equities and injustices in the application of the law are described. Clearly, corrections in these weaknesses and contradictions in the law should be made. I was not in Congress when the social-security program began, but I have watched its operation and have observed many inequities. A committee is presently studying a revision of the program. It is hoped some needed improvements will result.

Among other needed changes, it seems to me the present $75 ceiling on earnings by a recipient of social-security benefits should be removed or raised substantially. Another complaint pertains to the inability of a person 60 years of age to draw on social-security benefits even though such person becomes totally disabled. And there are many other valid complaints. Since social security is described as a form of insurance, it would seem that the benefits should in general be proportionate to the amount of contributions that are made by a participant.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

Public interest in congressional investigations, particularly as they pertain to subversives, is manifest by the answers to question 11, and many comments on that subject. Some feel that the FBI should have exclusive jurisdiction in this field. Others feel that congressional hearings, properly conducted, can implement the work of the FBI. Congressional committees have subpena powers, whereas the FBI, being an executive agency, does not have.

All such congressional investigations must be done by designated committees of the House and of the Senate. In the case of the House, the Un-American Activities Committee has been functioning for 16 years. Through its work, Alger Hiss, William Remington, and scores of others have been exposed, and the work continues. That committee has been instrumental in prosecutions of more than a hundred traitors and subversives.

There is a need for granting the FBI more authority in collecting and making use of evidence. And there is need for increasing the punishment for peacetime espionage. Bills have been passed and others are pending which are designed to accomplish these laudable purposes—including a proposal, sponsored by the Attorney General, to help prevent the abuse of the fifth amendment by witnesses who are accused of subversive activities.

WATER CONSERVATION

Many comments pertain to water conservation and flood-prevention practices. In an area that has been plagued by a disastrous drought, the value of water is more appreciated than ever before. Already through local cooperation the Soil Conservation Service has undertaken a series of upstream flood prevention projects in the area, and a number of others are under study.

A bill recently passed by the House encourages these practices, and implements existing authority. The measure recognizes the fact that the soil is the most marvelous reservoir ever devised; that the earth itself will hold more water than all the structures that man can ever build upon it. Indeed, the basic purpose of the bill is to hold a larger part of the water where it falls, either in the earth or in small structures which will help to prevent accumulated runoff.

The plan is democratic and under local control. All projects must be initiated on a local level. Local people, to participate in it, must furnish all necessary easements and rights-of-way; assume such proportionate share of the cost of installing works of improvements as the Secretary of Agriculture determines to be equitable in consideration of anticipated benefits; and make satisfactory arrangements for defraying all costs of operation and maintenance.

The effective control and use of water and the conservation of our irreplaceable topsoil are of the highest importance to our economy and to our future.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 21, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 13, 1954)

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

Dr. Robert S. Woodson, minister, First Presbyterian Church, Yazoo City, Miss., offered the following prayer:

Mighty God and everlasting Father, we thank Thee for Thy generous and gracious providence which has protected us, provided for us, and promoted us. We gratefully acknowledge Thy grace and goodness, Thy mercy and magnanimity, Thy compassion and comfort, Thy forgiveness and favor, Thy love and light.

As this legislative body convenes and resumes its business for this day, grant to each Member a full measure of strength and sagacity, vision and vitality, discrimination and discernment. Take away from our hearts everything which denies and dishonors and distorts Thy holy name. Set before us high standards of honesty and honor, sobriety and service, intelligence and integrity, righteousness and religion. Help each of us to practice and propagate these principles.

Forgive us for all of our failures and failings, our faults and our follies, our lapses and relapses.

Remind us anew that righteousness exalteth a nation, and that sin is a reproach to any people.

Enable us to renew our faith and our fortitude, our vows and our virtues, our loyalties and loves.

We pray, too, for Thy servants the President and the Vice President, together with the other leaders of our Nation. Give to them an abundance of divine grace and goodness, courage and consecration, vision and vitality. Remember them in their relationship with each other and with leaders of the other nations of the world. Hasten the day when nations will learn to love and not to loathe each other, to defend and not to offend, to help and not to hinder, to trust and not distrust, to develop and not destroy.

Remember our Nation in its great role of trusted leader, good neighbor, big brother, and faithful friend.

Bless Thou those who make our laws, remember those who interpret them, those who administer them, and those who enforce them, and may we all obey them.

May Thy spirit enable us to repent of our many sins, and grant to us the assurance not only of Thy full forgiveness, but of the blessed restoration of Thy divine favor.

In the name of Christ our Saviour, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., May 21, 1954.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. HOMER FERGUSON, a Senator from the State of Michigan, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

STYLES BRIDGES,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 20, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2225. An act to provide for sundry administrative matters affecting the Federal Government, particularly the Army, Navy, Air Force, and State Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4231. An act to authorize appointments to the United States Military Academy and United States Naval Academy of sons of certain individuals who were killed in action or who died or shall die as a result of active service in World War I, World War II, or between a period beginning June 27, 1950, and ending on a date proclaimed by the President or the Congress;

H. R. 7308. An act to repeal section 307 of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; and

H. R. 7541. An act to promote the national defense by including a representative of the Department of Defense as a member of the

National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 8571. An act to authorize the construction of naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 481. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 5, 1949 (Public Law 157, 81st Cong.); and

H. J. Res. 508. Joint resolution to extend the time for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 230), in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed 30,000 additional copies of the report entitled "Eighth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations"; and that 10,000 copies shall be for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and 20,000 copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of 90 days, after which time the unused balance shall revert to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

LEAVES OF ABSENCE

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARRAN and Mr. MURRAY were excused from attendance on the sessions of the Senate today and next week.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, some very important hearings concerning the Kentucky River are to be held in Kentucky on tomorrow. I ask unanimous consent for permission to be excused from further attendance in the Senate today in order that I may attend the hearings.

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following a brief executive session there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, with the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CARLSON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and ninety-six postmasters.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a group of routine nominations in the Navy, the Regular Air Force, and the Marine Corps, in the grades of ensign in the Navy, and second lieutenants in the Regular Air Force and the Marine Corps. In order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar this large number of names, which have already appeared once in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, it is requested that these nominations be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the Diplomatic and Foreign Service nominations be confirmed en bloc.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

CONTINUATION OF CEDAR CREEK FOREST AND PASTURE PROJECT, BOONE AND CALLAWAY COUNTIES, MO.—PETITION

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a petition from a great number of citizens in Boone and Callaway Counties in Missouri, urging continuation of the Cedar Creek Forest and pasture project in those counties. I should like to include, also, the recommendations with respect to this project made by the directors of the Cedar Creek Grazing Association and the boards of supervisors of both the Callaway and Boone County soil districts.

There being no objection, the petition and recommendations were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 1, 1954.

We, the following, have learned that the present Congress have not included funds in their appropriations for continued development work on the Cedar Creek Forest and pasture project in Callaway and Boone Counties. (Land acquired under title III, Bankhead-Jones Farm-Tenant Act.) Knowing that approximately 350 acres of this land has been developed for pasture annually, 4,254 acres to date, leaving 1,493 acres undeveloped, we strongly urge its completion.

If no funds are made available, the remaining acreage will be of no agricultural value to our community.

We likewise know that the developed pasture lands have produced approximately 10 times as much grazing per year as has the undeveloped land.

These grazing privileges have been extended to the livestock farmers living adjacent to, and within the area.

As a result of this project, the general agricultural economy in the area has been greatly improved, not only for the farm operators within the area, but because it has greatly improved in intrinsic value. The demonstrational value of the project has been of great benefit to the community.

We the undersigned feel it would be a grave mistake not to complete development of this project, now so nearly completed, and urge that you make every effort possible to see that funds are made available for its completion.

We believe that if the projejct is completed, it will maintain itself with the income derived therefrom.

(Signatures omitted.)

Copy of recommendations made by—

Directors, Cedar Creek Grazing Association, Fulton, Mo., October 27, 1953.

Board of supervisors, Callaway Soil District, Fulton, Mo., October 29, 1953.

Board of supervisors, Boone Soil District, Columbia, Mo., October 28, 1953.

We recommend that the Government continue to hold title to the Cedar Creek project lands and that the present plan of operation for this area be continued as it now exists for the following reasons:

1. The land is producing much more food under the present plan than it did under private ownership.

2. The fertility of the land is gradually being increased.

3. We believe that if the land is returned to private ownership the fertility in 10 years time will be reduced to the level that existed at the time the land was purchased by the Government. At this time, most of the land was submarginal land unable to support the people living on it.

4. The Cedar Creek Grazing Association has been in operation since June 1951. We believe it would be a mistake to discontinue it until given a thorough test.

5. The people living within the area approve the present plan.

6. The pasture improvement has been of educational value to the farmers of the area.

7. We believe that if this land is disposed of that it would necessitate a reorganization of the livestock operations of farmers in the locality because the present permittees would be forced to operate an uneconomical farm unit.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

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

S. 2654. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Montgomery County, Md., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1376); and

H. R. 4940. A bill to provide for the redemption of District of Columbia tax stamps (Rept. No. 1377).

By Mr. CASE (for Mr. BEALL), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment;

S. 2172. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of veterinary medicine in the District of Columbia," approved February 1, 1907 (Rept. No. 1378);

H. R. 7061. A bill to prescribe and regulate the procedure for adoption in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1379); and

H. R. 7062. A bill to amend the act of April 22, 1944, which regulates the placement of children in family homes in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1380).

By Mr. CASE (for Mr. BEALL), from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 3213. A bill relating to the merger of the Columbus University, of Washington, D. C., into the Catholic University of America, pursuant to an agreement of the trustees of said universities (Rept. No. 1381).

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

S. 2657. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia" (Rept. No. 1382).

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

S. 885. A bill to prohibit the acceptance of certain offices or employment by persons who within 2 years have served as members of certain regulatory agencies of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1383);

S. 1403. A bill to authorize the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to regulate and condition the declaration and payment of dividends by public utilities in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1384);

S. 2661. A bill to regulate the sale of shell eggs in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1385); and

S. 3387. A bill to make certain changes in the regulation of public utilities in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1386).

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

S. 2701. A bill to establish the Family Court for the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1387).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for Mr. BURKE):

S. 3501. A bill for the relief of Abbas Mohammad Awad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENNINGS (for Mr. KERR):

S. 3502. A bill for the relief of Dirk Felthuis and his wife, Willy Philippine Felthuis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 3503. A bill to amend section 23 (g) (4) of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Finance.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles, and referred as indicated:

H. R. 8571. An act to authorize the construction of naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. J. Res. 481. Joint resolution to amend the act of July 5, 1949 (Public Law 157, 81st Cong.); and

H. J. Res. 508. Joint resolution to extend the time for the erection of a memorial to the memory of Mohandas K. Gandhi; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

TRIBUTE BY HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS, OF ILLINOIS, TO LT. COL. HENRY J. "HANK" ADAMS, JR.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in tribute to Lt. Col. Henry J. "Hank" Adams, Jr., of the United States Marine Corps, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOUGLAS

I would like to take a few minutes today to pay a well-deserved tribute to an honest, courageous, two-fisted, straight-shooting officer of the United States Marine Corps, who has just been relieved from service at his own request, to run for public office as the Sheriff of San Diego County, Calif.

I am referring to Lt. Col. Henry J. "Hank" Adams, Jr., who served with me in the First Marine Division in World War II, fighting his way in the running battle across the southwest Pacific, from Guadalcanal to Okinawa. His record as a marine hero began on his first night of combat when he earned the title of the "One Man Army of Tulagi," for his exploit of killing 15 of the enemy single handed.

Although his exploits as a marine are legendary, Hank Adams is also known nationally and internationally as one of the great rifle and pistol champions of America. He has some 700 medals and trophies to his credit, including the all-around rifle and pistol championship of the United States. He was also a firing member for 5 years on United States international rifle teams. Although I know him as a friend, and fellow marine, I am also proud of the Illinois background of his late father and his grandfather, both of whom lived for many years in Sterling, Ill., before moving out to the west coast at the turn of the century.

But Hank Adams is more than a fighting marine, and a straight-shooter. As a law enforcement officer he has the kind of background that is so vitally needed in all parts of America today to curb and clean up the growth of crime, corruption and lawlessness, and juvenile delinquency. As a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Hank Adams served for 2 years in 1940–41 here on the east coast, under the direction of J. Edgar Hoover. Among other assignments he captured more bank robbers in the New Jersey area than any other agent in that area. Later as undersheriff in San Diego, before being recalled to service, Hank Adams instituted many progressive methods of modern criminology and worked closely with State and Federal officers on numerous cases along the international border of Mexico. And, for the past 3 years, up to March 31 of this year he has rendered distinguished service as provost marshal of the United States Marine Recruiting Depot in San Diego. It is a privilege and an honor for me to commend Hank Adams for his services to his country and his community as an outstanding young American, a red-blooded marine hero, and a courageous peace officer, and to wish him luck in whatever he does.

SHIPMENT OF ARMS TO GUATEMALA—UNITED STATES SHOULD STAND ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the Washington Post this morning carried an editorial under the heading "Communist Beachhead," which deals with the subject of the landing of arms in Guatemala from a shipment originating behind the Iron Curtain. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

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

COMMUNIST BEACHHEAD

The shipment of arms to Guatemala from the Polish-controlled port of Stettin ought to remove any lingering doubts that Guatemala is the beachhead for active Communist designs in the Western Hemisphere. The 2,000 tons of arms, which arrived in Guatemala last weekend in a Swedish ship chartered by a British firm, are enough to upset the entire balance of power in Central America. The fact that the pier was surrounded by a cordon of soldiers and that the Guatemalan defense minister was on hand to supervise the secret nocturnal unloading makes eyewash of the explanation that the shipment was merely optical equipment. Nor, it may be safely assumed, is this quantity of armaments needed for purposes of keeping internal order.

Additional emphasis is given to a serious situation by the break in diplomatic relations between Nicaragua and Guatemala. This break had been building up for some time because of the Guatemalan plotting against the Nicaraguan regime. It also is significant that shortly after three Guatemalan consulates were established in neighboring Honduras a crippling general strike broke out; the consular personnel have been declared personae non gratae but the trouble remains. There are similar reports that Guatemalan agents are now attempting to foment strikes in Panama.

Some Latin Americans have taken the mistaken view that the United States concern in Central America has been merely to protect the interests of the United Fruit Co. The naive explanation that Guatemala has been undergoing a social revolution similar to that experienced by Mexico after 1910 ignores, of course, the fact that there is now an aggressive foreign imperialism anxious to take over. The arms shipment ought to help dispel any such illusions. For the arms are entirely outside the pattern of normal defense, and far in excess of anything the United States has prepared to send under its assistance pact with Nicaragua or the proposed pact with Honduras. The shipment is not to be compared with the activities of the international freebooters who are continually making trouble in the Caribbean area.

No longer is it possible to believe that the Guatemalan Government is merely a dupe. Acceptance of these arms denotes active complicity in a Soviet plot—and in the vicinity

of the Panama Canal. What apparently is in the works is a repetition of the excursions of the Caribbean Legion, coupled with the export of subversion to neighboring countries. In the circumstances the Guatemalan action constitutes an unmistakable threat to the peace. It affords full grounds for the United States to bring the situation to the attention of the Organization of American States and to explore the possibilities of collective measures, including those provided under the Caracas resolution and the Rio treaty. The United States further must convince its neighbors that it means business. What is of the utmost importance for the entire hemisphere to understand is that the threat of Communist imperialism is no longer academic; it has arrived.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, let me emphasize one thought from this editorial:

Acceptance of these arms denotes active complicity in a Soviet plot * * * and in the vicinity of the Panama Canal. * * *

The Guatemalan action constitutes an unmistakable threat to the peace. It affords full grounds for the United States to bring the situation to the attention of the Organization of American States and to explore the possibilities of collective measures, including those provided under the Caracas resolution and the Rio Treaty. The United States further must convince its neighbors that it means business.

What is of the utmost importance for the entire hemisphere to understand is that the threat of Communist imperialism is no longer academic: the threat of Communist imperialism is no longer academic: it has arrived.

Mr. President, I stood on the floor of the Senate last night and discussed what is happening in Latin America as it appears in the light of the Monroe Doctrine. That doctrine, enunciated by President Monroe in his seventh annual message on December 1, 1823, contains this very clear language:

We owe it to * * * those powers to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety. * * * We could not view any interposition * * * in any other light than as a manifestation of an unfriendly disposition toward the United States * * * (our policy will be) meeting * * * the just claims of every power and submitting to injuries from none.

Mr. President, those are the key phrases of the statement of the Monroe Doctrine, which has been the foundation stone of our foreign policy in the Western Hemisphere. It is as American as the Declaration of Independence, and is precious to us in our determined fight for survival as a free people.

Is it not time, Mr. President, for an examination of the happenings in this hemisphere in the light of this historic and time-honored doctrine?

It seems to me that we face the decision as to whether we intend to stand resolutely with the principle of the Monroe Doctrine, or whether we shall permit it to become a meaningless memory.

In my opinion, the countries of South America are looking to us for leadership in what appears to be a crisis. The countries of Central America, justifiably apprehensive, look to us for guidance in these circumstances. A continuance of our frequent issuance of statements embodying high-sounding phrases and expressing lofty purposes, will not alone suffice.

The time has indeed come for a calling together of the nations of the Americas, to explore and confer, with a view toward action—action, we hope, leading to practical programs of mutual defense, development, prosperity, security, and peace.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXTENSION OF VOTING RIGHTS TO CITIZENS AT AGE OF 18

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is open to amendment.

THE SO-CALLED McCARTHY-ARMY HEARINGS

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, since the so-called McCarthy-Army hearings have temporarily recessed, I shall take advantage of the interim to make a few comments that I am sure will be pertinent and I hope will be helpful.

Specifically, I shall discuss briefly the fifth amendment to the Constitution, as its provisions apply to the work of this subcommittee in its regular investigations. I am not, Mr. President, referring to the portion of the fifth amendment, so frequently invoked by witnesses before this and other committees, which protects everyone from being compelled to bear witness against himself in a criminal case. What I wish to discuss is the impact of the subcommittee's activities on the portion of the fifth amendment which secures all our citizens from being deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Since the widespread publicity that has been given to this committee during the past few weeks, through television, radio, and other news coverage, as well as through editorial comment in most, if not all, publicity media, we Members of the Senate have received a veritable flood of mail critical of the work of this subcommittee and particularly critical of the executive and legislative machinery that permits the scarcely commendable spectacle to continue. The so-called McCarthy-Army hearings have been highly illuminated, if not highly illuminating.

These criticisms almost invariably take one or more of these three forms:

First. The charge is made that the manner in which these proceedings have been conducted and publicized has brought the Senate of the United States into disrepute and has seriously impeded the congressional legislative program, and has also seriously impaired our prestige abroad.

Second. There are those who charge that the President of the United States should have intervened long ago to call off the activities of the chairman of the subcommittee, or, as an alternative, should have directed that the controversy between the subcommittee and the Army be terminated forthwith.

Third. There are others who charge that the Senate has failed in either controlling or eliminating the activities of the subcommittee.

I shall comment briefly on the first two of these criticisms, and shall speak more at length on the third one.

I believe there is no doubt that the first criticism is a just one, and that the glare and blare of publicity that has attended the recent hearings have brought a distinct loss of dignity to our Nation, both at home and abroad, and will further debase the high quality of American world leadership.

With reference to the second criticism—namely, that the President has been dilatory in stepping into the picture and terminating the proceedings—I assert that this criticism is completely unjust. The subcommittee is not a part of the executive arm of the Government. It was not created or clothed with power by the executive branch. The great doctrine of separation of powers, which is the cornerstone of our Nation, does, in my opinion, effectively preclude the intervention of the Chief Executive in these current proceedings, through the exercise of Executive authority. I commend the President for the attitude he has evinced under the pressures attendant on widespread criticism of his failure to interpose executive authority to control, direct, or terminate this purely legislative function.

With reference to the third criticism—namely, that the Senate should take action in the premises—I am in complete agreement.

The so-called McCarthy subcommittee actually has the following unwieldy name: it is legally named the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigation of the Committee on Government Operations. It was created by action of the Committee on Government Operations in the 2d session of the 80th Congress, and was renamed in the 82d Congress.

On January 16, 1952, the parent committee, being known as the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments, under the chairmanship of the late lamented Senator Hoey, changed the subcommittee's name, as I have just stated; and since that time it has functioned under this name.

The functions of the subcommittee are not controlled by its name or by any guidance which may be given it by the parent Committee on Government Operations. The control lies within the language of the various resolutions that have guided and continued the subcommittee's work in the past. Senate Resolution 189, of the 83d Congress, 2d session, agreed to on February 2, 1954, is the latest resolution under which the present Subcommittee on Investigation now operates. This resolution provided that the subcommittee proceed pursuant to the provisions of rule XXV of the Senate, reading in part as follows:

Such Committee on Government Operations shall have the duty of studying the

operation of government activities at all levels with a view to determining its economy and efficiency.

It will be seen from the foregoing that the subcommittee is an agent of the United States Senate, created under its rules, maintained under its rules, guided under its rules, and exercising power delegated to it by the Senate of the United States.

No Senator, Mr. President, has any power as an individual to make investigations of an official nature or to subpena witnesses and compel their testimony. No Senator is a magistrate. No Senator or group of Senators has power to conduct investigations such as the ones being conducted by this subcommittee group, except under power delegated to them by the Senate rules for the performance of certain specific delegated tasks.

The McCarthy subcommittee has no power whatever as a group, except for such power as it derived from the United States Senate. As such agent, it is responsible to its principal. As the principal, the United States Senate is responsible to the people of the United States for the conduct of its subsidiaries.

One of the very few Latin phrases that I remember from my early study of law is the phrase, "Qui facet per alium, facet per se." As every lawyer knows, the free translation of this Latin precept is "The acts of his agent are his own acts." Nowhere, Mr. President, is this rule more apparent and more applicable than in the instant situation pertaining to the work of the subcommittee.

At the outset of these few remarks of mine, I stated that I would discuss a certain portion of the fifth amendment to the Constitution. I repeat that portion:

> No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law.

Dr. Mott once said:

> This portion of the fifth amendment may thus be regarded as containing phraseology of purest gold, mined under the stress of heated constitutional crises, refined by the fire of violent revolutions, proved by the acid test of centuries of struggle, and moulded by the hand of one of America's greatest constitutional draftsmen.

Any discussion, however brief, of this portion of the fifth amendment brings to mind three definite questions which require definite answers. Everyone knows what it would mean to be deprived of life or property, but what is liberty and what is due process of law?

On Monday of this week, when the Supreme Court handed down its decisions in the school segregation cases, Mr. Chief Justice Warren stated:

> Although the Court has not assumed to define liberty with any great precision, that term is not confined to mere freedom from bodily restraint. Liberty under law extends to the full range of conduct which the individual is free to pursue and it cannot be restricted except for a proper governmental objective.

In the same opinion the Chief Justice also stated:

> The concepts of equal protection and due process of law both stem from an American ideal of fairness.

Mr. President, for the purpose of the immediate discussion I shall try to define liberty as protection of the individual citizen against arbitrary, unwarranted, or improper use of the organized power of the state through its officials. I believe that contravening the injunction requiring due process of law means a violation not only of some specific law but a violation of the deep sense of justice and fair play that is inherent in the thinking of all free men, and which insists on decent treatment by our public officials in whatever capacity they are exercising their proper functions.

Whenever under claimed color of official action or a distortion of official authority these processes are violated, we instinctively record in our minds and our hearts resentment against such violations. As an additional comment on officials acting under color of authority and voiding the protection of due process of law, we can well go back to officials of the past whom we called tyrants. A tyrant, Mr. President, is either an individual official or a group of officials who use the collective power of the state in a capricious, selfish, or arbitrary manner.

It follows as night follows day that whenever any agency of our Government or any subagency thereof uses its legitimate authority in a way that contravenes the basic right of any citizen to protection against arbitrary, capricious, selfish, or unwarranted use of official authority, that agency or subagency violates the clearly enunciated security of the fifth amendment to the Constitution by infringing on the liberty of the individual without due process of law.

This brings to mind the specious and ignoble statement that some of our people have made to the effect that "I am in sympathy with the goal the official or committee is trying to attain, but, of course, I do not approve of the methods." Such statements, Mr. President, are subterfuge statements, and have no basis in law or fact. Methods and procedures are of the very essence of due process, and are prime essentials to the protection of liberty.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter has said:

> The history of liberty has largely been the history of the observance of procedural safeguards.

Mr. Justice Brandeis wrote more than 25 years ago that—

> In the development of our liberty insistence on procedural regularity has been a principal factor.

Mr. President, in the long history of our criminal and civil jurisprudence torture of an accused was a procedure; being held to answer for an infamous crime without presentment by grand jury was a procedure; the Inquisition of centuries ago without formal charge was a method; the infamous Star Chamber was a method; when Pontius Pilate, at the trial of the Master, turned Him over to be crucified he was simply following established procedures under the Roman and Jewish law.

Liberty can be established, maintained, and protected only by adherence to proper procedures. Goals can never be good or justified if they are to be reached by the impairment of constitutional liberty and due process.

It has been thoughtlessly said at times that the end justifies the means. Lenin, the great Communist leader, once said, "The end sanctifies the means." But one of our fundamental precepts is that the means determine the end. The Communist Lenin could say that a supposedly worthy goal sanctified the methods used to attain it, but no Christian doctrine and no American governmental principle can possibly excuse improper procedures and methods by relating them to the worthiness of the ultimate goal that is sought.

It is my sincere opinion that the methods which have been pursued in some recent legislative investigations have been clear violations of the portion of the fifth amendment which I have heretofore quoted in that individuals are deprived of liberty without due process of law. Some may ask, "If this be true, why have not the courts so held?" The answer is clear. Our courts do not have sole responsibility for the proper conduct of our Government. One of our great Supreme Court Justices once said:

> Courts are not the only agency of Government that must be assumed to have capacity to govern.

Once again I refer to the great American doctrine of separation of powers. The courts have their responsibilities, but so do the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

Every official in every one of these branches is sworn to uphold the Constitution, including the due-process clause guaranteeing individual liberty. The responsibility for the proper conduct of legislative investigations is in the legislative branch.

Each branch of the Congress is clothed with authority to function in its prescribed sphere and to make its own rules. Any committee or subcommittee of the United States Senate is composed of Members chosen and approved by the Senate itself. It operates in an area of authority delegated to it by the Senate itself. It operates under rules promulgated by the Senate. Its expenses are paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on authority approved by the Senate itself.

It is insincere and fatuous for anyone in this body to claim that if an agency of the United States Senate, or an agent thereof, is acting beyond the powers delegated to it, or in a manner which, without due process of law, violates the right of the individual to unrestricted liberty, we can wash our hands of responsibility and say, in paraphrase of Pontius Pilate, "It is your problem; see ye to it."

The Senate can revoke any authority delegated to its subagencies. The Senate can prescribe the rules under which a subagent must proceed. The Senate can withhold funds from its subagencies and can change the personnel of its committees and subcommittees.

Mr. President, I hope the so-called McCarthy-Army hearings will be completed as speedily as possible, but as completely as possible. My purpose in

referring to the subject today is the definite one of calling attention to the injustice of criticism of the executive or judicial branches of our Government so far as the procedures and the exercise of improper authority by this or any other committee are concerned; to point out as clearly as I can the sole and complete responsibility of the Senate itself for the action of one of its created agencies; and to express the belief that the public will and should hold the Senate of the United States responsible for the protection of United States citizens haled before one of its committees or subcommittees in securing for these citizens the full protection of the full language of the fifth amendment to the Constitution.

EXTENSION OF VOTING RIGHTS TO CITIZENS AT AGE OF 18

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, today the Senate is at last taking up the proposed amendment to the Constitution which would result in conferring the right to vote on persons between the ages of 18 and 21. Such action is already overdue. Amendments to this effect have been introduced throughout the years by a number of very able and distinguished Senators.

Among these are former Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], and former Senator Blair Moody, of Michigan.

If I possess any doubts about the merits of this proposal, which I do not, I would be extremely comforted by the company of such able and distinguished men as those whom I have listed. In addition, this proposed amendment has the support of the President of the United States who recommended such an amendment in his message to the Congress at the beginning of this session. I compliment the President of the United States on his support of this proposal, especially since this was a subject which he endorsed during his candidacy for the nomination and election to the high office of President of the United States.

I only hope that attempts will be made to carry out all the promises contained in the Republican platform as this promise is sought to be carried out.

I think that even this brief recitation of support illustrates the distinguished and bipartisan support which this amendment has. In addition to these persons, however, it has the support of a great many others, foremost among whom is the former Governor of Georgia, Mr. Arnall, who was governor of that State at the time Georgia adopted an amendment to its constitution permitting 18-year-olds to vote. I understand also that the present Governor of Georgia, Mr. Talmadge, likewise, favors voting privileges for persons 18 years of age and over. Other Governors have also supported this proposition. Governor Craig, of Indiana, in his inaugural message to the legislature, recommended an amendment to the State constitution to lower the voting age to 19; and in his 1954 State legislative speech, Governor Herter, of Massachusetts, recommended lowering the voting age. Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina, also recommended lowering the voting age in his annual legislative message of 1954.

One of the complaints which I have heard voiced most often in this Chamber when a constitutional amendment is considered, is that the amendment has not had sufficient discussion throughout the United States to warrant its approval by this body. I doubt if anyone will contradict me when I say that this is one amendment which cannot be so criticized. The objective of this amendment has been discussed throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The legislatures of at least 37 States have had similar proposals presented to them in the past few years. In many of these legislatures, unfortunately these measures died in a pigeonhole in some committee. I want to make it clear here and now to the Members of the Senate that while I am chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary I do not intend that the subcommittee on constitutional amendments shall become a legislative burying ground for proposals to amend the Constitution which some Senators have deemed worthy of introduction. This is the principle under which I have acted as committee chairman, and I shall continue that policy so long as I remain chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

I may add that during this session of Congress more constitutional amendments have been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary than at any time within my memory.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDRICKSON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator stated that this proposal has been under consideration in 37 State legislatures.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. If there was the overwhelming sentiment he indicates in favor of reducing the voting age to 18 years, why has only one State legislature acted favorably on it?

Mr. LANGER. I shall go into that point a little later in my remarks. I prefer not to be interrupted until I have finished my remarks. Then I shall be very happy to yield to Senators.

Mr. HAYDEN. I am intrigued by the Senator's statement. I am curious to know, if 37 State legislatures have considered the subject, why has only 1 State legislature acted favorably on the proposal? It does not seem to strengthen the Senator's argument when he cites the fact that while 37 States have considered the subject only 1 State has acted favorably on it.

Mr. LANGER. I am giving the Senate the facts. There is no question that that is true.

This proposed constitutional amendment, I believe, particularly deserves the attention of this body. Proposals for lowering the voting age have had a somewhat rocky road thus far, but such proposals have been gaining in strength throughout the years, and I fully anticipate that if this proposed amendment is not adopted at this time, it will be eventually.

Let me point out how the amendment has been gaining in strength throughout the years by reference to the Gallup poll. I cannot vouch, of course, for the accuracy of this poll, for it has on occasions been known to err, but from my own experience and observation I feel that results which it has disclosed on this subject are reasonably accurate. In 1939, 79 percent of the people polled were opposed to lowering the voting age to 18.

I should like to call that fact to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I repeat that statement. In 1939, 79 percent of the people polled were opposed to lowering the voting age to 18. It may be that some of the State legislatures at that time acted as they did because of that fact.

In 1943, 61 percent were opposed. In 1947, 60 percent were opposed, In 1951, 49 percent were opposed, and 51 percent were in favor. A poll released on July 4, 1953, shows that 63 percent of those polled now favor lowering the voting age to 18, whereas 31 percent are opposed. Thus it may be seen that over the course of the past 14 years the opposition to this amendment has been reduced from 79 percent to 31 percent. Even the New York Times in an editorial of January 12, 1954, conceded that there is no doubt that the movement for lowering the voting age has been gaining strength in recent years. I do not profess to know how long State legislatures or the Congress may continue to refuse to endorse this principle in the face of such support. I am confident, however, that the public desire will ultimately prevail.

With these introductory remarks let me proceed to a consideration of the pending joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 53. The Constitution of the United States provides, in the case of the election of Senators and Representatives, that the electors, or voters, in each State "shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." Thus, by the Constitution of the United States, and the constitution and laws of the several States as well, the age at which an individual may be qualified to vote is determined by State law.

Acting under these provisions of the Federal Constitution and its own State constitution, the State of Georgia has already lowered the voting age to 18, but, as the situation now stands, while 18-year-olds in Georgia can vote, an 18-year-old in North Dakota or any other jurisdiction has no such right.

During the Korean conflict and the Second World War, many young men undoubtedly looked with envy on these young citizens of Georgia. For these young Georgians at least had an opportunity to choose the persons who were to decide whether they should be committed to war or not. It seems to me that this is an extremely basic right of each citizen, and that it is fundamentally wrong to commit any man to such involuntary service unless he has had an opportunity to express himself, either for or against, such commitment by his choice of those who will represent him in the Congress of the United States.

Apparently this is the argument which most appealed to the President of the United States, for he has been quoted as saying that if a man is old enough to fight he is old enough to vote. To me, this is good reason for extending the right of franchise to 18-year-olds, for it seems that whenever and wherever future wars are fought by the United States, those 18, 19, and 20 years of age will be pressed into service, as well as those 21 years of age and up.

I saw a headline in the newspaper the other day to the effect that in another war we will likely have to draft women into the service of the United States. With all the new and deadly weapons, wars will become more and more destructive and require great sacrifices from younger persons, but it is still felt by some that we are bound to observe a voting age which found its origin in early Anglo-Saxon law. These people, it seems to me, fail to take into account the tremendous educational advances made throughout the years since the adoption of this age criteria for voting. As the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] pointed out on the floor of the Senate on July 18, 1953:

> I think our failure to give 18-year-olds the right to vote amounts to a criticism of our 150 years of free education in the United States. It seems to me to be a sad reflection on the American school system, and one which is not deserved.

To this there may be added the statement of the national legislative director of the American Veterans of World War II, who observes:

> In the 18th and 19th centuries, 18-year-old citizens very probably knew little about their Government. But today it is noteworthy that many of our most informed citizens fall into this age group. The education resulting from the mandatory teaching of United States and world history, civics, government, and economics is often more evident at the time of graduation from high school and during the early years of college than in any other time in a person's life. Added to this is the certain knowledge that a world of education is gained by many millions of young men through the medium of military service. These factors combined provide a wealth of potential clear thinking voters who can and should assist the Nation in choosing its leadership.

On the other hand, some persons criticize this proposal on the basis that an 18-year-old lacks sufficient maturity to exercise the right of franchise wisely. I certainly do not agree with that. I was glad to discover that Representative KEATING, of New York, a very able member of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, stated on January 31, 1954, in a radio debate conducted by the American Forum of the Air:

> I think 18-year-olds today have more maturity of judgment than 18-year-olds did 1 or 2 generations ago. I have a daughter who is now 20, and I feel at 18 she was at least as well-equipped to decide who she wanted to have for governor and what her position should be on public affairs as I was at 21.

My good friend from the State of Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] pointed out in his statement to the Judiciary Committee on this amendment:

> The young people of this generation are better prepared educationally for political responsibility at the age of 18 than were the Americans of previous generations. We do not have very complete figures on the education of our population prior to the 1940 census, but even comparisons with the year 1940 tend to highlight our progress toward the preparation of our youth for civil responsibility. In 1940, 14.1 percent of Americans completed high school; 4.6 percent completed college. In 1950, 20.2 percent of Americans completed high school; 6 percent completed college. Also, the intensity of living for young people today is something that surely prepares them for mature political responsibilities.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I should like to ask if the committee, in considering this measure, took into account the fact that in changing the age of majority we might be moving toward conflict with laws governing the holding of property and guardianship, which, under the amendment, if adopted, might end at the age of 18 instead of at the age of 21.

Mr. LANGER. That question was discussed.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Did the committee feel that it is involved in this proposal?

Mr. LANGER. It was discussed, among other things.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I have been asked by many persons whether we are not moving pretty fast in this connection, and possibly interfering with present property laws.

Mr. LANGER. There is no disposition on the part of the committee to do that at this particular time.

I myself was recently duly impressed on this subject. As Senators know, there is a television program known as Youth Wants to Know in connection with which different Representatives and Senators are invited as guests to answer questions proposed by certain high-school students. This program is entirely unrehearsed, and the ages of the students range from 15 to 18 years. I had the honor to be their guest on February 28, 1954, and I am sure Senators will believe me when I say that I left that session very deeply impressed with the grasp of knowledge and seriousness of these youngsters, as in a short space of time I had discussed all sorts of political questions. If I had entertained any doubts as to the ability and understanding of these students whose maximum age was 18, those doubts were certainly dispelled. When I left that television studio, I was more firmly convinced than ever that an 18-year-old should have the right to vote.

All of this would perhaps be entirely theoretical and speculative were it not for the fact that the State of Georgia, in our own country, and many nations, have already seen fit to extend suffrage to 18-year-olds. Those most able to describe the experiment of the lowering of voting age in Georgia have been high in its praise. Governor Arnall described it as very salutary and very fine.

Some of the nations which have adopted 18 as the minimum voting age are Brazil, Argentina, Ecuador, Israel, El Salvador, Paraguay, and Peru. In addition to these, several other nations behind the Iron Curtain have seen fit to lower the voting age to 18.

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

Mr. LANGER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from North Dakota overlooked naming the largest country which allows 18-year-olds to vote—the Soviet Union.

Mr. LANGER. I did not overlook it at all. I named it a moment ago, in addition to several other nations behind the Iron Curtain. I made it very plain that I was not ducking it at all.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wanted to say that the largest nation which permitted voting by 18-year-olds was Russia, but I do not think Russia affords a very good illustration of democratic elections.

Mr. LANGER. Simply because Soviet Russia may favor one good thing is no reason why the United States should be opposed to allowing 18-year-olds to vote. Suppose Russia had set the voting age at 25. Would the argument of the distinguished Senator from Georgia then be that the United States should make the voting age 25, because Russia had done so?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I have rejected the argument of drawing a parallel between what is done in the United States and what is done in Russia, of doing things in the United States in an attempt to influence Russia. But I do say that whether the voting age in Russia be 25 or 20, the results of the elections there would be the same, because 99.9 percent of the votes are counted for one candidate.

Mr. LANGER. That is because of their system, with which I do not agree. I think the Senator from Georgia is quite correct about that.

In addition to Russia, several other nations behind the Iron Curtain have seen fit to lower the voting age to 18.

On the latter point I wish to call attention again to a remark of Representative KEATING, who observed:

> The mere fact that youth votes at 18 in Soviet Russia seems to be no argument that "evils of youthful voting will follow." It makes no difference whether you are 18 or 80, your vote doesn't count for anything in Soviet Russia anyway. The idea of getting the young people of America to do any goosestepping around seems to me to show an utter lack of comprehension of the American youth. I don't think you can regiment the youth of this country, in any such way. In fact, I think just the opposite is true.

You can no more influence young people than you can some of the older people. They have more independence of judgment. They are more apt to decide things on the issues but I don't think it is a political matter, I think it is a matter of fair play.

I think that as the life span gets longer in this country, as it is doing, people will live longer; there are more people in the older ages voting and to offset that, to give a fair balance, to determine the great issues of the day and to determine who shall govern the country, it seems we have to open it up at the lower end and balance the thing out so that we get a fair expression of all the people of this country.

Getting back to the matter of maintaining the same voting age as has been the rule since early Anglo-Saxon history, I wish the Members of this body would reflect for a moment on the tremendous advances which have been made in the past 50 years in education and in the transmission of information. How many voters 50 years ago had gone through high school? How many of them had an opportunity to come to Washington and view and interview their Representatives and Senators in Washington? How many of them had access to radios, television, daily newspapers, and periodicals, which today keep American voters alerted to political developments, not only in the United States but also throughout the world? Never in the history of man have the young people been as well prepared to exercise the right of franchise as they are today.

These tremendous advances in education and the transmission of information have been paralleled by equally tremendous advances in the machinery of war. Yet I have noticed no inclination on the part of the armed services of the United States to refrain from using young men who have not achieved their 21st birthday when it comes to piloting the jets or one of the gigantic bombers of our day. As a matter of fact, it seems to me, from the recruiting information which I have seen and read, that the accent is continuously placed upon youth. Some of these tremendously complicated instruments of warfare require a knowledge and understanding which would confound many an older person, yet it is said that this capacity to operate complicated machinery cannot be translated into an ability rightfully to exercise the right to vote. I do not follow such logic, nor do I give it any great credence. To my mind, the maturity required to exercise these feats of warfare are commensurate with the maturity required to choose between candidates for election to a public office.

At the hearings on a similar proposed amendment in the 82d Congress, one of the witnesses observed that, roughly, one-fifth of our armed strength is composed of men between the ages of 18 and 20. These men are, by force of circumstance, mature enough to assume the obligations of full citizenship. Former Senator Moody testified that if they are old enough to fight, if they have sufficient maturity to be introduced to jets and assigned to foxholes to defend our liberty, then they are old enough to vote. They are mature enough to assume their responsibilities and rights as full-fledged citizens.

Now, let me review the things that a young man of 18 can do.

At 18, a young man is qualified for employment under our civil-service laws.

At 18, a young man is civilly and criminally responsible for the statements he makes in his Federal income-tax return—section 39.51–3 of regulations 118, Internal Revenue Code.

At 18, a young man may marry without parental consent in the States of Georgia, Idaho, Michigan, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

At 18, under our Penal Code, a young man may be committed to a Federal prison.

At 18, a young man or woman is no longer eligible to receive assistance in social-welfare matters and pensions, since they are considered as adults. In other words, at 18, they are on their own.

At 18, a young man may volunteer his services in our country's forces without his parents' consent. This is a right of contract, the importance of which has no parallel in ordinary contract law.

At 18, a young man is required by law to register for selective-service and to be inducted voluntarily or involuntarily without his parents' consent.

These are but some of the responsibilities which face an 18-year-old.

There is at least one additional reason which has been mentioned by some as supporting the lowering of the voting age. At the hearings on the predecessor amendment in the 82d Congress, one of the witnesses testified that young people are enthusiastic in their desire to participate in political decisions, especially those which vitally affect their lives, and that if this enthusiasm cannot be expressed until the age of 21 is reached, their interest often is lost, or at least materially diminished. This, it seemed to the witness, and it seems to me, represents a loss to the United States as well as a loss to the individuals themselves.

I venture to say that when any Member of the Senate has become a candidate for the office of attorney general of a State, or United States Senator or Representative, or whatever other office it may be, he has been impressed by the fact that scores of young people have crowded around to help. They are willing to distribute literature. They are willing to go from door to door. They are willing to seal envelopes. In campaign after campaign it has been the young folks, from the age of 18 up, who are out battling in order to help elect a particular candidate whom they happen to like.

When young people emerge from high school, they are anxious to participate in the affairs of government. They are as well informed, they are as mature, they are as capable of exercising the franchise as are voters of any other age which might be chosen.

In closing, I wish to allude to one of the arguments which has been advanced as a roadblock to the adoption of the proposed amendment. It has been repeatedly said that this is a matter to be decided by each of the States. I wish to point out that the pending measure is not any different in principle from the proposal which resulted in the 19th amendment, which conferred the right to vote upon the women of the United States. The amendment now proposed would no more abrogate States' rights than that one did; yet that amendment was ratified in less than 2 years after its submission to the States.

Among the States ratifying the amendment were Texas, Missouri, Oklahoma, West Virginia, Tennessee, and I am proud to say, North Dakota. Yet, Mr. President, I remember all the arguments which were raised against giving women the right to vote.

I do not believe that a constitutional amendment which requires ratification by three-fourths of the States represents any great encroachment on States rights, and I fully anticipate that if this amendment is submitted to the States for ratification, some of the States which are now numbered among the foremost guardians of States rights will be found among those ratifying the amendment.

Mr. President, this is as good a time as any to press the amendment. With the public support for the amendment increasing all the time, with the occupant of the White House and the present majority leader in the Senate supporting it, this is an excellent time to approve it. I am satisfied in my own mind that the issue narrows down to the simple question: Eventually, why not now?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota yield for a question?

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

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has mentioned that Governor Byrnes, of South Carolina, had favored lowering the voting age to 18. I served with Governor Byrnes in the House of Representatives and in the Senate, and knowing him as a stanch advocate of States rights, it is inconceivable to me that Governor Byrnes has recommended that there be an amendment to the Constitution lowering the voting age to 18. I would not doubt that he would make such a recommendation to the South Carolina Legislature.

Mr. LANGER. What I said was that Governor Byrnes has mentioned recommending to the State legislature that the voting age be lowered.

Mr. HAYDEN. So far as I am concerned, I should like to see the voting age in Arizona lowered by an amendment to the State constitution. Several resolutions to that effect have been introduced in the Arizona State Legislature, but they did not get out of committee, so there could not have been any great public sentiment in favor of lowering the voting age. However, I do object to the State of Arizona being compelled to lower the voting age by an amendment to the Constitution of the United States. That question ought to be left to the people of my State.

The Senator from North Dakota has mentioned the amendment to the Constitution which provides for woman suffrage. I supported that amendment vigorously. However, 29 States had already adopted woman suffrage to some degree, which explains why such an

amendment to the Constitution was so quickly ratified by the State legislatures. With regard to the amendment now under discussion, only one State in the Union has adopted such an amendment to its State constitution. If lowering the voting age to 18 is as popular as the Senator from North Dakota has suggested, it would seem to me that by this time many of the legislatures would have submitted such an amendment for consideration by the people of their States.

Mr. LANGER. I call the attention of my distinguished friend to the Gallup poll, which shows that in the last 14 years the opposition to lowering the voting age dropped from 79 percent to 31 percent. More youthful members have been elected to the State legislatures in recent years. The move for such change has to be started some time. One State has already lowered the voting age. Maybe we will soon have more States taking similar action.

Mr. HAYDEN. At the last session of the legislature of my State resolutions were introduced to amend the constitution of the State of Arizona by lowering the voting age to 18 years. However, no action was taken on the resolutions. If the people of my State were so much in favor of lowering the voting age, I assume the State legislature would have taken necessary action, and undoubtedly the same would be true in other States. Such action by the State legislatures would relieve the Congress from the necessity of taking the action now suggested.

Mr. LANGER. I may say that if the members of the State Legislature of Arizona were of the same high caliber as is the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, I know that such a resolution would have passed unanimously.

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

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

Barrett	Green	Pastore
Bush	Hayden	Payne
Capehart	Hendrickson	Robertson
Carlson	Hennings	Russell
Case	Holland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Hunt	Stennis
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Thye
Eastland	Knowland	Williams
Ferguson	Langer	Young
Frear	Martin	
George	Neely	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Sena. r from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS, the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay Mr. AIKEN, Mrs. BOWRING, Mr. BUTLER of Maryland, Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CORDON, Mr. DANIEL, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GILLETTE, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HILL, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. JENNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MAYBANK, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. SCHOEPPEL, Mr. SMATHERS, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is present.

IRREGULARITIES IN GRAIN STORAGE PROGRAM OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the question is often raised as to what good, if any, results from an investigation by a congressional committee, and today I wish to call atttention to one investigation which produced constructive results.

Beginning back in 1950 I, along with many other Senators, began raising grave questions regarding the possibility of widespread irregularities existing in the grain storage program as administered by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

As a result of our allegations an investigation was ordered by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with the result that many individuals both in and out of Government were indicted.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson, recently issued a report which contained a list of all cases upon which convictions had been obtained as of January 1, 1954.

In this report the Secretary pointed out that as of January 1, 1954, shortages involving a total of some $11,310,000 had been discovered over a 5-year period and that recoveries of over $4 million had been effected.

Mr. Benson also pointed out that in the first year of his operations, 76 new shortage cases were discovered; however, 70 of these were discovered during the first half of the calendar year of 1953 and only 6 during the last 6 months, which would indicate that the conditions are being effectively cleared up.

As evidence that the charges of alleged irregularities which some of us made against this program back in 1950 were not unfounded and as evidence that the careful investigation by the Senate Committee on Agriculture was not in vain, I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated at this point in the RECORD a list of 58 storage cases involving shortages which have reached the court stage subsequent to January 1, 1951.

The money figures given in each represent the Commodity Credit Corporation's "claim" against the warehouse at "highest market value" of the commodity for the period involved. In some of the later cases, this claim is subject to revision pending final audit.

Net losses cannot be determined until all action is completed. In some cases proof of claim filed in bankruptcy action is larger than appears on this list. The difference is that proof of claim includes interest on the Government's claim. This list contains 37 cases upon which criminal action was taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

WAREHOUSE STORAGE CASES AS OF JANUARY 1, 1954

GRAIN, DRY BEANS, SEED

(1) Lemoore Grain & Feed Co., Lemoore, Calif.,[1] CCC barley (loan stocks): December 31, 1948, H. S. Brietigam, partner, indicted for theft and served 1 year in State penitentiary. February 21, 1951, indicted by Federal grand jury for conversion and false claim. Concern bankrupt. Question of Government's right to priority of payment now before court. If allowed priority, full recovery anticipated. Claim, $224,514.67.

(2) Tanner's Inc., Cortez, Colo.,[1] CCC dry edible beans: February 21, 1951, civil action filed with United States district court. October 25, 1951, Harold D. Tanner indicted at Denver, Colo. March 5, 1952, Harold D. Tanner and Halworth Tanner indicted for conversion and false claims. March 26, 1952, R. R. Wilson and Harold Tanner indicted for conspiracy and R. R. Wilson for perjury. April 4, 1952, Harold Tanner pleaded guilty to charges of conversion, conspiracy, and false claims. Harold Tanner and Halworth Tanner pleaded guilty to submitting false financial statements. April 11, 1952, R. R. Wilson arraigned and pleaded not guilty to conspiracy and perjury indictments. December 4, 1952, Wilson pleaded guilty to issuing false warehouse receipts. February 4, 1953, Harold Tanner sentenced to 18 months, R. R. Wilson to 15 months and $10,000 fine, and Harold Tanner was given a 3-year suspended sentence. Claim, $1,108,290.23; collections, $11,627.96; balance, $1,096,662.27.

(3) George D. Bates Elevators, Calhan, Simla, Matheson, and Platner, Colo. (Bates deceased), CCC wheat, barley, beans, grain sorghums: June 14, 1951, suit filed. June 19, 1951, temporary receiver appointed. July 17,

[1] Criminal action has been taken in 37 of the 58 cases on this list.

1951, appointment of receiver made permanent. Claim allowed by court but question of Government's right to priority of payment reserved by court pending hearing. Claim, $382,386.48; collections, $120,985.89; balance, $261,400.59.

(4) H. G. Williams Feed Mills, Ashburn, Ga.,[1] CCC corn: August 21, 1951, Williams indicted by grand jury. August 24, 1951, civil suit filed against Williams in United States district court. April 9, 1952, in Federal court at Albany, Ga., Williams pleaded nol contendere, was fined $2,500, and was placed on probation. Claim, $67,406.55; collections, $775.01; balance, $66,631.54.

(5) Edison Mills, Edison, Ohio (H. W. Martin, deceased), CCC corn, wheat, and soybeans: August 6, 1951, writ of replevin filed. November 15, 1951, amended proof of claim submitted. Claim, $395,923.97; collections, $173,826.74; balance, $222,097.23.

(6) Shannon Elevator, Sudan, Tex.,[1] CCC grain sorghums and wheat: November 6, 1951, civil action Federal district court. November 16, 1951, receiver appointed. March 28, 1952, O. L. Shannon indicted for conversion. May 13, 1953, voluntary petition in bankruptcy filed. January 8, 1953, found guilty. January 9, 1953, O. L. Shannon sentenced to 5 years imprisonment and fined $15,000. January 15, 1954, court of appeals affirmed conviction. Claim, $1,038,051.63; collections, $36,084.41; balance, $1,001,967.22.

(7) Nohr Elevator, Crofton, Nebr. (Vern Nohr, deceased), CCC corn: November 16, 1951, estate in probate. Claim filed by county ASC committee. Claim, $18,482.02; collections, $5,720.21; balance, $12,761.81.

(8) Spellman Feed & Grain Co., Rochelle, Ill.,[1] CCC corn: December 7, 1951, CCC filed claim and proof of loss with trustee in bankruptcy. January 21, 1952, Francis Spellman, Jr., and James Spellman indicted. April 21, 1952, Francis Spellman, Jr., pleaded guilty. James Spellman pleaded not guilty. November 10, 1952, James Spellman indicted. November 12, 1952, James Spellman pleaded not guilty. December 27, 1952, Francis Spellman sentenced to 5 years imprisonment and sentence suspended provided he serves prison sentence of 1 day a week for 2½ years. James Spellman sentenced to 3 years imprisonment and sentence suspended provided he serves prison sentence of 1 day a week for 6 months. July 14, 1953, State court ruled that Spellman may be tried in the State court. Claim, $313,182.52.

(9) Henderson Grain & Seed Co., Farwell, Tex.,[1] CCC wheat and grain sorghums: December 21, 1951, civil action filed to recover claim due CCC. March 21, 1952, C. M. Henderson adjudicated bankrupt. March 28, 1952, C. M. Henderson indicted for conversion. July 14, 1952, C. M. Henderson found guilty on 47 counts. July 23, 1952, C. M. Henderson sentenced to 4 years in penitentiary and fined $1,000. April 3, 1953, circuit court of appeals affirmed decision of lower court. August 29, 1953, proof of claim filed. Claim, $1,009,994.84; collections, $8,624.61; balance, $1,001,370.23.

(10) E & S Bond Warehouse and Union Feed Co., Inc., San Antonio, Tex.,[1] CCC grain sorghums: December 10, 1951, referred to United States attorney. Bankruptcy petition filed by creditor. June 10, 1952, W. H. Eckhardt, vice president and general manager, indicted at Austin, Tex., for conversion and false claims. June 2, 1953, W. H. Eckhardt pleaded guilty. October 6, 1953, Eckhardt sentenced to 3 years in the penitentiary. Claim, $214,319.05; collections, $1,529.50; balance, $212,789.55.

(11) Plains Grain & Storage Co., Inc., and Herman Dawson Co., Fort Worth, Tex.,[1] CCC wheat and grain sorghums: January 16, 1952, civil action instituted. January 21, 1952, receiver appointed. February 7, 1952, Herman Dawson indicted on 24 counts of theft of Government grain. March 5, 1952, Dawson convicted on 16 counts. April 4, 1952, Herman Dawson fined $15,000 and sentenced to 6 years in prison, with the last 3 years of the sentence to be suspended and Dawson placed on probation on condition of his effort to make restitution to the Government, and for good behavior. April 8, 1953, circuit court of appeals affirmed decision of lower court. Claim, $561,158.45; collections, $2,291.51; balance, $558,866.94.

(12) Garden Grain & Seed Co., Inc., Garden City, Kans.,[1] CCC grain sorghums: January 17, 1952, company consented to adjudication as bankrupt. February 20, 1952, W. S. Marteney, vice president and manager, charged with felony in State court. May 2, 1952, Marteney bound over to State district court and released on $5,000 bond. August 15, 1952, claim filed. August 21, 1952, W. Marteney indicted for conversion; C. M. Henderson, T. C. Harper, and W. Marteney indicted for interstate transportation of grain and documents under Stolen Property Act; W. Marteney and Sam Gish indicted on charges of mail fraud. November 3, 1952, Marteney, Harper, and Gish pleaded not guilty. February 27, 1953, verdict of guilty on 29 counts returned against W. S. Marteney. May 9, 1953, Harper pleaded nolo contendere. Claim, $148,980.90; collections, $12,440.24; balance, $136,540.66.

(13) Schroer Grain Co., Dresden, Kans., CCC wheat (includes some loan wheat): January 30, 1952, petition in voluntary bankruptcy filed. January 31, 1952, receiver appointed. August 19, 1952, claim filed with referee. Claim, $75,496.04; collections, $8,517.89; balance, $66,978.15.

(14) Alishouse Grain Co., Sheridan Lake, Colo.,[1] CCC wheat and grain sorghums: February 7, 1952, receivership proceedings started and temporary restraining order issued. September 15, 1952, Paul Alishouse indicted for conversion. October 31, 1952, Paul Alishouse pleaded not guilty. March 4, 1953, Paul Alishouse changed plea to guilty on 2 counts. Paul Alishouse sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment. Court has allowed the claim of CCC in the amount of $209,542.62 and reserved for later determination the question of priority. Claim, $212,864.54; collections, $3,321.92; balance, $209,542.62.

(15) Everett Grain Co., Vega, Tex., CCC wheat: March 1, 1952, civil suit filed against Kenneth Cook. Claim, $290,296.81; collections, $2,903.30; balance, $287,393.51.

(16) Eesley Mills, Morrow, Ohio,[1] CCC wheat: March 5, 1952, Bert Eesley indicted for conversion. May 5, 1952, Bert Eesley sentenced to 2 years imprisonment and fined $5,000. May 16, 1952, civil suit filed against Bert Eesley at Dayton, Ohio. November 13, 1952, Court entered default judgment against Eesley in amount of claim. Claim, $36,528.74.

(17) Burt Grain Co., Clarion and Galt, Iowa,[1] CCC corn: March 21, 1952, Clyde L. Burt indicted for conversion by Federal Grand Jury at Waterloo, Iowa. September 3, 1952, Burt indicted on additional counts. September 3, 1952, court issued injunction prohibiting sale of corn. October 14, 1952—C. L. Burt pleaded guilty; sentenced to 2 years imprisonment. May 14, 1953. Suit filed against Burt and Surety Co. Claim, $418,932.84; collections, $20,990.34; balance, $397,942.50.

(18) Robinson Produce Co., Olathe, Colo.,[1] CCC dry edible beans: March 25, 1952, O. W. Robinson indicted for conversion. April 16, 1952, O. W. Robinson pleaded guilty. March 20, 1953, O. W. Robinson died. Claim, $35,433.09; collections, $6,116.72; balance, $29,316.37.

(19) Page Bean and Warehouse Co., Denver, Colo.,[1] CCC dry edible beans: March 25, 1952, Glenn Page indicted for conversion. April 16, 1952, Glenn Page pleaded not guilty. October 24, 1952, Glenn Page indicted for conversion. November 1952, Glenn Page found guilty on two counts. January 15, 1953, Glenn Page sentenced to 18 months imprisonment and probation for an additional 2 years. Claim, $69,734.58.

(20) Honegger-Hanley Mills, Inc., Mansfield, Ohio, CCC wheat: April 9, 1952, civil suit filed against Honegger-Hanley Mills, Inc. Claim, $9,754.71.

(21) Meekins Warehouse & Storage Co., Corpus Christi, Kingsville, and Taft, Tex., and Meekins Farm & Ranch Elevators, Inc., Corpus Christi, Tex.,[1] CCC grain sorghums: September 15, 1951, referred to United States attorney. April 15, 1952, Lewis E. Meekins indicted for conversion and false storage claims in United States district court at Corpus Christi, Tex. November 3, 1952, L. E. Meekins indicted for conversion in United States district court at Corpus Christi, Tex. November 5, 1952, Meekins pleaded not guilty. April 20, 1953, L. E. Meekins pleaded nolo contendere on 22 counts. Sentenced to 6 months' imprisonment and sentence suspended for period of 2 years. Fined $2,000. Claim, $153,215.50; collections $127,859.25; balance, $25,356.25.

(22) Aileen Quirk & Sons, Inc., North Kansas City, Mo., CCC dry edible beans: November 18, 1952, civil frauds suit and action for an accounting filed in Federal district court. February 12, 1953, court ordered company to produce records for examination by Government. Claim (being computed); complaint 1, $2,000 penalty.

(23) Midwest Grain Co., Inc., Fort Wayne, Ind.,[1] CCC corn: April 21, 1952, civil suit filed at Fort Wayne, Ind. September 10, 1952, R. E. Brown indicted for conversion. December 10, 1952, R. E. Brown found guilty. February 7, 1953, R. E. Brown sentenced to 15 months' imprisonment and $5,000 fine. March 31, 1953, civil suit filed at Fort Wayne, Ind., against R. E. Brown personally for $17,786.67. Claim, $85,751.71; collections, $4,168.24; balance, $81,583.47.

(24) Frankfort Feed & Grain Co., Frankfort, Ind.,[1] CCC corn: May 27, 1952, civil suit filed in United States district court at Indianapolis, Ind. September 12, 1952, L. L. Augenstein indicted for conversion. September 19, 1952, defendant pleaded not guilty. November 28, 1952, jury returned verdict of not guilty. August 5, 1953, amended complaint filed in civil action. Claim, $40,128.60; collections, $14,754.77; balance, $25,373.83.

(25) Ten County Grain Co., Kinston, N. C., CCC wheat: June 3, 1952, suit filed in United States district court. Claim, $76,868.70; collections, $1,914.64; balance, $74,954.06.

(26) S. V. Smith Mill & Elevator Co., Tullahoma, Tenn.,[1] CCC wheat: June 16, 1952, civil suit filed in United States District Court at Winchester, Tenn. October 20, 1952, W. W. Smith indicted for conversion by Federal grand jury at Winchester, Tenn. Claim in the amount of $9,804.96 was settled for $7,500.

(27) Silver Brothers, Urbana, Ill.,[1] CCC corn, wheat, and soybeans: June 17, 1952, involuntary petition in bankruptcy filed by three creditors. June 30, 1952, Harold A. Silver and John A. Silver indicated for conversion, July 25, 1952, Harold A. Silver and John A. Silver entered pleas of not guilty. September 27, 1952, Harold A. and John A. Silver filed voluntary petition in bankruptcy. Claim, $391,237.58; collections, $43,116.87; balance, $348,120.71.

(28) Kirby Elevator, Inc., Kirby, Ohio,[1] CCC corn, wheat, and soybeans: September 23, 1952, civil suit filed in United States District Court at Toledo, Ohio. October 29, 1952, corporation and W. Harvey indicted. November 10, 1952, defendants pleaded nolo

[1] Criminal action has been taken in 37 of the 58 cases on this list.

[1] Criminal action has been taken in 37 of the 58 cases on this list.

[1] Criminal action has been taken in 37 of the 58 cases on this list.

contendere. June 9, 1953, court returned judgment for $89,755.12. June 9, 1953, petition in involuntary bankruptcy filed. June 22, 1953, a fine of $1,000 assessed against elevator and $2,000 against W. Harvey. Fine against corporation was suspended inasmuch as it is insolvent. Fine was paid by Harvey. Order amending the amount of the judgment to $92,789.65 was entered by the judge on July 27, 1953. August 14, 1953, proof of claim in behalf United States filed with referee in bankruptcy. Claim, $94,364.85; collections, $12,424.29; balance, $81,940.56.

(29) Stark-Lawless Grain Co., Stark and Wyoming, Ill., CCC corn: September 15, 1952, petition for arrangement filed in bankruptcy. Claim, $144,280.17.

(30) Louisville Soy Products Corp., Louisville, Ky., CCC wheat: On or about November, 1, 1952, suit by third party resulted in appointment of receiver. Claim, $11,820.55; collections, $2,810.37; balance, $9,010.18.

(31) Cargill, Inc., Albany, N. Y.,[1] CCC corn: December 17, 1952, Cargill, Inc., Marcus Marshall, general superintendent of the Albany elevator, and George Carlson, grain superintendent, indicted for conversion. February 11, 1953, defendants pleaded not guilty. Claim, $662,692.02.

(32) Boundary Grain & Feed, Inc., Bonners Ferry and Copeland, Idaho,[1] CCC wheat: December 17, 1952, temporary restraining order issued. December 24, 1952, receiver appointed. May 14, 1953, Wayne Mills, manager, indicted on one count by Federal grand jury at Pocatello, Idaho. June 4, 1953, Wayne Mills pleaded nolo contendere. Claim, $194,255.28; collection, $3,815.37; balance, $190,439.91.

(33) M. D. Shutes & Son, Inc., Schoolcraft, Mich.,[1] CCC wheat and corn: January 12, 1953, M. D. Shutes pleaded guilty—later changed to plea of nolo contendere—to an information containing five counts. January 13, 1953, proceeding in involuntary bankruptcy filed. January 28, 1953, corporation adjudged a bankrupt. February 26, 1953, Myron D. Shutes sentenced to $5,000 fine and suspended sentence of 2 years' imprisonment with 3 years' probation. July 9, 1953, proof of claim filed. July 24, 1953, assets of warehouseman sold at public auction resulting in a net of $820,200 for the estate. Claim, $115,023.74.

(34) V. M. Harris Grain Co., McElhaney, Mo., CCC wheat and grain sorghum: January 15, 1953, civil suit filed against V. M. Harris and bonding company. Claim, $435,138.47; collections, $10,959.37; balance, $424,179.10.

(35) Seybert's, Inc., White Pigeon, Mich.,[1] CCC wheat and corn: January 23, 1953, Fred S. Seybert pleaded nolo contendere to seven-count information. February 27, 1953, Fred Seybert fined $3,000, sentenced to 1-year suspended sentence, and placed on probation for 2 years. Claim, $44,483.91; collections, $3,850.49; balance, $40,633.42.

(36) Farmers Elevator Co., Walker, Iowa, CCC corn: February 6, 1953, suit filed for $3,302.23 (CCC claim of $2,888.02 plus interest to November 3, 1952). March 9, 1953, default judgment entered in favor of United States for $3,360.49 plus interest from March 9, 1953, and court costs. Claim, $4,322.86; collections, $1,434.84; balance, $2,888.02, plus interest from December 24, 1949.

(37) Dimmitt Elevator Co., Dimmitt and Athens, Tex.,[1] CCC grain sorghums and wheat: Case involving grain sorghums at Dimmitt, Tex., settled by payment of CCC's claim amounting to $31,364.41 and return of "no bill" by grand jury. Case involving wheat at Athens, Tex., presented to grand jury February 23, 1953. Jack Trimble, partner, indicted on two counts of conversion of CCC wheat. Jack Trimble pleaded guilty to charges of converting CCC-owned grain and was fined $500 and given a 2-year sentence, suspended for 3 years. Claim $101,383.36; collections, $15,283.74; balance, $86,099.62.

(38) Zieske Elevator Co., Cobden, Minn.,[1] CCC corn: February 27, 1953, indicted by Federal grand jury, St. Paul, Minn. Claim, $25,353.29; collections, $4,114.14; balance, $21,239.15.

(39) Boyer Grain & Feed Co., Luverne, Minn.,[1] CCC corn: February 27, 1953, indicted by Federal grand jury, St. Paul, Minn. Claim, $14,897.23; collections, $214.26; balance, $14,682.97.

(40) Farmers Cooperative Elevator Co., Buffalo Lake, Minn.,[1] CCC corn and wheat: Referred to United States attorney October 1, 1952. February 27, 1953, R. Witthus, manager, indicted by Federal grand jury, St. Paul, Minn. Claim, $46,370.08 paid.

(41) J. S. Fluker Grain Co., Chapman, Kans., CCC wheat: March 16, 1953, complaint filed. Claim, $7,261.73; collections, $1,050.35; balance, $6,211.38.

(42) Michigan Processed Foods, Quincy, Mich., and Illiopolis, Ill.,[1] CCC corn: April 8, 1953, T. R. Metzger, president, indicted by Federal grand jury on two counts of conversion. April 14, 1953, pleaded not guilty. September 18, 1953, Metzger entered a plea of guilty to an amended form of count two of the indictment. Count one was dismissed on motion of the United States attorney. October 26, 1953, Metzger was sentenced to imprisonment for 1 year and 1 day and a fine of $1,500 was imposed. Imprisonment was suspended and the defendant was placed on probation for a period of 2 years. Claim, $62,040.04; collections, $7,802.62; balance, $54,237.42.

(43) Roberts Enterprises, Inc., Rockdale, Ill., CCC corn: April 24, 1953, civil suit filed. Claim, $436,786.88; collections, $86,180.96; balance, $350,605.92.

(44) Fazel Bros. Co., Perry, Iowa,[1] CCC corn: May 20, 1953, civil suit filed Des Moines, Iowa: September 11, 1953, grand jury returned an indictment against Fazel Bros. Co., Roy E. Fazel, Dwight H. Fazel, and Earl Fazel, officers and directors of the company, charging them with conversion and conspiracy. November 25, 1953, the case was presented to a jury at Des Moines, Iowa, and the jury returned a verdict against all four defendants on all counts of the indictment. Sentence will be imposed after investigation by the probation officer. Claim, $129,243.88; collections, $9,790.02; balance, $119,452.86.

(45) Farmers' Elevator of Colfax, Colfax, Ill., CCC corn shortage and quality deficiency: June 27, 1952, referred to United States attorney. June 30, 1953, civil action filed. July 3, 1953, Federal grand jury returned a no bill with respect to Elmo Meiners and Kenneth Orendorf, owner and manager. Claim, $55,765.90.

(46) Crane Creek Elevator Co., Rushville, Ill., CCC corn shortage and quality deficiency: October 17, 1952, referred to United States attorney. June 12, 1953, civil action instituted. Claim, $45,134.36; collections, $2,952.17; balance, $42,182.19.

(47) Guingrich Grain Co., Wolcott, Ind.,[1] CCC corn shortage: November 3, 1954, referred to United States attorney for criminal and civil action. June 10, 1953, indictment in three counts was returned by Federal grand jury against W. Vernon Guingrich, owner, charging him with violations of section 714m (c) of title 15, United States Code, and section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, The United States attorney advised that when the next Federal grand jury meets at Hammond, Ind., he will cause the present indictment to be dismissed and resubmit the matter in order to obtain a proper indictment under section 714m (a). November 2, 1953, case represented to the Federal grand jury, and an indictment in three counts was returned. Claim, $25,677.03; collections, $4,174.47; balance, $21,505.56.

(48) Wagner Mills, Inc., and Wagner & Co., Schuyler and Edholm, Nebr.,[1] CCC corn and wheat shortage and deterioration: February 5, 1953, referred to United States attorney. Federal grand jury returned indictments against Wagner Mills, Inc., Robert Wagner, W. H. Broekemeier, and Walter Wragge, for violations of the United States Warehouse Act. Claim, $104,033.43; collections, $66,354.34; balance, $37,679.09.

(49) Grover Elevator Co., Grover, Colo., CCC wheat shortage: March 3, 1953, referred to United States attorney. United States attorney filed a complaint June 24, 1953. Claim, $3,289.21; collections, $350.80; balance, $2,938.41. Compromise offer of $500 accepted in settlement of balance of claim.

(50) J. E. Clarke Grain Co., Auburn, Nebr., CCC corn shortage: April 9, 1953, referred to United States attorney. United States attorney declines criminal prosecution. August 25, 1953, complaint filed. Claim, $3,115.20; collections, $123.76; balance, $2,991.44.

(51) Palestine Elevator, Palestine, Ohio.,[1] CCC corn shortage: April 4, 1952, referred to United States attorney. December 1, 1952, indictment returned against Carl D. Forney, owner, and Ralph T. Oliver, manager. Claim, $7,191.84, paid.

(52) Anderson Elevator & Feed Co., Anderson, S. C., CCC wheat shortage: December 31, 1952, referred to United States attorney for civil and criminal action. Civil complaint filed August 26, 1953, to recover amount due CCC. Criminal prosecution declined. Claim, $23,440.88; collections, $19,537.21; balance, $3,903.67.

(53) Daugherty Grain Co., Bartlett, Tex.,[1] CCC wheat shortage and deterioration: June 12, 1953, referred to United States attorney. November 10, 1953, presented to Federal grand jury. William Daugherty, Jr., indicted on six counts, charging him with conversion of wheat owned by CCC. December 2, 1953, pleaded guilty to all six counts. Claim, $41,311.09; collections, $22,321.07; balance, $18,990.02.

PEANUTS

(54) Denton Peanut Co., Denton, Tex., CCC peanut loan collateral shortage: June 17, 1949, petition in involuntary bankruptcy filed. Claim, $97,992.23.

(55) Charles Ray Warehouse, Sycamore, Ga.,[1] CCC peanuts: February 22, 1952, Charles Ray and others indicted on charges of conversion, false claims, and conspiracy. October 8, 1952, Charles Ray sentenced to 8 months in prison. Claim, $44,500.60; collections, $9,497; balance, $35,003.

(56) Lamar Powell Gin & Peanut Co., Omega, Ga., CCC peanuts: September 19, 1952, suit filed. March 17, 1953, United States district court, Valdosta, Ga., issued judgment by default in amount of $6,396.37 plus interest and costs in favor of United months in prison. Claim, $44,500.60; collections, $20,000; balance, $6,396.37.

(57) D. H. Wiley, Jr., Cordele, Ga.,[1] CCC peanuts: Referred to United States attorney November 20, 1952. January 22, 1953, D. H. Wiley, Jr., pleaded guilty to information in 2 counts charging false representations, and sentenced to imprisonment for 1 year and a day. Claim, $40,869.98.

COTTON

(58) Farmers Market Warehouse, Cordele, Ga.,[1] CCC cotton: February 24, 1953, Perry C. Clegg, Jr., manager, indicted by Federal grand jury, Macon, Ga., on 13 counts charging conversion. February 27, 1953, Clegg arrested and free on $5,000 bail. Claim, $39,124.41.

[1] Criminal action has been taken in 37 of the 58 cases on this list.

[1] Criminal action has been taken in 37 of the 58 cases on this list.

[1] Criminal action has been taken in 37 of the 58 cases on this list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, immediately following the foregoing insertion I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a second list as prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Benson. This list shows 15 other warehouse storage cases on which court action was taken subsequent to January 1, 1951, but which cases have now been closed.

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

CLOSED WAREHOUSE STORAGE CASES AS OF JANUARY 1, 1954

Storage cases on which court action was taken subsequently to January 1, 1951, which are now closed.

(1) Bryan Farmers' Cooperative Grain & Supply Co., Bryan, Ohio,[1] CCC wheat and soybeans: March 7, 1951, petition filed in bankruptcy. February 29, 1952, Clarence E. Davis, president and manager, indicted for conversion. April 1, 1952, Clarence E. Davis entered plea of nolo contendere. December 29, 1952, C. E. Davis put on probation. Probation suspended. Claim of $118,528.40 collected in full. Case closed.

(2) Kasbeer Farmers' Elevator Company Cooperative, Kasbeer, Ill.,[1] CCC corn: Referred to United States attorney October 24, 1951. December 3, 1951, J. H. Zink, former manager, indicted. April 30, 1952, J. H. Zink pleaded guilty. July 1952, J. H. Zink sentenced to 3 years and placed on probation. February 15, 1952, claim of $19,457.92 collected in full.

(3) Page Milling Co., Luray, Va.,[1] CCC wheat: February 11, 1952, William C. Harnsberger, former treasurer and manager, indicted on charge of conversion of 19,284 bushels. March 10, 1952, Harnsberger pleaded guilty and was fined $1,000. Claim of $44,510.76 collected in full.

(4) Sycamore Mill & Supply Co., Sycamore, Ohio,[1] CCC corn: February 15, 1952, suit filed and injunction requested against disposal of assets. February 29, 1952, Ward Walton and Marion A. Ward indicted for conversion. Ward Walton and Marion A. Ward entered pleas of nolo contendere, April 8, 1952. December 29, 1952, Marion A. Ward and Ward Walton each found guilty and fined $2,000. January 8, 1953, civil suit dismissed following settlement agreement. Claim, $373,482.58; collections, $19,162.84; balance $354,319.74.[2]

(5) Walton & Myers Elevator, Upper Sandusky, Ohio, CCC corn: February 15, 1952, suit filed and injunction requested against disposal of assets. February 29, 1952, Ward Walton indicted for conversion. April 8, 1952, Ward Walton entered plea of nolo contendere. December 29, 1952, Ward Walton fined $1,000. January 8, 1953, civil suit dismissed following settlement agreement. Claim, $479,632.62; collections, $332,038.12; balance, $147,594.50.[2]

(6) Walton & Case, Richwood, Ohio,[1] CCC corn: March 5, 1952, Ward Walton and Russell P. Case indicted for false storage claims and conversion. May 21, 1952, Russell P. Case and Ward Walton pleaded not guilty. June 9, 1952, Ward Walton and Russell P. Case withdrew their not guilty pleas. December 29, 1952, Russell P. Case and Ward Walton found guilty and each fined $2,000. January 8, 1953, civil suit dismissed following settlement agreement. Claim, $371,171.77; collections, $29,100.48; balance, $342,071.29.[2]

(7) Dewerd Milling Co., Milbank, S. Dak.,[1] CCC flaxseed: March 27, 1952, company indicted for conversion by Federal grand jury at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. October 8, 1952, indictment dismissed. Claim of $2,527.99 collected in full.

(8) Sheldon F. Reese Elevator, Aberdeen, S. Dak.,[1] CCC flaxseed: March 27, 1952, company indicted for conversion by Federal grand jury at Sioux Falls, S. Dak. October 8, 1952, indictment dismissed. Claim of $2,585.46 collected in full.

(9) Spurgeon's Elevators, Galva, Iowa,[1] CCC corn: March 21, 1952, G. W. Spurgeon indicted. March 29, 1952, Spurgeon entered plea of nolo contendere. April 22, 1952, Spurgeon fined $3,000. August 18, 1952, compromise offer accepted by Justice. October 21, 1952, suit filed to recover $22,500 from escrowee. January 24, 1953, Judgment entered against escrowee. Claim, $32,629.74; collections, $31,428.14. In final settlement, Department of Justice compromised $1,201.60.

(10) Farmers Cooperative Manufacturing & Mercantile Association, Lucas, Kans., CCC wheat: April 22, 1952, petition filed and receiver appointed. March 1, 1953, Justice Department declined criminal prosecution. Claim, $120,794.74; collected, $117,211.23. December 29, 1952, in final settlement, Department of Justice compromised $3,583.51.

(11) Sumter Peanut & Produce Corp., Sumter, S. C.,[1] CCC peanuts: Referred to United States attorney October 23, 1952. April 28, 1953, indicted by Federal grand jury, Florence, S. C., charging conspiracy and conversion. June 1, 1953, after pleas of nolo contendere, defendants paid fines aggregating $1,700. Claim, none.

(12) Kingston Farmers Exchange, Kingston, Ohio,[1] CCC wheat: January 16, 1952, filed suit for civil action. March 5, 1952, Everett F. Reynolds, vice president, and Ronald W. Churtz, manager, indicted for conspiracy and conversion. May 20, 1952, Reynolds and Churtz pleaded not guilty. April 6, 1953, Kingston Farmers Exchange fined $1,500. Indictments agains Reynolds and Churtz dismissed. Claim, $112,518.24; collections, $108,729.75. (Note for $21,334.90 secured by mortgagee.) In final settlement Department of Justice compromised $3,788.49. Civil suit dismissed.

(13) Bloomington Milling Co., Bloomington, Ind.,[1] CCC corn: September 12, 1952, Harold Miller indicted for conversion. February 27, 1953, Harold Miller pleaded nolo contendere, April 10, 1953, Bloomington Milling Co. found guilty and fined $5,000. April 17, 1953, promissory note payable to CCC for $30,595.86 adequately secured delivered. A fine of $2,500 and a sentence of 2 years' imprisonment imposed on Harold Miller. Prison sentence was suspended and Miller placed on probation. Claim of $61,789.75 collected in full.

(14) Tonganoxie Elevator Co., Tonganoxie, Kans., CCC wheat: June 12, 1950, suit filed by United States attorney. Claim, $34,993.84; collections, $10,799.51; balance, $24,194.33. June 22, 1953, judgment rendered in favor of Government in amount of $24,194.33. July 10, 1953, judgment was paid.

(15) Cape County Milling Co., Jackson, Mo., CCC wheat: February 20, 1953, suit filed. Claim, $28,566.41; collections, $21,403.52. In final settlement, Department of Justice compromised $7,162.89.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in addition to these 73 cases, there are 71 other cases—58 of which have been referred to the Department of Justice but have not been reported as having reached the court stage. The names of these are omitted since the presumption of innocence exists until the cases have been determined by the courts.

It is only fair to state that all of these cases do not represent disclosures by Members of Congress or by the congressional committee. Many were discovered by the Department of Agriculture itself and referred to the Department of Justice by them; however, the record still remains that the top officials of the Department of Agriculture under the past administration did not inaugurate their investigations until forced to do so by Congress.

Secretary Benson should be complimented upon the effective manner in which he has followed through in an effort to collect as much as possible on these claims and to prosecute those responsible for the irregular conversions.

Without attempting to review all these cases, I call particular attention to cases No. 34 and No. 33.

Case No. 34 is remembered as one of those which was responsible for touching off the congressional investigations.

On September 1, 1950, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 96, part 10, page 14119, I called attention to this company, which along with the Midwest Storage & Realty Co., Kansas City, Mo., had leased, for an insignificant figure from the War Assets Administration, Government-owned property at Camp Crowder, Mo.

The complete story of how the Camp Crowder property was rented to this company and the Midwest Storage & Realty Co. by Government officials who had an agreement with one of the tenants whereby they could share in the profits can be found in my remarks of September 1, 1950, which were supplemented on March 10, 1952.

Case No. 33, M. D. Shutes & Son, Inc., Schoolcraft, Mich., represents an even more fantastic case.

This case was one which was first called to the attention of Representative PAUL SHAFER, of Michigan, in May 1952, who in turn, knowing of my interest in this particular problem, conferred with me. The case as we developed it indicated that not only was there a shortage in Government grain which had been stored in this particular warehouse, but also, what was even more alarming, an indifference on the part of the Department of Agriculture regarding a possible shortage in this warehouse or a lack of knowledge regarding what was actually supposed to be stored there.

Failing to obtain a satisfactory explanation from the Department of Agriculture, the allegations and the case as we had developed it were submitted on May 29, 1952, to the Honorable Lindsay C. Warren, Comptroller General of the United States, along with a request that he investigate the case.

The results of the Comptroller General's investigation were forwarded to the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Justice, subsequently Mr. Shutes was convicted.

Under date of August 17, 1953, the Comptroller General submitted his final report on this case—Report No. I–17640—and while this report is too voluminous to incorporate in the RECORD, I shall ask that it be referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for their examination.

Without delaying the Senate, I shall only quote a few paragraphs from this report, which summarize the story.

[1] Criminal action.

[2] Jan. 7, 1953, note for balance of claim secured and civil suit dismissed.

[1] Criminal action.

In his accompanying letter, the Comptroller General stated:

The investigation established certain irregularities in the storage of grain by the warehouse, including conversions, shortages, and deterioration of the Government-owned commodities stored at the elevator, as well as what appears to have been the Department's unnecessary delay in taking the steps required to protect the interests of the Government.

I continue to read from the report:

Claims of $23,669.77 were established against the warehouse by CCC because of abnormal quality deficiencies in the grades of CCC wheat shipped prior to 1952. The CCC took no action, however, to discontinue storing grain at the elevator. The fact that claims were not computed for over 6 months after shipments were completed by the warehouseman was attributed to office procedures by the assistant director, Chicago Commodity Office. * * *

The total liability of M. D. Shutes & Son, Inc., was estimated to be $116,509.44. The shortage of wheat was 30,334.69 bushels, and although only good wheat was placed in storage, the wheat shipped on the last loading order was tough, weevily, and sour, all sample grade.

Although 40,437.87 bushels of 1951 crop wheat used by producers for CCC loans was stored at the elevator prior to October 15, 1951, the Chicago Commodity Office did not record this wheat as stored at the elevator until May 24, 1952, and due to office procedures the Commodity Office did not know just what was supposed to be on hand when a suspected conversion of wheat was reported on April 23, 1952. * * *

Although the Chicago Commodity Office was notified of the conversion by memorandum dated April 23, 1952, an investigation was not requested until May 22, 1952. The investigation, begun July 24, 1952, was not completed until November 10, 1952. The regional attorney, who was advised of the conversion in July 1952, did not refer the case to the United States attorney until November 26, 1952. The Chicago Commodity Office had not computed the amount due from the warehouseman as of January 20, 1953. * * *

The officers of the corporation commenced proceedings to dissolve the corporation due to bankruptcy during December 1952 and it is doubtful that the Government will collect any of the amounts due.

I ask unanimous consent that this report, No. I–17640, entitled "Report of Investigation, Alleged Irregularities in the Storage of Grain at the Elevator of M. D. Shutes & Son, Inc., Schoolcraft, Mich.," as submitted by Mr. William L. Morrow, Acting Comptroller General, under date of August 17, 1953, be accepted by the Senate and referred to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for their information.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the report will be received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I summarize the report in the last case by stating that, according to the report, the evidence was that when the situation was called to the attention of the Department of Agriculture, their excuse was that they had done nothing to correct the situation because they apparently were unable to locate on their books any record of ever having had any grain stored in that particular warehouse.

As of January 20, 1953, 1 year afterward, the Department did not have the slightest knowledge of what the loss might be or of what it was supposed to have in that particular warehouse.

EXTENSION OF VOTING RIGHTS TO CITIZENS AT AGE OF 18

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the joint resolution now before the Senate proposing an amendment to the charter of our liberties is of great importance. Any proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States should be carefully considered, fully weighed, and investigated from every angle.

The legislative history of the proposed amendment to the Constitution and the record of its public discussion are sad commentaries on the capacity of the representatives of a self-governing people to grasp the real issues which are involved. I hold in my hand the hearings before the Committee on the Judiciary with respect to the proposed constitutional amendment, an amendment to our basic law which would make vital changes in our entire structure of government. It consists of some 18 pages of printed matter.

The record of the hearings shows that Mr. Rufus Wilson, national legislative representative of the American Veterans of World War II, appeared as a witness before the subcommittee which conducted the hearings. A brief, one-page statement was made by Mr. Philip S. Wilder, Jr., associate professor of political science at Wabash College; a statement was made by Mr. Duane Emme, of St. Paul, Minn., president of the Young Democratic Farm Labor Clubs; and a one-page statement was made by Mr. Gorman King, of Valley City, N. Dak.

There appear also about 3 or 4 letters, and a written statement submitted by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

It contains the information that three of the largest veterans organizations were invited to appear but advised the committee they had no interest in the proposed amendment.

These, Mr. President, constitute the hearings on a proposal to alter the structure of our national Government as it relates to the direction and regulation of the most important function of a democracy, the holding of elections. Not a single official of the Federal Government appeared before the committee to assist it in its deliberations. Not a single governor of a State appeared; nor does the record show that one was invited. Not one member of a legislative body from a single State appeared to testify with respect to this proposal of such far-reaching consequence. The joint resolution was reported to the Senate on brief statements which revolved wholly around what, to me, is a secondary issue, that is, whether 18 years of age is an appropriate age for voting.

Mr. President, this is a matter which is not of concern to the Congress of the United States. It is one which has been entrusted, and wisely entrusted, to the government of the several States.

There is no provision in the Federal Constitution which fixes the age of voting. Indeed, Mr. President, there is very little in the Constitution which relates to the qualifications of electors. The Founding Fathers realized that if our form of government was to be preserved, they would have to prevent, at all hazards, centralized control of Federal elections. It is significant that the only language which appears twice, verbatim, in the Constitution is that in which it is made crystal clear that the States, and the States alone, are to control the right to prescribe the qualifications of electors.

In section 2 of the first article of the Constitution there is found the provision for the election of the Members of the House of Representatives, and the language of the provision is:

The electors in each State—

That is, those voting for Members of the national House of Representatives—

shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

When the method of choosing the Members of this body was changed by the 17th amendment, the Federal Government did not seek to coerce the States or to exercise power over them in prescribing the qualifications of the electors. The identical language was inserted into the 17th amendment relating to the election of Senators:

The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

So I say it is a sad commentary on our times that it is proposed to have the Federal power invade the several States and prescribe the qualifications of the electors, and to have that done on such skimpy and inadequate hearings as those which were conducted by the subcommittee in this case.

Mr. President, in the public discussion the issue has not revolved around the importance of preserving the dual system of a national government and 48 sovereign States in an indissoluble union. The discussion has revolved entirely around the question whether 18 years is the proper age to vote. So I say it causes some of us to have concern for the future of government by the people when a more important issue is lost sight of in order to grapple with and discuss an issue of secondary importance.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. I completely agree with the views which are being expressed by the Senator from Georgia. So far as I am concerned, it is completely all right for 18-year-olds to vote. The State Legislature of Louisiana is in session at the present time. If the people of my State desire to lower the voting age to 18, the State legislature can adopt a measure to

permit the voting age to be lowered to 18 years. However, I see no reason why I should vote for a measure which would require the States to do so. That is purely a question for the people of the respective States to decide.

Mr. RUSSELL. It so happens that I represent in part in this body the one State which allows persons to vote on attaining the age of 18. That was brought about by using machinery provided under our State law. There is not a single State in the Union which does not have adequate machinery at the State level to enable it to fix the age of voting at any age. I think that permitting all those attaining the age of 18 to vote in my State has worked very well. I have no complaint to make with regard to that; but I do not propose to vote to coerce any other State of the Union to follow the example of my State. Neither do I propose to vote for an amendment which would put my State in a straitjacket which would prevent it from making a change in that regard. For illustration, suppose in the next few years the Legislature of Georgia decided that the age of 18 was 1 year too soon to allow persons to vote, and the people of my State wished to change the voting age to 19. That right is guaranteed to the people of my State by the terms of the Federal Constitution. If they wished to do so, the voting age could be changed to 19 instead of 18. I do not propose to encase the people of my State in any Federal straitjacket such as this measure offers.

Mr. President, States are fast losing their identity as units of Government. Our once proud dual system seems to be giving way to the view that all power should be concentrated in Washington, that only Washington has the wisdom to direct and control the people of the United States in every detail of their daily lives. We know we have achieved our present greatness not through the concentration of power in the Federal Government, but because the functions of Government were kept close to the people, and all the people took great interest in their Government, because we have felt greater responsibility for local governments, and because, embraced within the Federal Government, we had 48 laboratories of government, each of which could try out measures and undertake to adapt itself to different conditions and different laws. The people of the United States have not heretofore considered it to be advisable or desirable to have every bit of the power of Government concentrated in Washington, with an allegedly allwise Congress sending word down to the States, which would reflect upon the intelligence, integrity, and capacity of every State legislature, the governor of every State in the land, and telling them, "You have the machinery available to you right at hand to fix the voting age within your State, but you have not the intelligence, the patriotism, and the integrity to use it properly."

I do not want the Federal Government to invade the States and say to their people, "We are going to tell you what to do. We are going to put you in a straitjacket. Henceforth and forevermore, you will be denied the right to legislate under State laws in this vital field of maintaining and operating the elective process in this Government and deciding the qualifications of your electors."

This step will be followed by others; perhaps the insistence that the votes should be counted here in Washington, and when that day comes the Republic will be gone. It will be well for us to remember what took place with regard to the election which resulted in what is known as the Tilden-Hayes case, when the Federal Government undertook to operate the election machinery of some of the States.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia if the Congress has received any resolution or memorial from any State legislature asking that such a proposed amendment as is now before the Senate be adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. My colleagues have available the report on the resolution, which is only a few pages long, and can be read in 5 minutes. No governor of any State was asked to come before the Senate committee and testify on this proposal which is of such vital importance to the people of the States.

Mr. STENNIS. Aside from the report, does the Senator know of any action by any State legislature resolving or memorializing the Congress on this question?

Mr. RUSSELL. State legislatures which would pass such a memorial would, of course, be completely devoid of any self-respect. This resolution assumes they are, because it directs them what they must do; but, in my opinion, the legislators of the respective States are as patriotic and as capable of managing and controlling the affairs of their States as the Congress of the United States is to legislate on the Federal level. As one who served for 10 years in the legislature of my own State, I resent this effort to use the Federal power to coerce the legislatures of the several States.

Some of my colleagues may say that before the amendment is effective it will be necessary for 36 States to ratify it and that it should be passed along to the States. If there were only one State left in the country which wanted to exercise its prerogative under the system which has enabled the United States to become a great nation, I would stand on the floor of the Senate and defend its right to do so. We should not coerce a single State in this important field, now reserved to the States exclusively.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Georgia has noted, has he not, that, skimpy as the printed hearing is, it shows 3 instances of testimony to the effect that in the most recent session of the legislatures of 3 States, they declined to adopt the proposal as to their States. Those States are Illinois, as indicated by letter from the representative of the State, appearing on page 8; Minnesota, as indicated by the testimony of a Minnesota citizen, appearing on page 13; and North Dakota, as indicated by testimony of a North Dakota citizen, appearing on page 18. Thus, so far as the record shows, the unanimous trend of the States is to repudiate any such proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps the distinguished Senator from Florida did not hear the very remarkable statement made by the Senator from North Dakota in presenting the proposed amendment to the Senate. He stated that the proposal had been brought up in the legislatures of 37 States, and except in 1 case had been rejected. The inference was that because 36 State legislatures did not agree with the Senate committee, they are incapable of running the affairs of their States. So now it is proposed that from Washington the Federal Government should go to them and say, "We will tell you what you should do. You State legislators do not represent the views of the people of your States. Without regard to the rights of the people of these 36 States to control their own elections and decide the qualification of the voters, the Federal Congress will impose its will upon you."

We have gone a long way in diminishing the power of the States. I hope we will not go to the extent of going into the States and saying to the State legislative bodies and to the officials of the State governments, "You are so incapable of dealing with this matter that, from Washington, we will direct you by amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

It has been stated here that the women's suffrage amendment has something to do with this case. Mr. President, all I have to say in answer to that is that if people cannot understand the difference between discrimination on account of sex and a classification on the basis of age, it is useless to argue and debate with them this or any other proposed constitutional amendment.

Mr. President, I have been amazed at some of the other arguments which have been advanced in connection with this matter. The distinguished chairman of the committee, in pointing out what citizens less than 18 years of age could do, referred to the fact that they could obtain Federal employment. He stated that as a reason why we should dictate to the States to let such persons vote. Mr. President, the Federal Government undoubtedly has power to prescribe the qualifications of those it will employ. This has nothing whatever to do with the rights of the States under the Constitution. The argument that because a man can be employed by the Federal Government at the age of 18 the Federal Government should compel the States to let him vote at that age, shows how far afield we have gone in this day.

I was somewhat surprised to hear the chairman of the committee refer to the fact that because those who are 18 years of age could receive social welfare payments, they should be entitled to vote. Mr. President, if we were to carry that

argument down to the Dependent Children Act, we would have to eliminate any age requirement. We would tell the States that they must permit infants in arms to be carried to the polls, where their ballots would be marked, and then placed in their little hands, and have someone guide the hand of the infant to place the ballot in the box—all because in this land we have sought to prevent dependent children from suffering. If we are going to base suffrage on the receipt of social security payments, it would be necessary to tell the States that they must let even infants in arms exercise the sacred right of suffrage, which has been the proud mark of distinction which sets citizens of the United States apart from the citizens of any other land under the canopy of God's heaven.

Mr. President, I like to think that I am a Jeffersonian. I do not claim that all the disciples of Jefferson are in my political party. Indeed, I have seen many members of my party who apparently forgot or found it convenient to disregard the fact that Jefferson ever had anything to do with the Democratic Party, because they have abandoned his principles. Thomas Jefferson was a voluminous writer; he was most prolific. He wrote letters and treatises; he gave his advice freely and indiscriminately. It has been stated that almost anything can be proved by the Bible. Similarly, Mr. President, almost any contention on matters of government can be proved from Jefferson's writings, because he was not always consistent. Nevertheless, one clear thread of consistency runs through all of Jefferson's writings, namely, that government of every degree should be kept as close as possible to the people. There is no conflict there; Jefferson believed in local self-government and in preserving the identity and rights of the several States. However he may have expressed varied views on other questions, he believed in local self-government; and I am one of those who believe that the future of the United States, inasmuch as its greatness stems from its past, depends on preserving the right of the people to govern at the local level.

But in this case it is proposed that we tell the people how they must conduct their local elections and what their qualifications for voting must be. Where does this idea come from, Mr. President? It is an amazing thing, to me, that in the summer of 1952, the Republican Party took over the cry of "States rights." While I remained with my party, I said:

> If the members of the Republican Party in the Congress are really going to stand for States rights, here is one Democrat who will step across the aisle and will vote with them on every occasion when they stand for that principle.

Yet, Mr. President, one of the first things recommended is to invade the States—although 36 State legislatures have turned down this proposal—and compel them, whether or no, to adopt a constitutional amendment, which could change their entire voting system and practices.

Mr. President, I have been a Member of this body for some time, and I have heard my Republican friends say time and time again, "The great trouble is that everyone is running to Washington to get something done. People are coming to Washington to impose their will on the people all over the land. They should go to their own statehouses and their own city halls for relief or reform, before coming to Washington."

I said a silent "amen" every time my Republican brethren made that statement. I said it again when the President of the United States made a similar statement when he was a candidate for office. If there ever was a classic illustration of something that people should go to their own statehouses for, instead of seeking to have the will of the Federal Government imposed on them, from Washington, it is before the Senate at this moment.

Mr. President, not a State in the land is without adequate machinery by which to fix the qualifications for voting at age 18, 19, 20, or, if that is preferred, 22. But it is here proposed that we say to the States that we will take away that right and power and fix your rules from Washington.

It has been said here, and argued at great length, that a man who is old enough to fight is old enough to vote; and that inasmuch as our young men are drafted to fight at the age of 18, therefore we should permit them to vote at age 18.

I like to think that my State moved on some other basis than that when it fixed its voting age at 18. I like to think that my State placed the voting age at 18 because the people of the State thought that in this modern day, at 18 years of age our young people had acquired sufficient maturity and education to enable them to participate in the affairs of government. A very powerful argument can be made for that, Mr. President, in every State capitol of the land. But the National Congress is not the forum where it should be made or find favorable reception.

Mr. President, to argue for this amendment on the ground that because our young men, when they reach the age of 18, are old enough to fight, therefore they are old enough to vote, is, to my mind, completely fallacious.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AIKEN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Is it not a fact that there are in the service many young men 17 years of age?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course.

Mr. MAYBANK. And, in fact, some 16 years of age?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, Mr. President, hundreds of young Americans who today are sleeping in foreign soil, died in battle before they ever reached the age of 18.

Mr. MAYBANK. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. All of us know that in the immediate family of many Members of the Senate there have been lads who enlisted before they reached the age 18 and were shot in battle during World War II before they attained the age 18. So those who make the fallacious argument that if a young man is old enough to fight at the age of 18 he is old enough to vote are stating to those who during World War II volunteered at the age 17, "Although you volunteered at the age of 17, you are not entitled to vote"; but to those who waited until they were caught up in the Selective Service System when they were 18 years of age they are saying, "You are old enough to vote because you were old enough to fight."

Mr. President, this amendment likewise will grant suffrage to girls of 18. Are we to say that we are voting for this proposal because we intend to vote for a draft of women in the next war, and that because they are old enough to vote we intend to make them fight, and send them along with the boys, if war should come again, which God forbid?

The Senator from South Carolina well knows that if my State had acted on any such basis as that, or if his State were to act on such a basis, the voting age would have to be made 16, because, in the deplorable and fratricidal strife of the 1860's, when, as General Grant said, everyone in the South from the cradle to the grave was called into the service, the draft age in some States was 16. Boys of that age were carried off to war, and many of them were killed in battle.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say to the former distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that, with their parents' consent, in past wars boys could enter the service at 16. Many such boys entered the service. So why make the voting age 18 instead of 16?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is just another one of the fallacious, superficial arguments which are made in connection with this proposal. If we establish the voting age at 18, we shall certainly do a grave injustice to thousands of younger boys who follow their country's flag in time of war.

Mr. MAYBANK. And a great injustice to those who volunteer.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. It is proposed that we discriminate against the boy who volunteers before he reaches 18. That would be the situation if we were to legislate on any such basis. We would be saying, "For your patriotism, your willingness to die before you reach the age of 18, you must pay a penalty. We are going to fix the voting age at 18 because that is the age at which we are calling boys into the service under the selective-service law."

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield once more.

Mr. MAYBANK. We would also be penalizing the parents of young boys who consent to their sons entering the service if we were to enact such a law.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. President, it so happens that there is a very full record of the Army of the United States from 1860 to 1865. No comparable records exist with respect to those who fought on the losing side, the Confederacy, and who paid a pretty

heavy price for leaving the Union, in more ways than in battle losses.

I have before me some statistics which show how unreasonable is the argument, "Old enough to fight; old enough to vote." It so happened that in the great Northern Army there were 25 lads 10 years of age or younger, who fought in the War Between the States. There were 38 boys 11 years old or younger. There were 225 boys 12 years of age or younger. There were 300 boys 13 years of age or younger. There were 1,523 boys who were 14 years of age or younger. There were 104,987 boys who were 15 years of age or younger. There were 231,051 boys 16 years of age or younger in the Union Armies. There were 844,891 boys 17 years of age or younger. There were 1,151,438 boys who were 18 years of age or younger. There were 2,159,798 boys 21 years of age or younger who served in the Union Army, one of the great armies of all military history.

It is considered a great discovery now that because a man might be selected for service at the age of 18, that fact, of itself, requires the Federal Government to invade his State and confer suffrage upon him. That may be a good argument to make before a State legislative committee, or on the floor of a State legislature, but it is the height of absurdity to make it in the United States Senate, and to give it as a reason for submitting a constitutional amendment which would interfere with the process which has been considered the sacred prerogative of the several States since the adoption of the Constitution in 1787.

This is only one more illustration of the theory of trying to carry on all government from Washington. It is another example of the claim that all the wisdom, all the patriotism, all the capacity, and all the integrity in matters of government in every field is here in the Congress of the United States, and that none of these attributes exist in those directing the governments of the several States or their local subdivisions.

Mr. President, this proposal should be voted down by a resounding majority. If it should be adopted as a result of pressure on the part of the majority leadership, and submitted to the several States, I hope the legislatures of the States will have enough self-respect to ignore and disregard it entirely, and go about considering the question of the qualifications of voters under State laws and State constitutions. I hope they will not submit to the implied insult which I see in this proposal, or admit the implied assertion that they are incapable of deciding the question of the qualifications of voters under State laws. I hope they will never confess such weakness by considering the approval of any such proposal as is now before the Senate.

I hope the time will come when those who achieve public office and power by talking about States rights, by saying that there are things which should be sought on the local level of government, without coming to Washington, will adhere to that policy after they assume the seats won on the strength of such representations.

I know that in recent years the importance of our dual system of government has apparently become less and less significant in the eyes of our legislative bodies and our courts. However, I cannot conceive of any valid reason why the Congress of the United States should submit an amendment of this kind. Even if there is only one State left in the Union which desires to preserve its right under the Constitution to prescribe the qualifications of its electors, the Congress of the United States, instead of seeking to deny it that right, should seek to protect and preserve it.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. In the event a State should wish to lower the voting age, could voters at the lower voting age, if it were legalized by the State, vote for Federal officials, for Senators and Representatives? I have not heard all the address of the Senator from Georgia. Perhaps he has answered the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. They could, indeed. There is no question about it. There is no age limit in the Federal Constitution. We leave that to the States. The only restriction is the requirement that the States must permit everyone to vote for Members of Congress who is permitted to vote for members of the most numerous branch of the State legislative body.

Mr. MALONE. What is the real purpose of Federal legislation in this field? What objective would be served?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have stated that I can see no reason on earth for it, except to promote the idea that all the wisdom of government resides in the Chief Executive and here in this Capitol Building—the idea of saying to all 48 States, to the State legislatures, and the State governors, "You are incapable of performing the State function of prescribing the qualifications of your voters, or of classifying them according to age. Therefore, the Federal Government is going to put you in a straitjacket and coerce you into taking the steps which we, in our omniscient, all-pervading wisdom, think you should take. We are sending word from Washington as to what you should do."

Mr. MALONE. I should like to say to the Senator that in the earnest opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, if we were to put a tent over the city of Washington, all we would have would be an international lobby.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is one reason the question is brought here. Those who agitate for measures of this kind wish to take the shortcut. They say, "Why should we go to the statehouses? Let us go to Washington." I am afraid that the fact that Congress has responded to pressure groups advocating bizarre measures encourages them to come here for more and more.

Mr. MALONE. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Georgia that I have just heard from a couple of Nevada groups. One was a group of junior high-school students. Last year the boys and girls took a vote, and they voted against lowering the age limit.

Mr. RUSSELL. All I can say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada is there may be merit on both sides of the question as to whether 18 should be the age at which a person should be permitted to vote. My position is that that argument should be made in the States where the power to fix the voting age was placed by the Founding Fathers in framing the Constitution, and it should not be made in Washington, in an attempt to have us impose our will upon the States. My State has enacted a law which permits 18-year-old persons to vote. Perhaps the Senator was not in the Chamber when I made that statement.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; I understand that to be the case.

Mr. RUSSELL. However, I am not by supporting any such constitutional amendment going to place my State into such a situation that henceforth it will not be permitted to raise the age to 19 or to lower it to 17, if the people of my State should wish to change the age.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. DANIEL. The junior Senator from Texas first would like to congratulate the Senator from Georgia on his speech, and to say that several years ago on the State level I advocated reducing the voting age to 19. Apparently the majority of the people of my State, certainly the legislature, did not believe that that was the right thing to do, and they did not even submit the proposal to a vote.

Even though I favor my State reducing the age, I certainly agree with the Senator from Georgia that the matter should be handled by the States, and that a decision of the question should not be forced on them against the will of the people and of the legislature of even a single State or of a minority of States.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I asked the Senator from Georgia a short time ago if any State legislature or any governor had sent to Congress any request, memorial, or resolution asking for the passage of the pending joint resolution. Since then I have hurriedly checked back, and I find that in 1918, when the 19th amendment was submitted by Congress, 29 States then permitted women to vote in one or all elections in those States. It shows the tremendous difference between the situation existing then and that existing now. At the present time only one State has passed such legislation, and no State and no legislature and no governor has requested that Congress propose to the States such a constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is very interesting, Mr. President, but, of course, there is not any comparison between permitting both sexes to vote and the States making a classification of voters by age as they see fit.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the distinction.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not believe there is any comparison at all between the two situations.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the situation. My point is that there is no appreciable sentiment for such a change in the Constitution, and there is certainly no official movement in any State in that direction, and such a proposal has not been adopted in any State, with the exception of one, and such action, furthermore, has not been requested of Congress by any State.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I gladly yield.

Mr. LANGER. In view of the statement made by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] a moment ago, I hold in my hand the result of a questionnaire mailed in the 21st Congressional District in Texas, in which this question was asked: "Do you feel that 18-year-old persons should be permitted to vote?" The result was yes, 48 percent; no, 45 percent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course. The Senator from Texas stated that he had advocated that the age be reduced to 19. However, that question does not ask, "Do you believe that Washington should tell Texas what age it should fix for voting purposes,"

I challenge anyone to submit that kind of question to the people of Texas. I am not authorized to speak for the people of any other State, but I believe that in that grand old State if the question were put to the people whether the Federal Government should tell the State of Texas what to set as the voting age, there would not be a corporal's guard to vote for it.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I gladly yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to congratulate the Senator on his speech and to endorse his point of view with regard to the pending measure. I should like to ask him a question, which he may have covered in the early part of his speech, but which I think should be in the RECORD. How many States had this question before them and considered it and approved it?

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that information on that point was not provided in the hearing, but the Senator from North Dakota gave it to us in his remarks on the floor of the Senate. He said it had been considered in 37 States and approved in 1. Therefore, because it had been considered in 37 States the inference was that Congress could now tell all the States what to do, and tell the people of the States that their State legislatures do not possess the patriotism, integrity, and intelligence to perform their proper function.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it contended that because 36 States turned it down that is a reason for passing the pending joint resolution?

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is a fair inference to be drawn from the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wish to associate myself with the Senator's statement as to where action on the proposal should be taken. Certainly it should not be taken by Congress.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I gladly yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on the same phase of the subject just covered by the question asked by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, I wish to invite the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia to the fact that in the Congressional Digest for 1944 there appears a very able review of the action taken by States on this subject under the pressure of war.

At pages 199 and 200 the action taken by the various States is shown, and there appears also a listing of the States. Mr. President, 31 States proceeded during that war period to bring this question up in their legislatures. The State of Georgia adopted an amendment, when submitted, lowering the age to 18. The other 30 States refused to take action in their State legislatures, even under the compulsion of war and when so many young men were serving in the military forces at the time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial published in the Evening Star of January 19, 1954, dealing with the subject under discussion.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I am very sorry I was not able to be present during the entire course of the distinguished Senator's remarks relating to the joint resolution now before the Senate. I wonder whether the Senator has not thought that possibly, living in this age of anxiety and some frustration, and confronted with world-wide problems, particularly now the crisis in Indochina, this proposal is not some evidence of a psychological result, by way of an effort to express some of our frustration and difficulties in the world in which we live. In saying that I am referring to taking whacks at the Constitution of the United States and undertaking to arrogate unto this generation an omniscience superior to that of the Founding Fathers and of the generations which followed them, and attempting to restrict and constrict by amending the Constitution the generations of the future.

I believe the President of the United States said the other day that he was not so sure that 18 was the right age, and that probably 19 would be just a little better. I do not know whether the distinguished Senator from Georgia has read from these extensive hearings, which I hold in my hand.

Mr. RUSSELL. It would not take a man of average reading ability more than 5 minutes to read the entire hearings.

Mr. HENNINGS. At page 18 there appears a statement by Mr. Gorman King, of Valley City, N. Dak., who makes some very interesting observations. Mr. King says:

> Another little sideline of it is probably women. I think that you know and we all agree that girls mature faster than boys. Right now, they see their boy friends and brothers leaving for the Army.

If that be the case, why should we not let girls of 18 vote and make the boys wait until they are 20 or 21?

If we are undertaking to set up criteria governing the age at which a boy or a girl attains maturity and sufficient wisdom to exercise the franchise, where do we start and where shall we stop, particularly if we are going to embed it in the Constitution of the United States?

I understand there are a number of other proposed constitutional amendments about to emerge from the Committee on the Judiciary. There has been a spate of them this year, and, apparently, we can anticipate others.

If the Senator from Georgia will bear with me just a moment further, Mr. King went on to say:

> If you will excuse the analogy, I mean I have never been able to kiss a girl unless I have had her at least close enough to me to do so, and it is the same thing as far as citizenship is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. Hearing that statement from Mr. King, I can understand what motivated the committee to report the pending joint resolution with such limited hearings.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the Senator from Georgia and many other Senators would not assume an attitude of old-fogyism or rigidity to the extent of believing that the human race does not make progress and suggesting that some boys and girls 18 years of age have not attained sufficient maturity and a sufficient degree of wisdom and judgment to exercise the franchise. I believe there are many youngsters of 18 years of age who can, perhaps, vote more intelligently than can some who have attained a much greater age.

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that that was not the issue at all, that there is much merit to the contention that 18-year-olds are qualified to vote, and my State permits them to vote. But the question is whether we should have a Federal straitjacket placed on the States by amending the Constitution which was deliberately drawn to provide the States some elasticity in requirements for voting.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I was here at the commencement of his fine address, but was called off the floor and could not hear all of it. I apologize for returning to an argument which he had already made.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Missouri speaks of frustrations. I do have a sense of frustration in undertaking to approach a subject of this kind, because it is brought before us on one leg, and we are asked to tell the once-sovereign States that they must permit voting at 18. The Senator from North Dakota said some States permit marriage at the age of 18. Many States permit females to marry at the age of 14, and other States permit them to marry at the age of 16. So, if that Senator's argument is applicable, we shall have to have an "accordion" Constitution providing that whenever any person is old enough to marry or to get on the Federal payroll he shall, ipse dixit, be permitted to vote within the State of

which he is a resident. That is not my idea of the proper function of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HENNINGS. If the Senator will yield further for one more observation—he has been very generous in yielding to me——

Mr. RUSSELL. I am very glad to hear the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, and I appreciate the interruption.

Mr. HENNINGS. I thank the Senator. I believe there is no Member of the Senate who believes more firmly than does the Senator from Georgia in the doctine that the collective wisdom of the people, as exercised through the franchise, is one of the greatest safeguards to the safety and welfare of the Republic. I believe that if there is anything the States can and should do to insure raising the level of collective participation, resulting in a fuller participation in the government of the country, the Senator from Georgia would be among the first to advocate it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly would, indeed.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Senator is also well aware, of course, that percentagewise, in the elections held over the years, many times less than 50 percent of the persons qualified to vote in our States do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. The editorial which I offered for the RECORD impressed me. It states that Congress has no business forcing this question, and if it should take any steps at all it should find means to get more people to vote who are already qualified to vote.

Mr. HENNINGS. I have not seen that editorial, but that is the thought I was about to express. Is it not specious to say that because some 50 percent of the people do not take sufficient interest in their Government to exercise the franchise we should, by constitutional amendment, give the vote to a number of others, establishing 18 years as the minimum, in order to get fuller participation in the Government?

Mr. RUSSELL. If that argument were carried to its logical conclusion we would have to amend the Constitution to provide that anyone who can read and write may vote, without regard to age.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I desire to commend the Senator from Georgia for making one of the best speeches I have ever heard in this body. In addition, I wish to express the thanks of the citizens of my State for the confidence he has expressed in their judgment.

I do not think we should ever use the questionnaire method as a predicate for legislation in the Senate. I should like to ask the Senator this question: If the people of Texas ever reach the point where they feel the age limit for voting should be lowered, they are perfectly capable of doing it themselves without any constitutional amendment, are they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is something which the people of Texas do not have to come to Washington for. If the majority of them wish to change the age of voting, they will certainly elect a legislative body to meet at Austin which will change the voting age.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Georgia has given us a warning which every Member of the Senate should heed. I hope that before we reach a vote on the pending joint resolution, every Member of the Senate who has not been able to hear the Senator's remarks today will have an opportunity to read his wise words.

EXHIBIT 1

STATES AND THE VOTING AGE

There seems to be nothing intrinsically wrong with the idea of lowering the minimum voting age in this country from 21 years to 18. Many 18-year-olds undoubtedly have at least as much political sense as some people in their thirties, forties, fifties, sixties, and seventies. Further, as has been asked on more than a few occasions in the past (especially during the Second World War), if these younger folk have the duty of serving in the Armed Forces of the United States, why should they not also have the privilege of casting their ballots in presidential and congressional elections?

Actually, when it comes to voting, nobody knows exactly why our country and the Anglo-Saxon world as a whole have for so long regarded 21 years as the best minimum age. Ancient Greece and Rome were less finicky about the matter, and today many nations, including the Soviet Union and several in Latin America, have an electorate broad enough to embrace the 18-year-olds. Indeed, one of our own States—Georgia—has had such an electorate since the presidential election of 1944, and if all the 47 other States followed suit, and thus increased the number of voters by about 10 percent, the political impact of the change would be mild enough except in the rather improbable event that the newly enfranchised youngsters would side overwhelmingly with 1 or the other of the 2 major parties.

With all that said, however, there is still reason to question the wisdom of President Eisenhower's proposal for a constitutional amendment to lower the minimum age for voters from 21 to 18. As it now stands, our Constitution leaves it to the individual States to determine all such voting qualifications for their citizens. The principle of States rights—which the President has repeatedly endorsed—is involved here. Why push it to one side in this particular field? Why not let the various States decide for themselves whether or not they want to do what Georgia has done and what Governor Byrnes now advocates for South Carolina? The issue is not an urgent or pressing one. The life of the Republic is not dependent on resolving it in a hurry. So why try to deal with it by tinkering with the basic law of the land when that law places the matter within the realm of State responsibility?

If there must be any kind of constitutional amendment on voting (it is difficult to see why there must be), and if the objective is to increase the size of the electorate, then the President and Congress might be better advised to seek a change that would make it compulsory—as in New Zealand and Australia—for eligible citizens to vote in national elections. Tremendous numbers of Americans ignore that privilege and duty, and perhaps they ought to be obliged by law to end their apathy. But that, too, like the question of lowering the minimum age, seems to be primarily a State responsibility. Taken as a whole, this is a field in which there is considerable reason to doubt the soundness or necessity of Federal action.

Mr. DIRKSEN obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield a minute to the Senator from Nevada to speak on a different subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, the President of the United States is reportedly relaxing the effort to push through the Randall report, which is incorporated in the Kean bill in the House and to be agreeable to a 1-year extension of the Trade Agreements Act. The Randall report contained a multitude of recommendations favoring foreign trade and foreign producers over domestic trade and domestic producers. The expiration date of the Trade Agreements Act is midnight on June 12. Trade agreements already made will remain in full force and effect, and the President of the United States would have to serve notice of the cancellation of such agreements. No extension is necessary. The President can come before the Congress next year with recommendations which he thinks are necessary, and Congress can then consider the matter further——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yielded a minute to the Senator from Nevada, and I do not want to interrupt the continuity of the subject which we have been debating.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have to leave the floor, and I should appreciate it if the Senator from Illinois would give me a minute or two more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yielded a minute, and I am glad to yield my friend a short extension, but I do not want any interruption in the continuity of the constitutional debate.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for half a minute?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield another minute to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. MALONE. I will try not to let the other matter get too cold.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of a dispatch from the New York Journal of Commerce of this morning, relative to several objectives which, it has been indicated, the President will seek to achieve through executive action on the Randall report, including a clarification of buy American legislation; assistance to nations which plan to make their currencies convertible; action to encourage foreign travel; and diplomatic support to those seeking to invest capital abroad, which means a lowering of the income tax, so that they will pay none here; also a simplification of commodity definitions and the rate structure, meaning that foreign value, instead of domestic value, will determine the rate of tariff.

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

DELAY ON TRADE PLAN ACCEPTED BY EISENHOWER—INDICATES SOME GOALS ARE TO BE ACHIEVED BY EXECUTIVE ACTIONS

(By Jacques Ozanne)

WASHINGTON, May 20.—President Eisenhower has agreed not to seek enactment this

year of the principal points of his foreign trade program.

The White House today disclosed that the Chief Executive believes that the controversial recommendations of the Randall Commission require more study from Congress than can be given before the end of the session.

FAVORS SIMPLE EXTENSION

In the meantime, the Chief Executive is hoping that Congress will pass a simple extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act for an additional year and that the customs simplification bill passed by the House last year will be approved by the Senate.

The President indicated, however, that he will seek to achieve through executive action several objectives of the Randall report, namely:

Clarification of buy American legislation.

Assistance to nations that plan to make their currencies convertible.

Action to encourage foreign travel.

Diplomatic support to those seeking to invest capital abroad.

* * * * *

The President's list of measures that he is counting on Congress to pass this year, as he stated them to Mr. Percy are:

1. "The tax incentives for foreign investment provided for in H. R. 8300" which he is confident will "become law shortly."

2. "The increase in the tourist allowance from $500 to $1,000 as provided in H. R. 8352 now pending before the House Ways and Means Committee."

3. "H. R. 6584 dealing with customs valuation."

4. "Simplification of commodity definitions and rate structure in the tariff act based upon a study by the Tariff Commission, and a better method of classifying articles not enumerated in the tariff schedules" which he said "should be authorized."

5. "Improvement in the statutes governing the administration of customs procedures and changes in the antidumping law and procedures to speed up its administration," which he said should also "be provided at this session."

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement by the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], contained in an article entitled "Stronger Tariff Safeguards Sought, Senator Tells NACM," published in today's issue of the New York Journal of Commerce.

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

STRONGER TARIFF SAFEGUARDS SOUGHT, SENATOR TELLS NACM

BOSTON, May 20.—Senator SALTONSTALL, Republican, of Massachusetts, will try to strengthen the peril-point and escape clause safeguards in the tariff laws, he told New England cotton-textile manufacturers today at the centennial of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers here.

There are provisions in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, now being considered by Congress, whereby tariffs can be raised when foreign competition threatens American industries.

Asserting that a vigorous and strong textile industry will always be essential to the economic well-being of New England, the Senator said that the superior productivity of our New Englands mills can't offset the differential between New England and foreign wages. He pointed out that New England textile workers are paid 200 to 1,400 percent more than textile workers in other countries.

TIME TO "STAND AND FIGHT"

"We New Englanders are tired of getting pushed around," Senator SALTONSTALL declared. "It's time to stand up and fight."

EXTENSION OF VOTING RIGHTS TO CITIZENS AT AGE OF 18

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to grant to citizens of the United States who have attained the age of 18 the right to vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, for a great many years I have had high admiration for the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who has just made his argument on the proposed Constitutional amendment, an argument which was based, in essence, on the principle of States rights. High as is my esteem for him, however, I can agree on only one point which he made in the course of his discussion this afternoon, and that is with respect to the rather interesting phrase that if a young person is old enough to fight for his country he is old enough to vote. I think I share the viewpoint of the Senator from Georgia on that, although I have never adopted that as the basis for my intention to vote for the pending joint resolution which proposes to amend the Constitution of the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia began his address by alluding to the paucity of the hearings. Frankly, I think Congress, and particularly the Senate, has developed the hearing complex. We are never content unless on almost every proposal which comes along we can load up a couple of thousand pages of testimony, which finally gather dust, because nobody ever reads them. It is scarcely necessary to have a tome of 1,000 pages on a question which is so obvious as is the proposed constitutional amendment now before the Senate, which provides, in substance, that neither the United States nor the several States shall deny or abridge the right to vote of a citizen who has attained the age of 18 years, or is between 18 and 21 years of age.

The proposed amendment confers no right to vote, any more than previous amendments have conferred the right to vote upon Negroes or upon women. It simply says to the States: "If you are going to allow anyone to vote in an election in your State, you shall not deny that right to those who have attained the age of 18 years. The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia, apparently, seeks to make a distinction between this proposed amendment and that which conferred on women the right of suffrage. Constitutionally, Mr. President, there can be no distinction whatsoever. The language of the joint resolution before the Senate is in part, as follows:

> The right of citizens of the United States, who are 18 years of age or older, to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of age.

The 19th amendment provides as follows:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

Let Senators try to make a distinction between those two statements. I should like to see them do so. I should like to hear an argument which constitutionally makes a distinction between the two provisions.

To return for a moment to the question of hearings, I suppose that if some Senator submitted a resolution proposing to pay testimony to the virtues of the Ten Commandments there would be a demand for hearings. Then people from all sections of the Nation would be summoned to give testimony with respect to that kind of resolution.

Mr. President, is it necessary to have 500 or 1,000 pages of testimony on the question of whether or not the States shall abridge the right to vote, or the United States shall do so, in the case of citizens of 18 years of age or older? This is an obvious matter; and the Senator from Georgia came to a conclusion about it, even though there were not 500 pages of hearings before him. That, however, is not material.

The argument has been made that no Federal officials appeared. Who should have appeared? Is this, for instance, the business of the Secretary of the Army because there are Wacs in the Army? The Secretary of the Army has no voice on a policy question of this kind. Should the Secretary of the Navy have been summoned because there are in the Navy Waves who may be 18 years of age? The Secretary of the Navy has no voice on a policy question such as this. It requires no Federal official to come before a committee and to give testimony on a matter which is so obvious as is the proposal now before the Senate.

The distinguished junior Senator from Georgia has said that he does not want his State to be compelled by the Federal Government to allow 18-year-olds to vote. The Federal Government is not compelling anyone. The proposed amendment to the Constitution is permissive. It would have to pass the other House and then be submitted to the legislatures or the conventions of the several States. It cannot be engrafted into the Federal Constitution until 36 States have ratified it. That would give an excellent opportunity for the people of the United States to discuss the question whether or not the voting age should be lowered. If the legislatures say "No," that will be all right with the junior Senator from Illinois; if they say "Yes," it will also be all right with me.

The questions of voting and of voting qualifications are as old as the Republic, and older. In the early days, when the exercise of the franchise was first permitted under the colonial form of government, what were the qualifications proposed in Massachusetts, in New York, in Connecticut, and elsewhere? It was proposed to hang the vote upon a property-owning qualification. How many lifted their eloquent voices to say, "Only those who own property should have the right to vote, because they alone have a durable interest in the perpetuity of the Government"?

Fortunately, that proposal was brushed aside. If it had not been, if it had been embodied in the Constitution, a father could surrender his son to the Army of the United States and his son could be killed in Korea, and if the father were not a property owner he could not participate in the deliberations of his Government by means of his ballot.

Fortunately, that situation never has obtained in this country, and the voting right is broad. It covers all citizens, regardless of their status with respect to the ownership of property.

This question was raised, Mr. President, in connection with the 15th amendment, which was adopted in 1870. Recently, in connection with the decision of the Supreme Court last Monday, we have heard something about the 15th amendment, which was adopted after the Civil War. What does that amendment provide? It says:

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Mr. President, let anyone show me a distinction between the language and the objective of the 15th amendment and the basic purpose of the proposed amendment now being considered by the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND rose.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would rather not yield until I have amplified my statement a little more. Then I shall be glad to yield.

So, Mr. President, when the question of States rights is advanced, there was an invasion of States rights by the 15th amendment, if one wishes to interpret it in that way, because that amendment, which was initiated by Congress, and was ratified, and placed in the Constitution, holds up a finger to the sovereign commonwealths of this great sisterhood and says, "If you are going to have voting in your States, do not deny it on the ground of color."

In 1920, once more, because Congress took action, there was written into the Constitution the provision that no State shall abridge or deny the right of suffrage because of sex.

In line with that unfolding pattern, which is somehow a part of the stream of this Republic, we propose to say to the States, in 1954, "If you are going to allow voting in your State, the right to vote shall not be denied because of age, down to the age of 18 years."

There can be no constitutional distinction, Mr. President, between any of these amendments insofar as the relationship between the Federal and the State governments is concerned.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield briefly.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have been interested to hear the Senator from Illinois refer to the several amendments to the Constitution which he has mentioned, and I notice he has avoided mentioning the 14th amendment, which is one of the amendments which followed the War Between the States, and which does give specific recognition to the fact that 21 years was the age limit for voting then observed by all States, I refer particularly to section 2 of the 14th amendment. I shall remind the Senator of that language, and then ask him for his comment on it. It reads:

> But when the right to vote at any election for the choice of electors for President and Vice President of the United States, Representatives in Congress, the executive and judicial officers of a State, or the members of the legislature thereof, is denied to any of the male inhabitants of such State, being 21 years of age and citizens of the United States, or in any way abridged, except for participation in rebellion, or other crime, the basis of representation therein shall be reduced in the proportion which the number of such male citizens shall bear to the whole number of male citizens 21 years of age in such State.

I am asking the Senator, while he is talking about these amendments, if he will indicate in his learned address how he explains the fact that, by reference, that was the law which prevailed in all the States, recognized by the reference to the 21-year-age limit for electors, and why the provision still remains unabated in the Constitution, and would be unaffected by the adoption of the amendment under discussion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. There is no magic answer about the number 21. After all, that was accepted as the practice in those days. That was 70 years ago. As a matter of fact, this seemingly magic figure of 21 goes back to the days of the Roman civil law. The Romans thought that the stages of life—infancy, childhood, and manhood—were divided into 7 periods each, and 7 plus 7 plus 7 equals 21. There was the magic figure. I do not think in modern days, when more information is available, when more knowledge is at hand, when maturity has been accelerated, there is anything magical about the figure 21 at all. But it was an accepted figure when the language of the amendment was adopted.

Let me go back for a moment to the question of women's suffrage. There is no constitutional distinction between the amendment relating to women suffrage and the question which is before the Senate today. The same argument was made on the floor at the time when the then Senator from California, Senator Sargent, first introduced a joint resolution proposing the amendment to the Constitution to provide for women's suffrage, and it took 41 years before it was adopted. Senator Sargent introduced it in 1878. In all the time up to that point there was this rather anomalous distinction between male and female, man and woman, insofar as their legal rights were concerned. Much of this is, after all, a throwback to what in the common law was called coverture, when woman was little more than a chattel. But little by little it began to shift into the conscience of the country, and finally it was written into the Constitution, that the right to vote should not be abridged either by the United States or any State because of sex.

The proposal before the Senate today may not prevail, Mr. President; I do not know. I shall vote for it. But this much is sure: If it is not adopted now, it will be adopted hereafter, and probably in our time.

I wish now to revert to the affirmative aspects of the matter before the Senate, which has had a rather interesting history.

I wish to say, as I said in the absence of the Senator from Georgia, that the meagerness of the hearings did not make it difficult for my distinguished colleague from the Commonwealth of Georgia to come to a conclusion, because he has followed a fundamental line, and I respect him for it.

However, the subject requires no long hearings. The objective embraced in the resolution has been in the minds of the people of the country for a long time. I point out that it was Senator Vandenberg who first introduced a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution to lower the voting age to 18, and that was in 1942, in this Chamber. So that was 12 years ago. Senator Vandenberg reintroduced the resolution in 1943.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], on the other side of the aisle, introduced Senate Joint Resolution 89 in 1943. The Senator from West Virginia introduced a similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 17, in 1945. Senator Vandenberg and the Senator from West Virginia again introduced resolutions on this subject in 1947.

In 1952 Senator Moody introduced such a joint resolution. In 1953 a similar joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

In 1954 a similar joint resolution was introduced by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for himself, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The question has been bouncing around, in this, the world's greatest deliberative body, for the past 12 years, so it is nothing new. But if it requires any implementation, then we might look at the record of the House of Representatives. The resolution in that body was introduced in 1942 by Representative Wickersham, of Oklahoma; Representative Randolph, of West Virginia; and Representative Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma.

In 1943 a similar resolution was introduced by Representative Fish, of New York; Representative Wickersham, of Oklahoma; Representative Randolph, of West Virginia; Representative Lane, of Massachusetts, and Representative Furlong, of Pennsylvania.

In 1945, 1947, 1948, 1949, 1952, 1953, and 1954, similar resolutions were introduced in the Senate and the House of Representatives. So this is no new matter, and, obvious as the question is, I cannot imagine that it would require a thousand witnesses and a thousand pages of testimony in order to inform the minds of the Members of the United States Senate with respect to the equities involved in the proposal now before the Senate.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I desired to complete my affirmative argument, but I shall yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the face of the fact that the numerous resolutions to which the Senator from Illinois has referred were introduced in the Senate and the House, how can the Senator explain that up to this time only one State has reduced the voting age to 18, whereas, when the constitutional amendment granting the right of suffrage to women was under consideration, 29 States had given women the right to vote?

Mr. DIRKSEN. What difference does that make? It makes no difference, as I see it.

Mr. HAYDEN. It makes this difference, that there was a great deal of sentiment for woman suffrage, as evidenced by the fact that the right of women to vote was implemented by the action of 29 State legislatures, whereas, with regard to the amendment now under consideration, lowering the voting age to 18, action along that line has been taken by only one State.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Of course, the Senator from Illinois cannot account for the conclusions of the members of the State legislatures of the 48 States. All I know is that I have here a list which indicates that at one time and another the question has been considered by the legislature of nearly every State of the Union. In many cases it has fallen by the wayside. In many cases favorable action was taken by one house, as happened in New York, and the resolution died before the other body of the legislature could take action on it; but the question has been under active consideration for a long time.

However, Mr. President, I am not concerned about what action the legislatures took. This measure will give them a chance to take formal action and to galvanize the thinking and the sentiment of the country, so that through groups and as individuals the people can manifest their opinion.

The chances are a thousand to one, as anyone familiar with legislative technique knows, that when a bill providing for lowering the voting age in a State is introduced in a State legislature, it will go into the committee archives. Perhaps the Members of the committee never will reach the bill; perhaps they are suffused with other work that seems more important, and so the bill to lower the voting age begins to lag. But, Mr. President, that does not diminish the interest there is in the country in this proposal.

It is rather interesting how sentiment in the United States has transformed over a period of time. In that connection, let me refer to the Gallup poll. Of course, I do not hereby testify to the authenticity of polls, as such—having been hurt once or twice by them—but, Mr. President, for whatever the Gallup expression of opinion is worth, let me point out that in 1939, 79 percent of the persons who indicated a choice, were opposed to reducing the voting age. However, in 1943—4 years later—the opposition had dropped from 79 percent to 61 percent. The next poll was taken in 1947, and at that time 60 percent were opposed. The next poll came 4 years later, in 1951. What happened then? At that time 49 percent were opposed to lowering the voting age; 51 percent were in favor of lowering it. And if this can be accepted as opinion gospel from Dr. George Gallup, in the great State of New Jersey, at Princeton, in 1953, 63 percent of the persons who expressed an opinion on this subject were in favor of lowering the voting age.

So here are five separate and distinct expressions of public opinion, through the instrumentality of the Gallup poll, over a period of 14 years—going back almost to the time when the late distinguished Senator Vandenberg, of Michigan, introduced in this body his joint resolution proposing a constitutional amendment whereby citizens who attained 18 years of age should not be barred from exercising the right to vote.

Mr. President, I wish to comment for a moment on the argument in regard to this matter. As I said a moment ago—and I list this as argument No. 1—I am not too much persuaded by the accident of age. It is easy to pick out, somewhere in history, an imaginary number, such as 21, and impart to it something prophetic, something miraculous. The fact that attainment of the age 21 lies ahead for a number of youngsters does not prevent them from maturing or from getting their hands upon information and knowledge that would make them not only good voters but intelligent voters.

Having been a part of a political organization, I may say that I do not believe the youngsters will do any worse than the people who will be hauled to the polls, and have printed ballots placed in their hands, and be told how to mark the ballots, and for what candidates. I have been up against the young voters; I have seen them in action. They display a degree of intelligence that is just as good as that manifested by the more mature citizens.

It might be said that, for instance, in the Commonwealth of Georgia, where there has been voting by 18-year-olds since 1944, there has not been evident any great expansion of the voting base, and there has not been shown any great and dynamic enthusiasm that would result in bringing out a 100-percent vote. Well, Mr. President, last week, a primary was held in Pennsylvania and 23 percent of the Democrats bothered to vote, and only 25 percent of the Republicans; and there is no 18-year limit there. Those voters were mature citizens. Where was their interest? In the face of that situation, is anyone so bold as to stand on this floor and say, "Oh, the youngsters will not be interested"? The oldsters in Pennsylvania displayed a rather dismal record to the young men of America who have been fighting its battles for a long time.

So, Mr. President, let us not make too much of the miraculous figure 21—3 times 7. It follows out what Shakespeare wrote, long ago, about the 7 ages of man—at least to the extent of using the figure 7, for in this case we use 7, plus 7, plus 7.

The figure 21, as the figure for the age at which voting is to be allowed, is very easy to adopt from the old Roman law; but in this modern age, are we to tie our people to such a figure, even though probably it has some basis and background for application, as one slips from adolescence into young manhood or young womanhood?

Mr. President, ours is an accelerated age, things move swiftly. There is TV and radio; there are magazines and newspapers. It is rather interesting to consider what a young man of age 18 was up against in the backwoods days, as compared with the situation today. In the old days, such a young man probably grew up in a log cabin, and probably he drank water from a gourd which he dipped into a wooden bucket—a practice which today by any standard probably would be classified as insanitary. Yet, somehow or other, those young people lived through those conditions. They lived on bacon and corn pone. There were no dulcet tones of orchestra music coming, via the air waves, from Kansas City, to waft them to sleep. There was no McCarthy hearing to be seen on the TV in the mornings and in the afternoons. Oh, Mr. President, how lacking they were in the availability of information and knowledge, and one thing and another. Today, information and knowledge are at the beck and call of everyone, both the young and the old. It is amazing to me how the young men and young women in the United States have matured and how their judgment has ripened at a reasonably early age.

I share the conviction of the Senator from Georgia that this matter cannot be geared to the old aphorism that, "If he is old enough to fight, he is old enough to vote." No, Mr. President, if voting means anything, it must be predicated upon intelligence, knowledge, and comprehension, not only of the issues, but also of the virtues of the candidates. That entire point is constantly missed, in connection with this matter, by begging the question.

So we must decide for ourselves whether the young men and young women in our States, by the time they reach age 18, have manifested a degree of intelligence and capacity which would entitle them to share not only in the burdens but also in the benefits of the country. That must finally be the test.

Mr. President, it is rather amazing, is it not, that in my State a person can grow up illiterate, and not be able to read or write, but can vote, whereas a young man who may be in his third year at the University of Chicago or the University of Illinois or Northwestern University, and who has attended political meetings and has examined the brochures of the candidates and the brochures on the issues, is not allowed to vote? Simply because of the accident of age and because of the indifference of the State legislature, he is inhibited in his right to share in the benefits of this country.

Mr. President, intelligence must be the basis for the decision in connection with this matter.

It should be remembered that one is not compelled to vote. However, I wish

to be able to say to the youngsters, "If you are interested enough and if you have the intelligence and the capacity to discharge this responsibility as a part of the American electorate, then march yourself to the polls and vote. If you do not want to go there, it is all right; it is deplorable, but it is still all right, because under the laws of the United States there is nothing to compel a young man or young woman to go to town and mark a ballot."

I wish to recur for a moment to the "fight and vote" aphorism—"If you are old enough to fight you are old enough to vote." When that argument is made I think the real issue in that field is obscured. I think, for example, of a young man who fell asleep in a bunker in Korea. He was court-martialed. I appeared before the military authorities. I said, "I feel like Abraham Lincoln, who, when he was asked to sign the death warrant of a young man who left the field of battle, could only say, 'Oh, do not blame him too much because the Lord gave him a cowardly pair of legs.'"

I said, "Do not blame this young man too much because, in his formative years, in the cold of winter, in a bunker on the Korean front, with the enemy just a short distance out of Seoul, he might have fallen asleep, if he actually did." The evidence on that point was not conclusive.

I project myself into that picture. I do not imagine a young man 18 years of age saying, "Well, I am 18 years old. I am old enough to fight, and I am old enough to vote," but rather saying, "Who sent me here? I am 18. I am in the Army. I did not even have an opportunity to vote for the man who was in office, who sent me to Korea."

That is quite a different thing. Those boys should be given the right to vote because they bear the burdens, not because they are old enough to fight, but because they have an interest in their own destiny, because they have an interest in somehow fulfilling every hope and ambition of life, when suddenly the long hand of Government intervenes. Why? Because it is set in motion by persons like me, who have been placed in public office. Such a young man may be sent abroad, and on a dismal night he may say to himself, "I did not have an opportunity to ballot on whether DIRKSEN ought to be in the Senate or not, but they have sent me here anyway."

That puts a different face on the question. We come back to what Abraham Lincoln said long ago. He said that he believed that all who assist in bearing the burdens of government should share in its privileges. These young men bear the burdens, not because they are old enough to fight, and have the necessary stamina, but because of a policy which sends them to war. They have no authority to pass upon the men who make the policy.

I am willing that those young men should have the opportunity to ballot on me; and when I make a mistake, in their judgment, they should have the power, by their vote, to haul the junior Senator from Illinois out of the United States Senate. That is only good American gospel, in my judgment, and it becomes exceedingly important in connection with this issue.

This question will recur again and again. It has been before this body since 1942. Let no one take comfort in the thought that if this proposal is not enacted today, or in this session, it will not be back, because it will. If it fails this time, if I am still here—God willing—in the next Congress, I will introduce such a measure if no other Senator does.

This question is now pending before the House. It will be considered in that body. I want the country to think about it. The best way to have the country think about it is to pass this proposal, send it to the House, send it to the State legislatures, and let the people of the country discuss it. Let it be discussed in the schools and colleges. Let the young men whose futures have so often been dislocated and distorted by war—hot war, cold war, and every other kind of conflict—have an opportunity to discuss the question. It will be a moot question in many legislatures unless the Congress takes action and exercises its prerogative under the Constitution of the United States by saying to the States of the Union, "It is your baby now. Call in the people and hear from them, and then determine what, in your judgment, should be done."

The argument is all on the side of this proposal today. This proposal follows the pattern which has been disclosed in the history of our country. First, the property qualifications for voting were brushed aside. Race questions were brushed aside. The question of sex was brushed aside. Now, in the gradually unfolding pattern, we come to the question of age.

There is no miracle, no magic, about the figure 21. This is an accelerated age. The young men and women of America have manifested a great interest in political considerations and in the destiny of their country. If they have the necessary intelligence—and in my judgment they have—they should be permitted to share not only in the burdens, but in the benefits of government as well, and should have an opportunity to pass judgment upon the human instrumentalities which create the conditions, both at home and abroad, in which the youth of America, like the youth of the rest of the world, must live. I trust that this proposal will prevail.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am pleased today to be able to speak on behalf of Senate Joint Resolution 53 proposing a constitutional amendment to grant the voting privilege to citizens who have attained the age of 18. The President of the United States is to be congratulated on his recognition of the rights of our Nation's youth for incorporating this amendment in his state of the Union message earlier this year. At that time the President said:

> For years our citizens between the ages of 18 and 21 have, in time of peril, been summoned to fight for America. They should participate in the political processes that produce this fateful summons. I urge Congress to propose to the States the constitutional amendment permitting citizens to vote when they reach the age of 18.

Along with five other Senators, Democrats and Republicans, I introduced a measure, on January 7, 1954, identical with the one which is before the Senate today, and I know the sponsors of my resolution join in congratulating the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for the action he has taken with respect to this subject.

It seems to me that in determining the extension of the elective franchise to those in the 18 to 20 age bracket two fundamental questions must be met. First, would such voters have an understanding of the issues involved in our elective processes; and, second, do such voters have a personal interest in the result of such elections?

In connection with the first question presented, every national poll which has been conducted in recent years to show the civic awareness of our citizens by age groups demonstrates consistently that the highest score is made by those in the 18 to 20 age group. In one such recent public survey conducted by the American Institute of Public Opinion, the answers to seven political questions showed that the contestants in the 18 to 20 age group scored higher than a second group in the age bracket of 30 to 39 and 14 points higher than those in the 21 to 29 age group. I ask unanimous consent to insert the results of this survey at this point in my remarks.

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

SHOULD 18-YEAR-OLDS BE ALLOWED TO VOTE?

(No. 1 in a series)

EIGHTEEN- TO TWENTY-YEAR-OLDS SURPASS ADULTS IN POLITICAL QUIZ—ONLY 1 ADULT IN 9 KNOWS ALL 48 STATES WILL ELECT MEMBERS OF HOUSE THIS FALL, QUIZ FINDS

(By George Gallup, director, American Institute of Public Opinion)

PRINCETON, N. J., March 2.—Are the Nation's 18-year-olds smart enough to vote?

Former President Truman believes they do not have the knowledge at 18 to qualify to vote. "Twenty-one is a better age; 24 would be better still," Truman has said.

On the other hand, President Eisenhower believes they should.

Who's right—Eisenhower or Truman?

To determine which age group in the population is best informed on basic political facts, the institute undertook what is believed to be the first nationwide political quiz in history among a representative sample of the Nation's present voters.

The same quiz, designed by editors of the Gallup Poll in cooperation with Princeton University professors, also was given to a typical sample of 18-, 19-, and 20-year-olds across the country.

Results show that, on the whole, the 18-to-20 age group does far better than their elders. On 6 of the 7 questions, their scores surpass those of present voters.

Other highlights:

Only 1 adult in 9 knows that all 48 States will elect United States Representatives this fall.

Only half of the adults know there are 2 United States Senators from each State and far fewer could correctly name the 2 Senators from their State.

Only 1 adult in 17 could state the purpose of the proposed Bricker amendment.

Two out of every three 18- to 20-year-olds know that the first 10 amendments to the Constitution are familiarity called the Bill of Rights. Only 1 out of every 3 adults could answer this one.

Here are the average scores for the seven questions by the various age groups:

Scores by age groups

Years:	
18–20	41
21–29	27
30–39	29
40–49	27
50 and over	24

Here are the seven questions asked by the Gallup poll in today's political quiz:

1. How many States will elect Members of the United States House of Representatives this fall?

Years:	Percent correct
18–20	22
21–29	10
30–39	9
40–49	13
50 and over	13
Total adults	11

2. How many United States Senators are there from your State?

Years:	Percent correct
18–20	66
21–29	42
30–39	54
40–49	50
50 and over	47
Total adults	49

3. Can you recall the names of your Senators?

Years:	Percent correct
18–20	29
21–29	24
30–39	30
40–49	31
50 and over	34
Total adults	31

4. What are the first 10 amendments to the Constitution called?

Years:	Percent correct
18–20	67
21–29	49
30–39	40
40–49	29
50 and over	22
Total adults	33

5. What is meant by the electoral college?

Years:	Percent correct
18–20	38
21–29	40
30–39	39
40–49	35
50 and over	32
Total adults	36

6. What are the three branches of the Federal Government called?

Years:	Percent correct
18–20	50
21–29	20
30–39	22
40–49	23
50 and over	15
Total adults	19

7. What is the purpose of the proposed Bricker amendment?

Years:	Percent correct
18–20	15
21–29	5
30–39	6
40–49	5
50 and over	8
Total adults	6

Mr. KNOWLAND. Additional statistics providing an answer to the first question proposed relate to the question of illiteracy among various age brackets. The principle of compulsory education has been adopted in this country for years, and accounts in large measure for the low illiteracy rate among those in the age group of 18 to 20 years. At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks a letter and table which I have received from the National Security Training Commission showing the percentage of illiteracy by age groups and race. The source of this information is a book called The Uneducated, published by the School of Business, Columbia University, in 1953. I should also like to include at this point in my remarks a memorandum supplied me by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense which shows the results of certain aptitude tests of Army enlisted personnel in selected age groups.

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

NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1954.

Hon. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Attached hereto is information regarding illiteracy among various age groups. The source of this information is a book called The Uneducated, published by the School of Business, Columbia University, in 1953. The adviser for this book was Maj. Gen. Howard McC. Snyder, of the United States Army Medical Corps, presently serving as the President's physician.

The figures given indicate the percent of illiterates within each age group listed and distinguished between the white and nonwhite population. For example, you will find that in the age group 14 to 24 only 0.6 percent of the white and 4.4 percent of the nonwhite are illiterate, whereas in the age group 65 and older 4.9 percent of the white and 32.4 percent of the nonwhite are illiterate.

I hope that this will be of assistance to you in preparing your study.

Sincerely,

EDGAR G. SHELTON, Jr.,
Executive Director.

Percent of illiteracy by age groups and race, 1947

Age group	White	Nonwhite
Total	1.8	11.0
14 to 24	.6	4.4
25 to 34	.8	7.2
35 to 44	1.3	9.7
45 to 54	2.0	13.8
55 to 64	4.2	19.1
65 and older	4.9	32.4

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D. C., February 23, 1954.

MEMORANDUM

Subject: Information concerning maturity of 18–21 year-old men serving in the Armed Forces.

Reference is made to your recent request for information presently available in the Department of Defense concerning the degree of maturity of the men of draft age serving in the Armed Forces, which might be of assistance to Senator KNOWLAND in his consideration of extending voting privileges to this age group.

The only information available in the Office of the Secretary of Defense which has been broken down by age groups is the following estimated percentage distribution of Army enlisted men by Army general classification test or aptitude area I scores for selected age groups as of September 30, 1953:

Army general classification test or aptitude I scores

	Ages 18–19 (percent)	Ages 21–22 (percent)
130–163	2	3
110–129	21	27
90–109	36	33
65–89	35	30
39–64	6	7

The possibility of obtaining other data which would be useful to you in comparing the two age groups was fully explored within the Army, Navy and Air Force. Since records are not kept by age, it is impossible to make the type of comparison in which you are interested.

WADE M. FLEISCHER,
Colonel, USAF, Director, Office of Legislative Liaison.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The second question presented: "Do such voters have a personal interest in the results of such elections?" can almost be answered completely by reviewing the world events as they affected those citizens during the past 14 years. During this period of time a world war and the war in Korea found approximately 20 million men in the armed services of the United States, a large percentage of which were composed of our citizens in the 18-to-21-year bracket. In World War II, 4,018,349 18-year-olds had registered under the Selective Training and Service Act by July 31, 1945. Of these registrants, 2,750,000 served in the Armed Forces during a part or all of their 18th year. Since the Congress enacted the Universal Military Training and Service Act in 1951, a million 18-year-olds have been registered each year under the law.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very much interested in the Senator's reference to the uneducated. Did he state how many young men who were registered under the draft during World War II were rejected because of mental or moral deficiency?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not believe I have those figures available. The figures I have before me show the illiteracy rate of those who were in the service.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe a significant figure would be one showing how many were rejected of those who were registered, because the proposed amendment does not apply only to those who were accepted, but applies to everyone 18 years of age. I believe the Senator will find that approximately 18 million young men were registered and called up by the draft boards, and that of that number more than 5 million were rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the Senator from Arkansas will find that, so far as the literacy of age groups is concerned, the age group of 18 to 21 compares very favorably with any other age group. I believe the statistics will show that to be the fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would agree with that statement. However, does not the Senator believe that 5 million out of 18 million is a rather high percentage of rejections?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe it is an unfortunate rate of rejections. Of course the rejections were not based entirely on illiteracy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I did not say they were.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There were other factors involved, such as health, for example.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is quite correct. It is difficult to draw a distinction with regard to the cause of a person's deficiency, such as some minor health deficiency, because quite often that deficiency arises from the person's lack of understanding.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. Before the distinguished majority leader obtained the floor, I undertook to ask the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] a question. I wonder whether the Senator from California feels, as I understood the Senator from Illinois to express himself as holding, that he does not care whether the legislatures ratify the amendment or do not ratify it, but that the constitutional amendment should in any event be submitted to the legislatures or to constitutional conventions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am frank to say that I did not interpret the remarks of the Senator from Illinois in precisely the way the Senator from Missouri seems to do. The Senator from Illinois is not on the floor at the moment. He can best interpret his own remarks. However, what I understood him to say was that at least in his view this is a very important question, and he believes that there is great value in giving the people of the United States, through their 48 State legislatures, an opportunity to express themselves on this very basic issue; and he said, which is quite true, that the State legislatures may either pass it or reject it.

I believe he has made his own position quite clear, that he favors the amendment. Of course, he cannot guarantee, if the proposed amendment is submitted to the States, that it will be ratified. He did express himself also, as I recall, to the effect that in the event Congress should not at this second session of the 83d Congress submit the question to the several States, in his judgment the issue will be back time and time again until it is finally submitted to the States.

Mr. HENNINGS. Of course, I do not want to charge or tax the distinguished majority leader with passing upon the meaning of what the Senator from Illinois said in his argument. I was leading up to asking the majority leader whether he believes, and, if so, to what extent, there is in the Senate a responsibility to stand as a sentinel between the many, and often almost reckless, attempts to amend the Constitution of the United States and the sending of proposed constitutional amendments to the State legislatures.

I ask that question because I understand that, to some extent, at least, the force of the argument in favor of the joint resolution is based upon the proposition that if a proposed constitutional amendment has been—I believe the expression was—kicking around here for a number of years, it should go to the State legislatures, so that the people could debate it, draw their conclusions, and, either by act of the legislature or by convention, work their will upon it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I believe the record should be made clear that I did not talk about the amendment being kicked around for years.

Mr. HENNINGS. I understand the Senator from California did not say it. However, what is the responsibility of the United States Senate? Is the Senate to be merely a conduit, so to speak, or a channel through which various attempts to amend the Constitution of the United States are to be funneled, so that they may be submitted to the State legislatures, or does the Senate have the solemn and definite constitutional responsibility to weigh and to determine whether an amendment should be submitted to the States?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator from Missouri not only knows the answer to the question for himself but he knows the answer so far as the majority leader is concerned, and I believe he knows the answer so far as all 96 Members of the Senate are concerned.

Obivously Senators have a responsibility to filter out amendments, and not merely pass along to the States any amendment which may occur to a Senator as being advisable. Of course, we have a responsibility under the Constitution. A Senator who believes that an amendment is not sound should not vote to send it to the States.

However, we also have the responsibility on an issue of this kind, if we believe an amendment has merit, to send it to the States and to thus give the people in each case, through their elected representatives in the State legislatures, an opportunity to express themselves at that level of government.

Certainly we have the responsibility of discussing and amending, if it deserves amendment, a proposed constitutional amendment, and finally to pass it or reject it.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am glad to hear the distinguished majority leader say that he does not hold with what I understood to be a part of the argument in behalf of the amendment, that because it had been kicking around, as I believe the expression was, a number of years, that it should be channeled or funneled through the Senate and submitted to the States, but that he believes we have a very clear duty under our constitutional function and responsibility to scrutinize, to weigh, and to evaluate every proposed amendment to the Constitution, and thus exercise the high function of the Senate.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I heartily agree with the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HENNINGS. The Townsend plan, for example, has been kicking around for 20 years, or so. That does not mean, merely because of that fact, that the Townsend plan necessarily has any merit.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the Senator is quite correct. I will say, in fairness to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], that he did not suggest, because an amendment may have been introduced in prior sessions of Congress, that, ipso facto, or that because it had been introduced 3 or 4 times, it automatically should be passed by the Senate without debate or discussion, regardless of its merits. I do not believe the Senator from Illinois either said or intimated such a thing.

He did point out, when some reference was made to the hearing, that this was not a new subject matter, that it has had widespread discussion in the States, in the newspapers, and in the Senate, over a period of years. He pointed out—I do not know whether he gave all this information, but for the benefit of Senators who were not present, I think it would be worth while to state it—he pointed out that in the 77th Congress Senate Joint Resolution 166 was introduced by the late Senator Vandenberg.

In the same year Senate Joint Resolution 89 was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

In the 78th Congress the late Senator Vandenberg introduced Senate Joint Resolution No. 7.

In the 79th Congress Senate Joint Resolution 17 was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE].

In the 80th Congress Senate Joint Resolution 73 was introduced by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], and Senate Joint Resolution 171 was introduced by the late Senator Vandenberg.

In the 82d Congress Senate Joint Resolution 127 was introduced by former Senator Moody.

And now this resolution is before us.

The point was that it is not a new subject. We are not proceeding de novo. I think the Senator's argument was leveled at our good friend and distinguished colleague from the State of Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] who apparently indicated that it might be bringing more pressure upon the States, as though we were passing a piece of proposed legislation that might interfere with the rights of the States.

I do not so interpret a proposed constitutional amendment. When the Congress, in its judgment, by a two-thirds vote of the House and Senate, submits an amendment to the States, which must run the gantlet of the legislatures or State conventions of three-fourths of the States, and must be ratified by three-fourths of the 48 States in order to become part of the Constitution of the United States, I do not think that is forcing upon the States a mandate from the Congress of the United States. To the contrary, I think it is entirely within keeping with our constitutional system and is the method by which our constitutional amendments always have been handled.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. Does the Senator from California think the Senate of the United States ought to be willing to submit as constitutional amendments matters which they would not pass in the form of statutes? That is the most remarkable argument I have heard. Even

though the Constitution is disregarded, and today people, even in high places, seem to be indifferent to it in rather surprising numbers, it is still the basic charter of our liberties. I fail to agree with the argument that because there is involved a proposed amendment to the Constitution, Congress can be careless in submitting it to the States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Oh, now——

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the Senator be willing to submit the Townsend plan as a constitutional amendment? I do not know whether he approves of that plan; but whether he does or not, it seems to me we should be much more careful in submitting constitutional amendments than when we are dealing with statutes. Congress can repeal a simple statute any time it may see fit to do so.

I cannot understand the purpose of reading a long legislative record of the number of times proposals similar to the one now pending have been introduced, unless it is for the purpose of arguing that because this proposed amendment had been introduced by Senators of different political philosophies, it should be submitted to the States.

That is, certainly, a rather strained argument, because the mere fact that a resolution has been introduced from year to year, is not, to me, indicative that it merits approval. There have not been any voluminous hearings held on the question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am surprised that my good friend from Georgia raises that question, because I know that many Senators on his side of the aisle, in the case of the poll tax, have urged that the matter be not approached from the point of view of legislation, but that if it is to be approached, it be approached by the method of a constitutional amendment. I believe there has been proposed a constitutional amendment dealing with the question of the poll tax. Senate Joint Resolution 25, dealing with that question, was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], one of the ablest Members of this body, for himself and the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the late distinguished and able Senator from North Carolina, Senator Hoey, the late Senator Smith, of North Carolina, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

I think that is an entirely proper procedure. I would not say that this is an improper procedure to follow, and that instead of introducing a joint resolution we should have proposed legislation in the form of a bill. I do not quite follow the Senator from Georgia in his argument.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator, of course, does not follow me, and he is evidently confused in his own argument, because he meets himself coming back. I am agreeable to the procedure followed in this case of bringing forward the subject in the form of a resolution proposing a constitutional amendment, rather than in the form of a proposed statute. I would not have been surprised if it had been submitted in the form of a proposed statute. The Senator is sound on most occasions, but I am amazed that he argues for bringing forth a bill instead of——

Mr. KNOWLAND. We are bringing forth a proposal for a constitutional amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. The matter is presented in the proper form. If it is to be done, I think it should be done by way of a constitutional amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the way we are presenting it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is a good argument to say that it was not necessary to hold hearings on the proposed amendment because it has been introduced so many times by Senators of conflicting political philosophies.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I did not read the list for that purpose. I was pointing out that the matter was not coming to the attention of the Senate de novo. It is a question which has been discussed on the floor and in committee over a long period of years, and also in the public press throughout the country. The State of the distinguished Senator has adopted legislation on the subject, and I am sorry other States have not done likewise.

As a matter of fact, hearings were held. No chairman of a committee can drag into the sessions of the committee the governors of the 48 States or the members of the legislatures of the 48 States, or witnesses from the executive department, or citizens generally.

It was recommended in the message of the President on the state of the Union. A number of constitutional amendments were proposed in January of this year. There was ample publicity and publication. Any witnesses who cared to attend, or any Senator who cared to attend and testify, could do so.

I am advised by the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], that when the resolution was ordered reported to the Senate it was done on a yea-and-nay vote. Those voting "yea" were the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], a former chairman of the committee, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Those voting "nay" were the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield further?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HENNINGS. I am sure the chairman of the committee, and perhaps the distinguished Senator from California, are aware that when I voted to report the measure I did so reserving the right to oppose it on the floor. Not having had an opportunity to examine it or to look into it carefully, I voted to report it to the Senate for the purpose of discussion and debate, which apparently is not going to consume more than half a day. I hoped that we might have a thorough discussion of it, after what seemed to me to be very meager hearings on a matter so vital as that of amending the Constitution of the United States.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from California has referred to the fact that this subject has been bruited about for a number of years; that it has been discussed in the public press; that it has been discussed on television; that a number of Senators have introduced it; that it has been discussed by Senators around luncheon tables and in other places.

I realize that I am rather old-fashioned. I am probably the last fundamentalist remaining in the Senate. But, in my opinion, all the discussion on the radio, in the press, and on the television, as helpful media as they are in transmitting information to the people of the country, and all the discussion around the luncheon tables and in cloakrooms, are not substitutes for a thorough hearing before a committee on a proposal to alter the basic charter of American liberties. I may stand alone on that statement, but as long as the Senator from California and I were engaged in a colloquy about the question, and he had been speaking about discussions throughout the country, I wanted to state that, although I may be the only remaining fundamentalist in the Senate, I do not believe that any of the situations which the Senator from California has mentioned, or all of them together, whether they be discussions at luncheon clubs throughout the land or sermons from every pulpit in the country, can be considered as substitutes for a full and complete hearing, at which not more than 2 or 3 witnesses, who had a right to appear as private citizens, and did appear in that capacity, can testify on a proposal to amend the Constitution.

The very least that should have been done, it seems to me, would have been to have had some representatives of the executive branch of the Government, which the Senator from California defends so stoutly on the floor, appear before the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Who could have expressed better the viewpoint of the executive branch than the President of the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. The President of the United States did not appear before the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It is not customary to have the President appear before committees of Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, it is not; but it is customary for him to send the Attorney General; and he sends the Attorney General whenever he is interested in a legal proposition. With respect to a proposal for an amendment to the Constitution, the Attorney General could at

least have submitted to the chairman of the committee, for inclusion in the hearings, the President's views. But they do not appear in the hearings.

It has been customary for the President of the United States, if he really favors a proposal in his heart, and simply has not been sold a bill of goods, but is certain of what he is doing, to send the Attorney General or other officers of the executive branch before committees to enlarge upon the views of the Chief Executive. That was not done in this case. I make no great point of it. I simply state that the hearings are the skimpiest I have ever seen on a proposal to amend the Constitution. I stand upon that statement. I could not allow the Senator from California to speak about discussions on the radio and television and in the press, without expressing my view that they are mighty poor substitutes for a hearing before a committee on a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not suggest that they are substitutes. The Senator from Georgia has ably discussed the matter on the floor. Perhaps not so ably, the Senator from California is trying to present a different viewpoint.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not have the distinguished Senator from California deprecate himself to that extent.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The fact that the President of the United States included the proposal in his state of the Union message indicates, I believe, that the President of the United States sincerely favors the amendment. One may argue whether he is right or wrong in his viewpoint, and certainly none of us is infallible, but certainly the President of the United States was very sincere and had a desire to have an amendment of this kind to be acted on favorably if Congress, in its judgment, desired to propose an amendment of this kind.

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

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

Mr. HOLLAND. First, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from California for having made reference to Senate Joint Resolution 25, which was introduced by 10 or more Senators from the South, in an effort to eliminate the poll tax as a requirement for voting in Federal elections.

I hope this first reference which, as I recall, has ever come from the other side of the aisle with respect to this resolution, which has been introduced in the last three Congresses, means that the resolution will be permitted to appear on the calendar and to be submitted to the Senate, because I am exceedingly anxious that that course be followed, and I am exceedingly anxious that the poll tax requirement be finally eliminated in Federal elections.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I may say to the Senator from Florida, if he will permit an interruption, that I hope we may expect as much support on the other side of the aisle from the associates of the distinguished Senator from Florida as he hopes to receive for his proposed constitutional amendment on this side of the aisle.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his expression of hope. I cannot predict whether it will be realized on this side of the aisle. The real test of the poll tax matter will be whether support comes from the other side of the aisle, from which it has not been forthcoming for the last 6 years, despite the fact that in the 1944 platform of the Republican Party there appeared a specific commitment of that party to abolish the poll tax requirement by a constitutional amendment. This commitment, so far as I know, has never been supported from that time on by Senators on the other side of the aisle.

I wish to make some clear distinctions, quite briefly, between that amendment and the pending proposed amendment. In the first place, the poll-tax amendment was introduced after the adoption, by 43 States, of provisions which terminated either any poll-tax requirement for voting or any property-owning or tax-paying requirement for voting. In other words, the matter has approached the stage where it is almost unanimous among the States.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. In this case, if the distinguished Senator will allow me to complete this point, the amendment which is being proposed now is based upon the approval of the principle of voting by 18-year-olds by only one State, despite the fact that 37 States have considered the proposal, and 36 of them, including the very fine State of the distinguished Senator from California, have, in their discretion, seen fit to reject it.

I now yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator from Florida will pardon me, it seems to me that some of the argument gets onto pretty thin ground because I think it is a matter of degree rather than a matter of principle. If, as some Senators have argued on the floor—and they have a perfect right to their viewpoint—that in this particular field, even if there is only one State left which has not determined the qualifications of the voters within the State, that State should not have the proposal forced upon it, the principle enunciated by the distinguished Senator from Georgia should apply just as well in the case of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida as it does in the case of the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER].

The same thing was true, as the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has pointed out, in the case of the woman suffrage amendment. In that case there were, I believe it was said, 29 States which had acted on the amendment. That meant there were 19 States which had not favorably acted on the question of woman suffrage. Yet, if it be a matter of principle, those 19 States should not have had forced upon them the requirement that they could not differentiate among voters because of sex.

In this case, it is true that at present there is only one State which has acted on the proposal, but all the States will have an opportunity to act on it if the proposed constitutional amendment is adopted by the Senate to the House, and then is submitted to the States, three-fourths of which will have an opportunity to act upon it.

What in the world are those who are opposing the amendment afraid of in submitting the matter to the 48 States of the Union? Why not let the States express themselves? If the States do not wish to draw the line at 18 years of age, they will have an opportunity to express themselves. I am willing to rely upon the judgment of the State. If, in their judgment, they do not wish to adopt the constitutional amendment, they cannot, of course, be required to do so, merely by having Congress submit the amendment to them.

So it seems to me that we are following an orderly procedure, a procedure which has been followed in the past in amending the Constitution. As I have said, this is not a new subject matter, which is being heard and which is coming up for consideration for the first time.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think the Senator from California is exactly correct in stating that a matter of principle is involved. Because the Senator from Florida and the Senators associated with him in introducing Senate Joint Resolution 25 were of that opinion, we do not make that particular proposed amendment apply to anything other than voting for Federal officials; whereas the pending proposed amendment covers not only Federal officials but also State and local officials, and covers such matters, in addition, as voting in bond elections and in every other type of election. This means that the pending proposed amendment reaches right into the intricate functionings of the 47 States which have not seen fit to approve, or most of which have not seen fit to approve, the far-reaching, sweeping provision which is now proposed to be submitted as a constitutional amendment.

I thank the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, although it is true that the selective service has not as yet inducted men under this act who are below the age of 19, thousands of 18-year-olds have entered the service voluntarily in order to serve their military time as soon as possible. The United States, as we know it today, began in a revolt against the colonial principle of taxation without representation.

On August 26, 1920, the Constitution was amended to provide women with the elective franchise, and, in my judgment, the time has now come to extend that responsibility to those who are 18 years of age and older.

I wish to say in conclusion, Mr. President, that it is not a question of compulsion on the States, because, in the last analysis, the States are going to have the final voice in the matter. I quite agree with the statement made by both the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and other Senators that the mere fact that persons who are 18 years of age

have fought for their country is not in and of itself an argument for the adoption of the proposed constitutional amendment. I concur in the argument presented by the Senator from Illinois that when a large segment of our population is called upon to bear some very heavy burdens in the protection of the Nation, from the point of view of those persons who are sent overseas, there is great merit in at least giving them an opportunity to be represented in the Halls of Congress and in their Government, and I think that would make for better government.

We do not know what is going to happen with regard to the amendment. I believe the proposal should be sent to the House, and submitted to the several States. As has been stated heretofore on the floor of the Senate, I am certain, however, that if it is not submitted to the States this year, it will be in a subsequent session of the Congress. It is a recommendation of the President of the United States. I hope the Senate will favorably act upon it today.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I believe the pending joint resolution should be passed by the Congress and the proposed constitutional amendment ratified by the States in order to give persons between 18 and 21 years old the right to vote. In my opinion, ratification of this constitutional amendment would be in the best interest of the Nation. I should like to discuss some of my reasons for reaching this conclusion.

First, persons who have reached the age of 18 in these times are competent and able to exercise their voting rights. They have reached the age of intellectual development which would so qualify them. In general, they have just completed their secondary-school education, which includes instruction in citizenship and government, and have such knowledge and information fresh in their minds at 18. I think that fact is well demonstrated. There is a television program shown in Washington which is known as Youth Wants To Know. There is also one in Philadelphia, in which youths are the inquirers of men in public life, and there is demonstrated by such youths an awareness of government and of the qualifications of those who are running for offices in government. Persons who are now 18 will not be able to vote until they reach the age of 21, when some of the knowledge they have absorbed in school will be lost because of their distraction with other occupations.

Second, I believe we can reasonably expect a high rate of participation among voters in the 18-to-21 group if the proposed amendment is approved. Their school training and their demonstrated interest point to a high percentage in this group who will actually vote, especially in contrast to their elders, who stay away from the polls in dismaying and shameful numbers.

Third, I believe this higher percentage of participation among voters in the 18-to-21 group will have a good example on older voters. It will encourage larger numbers of persons over 21 to vote.

Fourth, any step which this Nation can take to broaden the base on which its Government is selected is to the national good. We believe that every free government must exist with the consent of the governed. That means it must have the consent of a majority of the largest possible share of the governed, and those between the ages of 18 and 21 are governed in no lesser sense than those over 21.

I find also that persons in the Nation generally, including those both over and under 21, favor the proposed amendment. The mayor's committee on children and youth of the city of Detroit took a survey on the subject in December 1952. Their survey covered 3,233 people of all ages and groups, and they found that 2,569, or 70 percent, favored giving the right to vote to persons at the age of 18. They further found that 82 percent of those between 18 and 21 favored the lowering of the voting age, and that 68 percent of the people over the age of 21 favored it. I do not know what will happen, but they should have the opportunity to act on this question.

These facts are important in indicating that people in the 18-to-21 age group are willing to take over the responsibility that goes with voting, for I do not believe we should lower the voting age unless a majority of the young people in that age group are willing to exercise that right.

I feel that if we give such a responsibility to the youth of this country, they will exercise their right to vote. They will be more eager at that age to acquire knowledge of the facts necessary to exercise the rights and duties of citizenship than if the right to vote is deferred until they reach the age of 21.

For the reasons I have stated, I joined in sponsoring a similar joint resolution for a proposed amendment to the Constitution as the one now before the Senate. The late Senator Vandenberg, once my distinguished colleague, had for many years sponsored this kind of resolution. I shall vote for the pending joint resolution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to speak briefly on 2 or 3 points. First, I should like to comment upon the position taken by so many Senators that the matter of serving in the military service is tied with the matter of qualifications for voting. I should like to quote from an unusually well prepared brief which was published by the Library of Congress in February of this year, for the use of all Senators on the question. I quote from it simply because I think it gives a brief statement and a rather unanswerable statement to any position that might be taken that because a youth is required to serve in the military service, he is qualified to vote:

> The argument "old enough to fight—old enough to vote" is false. Mrs. Dorothy Canfield Fisher, the well-known author, has exposed it clearly: "To say that because a boy of 18 is old enough to fight, he is therefore proved old enough to vote, sounds to me as beside the mark as it would be to say that because somebody can make a swan-dive in good form * * * he is hereby proved capable of writing a textbook on philosophy * * * in both cases the kinds of qualities, skills, and knowledge involved are not comparable."

I continue to quote from the brief:

> The ideal qualities for a soldier are probably physical strength and stamina and willingness to take orders. But in a voter physical qualities are unimportant, and willingness to obey orders essentially undesirable. If we follow the "fight-and-vote" argument to its extreme, we might just as well say that persons over the draft age should not be allowed to vote.

Mr. President, my next point is that whereas the States that have considered this matter, and will consider it, I hope, from time to time, have it completely within their right to change their own constitutions, 47 of which now set 21 as the age limit for voting, when the States do consider this matter, they will have the right to consider it against the many other background matters incident to attaining age. The standard of attaining the age 21 as the standard for attaining one's majority and maturity has come to us from the common law, and was included in either the constitutions or the statutes of the Original Colonies, and later was adopted by the new States.

Mr. President, the matter of attaining one's maturity or one's majority involves a great many things other than the privilege of voting. For instance, marriage is involved. I believe the distinguished Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] said that 5 or 6 States now have changed that rule. However, the great majority of the States still require that persons must attain the age of 21 before they can legally be married without the consent of their parents.

The second point is with regard to the rendition of jury duty.

The third point is with regard to serving in the legislature and other offices. A very large number of our States have in their constitutions provisions—which still will remain in their constitutions, if this proposed constitutional amendment is submitted and adopted—that those who are qualified electors are, by virtue of that very fact, qualified to serve in the State legislature and to serve in various other posts of importance and trust.

The fourth point is with regard to the matter of ability to be sued and to sue—which, of course, is an incident of maturity.

The fifth and last point is with regard to the matter of being bound upon one's contract, and thereby being able to proceed as a person sui juris, as a person who has the maturity that must be acquired before he can be held and bound.

Mr. President, in passing, I call attention briefly to the absurdity of a provision which would allow 7 million or more minors who, in general, are not permitted to obligate themselves to the extent of as much as $10 by signing a note or by purchasing goods, or anything of the sort, to have the power to pass upon amendments to the constitutions of their States or to pass upon proposals to obligate their States to the extent of hundreds of millions of dollars—matters which frequently are involved in connection with the approval of State and other bond issues.

Mr. President, is it sound judgment to permit the creation of a situation in which millions of persons who, under the laws of their States—and those laws,

I point out, will not be changed in that regard if this amendment is adopted—are unable to obligate themselves or their fortunes or their estates in any way, because of the mere fact that they are minors, would, if the constitutional amendment now proposed actually goes into effect, be able, by their votes, to saddle hundreds of millions of dollars of indebtedness upon the cities and counties and States?

Mr. President, it seems perfectly clear to me that the very States which do control all those matters—and the States are not alike in that regard—are the agencies that are best qualified to deal with this subject, because when they deal with the question of the age for voting, they can also deal with the other multifarious questions which will be left floating about, untied to anything, by this particular amendment.

Mr. President, I close by stating that the amendment proposes to fix this test not only as a qualification for voting for Federal officials, but also as a qualification for voting for State and local officials. In the event this amendment were approved by 36 States, although opposed by 12 States which may have very definite traditions and convictions against permitting voting by minors, nevertheless those 12 States would then be confronted with the problem of complying with a law which thus would apply to them and to the millions of people who live within their borders.

Mr. President, I do not think this proposal is sound democracy or sound business judgment. I think it is a proposal for a step in exactly the wrong direction.

Let me call attention to the fact that the hearings were held and the measures on which the hearings were based were introduced before the President asked for the enactment of this measure. The hearings were held in June and July of last year, following the introduction of the joint resolutions on which they were based However, for some reason or other, those hearings have simply been picked up—notwithstanding the want of supporting administration evidence, the skimpiness of the hearings and notwithstanding that many of the basic facts do not appear in the printed record—and have been tied to the request of the administration, which in no sense was responsible for the introduction of the measures on which last year's hearings were based, they having been introduced in similar words by the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], in one case, and, in the other case, by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. President, I hope the pending joint resolution will be rejected.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate for not more than 2 minutes.

One point of deep concern to me, in connection with the debate, is the tendency to lessen the responsibility of the Congress in passing upon proposed constitutional amendments. Certainly it is a serious matter for Congress to pass upon proposed constitutional amendments, because, regardless of whatever may be said in the course of the debate on such proposals, they go to the State legislatures with the recommendation of Congress; and such a recommendation is a very strong, serious, and solemn one, from their point of view, and it should be.

In the present case, no one from any State has requested that this proposed constitutional amendment be submitted. No State legislature has passed a resolution or has memorialized the Congress on this subject. Only one State has changed even its own law in this respect. No governor has requested the proposed change. No one representing a great body of people within the States or representing national organizations has submitted to Congress their views or their recommendations on this matter.

The principal argument which has been made in favor of the proposed constitutional amendment is that it has been floating around for quite a time and has been the subject of a Gallup poll, which indicates approval of it, and that therefore we should pass it on, and thus place on someone else the responsibility for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARRETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Mississippi failed to state that it has also been on television at least 2 or 3 times. [Laughter.]

Mr. STENNIS. It has been on television, but it has not been sponsored by anyone on television; and unless a television program is sponsored, it does not seem to be entitled to a very high rating. [Laughter.]

Even certain activities of an agency of the Senate are now being sponsored on television programs—very much to my disapproval, incidentally.

But, Mr. President, a Gallup poll, a television program, and endorsement by a few scattered organizations are about the only things we have to pass upon in connection with this proposal.

As I have said, a constitutional amendment is a most serious matter, and if acted on favorably by the Congress, will go to the State legislatures and to the States with a strong recommendation on the part of Congress. We do not wish to change that atmosphere and that consideration of such matters.

I have before me figures in regard to an amendment that in some ways is kindred to the one now proposed, because these figures relate to the woman suffrage amendment in 1918, when that proposal was submitted to the States for ratification. At that time, 29 States already had passed laws of their own permitting women to vote. Not all of them permitted women to vote in all elections, but as many as 29 States had enacted affirmative laws on the subject, permitting women to vote in one or more of their elections. In the present case only one State has acted.

There have been no extensive hearings. That is no reflection on the committee. Very few witnesses were interested enough to appear. We are not in possession of all the facts. There is no great public interest or demand in connection with the pending proposal. There is no urging on the part of the people, and no indication of a deep concern. There has been no expression on the part of the States, officially or unofficially. So I submit that the entire proposal falls by reason of the lack of meritorious considerations which ordinarily surround a proposal of this kind.

So far as age is concerned, many boys who are under the age of 18 are far better qualified to vote than some who are more than 21 years of age, and who are now voting. It is not a matter of intelligence. It is not a matter of education. It is a matter of maturity and judgment. Even though our children are better informed than we were at their age, and better educated, I do not believe that they carry the responsibilities which an 18-year old child carried a generation ago. To that extent, I do not believe that the present generation of youth possesses as much maturity as was exhibited by children of the same age a generation ago.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Since the Bill of Rights was adopted soon after the adoption of the Constitution, the Constitution has been amended only 12 times. Reluctance to amend the Constitution is one of our most valuable safeguards and bulwarks of stability.

We have thus far attempted to amend the Constitution at least three times this session. This is the fourth time that a single Congress has passed upon this important step which was taken only 12 times since the beginning of our Nation. Yet the hearings were extremely brief. Only four witnesses were heard. Some statements were placed in the RECORD by request. I do not believe a single Member of the Congress appeared before the committee to testify in person in favor of the joint resolution. The record contains no resolutions by State legislatures stating their support of the proposed amendment.

Moreover, only one State out of 48 has taken any action in this field, although all States have been free to do so. Therefore, although the maturity and wisdom of those in this age group is not to be deprecated—indeed, I would support such an amendment in my own State, and in the Congress if it were supported by the experience and demand of many States—there have not been demonstrated sufficient grounds for changing this basic document today.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yea and nays on final passage of the joint resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as the youngest Member of the Senate from the point of view of age, I should like to state why I shall vote against the proposed amendment to the Constitution.

It is my feeling that the States should decide for themselves whether or not they wish to grant to young men and women 18 years of age the right to vote. I am entirely convinced that there are a

great many 18-year-olds in every State in the Union who are well qualified to vote; I am likewise convinced that every one of those young people would be even better qualified if they were to wait until they are 21 before casting their first ballot. They would have greater maturity and greater ability to judge public issues if they were required to wait until they had attained the full age of majority.

The Legislature of the State of Louisiana is now in session. If the legislature of that State, which I have the honor in part to represent, feels that 18-year-olds should vote, it has every right to enact legislation to that end. For my part I am willing to abide by the judgment of the legislature.

It seems to me that the greatest service the Congress could render in this connection would be to give the States advice on the basis of which they could better reach a decision, either to ratify an amendment to the Constitution or to enact legislation giving 18-year-olds the right to vote.

Perhaps Congress could serve a useful purpose by appointing a committee to study the question, with the aid of psychologists and leaders in the field of aducation and various other fields, in order to provide the Congress with better information on this subject. However, we do not have such information before us. We do not have the benefit of the guidance which we would like to have in voting on this question. I hope that in the future Congress may study the subject, and that thorough hearings may be held, in order that both the Congress and the State legislatures may have all the information which will be desirable when such a proposal as this is acted upon by State legislatures in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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	Gillette	Martin
Barrett	Green	Maybank
Bowring	Hayden	Millikin
Butler, Nebr.	Hendrickson	Monroney
Byrd	Hennings	Pastore
Capehart	Hickenlooper	Payne
Carlson	Holland	Robertson
Case	Ives	Russell
Daniel	Jackson	Smathers
Dirksen	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.	Symington
Eastland	Kennedy	Thye
Ferguson	Knowland	Upton
Frear	Langer	Watkins
Fulbright	Long	Williams
George	Mansfield	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BOWRING in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. 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. BUSH, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUNT, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mrs. SMITH of Maine, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 53. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]. If they were present and voting they would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] would each vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] are paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] would each vote "yea," and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would each vote "yea."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. GORE and Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] are paired on this vote with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] are paired on this vote with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from New York would vote "yea," and the Senator from South Carolina would vote "nay."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] are paired on this vote with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," and the Senator from Louisiana would vote "nay."

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are paired on this vote with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea," and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 34, nays 24, as follows:

YEAS—34

Aiken	Hickenlooper	Payne
Barrett	Hunt	Potter
Bowring	Ives	Saltonstall
Bush	Jackson	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Langer	Thye
Case	Magnuson	Upton
Dirksen	Mansfield	Watkins
Douglas	Martin	Williams
Dworshak	Millikin	Young
Ferguson	Neely	
Hendrickson	Pastore	

NAYS—24

Byrd	Green	Long
Chavez	Hayden	Maybank
Daniel	Hennings	Monroney
Eastland	Hill	Robertson
Frear	Holland	Russell
Fulbright	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
George	Johnson, Tex.	Stennis
Gillette	Kennedy	Symington

NOT VOTING—37

Anderson	Bridges	Clements
Beall	Burke	Cooper
Bennett	Butler, Md.	Cordon
Bricker	Butler, Nebr.	Duff

Ellender	Kilgore	Mundt
Flanders	Kuchel	Murray
Goldwater	Lehman	Purtell
Gore	Lennon	Schoeppel
Humphrey	Malone	Sparkman
Jenner	McCarran	Welker
Johnston, S. C.	McCarthy	Wiley
Kefauver	McClellan	
Kerr	Morse	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present not having voted in the affirmative, Senate Joint Resolution 53, proposing to amend the Constitution, is rejected.

Mr. RUSSELL. Madam President, now that the vote has been had on the proposed constitutional amendment which dealt with the fixing of the age of voting within the several States, I wish to express my appreciation to the administration, and especially to the Attorney General, who, I assume, prepared the proposed legislation, for submitting it in the form of a constitutional amendment rather than as a simple statute.

I am quite confident that if the matter had been presented to us in a bill to enact a simple statute, and should have received more votes in the affirmative than were cast in the negative, as was true in the case of the proposed constitutional amendment just acted upon, the present Supreme Court would have sought to have enforced the simple statute upon the several States.

Indeed, Madam President, if the Chief Executive had issued an executive order instructing the States to change their legal requirements with respect to the age for voting, I fear that some Members of the present Supreme Court would have undertaken to have found means to incorporate the order into a decision by the Court which would have sought to force compliance by the States.

Some Senators, who have tried for many years to preserve constitutional processes, are very grateful to the administration for having properly brought the matter before the Senate in the form of a constitutional amendment.

LONG-TERM TIME CHARTER OF TANKERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1341, Senate bill 3458. I may say that the bill will not be taken up for debate or discussion this evening but is merely being made the unfinished business before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the bill by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 3458) to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 (S. 3458) to authorize the long-term time charter of tankers by the Secretary of the Navy, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT OF RECREATION ACT OF JUNE 14, 1926, RELATING TO THE LEASING OF PUBLIC LANDS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Madam President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1815) amending the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1815) amending the Recreation Act of June 14, 1926, to include other public purposes and to permit nonprofit organizations to lease public lands for certain purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 3.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, and 6 and the amendment to the title, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

Strike the words "or otherwise"; and the Senate agree to the same.

HUGH BUTLER,
EUGENE D. MILLIKIN,
By B
GUY CORDON,
JAMES E. MURRAY,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

WESLEY A. D'EWART,
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
KEN REGAN,
WAYNE N. ASPINALL,
Managers on the Part of the House.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KNOWLAND. Madam President, I am about to move that the Senate recess until Monday next, unless Senators desire to make insertions in or statements for the RECORD. On Monday it is proposed to have a call of the calendar. When the call of the calendar has been completed, it is planned to begin the debate on the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 3458, the so-called tanker bill.

CERTAIN BILLS TO BE CONSIDERED ON THE NEXT CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the calendar is next called, the following bills be included in the call: Calendar No. 1152, S. 42, to provide for attorneys' liens in proceedings before the courts or other departments and agencies of the United States; Calendar No. 1179, H. R. 887, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski; Calendar No. 1248, S. 46, for the relief of E. S. Berney; and Calendar No. 1333, H. R. 2512, to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the purchase of public lands for homes and other sites."

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

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Are these the four bills which, at the last call of the calendar, it was requested go over until the next calendar call?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Calendars Nos. 1152, S. 42; 1248, S. 46; and 1333, H. R. 2512, are; Calendar No. 1179, H. R. 887, was not. That is the bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward Levandoski.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection to these bills being included in the next call of the calendar.

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

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. I move that the Senate now stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 24, 1954, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate Friday, May 21 (legislative day of May 13), 1954:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment as Assistant to the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and as brigadier general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 11, National Defense Act, as amended, and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947:

Col. Louis Jacob Rumaggi, O14900, United States Army.

Col. Howard Ker, O15518, United States Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 21 (legislative day of May 13), 1954:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Livingston Satterthwaite, of Pennsylvania, for promotion Foreign Service officer to class 1.

Cloyce K. Huston, of Iowa, for promotion Foreign Service officer to class 1 and to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 2:

Clarence Boonstra, of Louisiana.
Horatio Mooers, of Maine.
R. Smith Simpson, of Virginia.
Carroll M. Terry, of Alabama.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 3:

David M. Bane, of Pennsylvania.
Rodger P. Davies, of California.
Henry L. T. Koren, of New Jersey.
Francis E. Meloy, Jr., of Maryland.
Richard E. Usher, of Wisconsin.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 4:

Stephen H. McClintic, of Maryland.
Charles M. Urruela, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

John C. Amott, of New Jersey.
Hugh G. Appling, of California.
Philip Axelrod, of Delaware.
William D. Brewer, of Connecticut.
Edwin D. Crowley, of Virginia.
John B. Dexter, of Maryland.
Herbert Gordon, of New York.
John Calvin Hill, Jr., of South Carolina.
Peter Hooper, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Rogers B. Horgan, of Massachusetts.
John M. Howison, of Texas.
Max V. Krebs, of California.
Richard H. Lamb, of Washington.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Matthew J. Looram, Jr., of New York.
Francis N. Magliozzi, of Massachusetts.
Robert M. Phillips, of California.
Paul O. Proehl, of Illinois.
Robert W. Ross, of California.
Sidney Sober, of New York.
Harrison M. Symmes, Jr., of North Carolina.
Viron P. Vaky, of Texas.
Stephen Winship, of Massachusetts.
Chalmers B. Wood, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to class 5:

Emerson M. Brown, of Michigan.
William P. E. Graves, of the District of Columbia.
Robert A. Hurwitch, of Illinois.
John M. Kane, of Illinois.
Donald E. Larimore, of Illinois.
Francis J. Meehan, of the District of Columbia.

Donald D. Edgar, of New Jersey, to be a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 1, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Durward V. Sandifer, of Illinois.
Robert P. Terrill, of California.

Mallory Browne, of Virginia, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Robert N. Anderson, of California.
Coburn B. Kidd, of Oklahoma.
Joseph Sweeney, of California.
Percy de F. Warner, of the District of Columbia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Chester E. Beaman, of Indiana.
H. Reid Bird, of Utah.
Davis Eugene Boster, of Ohio.
G. Edward Clark, of New York.
Robert Donhauser, of New York.
Charles C. Finch, of Ohio.
Miss Constance L. Grant, of Massachusetts.
Albert Harkness, Jr., of Rhode Island.
L. Douglas Heck, of Maryland.
Valdemar N. L. Johnson, of Florida.
William B. Kelly, of Ohio.
Terrance G. Leonhardy, of North Dakota.
Frederic K. Lundy, Jr., of Virginia.
Harold M. Midkiff, of Florida.
Lynn H. Olson, of Minnesota.
Givon Parsons, of Texas.
Robert H. Shields, of California.
Charles Wilson Thomas, of Utah.
Mrs. Musedorah W. Thoreson, of Tennessee.
William L. Wight, Jr., of Virginia.
Elbert R. Williams, of Pennsylvania.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 24, 1954

(Legislative day of Thursday, May 13, 1954)

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

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

O Lord, Most High, before whose infinite majesty and greatness we bow in deep humility as we come acknowledging our littleness and our dependence, Thou art full of grace and truth. Thou hast promised to teach judgment to the meek and to whisper divine secrets to the pure in heart. Entering in through the lowly doors of our fallible petitions wilt Thou fill the house of our lives with music and even its chambers of discontent with peace.

We thank Thee for this world of beauty in the midst of which we walk, for the dawning light out of darkness, for all the gifts of love and of friendship, for sunny memories of remembered yesterdays, for the stirring challenges of these epic days, and for every hope that beckons on to radiant tomorrows. As we face all that this new week may bring to us, of tests and tasks, our hearts are singing:

"This is my Father's world,
O let me ne'er forget
That though the wrong seems oft so strong,
God is the ruler yet."

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. SALTONSTALL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, May 21, 1954, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6374) to revise certain laws relating to warrant officers of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

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

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

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

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

William Ernest Smith, of Tennessee, to be United States marshal for the western district of Tennessee, vice Ben Ivy King, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on the Executive Calendar is a list of nominations of postmasters. I have discussed the matter with the minority leader, and I understand there is no objection to considering the nominations en bloc, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc at this time, with the exception of that of William P. Gray, whose name appears on page 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be considered en bloc, with the exception indicated.

The nominations of postmasters, with the exception of that of William P. Gray, to be postmaster at Pleasant Hill, Mo., were confirmed en bloc.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE, IN THE NAVY, AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be considered en bloc the nominations for appointments in the Regular Air Force, in the Navy, and in the Marine Corps, reported favorably, but not printed on the calendar, including the nominations of James Henry Ahmann and others, and Paul M. Beckham and 70 others.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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