upon by the full committee, and reported to the House. That is a good custom. Seven members of a subcommittee, in this instance, will report to a full committee of 50 members and it is obvious that, as with any appropriation bill, a discussion in the full committee could result in changes, either in figures, or in language, or in the accompanying report. A premature announcement could therefore cause confusion.

However, I have asked the chairman, and the policy committee, as you know, Mr. Speaker, on my own responsibility, to permit me to come to the floor today and speak of the intentions of the subcommittee, and its recommendations, regarding some of the items in the VA appropriation. I think it is time some of the misunderstanding is cleared up. This is particularly true, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that there will be an unexpected delay of a week in reporting the bill, beyond the dates I mentioned before this to some of the Members.

VETERANS OR POLITICS?

I make this as a personal statement, Mr. Speaker, but I think I speak for the overwhelming majority of the Members of this Congress when I say that it would be most unfortunate if the problems of taking care of the deserving veterans of our wars, or of the money appropriated for that purpose, were to be made political issues. The eventual damage to the cause of deserving veterans would swamp any temporary political advantage.

VETERANS SUPPORT CONGRESS

Neither the attitude of the subcommittee nor its procedures in handling this budget item for the VA has been changed. Neither the opinions nor the intentions of the chairman and the other members of the subcommittee have been changed. We have had confidence that the same people who have sent the letters and the telegrams will be the ones who will support the committee and the Congress when they discover the facts. I have come to the conclusion, however, that a combination of Pennsylvania Dutch and Cornish blood is an asset to a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

On the 16th of this month we expect to bring to the floor the second independent offices appropriation bill. It will contain the appropriations for the Atomic Energy Commission; for the Selective Service System; for the Tennessee Valley Authority; and for the Veterans' Administration. My hope is that with the material I will give, informally and briefly in this statement, as compared to the often inaccurate figures with which the Congress has been flooded for weeks, the Members, Mr. Speaker, will be able to pass this information on to the veterans in their home communities. My own mail is an indication that 80 percent of the veterans will support the Congress. In fact, I think the only criticism from the great body of veterans, who are themselves the taxpayers who will be called upon to pay the bill for the Federal budget for the fiscal year 1954, is that the Congress probably did not cut deeply enough.

VA BUDGET TOTALS

The Veterans' Administration, Mr. Speaker, is the largest of the independent agencies. It is doubtful if any Member of this Congress could give me, offhand, a complete and accurate list of the services and benefits it offers to the veterans of our several wars. I could not myself. There are 40 benefits listed, from different enactments by the Congress, in one list.

For these benefits, services, and functions, the VA asked the Congress, for fiscal year 1954, for \$4,574,214,664, and this figure was reduced, in the revised budget figure, to \$4,295,046,664. Compared with the so-called Truman budget, this is a reduction of \$279,168,000, or only about 6 percent which, when you deal with billions, is not a very large reduction in a request for additional funds. Compared with the estimated expenditures for the current year, how-

ever, the revised budget is an increase of \$137,842,704.

I am unable to give you the exactly comparable figures in the coming budget, Mr. Speaker, because they require computation. The total in our recommendations will probably be about the same as the figure in the revised budget; perhaps a little larger, but not very much larger, if you will support us. The biggest figures, of course, are for compensation benefits, for insurance, and similar items. These are simply matters of calculation. The original estimates were made up by the VA, probably about the time we left for home a year ago, and no crystal ball is accurate enough to determine a year in advance how many Korean veterans there will be, nor what they will require, nor how many older veterans there will be still getting compensation, educational benefits, and other aids. So, as we do every year, Mr. Speaker, my subcommittee went over the figures, bringing them up to date as nearly as possible. We raised the estimates on insurance, for example. We reduced the calculations on compensation. I do not think that these are controversial items.

It is in the field of hospitalization that there has been some misunderstanding, and I now direct my comments to that section of the budget.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTING

As I said in April, some of this misunderstanding has to do with the accounting system of the Veterans' Administration. It is a good system. It was set up by the Veterans' Administration under the supervision of the Comptroller General, and with suggestions from members and staff members from the Committee on Appropriations in the 80th Congress. It could be left alone but, in order to clear up the present confusion, my subcommittee will recommend breaking the accounts into several appropriation items instead of the present single item in that part of the budget.

The present system sets up the total item as "Veterans' Administration: Administration, medical, hospital, and domiciliary services" under the accounting code numbers 1000 to 9000 inclusive. As I said in part on April 1: Item 1000 is for the general administration of the VA, and there is a separate item, 8100, to cover the direct administration of the hospitals and related services. The subcommittee recommends increasing the 1000 item by about \$400,000 to improve internal auditing. I mention this, Mr. Speaker, only in passing, as it seems to be known very quickly in every corner of the United States, when we reduce a request, but I seldom hear it mentioned that we quite often increase requests.

Item 2000 is for the field contact service. This was controversial last year. I do not think it was completely understood. This does not include the contact men actually in the hospitals, who are accounted for in the direct hospitalization costs.

Item 3000 is for the administration of the compensation and pensions division. Congress will be asked to appropriate \$2,246,291,000, for compensation and

pensions in another part of the bill, and \$34,738,000 for the administrative activities, under code number 3000, to which I am now referring.

Item 4000 is the one for the administration of the insurance section, and again I point out, Mr. Speaker, that the subcommittee will recommend a million dollars more than the budget figure. We are convinced the high percentage of errors can be reduced by certain procedural improvements for which this money would be needed. We will recommend about \$30 million for administration costs, to operate a fund whose liabilities now total \$40 billion, and for which we will this year appropriate \$93 million, for military and naval insurance, the national service life insurance, and servicemen's indemnities.

I interpolate, Mr. Speaker, that although I understand my subcommittee has been jokingly referred to as the "Antiappropriations Subcommittee," we are not really as bad as that. We do have a policy of trying to understand the purposes for which money is requested, and on your behalf, we do increase or decrease items in the yearly budget, where we think it desirable. We do prefer to make cuts, knowing why, and where, rather than to make percentage cuts. We also think our record is the best proof of the fact that we recognize the urgent necessity of getting the budget back in balance.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I have said, again and again and again, that it is the disabled veteran who will suffer the most from the effects of a continued deficit policy. Not only do approximately half of the taxpaying families find themselves in the veteran category, but further deficits can mean only paying the veterans, among others, with inflated dollars. I said in April that the World War I veteran buys about one-third with his dollar today that the dollar would buy when he was discharged. The World War II veteran buys about one-half with his dollar that it would buy when he enlisted. I ask again, Do we want all veterans to buy still less, in the future, with the dollars the Congress appropriates for them? My subcommittee is trying to do its small part in protecting the veteran's dollar.

I continue the accounting analysis.

Item 5000 is for the administrative costs of the vocational rehabilitation program, but does not include education and training in the hospitalization program. Item 6000 is the loan-guaranty program, and item 7000 refers to readjustment allowances.

HOSPITALIZATION ITEM

Now, at long last, as I recall the Duke of Windsor once said, Mr. Speaker, I come to the item you have been waiting patiently to hear about. The cost of hospitalization of disabled or sick veterans is under code No. 8000. This breaks down into 8100, which is the administrative costs of all such hospitalization and care; 8200, which covers research work in the hospital program; 8300, education and training in the hospitals, and you must differentiate this from code 5000, already spoken of, which is reha-

bilitation work outside the hospital program. Then comes 8400, which breaks down still further into 8410, the cost of operating NP hospitals; 8420, the cost of operating TB hospitals; 8430, the cost of operating G. M. and S. hospitals; and 8440, the cost of contracting for additional beds in Federal, State, or private hospitals. The remaining items under code 8000—hospitalization in general—are 8500, the cost of appropriation items for domiciliary care; 8600, the appropriation for outpatient care, both medical and dental; and 8700, the cost of supplies for all hospital programs.

I want to make clear, Mr. Speaker, that it is this entire field of VA activities, from the salary of the Administrator himself, and the other 41,522 employees of the VA who have no direct relation to hospitalization, down to putting a new pane of glass in a broken window of a regional office, which added up to a total of \$921 million in the original Truman budget request. It includes code numbers 1000 to 9000 inclusive, plus other items. There are numerous expenditures in this total, concerning which the veterans' organizations have indicated possible economies. These run into millions of dollars, because we work in large figures. What may be only a dollar or so, in some individual case, becomes millions of dollars by the time it reaches the subcommittee room, because we have the item multiplied by the number of veterans benefiting.

The figure which should have been used, in the telegrams we all received, is \$549,079,300. This is the amount, in the \$921 million total, which covered the costs of operating VA hospital beds. That does not include money for contract beds in other hospitals, and for both domiciliary care and outpatient care.

HOSPITALIZATION RECOMMENDATIONS

The subcommittee will recommend a reversal of the usual procedure this year. In previous years the Committee on Appropriations has set a money figure, based on the estimated number of beds, multiplied by the estimated costs of operating those beds. I do not want to engage in an argument over whether or not the appropriations have been adequate. I will say that this method has not connected the two figures closely enough, the number of beds to be operated, with the money appropriated.

This year the committee secured from the VA its own figure, as usual, of the maximum number of beds which it could open, equip, staff and operate in fiscal 1954, allowing the VA officials themselves to make the justifiable allowances for actual dates of opening new hospitals; and for other items which enter into such a figure, including the difficulty of getting the doctors, dentists, nurses, psychiatrists, technicians, and all other categories required for a balanced hospital staff.

This figure is set by the VA as 114,315. On the experience of the VA that average occupancy of these beds will be about 90 percent, the VA again set this figure as approximately 102,000 daily patient load.

The committee then asked for the money figure which would permit the VA to operate that many beds, on its own standards, and to its own satisfaction, in fiscal 1954. After some calculation, the VA officials came up with a figure of \$555 million.

This is the figure which the subcommittee proposes to recommend to the full committee and, if accepted by it, to the Congress. There is, however, a string attached, of which all Members of Congress will approve. Since these are the VA's own figures, and since in previous years, argument over this item in the budget centered around whether or not the money was used for the purposes for which it was appropriated, the subcommittee will recommend that the money be tied directly to the number of beds. If these beds are not opened in the next fiscal year, then the money will be reduced proportionately.

We will further identify this hospitalization cost by taking the figure I have indicated out of the larger figure and making it a separate item in the budget itself.

ASSURANCE TO VETERANS AND OTHERS

On the basis of this recommendation, Mr. Speaker, every Member of Congress may write to anyone interested, that the Committee on Appropriations will recommend, for the hospitalization of deserving veterans, every dollar requested for this purpose by the Veterans' Administration. They may go further, on reading our hearings, and say that it is the opinion of VA officials that the figure of 114,315 beds is the absolute maximum number of beds they feel they can activate and staff in fiscal year 1954. This will be more beds and more patients taken care of than in 1953, or in any previous year, by the VA.

"CLOSED BEDS"

I can think of few things more useless than verbal post mortems, Mr. Speaker, but since a great many of the telegrams and letters have demanded the return of money supposedly cut from last year's appropriation, or the reopening of beds closed for failure to supply the money needed to keep them open, I think I must make some brief statement to clear up this misconception.

Congress approved a reduction in the requested funds for 1953 for about \$39 million. The Senate suggested a cut of \$31 million. The conference committee took the smaller figure and wrote into the conference report, and both Houses approved, the following statement:

Conferees have approved the full amount of the budget estimate for research, including work in connection with prosthetic appliances, and have further agreed that there should be no reduction in the number of doctors, dentists, nurses and technicians.

We had appropriated \$502 million in fiscal 1952 for the operation of the three categories of VA hospitals; and we were appropriating \$515 million for the same item in fiscal 1953. The reduction suggested in other areas was less than 5 percent of the total request for these items for the entire program, and I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if you will say that a

5-percent reduction could not have been made in the VA without closing beds?

WHY BEDS WERE CLOSED

Nevertheless, beds were closed, or else they were not opened as Congress had been told they would be opened. Why? I cite a few reasons:

First. In certain of the hospitals on the published list, it was not possible to get the necessary staff. This applies particularly to psychiatrists. A ward of 18 beds in the Manchester, N. H., hospital was never opened, because it was impossible to get a psychiatrist for so small a number of patients. Money was not the reason. Only within the last few weeks has the VA, so it thinks, been able to work out a relationship with Boston University, so that this ward can be serviced through that medical school and hospital.

Fargo, N. Dak., lost a surgeon. Even after closing the beds at Fargo, listed on the published list, there were still fewer patients than available beds. I could go down the list and prove to you that the lack of funds, in many cases, was not the reason for what have been called closed beds.

Second. Location of the hospitals. A few of our VA hospitals are not located where the patient load justifies opening more beds. This is particularly true when there is shortage of doctors and other staff members.

That is the fault of the Congress, not the fault of the VA.

Congress must remember, Mr. Speaker, that only a few days ago we were forced to pass a bill, which many of us did not like, to draft doctors and dentists, in order to supply the necessary medical and dental attention to the men actually in the military today. Shall we draft doctors to serve nonservice connected veterans, whose reasons for hospitalization have nothing to do with their war services?

Third. The VA, for reasons known only to its Administrator and its medical director, chose to increase salaries to a total of \$7,500,000 when this amount alone would have kept open all the beds on the published list. A reduction of only 2,000 employees, not touching the hospitals, would have provided that amount of money, even if no other reductions or economies had been made.

Fourth. The VA admits that it will come out at the end of the year with a surplus of \$8½ million in the 1,000 to 9,000 programs, at least \$6½ million of which will be in the hospitalization program alone. In addition, the VA transferred \$4 million to the out-patient dental program, which already had, in February, a balance of over \$5 million. The VA apparently decided that fixing a few teeth was more important than keeping open the beds on the published list.

I should add that our committee's own accountants, working in the VA, tell us that the above estimate of surplus is conservative. A year ago the surplus was over \$15 million.

Fifth. Finally, and I hope conclusively, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind you of the supplementary appropriation of \$10 million, which the House voted the VA

on February 19 in a bill signed by the President March 28. This was intended to give the VA additional money for the fourth quarter. Of this money \$5 million was specifically requested for the hospitalization program. I think it might interest you if I gave the justification figures on which the appropriation was made:

For neuropsychiatric hospitals	\$1,092,000
For tuberculosis hospitals	557,000
For general medical and surgical hospitals	5,586,700
For additional travel	132,000
For consultants	981,000
For initial supplies	2,000,000
Less: Reimbursements	2,310,751
Less: Available funds	3,038,849
Net total	5,000,000

This money could have opened most of the beds listed as closed. Not \$1 of the \$5 million, Mr. Speaker, was used for the purposes for which it was given the VA. One million dollars was used to start building the staffs of hospitals to be opened in fiscal 1954, and the remaining \$4 million, as I have just said, was transferred to the out-patient dental program.

NO HOSPITALS TO BE CLOSED

Many Members of the Congress received letters or wires asking if hospitals were to be closed. Evidently information was sent out from some source indicating that the budget requests for 1954 would make it necessary to close some hospitals. It must have been implied that these hospitals were in every State, from the telegrams and letters. In at least two instances, specific hospitals were named. One was at White River Junction, Vt., which is a few miles from the home town of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], and the other was in the State of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS]. By a peculiar coincidence, both of these gentlemen are members of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices. This coincidence is undoubtedly related to the one which found notices of reduction in force in the VA—actually necessitated by not spending appropriated funds on the basis justified before our subcommittee—being sent out in the month of October 1952, to take effect on November 4. That date, Mr. Speaker, you may recall was election day. Our hearings, when published next week, will show conclusively, and on the word of VA officials, that there was not the slightest basis in fact for the rumors. Neither the Truman budget recommendations, nor those of the revised budget, would have necessitated the closing of hospitals, and this was not contemplated by the VA.

VISIBILITY

The committee will recommend that the code 1,000 to 7,000 items, inclusive, be put in one figure in the bill. We will also recommend that the three items 8100, hospital administration; 8200, research, in hospitals; 8300, education and training, in hospitals; be set up as an item; the three combined.

We will then recommend that the appropriation for the costs of operating neuropsychiatric, tuberculous, and general medical and surgical hospitals—for

which I said we would recommend \$555 million—be separated and set up as an item in the bill.

We will recommend that the three following items be separated and each one set up as an individual item in the bill: We will recommend that contract beds in other than VA hospitals—8440—be set up as a separate item, taking about \$20 million; that domiciliary care—8500—to be set up as an item for about \$24 million, and that out-patient care—8600—dental and medical, which will run over \$90 million, will be set up as a separate item.

This leaves me only an item, covering supplies, to wrestle with, as the separation of the other items from the customary single budget figure make it necessary to change the accounting procedure which has to do with the VA inventory. I do not think you are particularly interested in this problem, Mr. Speaker, so if you will wait for the bill to come out on the 16th, you will find out how we had to figure it out. It is an accounting problem, and there is no controversy involved.

BUILDING NEW HOSPITALS

For a number of years, under both parties, the Bureau of the Budget, speaking for the President, has recommended against building new hospitals until a thorough reexamination can be made of the entire VA hospital program. All veterans' organizations have felt that some such reexamination is indicated.

The Committee on Appropriations has agreed with this so far as G. M. and S. hospitals are concerned. The Nation has been building Army, Navy, and private hospitals. There are at least 200 vacant beds in the Navy hospital at San Diego, for example. Shall we spend the money to build a new 200-bed G. M. and S. hospital in San Diego, or shall we contract for the use of unoccupied beds in the Navy hospital?

Cleveland wants a new G. M. and S. hospital to replace the existing VA hospital at Parma, the Crile Hospital. We are right now closing a Public Health Service hospital in Cleveland which has about 200 beds. The proposed hospital in Wade Park is shown as a replacement.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to my good friend, the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. There is no present hospital in Wade Park; it has not been built. We have been waiting for 4 or 5 years to get it built.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am very glad to have that correction. The proposed hospital is shown as a replacement.

As a matter of fact, we have closed, or are closing four Public Health Service hospitals. There are VA hospitals with many vacant beds. There are thousands of vacant beds in Army and Navy hospitals.

The subcommittee does not attempt to decide this issue. We only say that, so far as general medical and surgical hospitals are concerned, that we urge a review of the entire VA program, and the use of our existing facilities to the greatest

possible degree, before we build more such hospitals. The adaption of wards; building additions; changes in the use of hospitals for a different category of patients, all these things are important, now that we have reached the edge of the possibility of staffing VA hospitals.

The subcommittee does not feel the same about the NP hospital program. This is a field so broad, and a discussion so technical, I do not want to open it now. It is a fact, however, that the veteran population has moved westward, and that the number of NP beds is not adequate for the present load. To take the program to its present limit, and then abandon it, would subject the Congress to well-deserved criticism. NP veterans are presently in State institutions, in crowded and hazardous conditions. They are sometimes in jails for want of hospital accommodations, or they are at home, when proper care and treatment might return them to mental health.

Last year, as the gentlewoman from Ohio will recall, this subcommittee recommended, against the suggestions of the Bureau of the Budget, that money be appropriated for building "with the approval of the President," 2 NP hospitals, 1 in Cleveland and 1 in Los Angeles. These were the spots of greatest need a year ago. The Los Angeles NP hospital will be finished in August 1954, and the Cleveland NP hospital has the money and should be in construction during the next fiscal year. At the moment, it has a temporary deferment because of the general administrative request that all new construction starts be held up until an opportunity could be given to review them.

In the new budget, the subcommittee will continue its NP building program, and will recommend money for the 2 remaining NP hospitals, one at San Francisco and one at Topeka. The latter is adjacent to the Menninger Clinic, and this is the source of many of the psychiatrists we need for the NP program. The same wording will be in the new bill, "with the approval of the President."

SHALL WE CONTRACT OR BUILD?

It should be of interest, Mr. Speaker, to state the costs of taking care of patients in VA hospitals, and in beds under contract in other hospitals. For the current fiscal year the cost of caring for a veteran in a VA hospital is \$8.87 for an NP patient; \$16.72 for a TB patient, and \$20.37 for a G. M. and S. patient. The contract cost of a bed in an Army, Navy, or Public Health hospital is \$14.25 right now. After July 1, the contract cost will rise to \$14.75 a day.

It is obviously economical to contract for the vacant beds, which now run into the thousands in other Federal hospitals, rather than build more VA hospitals at an approximate cost of \$20,000 a bed—the cost of a 1,000-bed hospital is about \$23 million—and then operate the beds in it at a cost of \$20.37 a day, when the patient can be cared for in a Navy hospital—which otherwise would have vacant beds—for \$14.75 a day.

My subcommittee has done nothing about this, but does suggest that a closer relationship between VA hospital beds

and contracted beds would solve some difficult situations, as well as save the taxpayers very large sums of money. We offer San Diego, Philadelphia, and Queens County, N. Y., as examples of the problem and refer it to the VA, under a new Administrator, for immediate consideration.

MONEY FOR HOSPITAL ADDITIONS

In addition to the money for the construction of the two final neuropsychiatric hospitals, the subcommittee will initiate what we hope may be a policy in the better use of existing hospitals. We have included \$5 million for the remodeling or additions to the hospital at Houston, Tex., to make additional beds available for neuropsychiatric patients. The neuropsychiatric load has been increasing in the western and southwestern area, seriously. Instead of recommending an additional hospital for this Texas area, the committee will make a recommendation for the enlargement of the present facilities. After this appropriation, further construction should wait for the reexamination of the hospital program, to which I referred above.

THE QUID PRO QUO

It should be obvious to all of us, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress, struggling to balance a budget, and to protect the buying power of the dollar, cannot add to the figures for the hospitalization of deserving veterans, and provide for the construction of the hospitals we consider necessary, without effecting savings to balance these additions.

We have discussed the possibilities with many others interested in this subject. The conclusions are written into several sections of the forthcoming bill, and I am as confident that we will be supported in these efforts to save money, as I am that we will be supported in our efforts to provide the best possible care and hospitalization for the veterans.

One of these has to do with the elimination of what was intended to be the payment of the first year's interest for veterans under the loan-guaranty program. Since I have yet to find anyone who thinks the veterans actually benefit materially by this generous gesture on the part of the Congress, and since some national veteran leaders are firmly of the opinion the money should be used for hospitalization, I expect no serious controversy on this suggestion.

Another saving has to do with a very small item. This is the small monthly payment given the schools to report that veteran students are still in the classes. This is now \$1.50 per month per student. On the basis of this report, the veteran receives his subsistence check. There is about as much justification for this as for paying me to send in my income-tax report. The subcommittee does not recommend the elimination, although we might well do so, but only a reduction from \$1.50 to \$1. This, however, will save almost \$2 million.

A third item will not save much cash, but will clarify a situation which could increase to a point where aroused public opinion could threaten another economy act. This is only an authorization to the VA to look behind the affi-

davit made by a non-service-connected veteran that he cannot afford hospitalization. I will read the section, so it may be clear:

Provided further, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of Public Law No. 2, 73d Congress, as amended (38 U. S. C. 706), the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized to investigate any non-service-connected veteran's statement of inability to defray the cost of hospitalization or treatment where reason exists to doubt the accuracy of such statement; and the Administrator shall make every effort to collect from any veteran treated for a non-service-connected disability according to the ability of the veteran to pay for such treatment: *Provided further*, That inability to pay shall not prevent any veteran from receiving hospitalization or treatment, if such veteran is unable to pay and there is a bed available.

From statements made by many Members of Congress, I do not believe this will be controversial. It certainly will not be controversial in veterans' organizations.

The subcommittee will recommend a broad statement of policy regarding the use or reactivation of all beds which can be staffed, which should clear up this misunderstanding in the minds of many veterans who have been writing to us on that subject.

The subcommittee will recommend to the Congress certain limitations in the growing out-patient dental service, which all veterans' organizations have indicated as a field for economy. This language is not yet ready. It will follow the suggestions of various bills introduced in the Congress for this purpose. It will also be supported in veteran circles.

VETERANS' ORGANIZATIONS WILL APPROVE

I am very sure, Mr. Speaker, for reasons known to you, that Congress will find the veterans' organizations of this Nation supporting these suggested changes and savings, just as I am sure they will approve the increases in the hospitalization items.

CONCLUSIONS

In a way, Mr. Speaker, I am saying today what I could be expected to say on June 16, when the second independent offices appropriation bill is scheduled to be taken up on this floor. I shall not need to repeat myself then. I shall give then the accurate figures. I shall also make some additional suggestions concerning possible economies in the VA. Until then, I hope that the information I have given today will be of interest and help to you and to the Members of the Congress.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield first to the gentleman from North Carolina, a member of the committee.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina. I should like to compliment the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] on the statement he has just made. He has covered the subject thoroughly, and I am quite sure he has given the Members of the House information they did not have before.

If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to state that I have had the

privilege of serving under him as chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee since the first of the year. I do not believe there is a man in the House who has a more genuine interest in the disabled veterans of our country than the distinguished gentleman from California, the chairman of our subcommittee. I have seen him demonstrate that interest time and time again when witnesses were before our committee and in our conferences. I think he has been subjected to a lot of unjustified criticism because of his desire to bring about needed economies in the administration of the Veterans' Administration. I am equally interested with him in doing everything that we should do to provide adequate medical care for our disabled veterans, but I am glad to join him in his unrelenting fight against waste and extravagance in the Administration of veterans' affairs, just as we fight against waste and extravagance in other agencies and departments of the Government that come before our subcommittees.

May I say this last word, Mr. Speaker, and the distinguished gentleman from California I suspect will not approve of my saying it publicly, but I would like to say it for the record.

The gentleman from California is not only a veteran himself and has worn the American Legion button for more than 25 years, but he is a disabled American veteran. I deplore the fact that he has been subjected to the sort of abuse and criticism that has been directed toward him in recent weeks throughout the country. He is a great American who deserves the thanks and appreciation of the veterans of this country instead of their animosity.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman, as I thank him also for the courageous support he has given the committee. He is just a grand person to work with.

I now yield to a gentleman who is very much interested and who I know wants to ask about Topeka, Kans.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. The gentleman is very correct. I may say to the gentleman that I have very recently come from Topeka and they have been very much concerned—I do not know whether there was any justification for it or not, but at least they have been thinking there was, and I am not so sure from the statement the gentleman has made except in general terms that Topeka—it is the Winter General Hospital the gentleman has in mind?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is correct. The recommendation will be for something over \$19 million, which is the amount requested for the rebuilding of Winter General Hospital which is a training school, as we might say, for psychiatrists. It is presently housed in temporary buildings that date back to World War II.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. The fund is for building, then?

Mr. PHILLIPS. All of the amount I have indicated is for rebuilding Winter Hospital.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas. I want to thank the gentleman from California and compliment him for the able manner in which he has set this out. I

know, because I have talked with him on this subject before. It has been very difficult.

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield.

Mr. DORN of New York. As the gentleman knows, I am particularly interested in the Fort Hamilton Hospital, and appeared before the gentleman's committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I know the gentleman did. He made an effective presentation.

Mr. DORN of New York. When I appeared before the gentleman's committee I asked particularly if there was any possibility of insuring that the 120 beds now vacant in the Fort Hamilton General Hospital would be reopened by a sufficient appropriation, and whether or not it would be possible to have it pinpointed in the budget.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think, yes, it will be reopened. I do not like to stand here on the floor and make a statement in regard to some specific hospital or a specific number of beds to be opened, because the Congress cannot direct that specific beds be opened; it depends upon the ability to staff the hospital, and other factors. If I recall Fort Hamilton is a G. M. and S. hospital.

Mr. DORN of New York. That is true.

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is no reason why the VA should have difficulty in getting a sufficient staff in Brooklyn.

I think it is safe for me to take a chance and say to the gentleman from New York that money is provided in the bill, that I know of no reason, at this moment, why it should not be activated to its fullest capacity. This amount is the figure for activating every possible bed, in the opinion of the VA, that can secure the necessary balanced staff, and assuming the patients are there.

Mr. DORN of New York. Will it be possible for the VA Administrator to refuse these funds to the Fort Hamilton Hospital if the Fort Hamilton Hospital can show that there are, say, 500 patients who cannot be admitted unless these 120 beds are activated and also show that there are sufficient medical personnel available? Would it be possible under those circumstances for the VA, as the gentleman mentioned they had done in the past, to not allocate these funds?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Technically, it would; but in the past the situation has been different. In the past the amount of money appropriated was not tied in with the number of beds. I can show you that the amount of money recommended for next year leaves the VA a margin of many million dollars more than any previous estimate of the costs of such hospitalization.

Perhaps the gentleman could arrange for a meeting with the new Administrator or the Acting Administrator in the near future.

We have done everything possible to open those beds for you.

Mr. DORN of New York. Then I can definitely inform the people of Brooklyn to that effect?

Mr. PHILLIPS. If I were in the gentleman's situation I would.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman has made an exhaustive study of the problem and he knows how necessary some of these things are.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I hope the distinguished gentlewoman recognized some of her suggestions and recommendations in our report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It is very kind of the gentleman to say that I was in any way influential, because the gentleman knows of my great interest; we are both enormously interested in the veterans and their proper care. The gentleman also knows that it is very difficult sometimes to secure figures from the Veterans' Administration, or rather statements of how they will spend the money they will get.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I would say that was an understatement.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Perhaps it is. I am delighted that the gentleman is recommending separating several items; hospital administration, research in hospitals, education and training in hospitals, and others items. Will the item for prosthetic appliances be set up as a separate item in the research work?

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is breaking it down pretty fine, but there is no question of our interest, as the gentlewoman knows very well. In the bill last year, I recall, we added money specifically for that purpose because a committee came in and testified to certain new opportunities, and so we gave additional money. That is an outstanding feature of the research work done by the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I know the gentleman's great interest in that. I think the gentleman may remember that people connected with other research activities in the Veterans' Administration have tried every time to have a lump sum provided for research and they have tried to take it away from the prosthetic appliances research to do other research work.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. I think we can fix that up. Actually, we are not recommending the full amount requested in the Truman budget for research. There is no lack of sympathy on our part for research. The VA has been asking more and more every year, while at the same time, to do the same work, we put \$17 million in the budget of another department and \$3 million in the AEC budget, for similar research. Our advice is that the research be coordinated and some of the money given to the other agencies be transferred to the Veterans' Administration because it has the patients and the opportunity to do it. I think we are pretty much in agreement on that.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In other research than for prosthetic appliances they literally stole from them. There is no authorization by law for the other research work.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I see how that can be corrected. I will speak to the subcommittee.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am delighted. I would like to express my

approval of the committee's action. You are recommending that the hospitalization items be separated and set up in the bill.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If they had been separated last year, we would not have received so many telegrams.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman tell me whether the hospital in Brockton will be opened as a result of the appropriation of this money? I understand it is nearly ready for opening.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I made an unfortunate error. I thought I picked up the list of hospitals, but I did not pick up the last page, which might give that information. I would say if there are beds that are ready to open, if the beds can be staffed, if they were to be opened in 1954, and if there are patients, I can assure the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that the hospital will be opened.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. They can get the staff, I know. You are appropriating more money to pay for added doctors?

Mr. PHILLIPS. For what?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. For additional doctors and nurses.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes. We appropriated \$981,000 for that in the supplemental bill and the VA did not spend it. There is additional money for specialists recommended in the coming bill.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think some doctors have been leaving the VA because they have been discouraged as to their future. I understand that the backlog on dental work is extremely heavy.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They have a \$19 million backlog and we have earmarked \$23 million for next year.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It seems as if that ought to be sufficient if they will go ahead and use it for that.

Mr. PHILLIPS. We are going to earmark it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. You will insist upon that? Will the gentleman give us some information as to other amounts for other activities in the Veterans' Administration, such as special services?

Mr. PHILLIPS. There is \$13,500,000, which is \$3,500,000 more than some people think they ought to have for that function.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. What do they claim? I agree that a few special services could be eliminated.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is a debatable subject. A lot of people who came before us, including veterans' organizations, recommended cutting that figure down. We thought we would talk that over with the Veterans' Administrator when he came in to see what he thought about it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I understand at the meetings you have been holding they agreed to certain cuts.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Sometimes reluctantly.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But they agreed. At a meeting recently held, some of the veterans' organizations brought that up.

Mr. PHILLIPS. That is the amount requested for special services.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I would like to see also that the veterans be given their interest on their loans.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Look! I look back over 27 years of working with disabled veterans, and I remember the time when we did not have to put up \$13,500,000 for special services to patients in hospitals. The local auxiliaries, the lodges, the luncheon clubs, and others put in the necessary money and time. We had the chaplains, and we had a grand program, and in my opinion there was a relationship between the community and the men in the hospitals which does not always exist when you take the money out of the Federal taxpayers' pocket and set up a \$13,500,000 special service program. But, as I told you, we did not cut it, and I am not arguing with the gentlewoman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. So they will have enough.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, all they asked for.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am extremely grateful.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. I rise to compliment the gentleman along with the other members of the committee for the splendid and informative speech which he has just concluded.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas, an able member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from California upon the comprehensive statement which he has furnished, which answers almost any inquiry that has arisen.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman makes me think that perhaps, if there are Members of the House who would like an easy way to answer their recent correspondence, I could have this reprinted.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I think that would be a very good thing to do. I wish to congratulate and commend the gentleman on the fact that he and his committee are now going to earmark these funds so that everybody will know the purpose for which they are appropriated and the purpose for which they are supposed to be used.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I, too, want to compliment the gentleman from California for the fine job he has done. There has been considerable misunderstanding. There has been considerable concern throughout the country, particularly among veterans' organizations, as to what was happening with our veterans' program. The gentleman referred to the recommendations of his committee which, as I understand, will by an amendment provide for means whereby the Veterans' Administration can go behind the application for hospitalization on the part of the non-service-connected veteran.

Mr. PHILLIPS. If there is reason to suspect that he has adequate income.

Many of these men are known in their little communities as people of means.

Mr. OSTERTAG. I am not questioning the intent of the committee, but I would like to ask the gentleman from California just how the Veterans' Administration is going to have some yardstick to go by when they go behind an application; how they are going to determine the means of a veteran. In other words, if a fellow has got a good job, I would say that he was able to pay. On the other hand, he may own a house, but be unemployed and therefore could not pay.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Actually, the VA is supposed to do something about it now, but does not do it. It is supposed to check and see what the financial condition is. We do not want to harass the veterans, but we do not want \$12,000-a-year non-service-connected veterans to go in and get free hospitalization.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Would it be necessary for the Veterans' Administration to set up some regulations governing the administration of this program?

Mr. PHILLIPS. It will have to, and I think we can work it out.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, the majority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. I want to commend the gentleman for the time and effort to give this very useful and valuable explanation. It bears out what I have been writing to a lot of Legion, VFW, and other veterans around the country that if they would just wait until this matter was completed I was quite sure they would have no reason to complain.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I thank the gentleman.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from California a question. At the present time a great many of the amputees at Walter Reed Hospital would like to stay there a longer time, but they are being put out into the Veterans' Administration hospitals, not that they do not think the VA hospitals are good, but they think the special treatment and the special type of arm they are receiving at Walter Reed are beneficial. If you had more contract beds at Walter Reed Hospital, you could take care of those cases.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think it goes beyond that, if I may say so to the gentlewoman. These men are out of the service, are they not?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; the men are forced to take a discharge, and then they go into the veterans' hospitals. Many of them cannot have their operations at Walter Reed Hospital. For instance, they would like to have them there, because they see what is done there before their very eyes. The operation is performed right there, and the appliances fitted to their arms and legs.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I suggest it goes a little deeper than the jurisdiction of my committee. If the gentlewoman would arrange a conference between representatives of her committee, and of the Committee on Armed Services, and of my subcommittee, something might be worked out. I think the problem applies not only to prosthetic appliances but to dental care and other conditions. The armed services have a policy, or a custom, of moving a soldier as soon as possible over into the care of the Veterans' Administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I will say to the gentleman that I am very sure that the Veterans' Administration wanted that also. They wanted to have that done in many instances.

Mr. PHILLIPS. They have complained about it to us.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But at one time I am very sure they did want it because that would give their doctors more of an opportunity to learn. I would like to say to the gentleman that I think one reason we need the money for the training staff for 1954 is because it is very important to arrange those staffs early. We have the best staffs in the world in the Veterans' Administration hospitals—even better than in the Army and Navy hospitals. We are very much interested in keeping that care up.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think I will accept that statement, although I think it is difficult to compare them. We give a somewhat different kind of treatment than the Veterans' Administration hospitals. The military hospitals are primarily set up to take care of a man in the service. I think the quality of medical treatment, and the quality of doctors and surgeons and staff, and I think the hospitals and the facilities are about equal, do you not think?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I think some of the Army and Navy hospitals may be better, but I do think on the whole the veterans' hospitals all over the country are superior to the others. I should hate to have legislation passed denying the admission of non-service-connected cases to the hospitals. Of course, we cannot make a hard and fast rule. I think a great deal of this difficulty would never have arisen if the Veterans' Administration had been careful. I think hospitalizing a man to have a tooth pulled was never justified. A man could have a tooth filled at a clinic.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the gentlewoman has put her finger on an important factor, proper administration.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Very few persons can afford to be ill today and pay for three nurses a day.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CAPITAL HOUSING AUTHORITY POLICY ON SEGREGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. DAVIS] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the people in this country who have the intelligence and judgment to recognize that there does exist a race problem, have also realized that it should be dealt with in such manner as to result in as little friction, hostility, and ill feeling as possible between the races.

The efforts of responsible people of both races to handle this problem sensibly, satisfactorily, and successfully, have been impeded and handicapped by two groups of people—one, conscienceless politicians who are willing to stoop to low levels of stirring race prejudice for political and vote-getting purposes, and another group, a crackpot element, who, whether wittingly or unwittingly, are playing into the hands of the Communist strategists, whose announced purpose has been and is to pit race against race and creed against creed, on the theory of divide and conquer.

Throughout the generations, experience has demonstrated that white people prefer to associate with white people, and Negroes with Negroes. Each race is happier carrying on their own activities among themselves, having their own schools, churches, amusements, and recreations, and living in their own neighborhood.

But the busybodies and meddlers are not content with peaceful relations on that basis.

Throughout the generations the wisdom of segregation practices has been recognized. In many of the States segregation has been and is required by law. In other States it has been a matter of choice. Experience has demonstrated that in the States where segregation can be practiced or not practiced according to the desires of the people, segregation is almost as widely practiced as it is in the States where it is required by law. The busybodies, however, are not satisfied to let people follow their own wishes, but have been for years carrying on a campaign to enact legislation to outlaw segregation.

That question is a legislative question, and Congress has consistently refused to enact legislation outlawing segregation. The last vote on the question was one taken in the House of Representatives on June 2, day before yesterday. The House overwhelmingly, by a vote of 78 to 15, voted down an amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill which would have prevented any of the money appropriated in the bill being used by any agency of the District of Columbia government which practiced segregation. A point of order was made against the amendment. The point of order was overruled, and the vote of 78 to 15 against the amendment was a direct vote on the merits of the amendment, and reflected the sentiment which now exists in Congress and which has existed in Congress throughout the years on this question.

Congress has on many occasions had the opportunity to express its will regarding segregation in public housing projects. Many efforts have been made to amend the public-housing laws to prohibit the practice of segregation insofar as tenants are concerned. Always these amendments have been decisively defeated. I do not believe that public-housing laws would have been enacted in the first place if any such nonsegregation provision had been contained therein. It was contemplated by the Congress, by the people in the areas where public-housing projects have been erected, and by the tenants of such projects, that there would be white public-housing projects for white people, and colored public-housing projects for colored people, and that each would be erected in areas populated by the groups who would occupy these public-housing projects.

Congress has not indicated directly or indirectly its will to change the situation in the slightest degree, and this in spite of the fact that the busybodies, meddlers, and crackpots, have been constantly stirring this matter up over the radio, in the papers, and otherwise, during the last year or two.

Yet, in the face of the last expression of Congress on June 2, which was a decisive vote, we find the National Capital Housing Authority on June 3 issuing a policy pronouncement that they will eliminate racial segregation in all present and future public housing projects in the District of Columbia.

So we have here a group of bureaucrats who have never been elected by the people promulgating their crackpot theories in direct contravention of the often expressed policy of Congress, in defiance of the wishes and will of the people who live in the areas to be affected, and in utter disregard of the property rights of those people and of the financial losses which will accrue to them when and if their radical theories are placed into effect.

I have for quite a while suspected that this constant agitation of the segregation question has been carried on by a small group of loud and vocal left-wing radicals in the hope that it would have an influence on the Supreme Court in rendering decisions in the various segregation cases which are now pending before that Court. The noisemakers who are promoting the alleged demands for nonsegregation do not represent any substantial number of white people. There are a few organizations composed of left-wing, radical white people, such as Americans for Democratic Action, American Council on Human Rights, AVC, and so forth, who have joined with such Negro left-wing organizations as the NAACP in the effort to create an impression that both white people and colored want to end segregation.

No such desire exists. On the contrary, the citizens associations in Washington, who are representative of the great majority of the self-supporting, taxpaying, property-owning people of Washington, are overwhelmingly in favor of continuing the pattern of segregation, and have so expressed themselves

many times. They have seen the results which have followed time after time when property owners sell out at substantial loss and move out of a block when the pattern of segregation has been disrupted and colored people move in. They have seen the exodus from the District of Columbia into nearby Virginia and Maryland not only on the part of people who have sold out and moved away from a particular block where colored have gained a foothold. This exodus has spread to the areas where no colored have as yet moved in. Property owners in those areas which are still exclusively white are selling while they can still obtain a reasonable price for a residence, and are moving out of the District of Columbia before they are caught in the squeeze and forced to sell at a loss after their area begins to change from white to colored.

These same factors are going to seriously affect the business establishments in Washington, to say nothing of the fact that the city will change from the Washington to which people of the United States have been accustomed, into a practical duplication of Harlem.

I am making these remarks today to call attention to the fact that these changes are not the result of a policy promulgated by duly elected representatives of the people; that they are not the result of the expressed will of the people of the District of Columbia; that they are not in the interests of the property owners of the District of Columbia; but that such policies are in direct conflict with all these factors, and are the actions of Government bureaucrats, encouraged by a small group of local left-wing radicals, and that this action is being taken as a part of an effort to gain block votes without regard to the rights or wishes of people who are being severely penalized by these acts.

I am convinced that these tactics are not going to result in an acceptance of the abolition of segregation. As swimming pools in Washington have been opened to interracial use, white people have simply quit using them. The net result has been that in such instances another swimming pool has been taken away from the white people and given to the Negroes. The same is true with reference to white playgrounds which have been declared interracial playgrounds. The situation has reached the point where it calls for vigorous, affirmative action on the part of the white people of Washington.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The speech the gentleman has just made will probably make him the target of every left-wing and Communist organization in the country. I look for his name to be smeared all over certain newspapers in the city of Washington denouncing him as a bigot, as a hate peddler, and all the other smear names they can coin. But the gentleman has spoken the whole truth and nothing but the truth. He knows that what he has said cannot be denied; he knows that it is just plain

unadulterated American common sense. I commend the gentleman for his courage in speaking so frankly on a subject that most people attempt to skirt and shy away from.

The gentleman lives in a city in which there are about 50 percent white and 50 percent colored, as I understand.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It is about two-thirds to one-third.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I live in an area where the ratio is 50-50; as a matter of fact, there are more colored people in my district than white. But where I come from and where the gentleman comes from we practice segregation both by law and by choice among both races.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In my hometown in Mississippi, a small town, it is true, but a town wherein 50 percent of the population is colored, we have not had an interracial crime in the last 50 years, certainly not since long before I was born. In the city of Washington, where the agitators are busy attempting to convince the Negroes that they are being persecuted through segregation, you cannot pick up a daily paper without reading several news items telling of interracial crimes being committed in the District of Columbia. The continuous concerted campaign being waged by these political racketeers who are always trying to upset the established social pattern of the District is having a telling and disastrous effect. It is generating hatred between the two races, and is causing much of the crime for which Washington has become noted, or, perhaps, notorious.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Washington has become notorious for that very thing. I may say to the gentleman at this point, that I was greatly disappointed when the President made his announcement recently that he intended to do everything within his power to see that segregation was abolished in every respect in the city of Washington. It was quite a disappointment to me to see such toadying and pandering to a particular group of block voters, particularly when there was no real reason for it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is entirely correct. But in fairness to the President, it must be remembered that he has lived, in a sense, a sheltered life, having made a career of military service. He did not live as most of us have lived in civilian life where daily we had to meet these problems face to face. When the President was Chief of Staff and appeared before a committee of the other body in 1948, he testified against legislation which would integrate Negro and white units in the Armed Forces. He said the Negroes would suffer and morale would drop. He was right. At that time I am confident the President was speaking his conscience. I wonder if he can be equally sincere now, with this crowd of professional politicians whispering in his ear every minute of the day? Or has he, too, succumbed to political expediency?

The gentleman has pointed up another thing that I think is most important, and that is that the Congress has consistently refused to act on any of these so-called civil-rights measures. The hypocrisy becomes clearly evident when the membership of this House is given an opportunity to vote without being recorded, and turns them down by a vote of better than 5 to 1.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. And it has had many such opportunities throughout the years and has invariably refused to vote into our laws any provision abolishing segregation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman has pointed out that the power to enact laws is invested exclusively in Congress and Congress alone. Any attempt on the part of the President or any of the executive agencies of the Government, the Department of Defense, or the Supreme Court, that seeks to put into effect antisegregation laws or to void existing State and local segregation laws is acting outside of its own authority and is usurping the constitutional prerogatives of Congress. I think that the Congress should take steps to recapture its proper legislative powers. I hope that the Supreme Court will recognize the constitutional division of powers when it decides the cases now before it.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman in that respect. I made a speech on the floor of this House approximately 2 years ago calling attention to the fact that the judicial branch of our Government had been guilty of usurpation of legislative functions. They invaded the legislative field when they said that the white primary was not legal; that restrictive covenants in deeds were not legal; and that it was unlawful for a state university to say that colored students should not be admitted. All of those things had been recognized law in this country for years and years and years, yet the Supreme Court as it was constituted at that time assumed unto itself the authority to overturn all that has been the established and accepted law in this country throughout the years, and issued this fiat which says that from now on that is no longer the law. It was a usurpation of legislative functions and one which this Congress and the country should not tolerate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman mentioned specifically the action taken by the District Housing Authority. I believe it was taken on yesterday, was it not?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I refer to the action by which it abolished segregation in the low-rent housing units in the District of Columbia. As everyone in the District knows, that action was in open defiance of the will of Congress as expressed less than 24 hours before that.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. In direct conflict with it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DAVIS of Georgia was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The gentleman is a member of the District of Columbia Committee in the House, and a good one. I would suggest that he ask the Committee on the District of Columbia to call before it this housing authority and inquire of them where there is any great demand to abolish segregation in public housing. Where is the demand coming from? Certainly it is not coming from the white tenants.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. It most assuredly is not, because they have protested it frequently and often and vigorously.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does the gentleman know of any petition that has been circulated among the colored tenants of public-housing units here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does he know of anybody who has expressed any desire to end segregation here, who is not connected or associated with, or influenced by some radical left-wing outfit or some Communist organization?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I do not. I thank the gentleman very much for his remarks and for his contribution.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FARRINGTON and to include a speech.

Mr. MERROW and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOSMER in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and to include an article by Admiral Boone.

Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. ANGELL and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PERKINS and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAYS of Ohio and to include a newspaper editorial.

Mrs. BUCHANAN and to include an editorial.

Mr. WIER and to include a statement by a constituent appearing in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune.

Mr. BOGGS and to include extraneous material.

Mr. DORN of South Carolina and to include an editorial.

Mr. METCALF in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include extraneous material.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE (at the request of Mr. SADLAK).

Mr. WOLVERTON (at the request of Mr. DEROUNIAN) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. JOHNSON in two instances.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. JONAS of North Carolina and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOLLING and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Kansas and to include two editorials.

Mr. BARRETT (at the request of Mr. WALTER).

Mr. MILLER of California and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska and to include a speech.

Mr. JACKSON and to include an article.

Mr. YORTY (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RABAUT.

Mr. KEAN.

Mr. FERNANDEZ and to include a telegram.

Mr. SIEMINSKI and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. O'NEILL and to include a letter.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. LECOMPTE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1334. An act for the relief of Helmuth Wolf Gruhl; and

H. R. 2366. An act for the relief of Fred B. Niswonger.

ADJOURNMENT

MR. JONAS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 5, 1953, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

749. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting the report on the audit of certain corporations supervised by the Farm Credit Administration and of the agricultural marketing revolving fund (administered by Farm Credit Administration) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1952, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 165); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

750. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting one copy each of certain bills and resolutions passed by the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, and by the Municipal Council of St. Croix, pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States approved June 22, 1936; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

751. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a resolution from the Governor of Hawaii which was adopted by the Legislature of Hawaii, requesting the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to allow full Senate consideration of Senate 49, a bill granting statehood to Hawaii; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

752. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the quarterly report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions of the Administration,

pursuant to section 13 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, for the period January 1, 1953, through March 31, 1953; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 30. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of United States wall maps for the use of the Senate and the House of Representatives; without amendment (Rept. No. 512). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LECOMPTE: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 253. Resolution for the relief of Mrs. Fay Little Boykin, daughter of Joseph H. Little; with amendment (Rept. No. 513). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. TALLE: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 5312. A bill to provide for the more effective prevention, detection, and punishment of crime in the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 514). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. FINO:

H. R. 5556. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide that employees with at least 30 years of service may retire with full annuities at 55 years of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGEN of Minnesota:

H. R. 5557. A bill to provide for the transfer of certain lands to the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. R. 5558. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to impose a duty upon the importation of ground nepheline syenite; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H. R. 5559. A bill to promote certain prisoners of war in Korea upon their discharge from the Armed Forces, and to pay them extra compensation for periods of captivity; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota (by request):

H. R. 5560. A bill to modify the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia to provide for a uniform succession of real and personal property in case of intestacy, to abolish dower and curtesy, and to grant unto a surviving spouse a statutory share in the other's real estate owned at time of death, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 5561. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, so as to provide that certain drugs which are or may be chemically synthesized shall be included within the classification of narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona (by request):

H. R. 5562. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act so as to authorize separate State plans for vocational rehabilitation of the blind; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H. R. 5563. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act by providing for Federal grants to States for vocational rehabilitation centers and sheltered workshops; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. ST. GEORGE:

H. R. 5564. A bill to require that the positions of postmaster in post offices of certain classes be occupied by persons who pass competitive civil-service examinations for the position of postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H. R. 5565. A bill to confer on the States civil and criminal jurisdiction over Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5566. A bill to require that the positions of postmaster in post offices of certain classes be occupied by persons who pass competitive civil-service examinations for the position of postmaster; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BATTLE:

H. R. 5567. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to permit individuals entitled to old-age or survivors insurance benefits to earn \$125 a month without deductions being made from their benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 5568. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the work clause shall not apply to work performed by individuals who have attained the age of 70; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5569. A bill relating to the allowance of the deficiency dividend credit in the case of certain personal holding companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5570. A bill to amend section 3442 of the Internal Revenue Code to provide tax-free status for certain articles sold for subsequent use in manufacture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONAS of Illinois:

H. R. 5571. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. J. Res. 271. Joint resolution for the preservation for posterity of the archives establishing the fundamental history of America made by the heroic men and women who emigrated from foreign lands to establish the plantations and colonies of America; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. Res. 270. Resolution providing funds for necessary expenses of the Committee on the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts in opposition to a reduction of the appropriation for the national school lunch program; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts congratulating members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the General Court of Massachusetts to urge that any steps aimed at curtailment of employment or curtailment of work at the Boston Naval Shipyard be reconsidered in view of the value of this facility to our State and National defense and our State and National economic security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Massachusetts Senate to reconsider any proposed curtailment of employment or work at the Boston Naval Shipyard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to exempt jury fees from Federal income taxation and to exempt jurors from requirement of reporting such fees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 5572. A bill for the relief of Lt. Comdr. Cook Cleland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. R. 5573. A bill for the relief of Eugene H. Caplan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE:

H. R. 5574. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Seyre Odichou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COUDERT:

H. R. 5575. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 5576. A bill providing for the relocation of the boundaries of Glacier National Park to permit highway improvements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. KELLY of New York:

H. R. 5577. A bill for the relief of Khushad Ullah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 5578. A bill for the relief of Hatsuko Kuniyoshi Dillon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5579. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Ferrigno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 5580. A bill for the relief of Jose R. Lourenco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

308. By Mr. HAYS of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. W. T. Tubaugh and 69 other citizens of Harrison County, Ohio, asking passage of H. R. 1227, to penalize alcoholic-beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

309. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of members of the Immanuel Baptist Church of Kenosha, Wis., to give favorable consideration to the special emergency legislation for refugees as proposed by President Eisenhower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

310. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. E. K. Collings and others, Miami, Fla., requesting passage of H. R. 2446 and H. R. 2447, social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

311. Also, petition of Romanian Club, Hotel Empire, New York, N. Y., relative to commanding Mr. Valeriu Georgescu for his shining example of courage and character in exposing the attempt of a so-called Romanian diplomat to blackmail him into betraying his adoptive country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 1953

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, to whom we must look for light and leading, may all the hours of this day be filled with new hopes and expectations, new desires and determinations to build a better world.

Grant that in the structure of a nobler civilization we may be intent upon applying moral and spiritual principles to all our economic, social, and political affairs and may the selfish rivalry among the nations be supplanted by the spirit of fellowship.

May we have a faith that is strong and great enough to sustain us as we meet the challenge of this stupendous undertaking of attempting to establish a more brotherly world order.

We pray that we may never become discouraged and yield to despair, but inspire us with the assurance that the triumph of righteousness is inevitable for Thou art our divine ally working within us and with us to achieve blessedness for ourselves and all mankind.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Ast, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 4974. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1954, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill; requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. HILL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

BURY SMALL BUSINESS WITHOUT A FUNERAL

Mr. PATMAN. 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 Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday it is my belief an effort was made to bury small business without a funeral. It is a very important bill, and I had to take the responsibility of threatening to make a point of order to have the proceedings put over. I regret very much if any Member of the House was inconvenienced, but at the same time the issue is too important to consider that. Today, if the leadership wants to insist on

proceeding with this bill, I hope we will have a majority of the Members here because it is a matter of great and far-reaching importance. The Committee on Banking and Currency voted out the Defense Production Act on yesterday stripped of almost everything, and it should not require 15 minutes of debate. I know it was expected to take a couple of days on that bill next week, and since it will not take any time, it occurs to me that this bill could be put over until Monday, but if the leadership wants to insist upon it being considered today, I think it should be considered in the right way in view of the importance of the bill. It is a most important bill. It is a bill to abolish the RFC really, and it is a bill to ratify and confirm what the administration is doing in destroying opportunities of the small-business concerns of the country.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

SMALL BUSINESS LEGISLATION

Mr. WOLCOTT. 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 Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think it is rather unfortunate that the gentleman from Texas did create a situation yesterday so that we could not dispose of the bill yesterday afternoon. It could easily have been disposed of in a couple of hours, and we would have completed our business here by 6 o'clock. It is not anticipated that today the bill will take any longer than that notwithstanding the fact that there are 2 hours of general debate provided for. Very little time has been asked for on this side, and with the exception of time which the gentleman from Texas will use on the other side, I have been told there is little request for time there. The gentleman from Texas, notwithstanding anything that might have been said, does not save small business by the action which he took yesterday. We will take all afternoon today if we have to, to discuss this bill. I quite agree with the gentleman that there should be a goodly number here. It is an important bill. It is important to small business. It is a bill to do much more for small business than has ever been done for small business before. I hope we can proceed in an orderly manner.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I have tried unsuccessfully to make the Democratic baseball team, even though I have gone out and offered my services