In each of other instances farmers knew they would be protected by 90 percent of parity if they accepted acreage reductions.

In present vote farmers have no assurance what support level will be, and have been informed that the quotas will mean the heaviest production restrictions yet invoked.

They still approved, by more than the required two-thirds, rather than risk losing effective price support.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS ON CERTAIN FHA SCANDALS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the able majority leader for several days has been trying to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement. Tonight both he and the minority leader made a great effort to secure one. In many respects, I am glad that they did not and in other respects, I am sorry.

My reason for being glad about it is that the Committee on Banking and Currency has scheduled approximately 8 weeks of hearings on the FHA scandals.

We intended to hold hearings in the field. Now that we are going to be in Washington for another 8 weeks, we will simply schedule all the hearings for Washington and bring all the witnesses here. I am glad to know that the other Senators will be here also to help us conduct 8 weeks of hearings.

RECESS TO 10 O'CLOCK A. M. ON MONDAY

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the late Representative CAMP, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 10 o'clock a. m. Monday, July 26, 1954.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess, the recess being, under the order previously entered, until Monday, July 26, 1954, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 24 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 2 years.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION

Norman P. Mason, of Massachusetts, to be Federal Housing Commissioner.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Charles Irwin Schottland, of California, to be Commissioner of Social Security of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

David John Wilson, of Utah, to be judge of the United States Customs Court.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PROMOTIONS AND/OR APPOINTMENTS

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion to grade indicated:

Francis A. Flood, of Oklahoma, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 2 to class 1.

William W. Walker, of North Carolina, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 3 to class 2.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:

William Barnes, of Massachusetts.
Findley Burns, Jr., of Minnesota.
John E. Devine, of Illinois.
Harrison Lewis, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Frank J. Devine, of New York.
David H. Ernest, of Massachusetts.
Douglas N. Forman, Jr., of Ohio.
Harold G. Josif, of Ohio.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:

Alan G. James, of the District of Columbia.
Abraham Katz, of New York.
Lawrence C. Mitchell, of California.
Jacob M. Myerson, of the District of Columbia.
Peter J. Peterson, of California.

Milton K. Wells, of Oklahoma, now a Foreign Service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 3 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

C. Vaughan Ferguson, Jr., of New York.
Paul Paddock, of Iowa.

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 5 and secretaries in the diplomatic service, to be also consuls of the United States of America:

Thomas H. Murfin, of Washington.
Harry F. Pfeiffer, Jr., of Maryland.
DeWitt L. Stora, of California.

William O. Hall, of Oregon, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 1, 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 2, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Alexander B. Daspit, of Louisiana.
Harvey Klemmer, of Maryland.

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:

John M. Bowie, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Edelen Fogarty, of New York.
Francis J. Gailbraith, of South Dakota.
William F. Gray, of North Carolina.
Miss Jean M. Wilkowski, of Florida.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Sam G. Armstrong, of Texas.
Daniel N. Arzac, Jr., of California.
Robert S. Barrett IV, of Virginia.
Melvin Croan, of Massachusetts.
Walker A. Diamanti, of Utah.
Richard W. Finch, of Ohio.
Martin B. Hickman, of Utah.
Edwin D. Ledbetter, of California.
S. Douglas Martin, of New York.
Calvin E. Mehlert, of California.
John E. Merriam, of California.
J. Theodore Papendorp, of New Jersey.
Harry A. Quinn, of California.
Charles E. Rushing, of Illinois.
Robert H. Wenzel, of Massachusetts.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

John L. Hagan, of Virginia.
Arthur V. Metcalfe, of California.
Nestor C. Ortiz, of Virginia.
Normand W. Redden, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Lucius D. Battle, of Florida.
Richard E. Funkhouser, of the District of Columbia.
John T. Hanson, of Maryland.
Donald D. Kennedy, of Oregon.

IN THE NAVY

PERMANENT PROMOTIONS

The following-named women officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the staff corps indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

In the Supply Corps

Margaret E. Barton
Natalie T. Bell
Betty J. Brown

In the Medical Service Corps

Frances Spear

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

The nominations of Harold W. Sill and 258 other persons for appointment in the Navy, which were confirmed by the Senate today, were received on July 14, 1954, and may be found in full in the proceedings of the Senate for that date, under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Harold W. Sill, which appears on page 10514 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and ending with the name of Fred Moore, Jr., on page 10515 of the said RECORD.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations of Max C. Aaron and 2,053 other persons for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps, which were received by the Senate on July 14, 1954, were confirmed today, and may be found in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under the caption "Nominations," beginning with the name of Max C. Aaron, appearing on page 10515, and ending with the name of Walter S. Zuck, which is shown on page 10519.

SENATE

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1954

(Legislative day of Friday, July 2, 1954)

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Charles C. Cowsert, of Fairlington Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Va., offered the following prayer:

Dear God, our Father, whose power is undiminished in our day, and whose long arm of mercy has not yet been cut short:

Refrain us from confusion in mind, lest we be tempted to call evil good, and good evil.

Make us discontent with legality that knows no morality.

Teach us that the great victories of our time must be won first in the souls of men—"out of the heart are the issues of life."

Fortify the Members of this branch of Government in body, mind, and soul against the pressures exerted by time as well as by unscrupulous interests.

Strengthen all our citizens against the onslaughts of fear; and enlighten them to see that greed in government may be replaced only by unselfishness in private

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

affairs, that hatred in the world may be overcome only by love nourished in personal lives, that communism in principle may be removed only by improving democracy in practice, that war among nations may be eliminated only by souls that know the joy of peace.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding day was dispensed with.

CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	McCarthy
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bowring	Hennings	Murray
Burke	Hickenlooper	Neely
Bush	Hill	Payne
Butler	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Humphrey	Purtell
Capehart	Ives	Reynolds
Carlson	Jackson	Robertson
Chavez	Jenner	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Crippa	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kilgore	Sparkman
Douglas	Knowland	Stennis
Duff	Kuchel	Symington
Dworshak	Langer	Thye
Eastland	Lehman	Upton
Ervin	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams
George	Martin	Young
Gillette	Maybank	

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] are absent on official business. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. At 11 o'clock, Mr. President, under the rule, the Senate, regardless of what business may be pending, will proceed first to have a quorum call, and establish that a quorum is present, and then, without further debate, proceed to a vote on the cloture motion. That leaves at this moment 40 minutes before the vote on cloture. Under the cloture rule, only those amendments which have been read can be considered. Therefore, technically, as of this time, the only amendment which has been read, of course, is the Lehman amendment. The other 30 amendments, or whatever the number is, would be excluded. So that they may not be excluded, in the event cloture should be adopted—although I am under no particular illusions on that score at the moment—but because they should not be foreclosed from being voted on, I ask that the suggestion of the Assistant Parliamentarian be adopted and that all amendments on the desk be considered as read in the event the cloture motion should be adopted.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Now, Mr. President, I am going to propose another unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The request raises one question in regard to the amendment I submitted the other day, and withdrew, proposing to strike the words "official spokesman" from the bill. It was my understanding that some Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle had a similar amendment. I should like to make inquiry first as to whether there is such an amendment pending, submitted by some other Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The inquiry of the Senator from Oregon is whether there is an amendment dealing with the general subject covered by his amendment which has been withdrawn, lying at the desk.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to make an additional inquiry which may help to clarify the situation.

The amendment of the Senator from Oregon had been the pending amendment before the Senate. I understand he withdrew his amendment. Does that mean it is completely withdrawn, or is it still at the desk?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is at the desk.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The amendment would be covered by my unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The fact that the amendment has been withdrawn does not mean it is not still on the desk. It retains its parliamentary status. The Senator's amendment and other amendments in that category which have been withdrawn are still on the desk and will be included in the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MORSE. I made this statement because I wanted to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that I am not pressing my amendment if they want to offer one of identical nature, as I withdrew it because some of them told me that is what they wanted to do. However, if they do not offer one, then at a later time I will offer this one.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, there are 35 minutes left before the vote takes place. I have the floor, and technically I could hold it for 35 minutes. Obviously it would not be fair for me to do, and I have no intention of doing so. So that the time may be equitably divided, I ask unanimous consent that the time between now and 11 o'clock be equally divided, to be controlled by the majority leader and the minority leader or the Senator acting for him.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Is there to be a morning hour this morning?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There will not be a morning hour.

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I ask the Senator from California if he does not think that the time should be divided by including the representative of the Independent Party in the operation?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I do not. I am dealing with the responsible leadership of the Democratic Party and with the Republican Party. We are not going to divide the time into three parts. I assume that the Senator from Oregon is opposed to the cloture motion. If so, he can get time from those on the other side who are opposed to it. If he is for the cloture motion, he can get some time from this side of the aisle. But time is now running, and I desire to propound my unanimous-consent request.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NEELY. Does the Senator not think that the Independent Party has responsible leadership?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would say that if each Senator out of the 96 Senators, by withdrawing from his party, established an independent party, and had to be dealt with separately, we would have chaos and not order.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would like to suggest that the time is running out, and this is being taken out of the time of both sides. I will yield for a short inquiry.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wonder if the majority leader will mitigate the severity of his proposal by permitting a few minutes for the morning hour, for the transaction of routine business such as insertions in the RECORD.

Mr. KNOWLAND. No, because I would have no way of controlling that. There are undoubtedly many Senators who would like to make insertions in the RECORD, which would require so much time that there would be little, if any, left for discussion. I think this is as important a question as we have had before the Senate. For that reason we do not plan to have a morning hour this morning.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. It is my intention to offer an amendment this morning.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the Senator desires to send the amendment to the desk so it will be covered by the prior unanimous-consent agreement, I will yield for that purpose and that purpose only, but it should be physically at the desk.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and will be considered as read.

The amendment submitted by Mr. MURRAY is as follows:

On page 15, line 4, add the following new section 28 and renumber present sections 27 and 28 as 29 and 30:

"SEC. 28. Electric Power Liaison Committee: There is hereby established an Electric Power Liaison Committee consisting of—

"a. A chairman, who shall be the head thereof and who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee; and

"b. A representative of the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwest Power Administration, the Southeast Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and such other Government agencies as the President may from time to time determine. The chairman of the Committee may designate one of the members of the Committee as acting chairman to act during his absence. The Commission shall advise and consult with other Government agencies, through the Committee, on all atomic energy matters which relate to electric power applications of atomic energy, including the development, manufacture, and use of atomic reactors for power purposes, the allocation of special nuclear material for such purposes, the technical, economic, and accounting relationships between production of special nuclear material and atomic energy for electric power and for atomic weapons, appropriate policies to govern the production and distribution of electric power from atomic energy in order that the benefits of such power shall be widely distributed and maximum revenues shall be returned to the Federal Treasury, and the integration of atomic power policies and administration with other power activities of the Federal Government; and shall keep other Government agencies, through the Committee, fully and currently informed of all such matters before the Commission. Other Government agencies, through the Committee, shall have the authority to make written recommendations to the Commission from time to time on matters relating to civilian applications of atomic energy as they deem appropriate."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I renew my request that the time between now and 11 o'clock be equally divided, one-half of the time to be controlled by the majority leader and the other half of the time to be controlled by the minority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to myself 3 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the Senate is about to vote on a cloture motion. I recognize that historically in this Chamber many Senators have been fundamentally opposed to cloture. Certainly they are opposed to it except under the most trying conditions. The Senate of the United States has been considering this bill for 11 days. We have had 4 days of around-the-clock sessions.

This rule is a protective rule. A two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the Senate is required in order that it may be invoked. This gives adequate protection to those who favor unlimited debate. But, Mr. President, if there was ever a time when cloture was in order, in my judgment, this is the time, under the conditions which prevail and when not only the majority party leadership but the minority party leadership as well have time and time again tried to work out reasonable limitations on debate.

I do not believe the Senate of the United States, the greatest deliberative body in the world, should advertise to the Nation and to the world that it is so paralyzed, so impotent, that it cannot conduct the public's business. We have only asked that the Senate of the United States be permitted to vote. Those who claim to believe in representative processes of constitutional government have time and time again said that they believed in majority rule, that they believed the representatives of the people should be allowed to vote. If we are allowed to vote on some amendments we may win, while on others we may lose.

The majority of the Senate may decide to recommit the bill, or they may decide to continue with the bill. They may decide to approve it, or they may decide to disapprove it. But, Mr. President, the only way we can determine what the judgment of the Senate is, in my opinion, is to bring this matter to a vote.

I do not believe that the Senate of the United States should permit obstructionist tactics, what has become an obvious filibuster, for the purpose of defeating the capacity of the Senate of the United States to function. I do not believe that the Senate of the United States should permit this to go on any further.

Mr. President, there are other courses of action open to one occupying the position I now occupy. Some of them are even more drastic than cloture. I hope that it will not be necessary to invoke them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

I do not believe it is in the interest of the Nation to permit this great body to be paralyzed. If the cloture motion is not adopted today, there is nothing under the rules to prevent me from offering another cloture motion, 1, 2, or 3 days from now. There may be Senators who today will vote against it, but who recognize that these obstructionist tactics are not in the Nation's best interests, and who have indicated, at least, that on the next cloture motion they may, for the first time in their lives, change their viewpoint.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from California has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator from Texas.

Mr. President, in a short while the Senate will vote on a motion, invoked under a bad rule to achieve a mistaken purpose, namely, to shut off debate on the atomic energy bill, perhaps the most important piece of legislation to come before the Senate at this session.

Some of us, Mr. President, a considerable number of us recruited from both sides of the aisle, from all three parties represented here in the Senate, have been engaged for some days in debating the pending bill.

We have not been merely debating it, Mr. President, we have been acting on it. We have not sought to prevent votes. We have been voting on amendments. Thus far we have adopted perhaps a dozen, perhaps more, important amendments to this bill, some proposed by the committee chairman, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and some by those of us who are seeking to improve the bill, to make it, as we see it, compatible with the public interest.

This bill of 104 pages, covering one of the most complex of all subjects, a new subject to almost every Member of the Senate except those on the committee, was, on the record, reported to the Senate on June 30. But the report was not actually printed and available to Senators until Tuesday, July 13, on the very day the majority leader brought the bill up for consideration.

Although the printed report of the joint committee bears the date June 30, and although the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD records the submission of the report on that date, the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Monday, July 12, records, in the Daily Digest, page D–820, that on that day, the joint committee met in executive session and adopted the report, which was not printed and available until the succeeding day, July 13.

It was not until that day, too, that copies of the bill, S. 3960, were made available to the Members of the Senate.

Hence, in actual fact, despite the RECORD which is misleading in this regard, the bill and the report were not physically available for inspection and study by the Senate until Tuesday, July 13, less than 2 weeks ago.

This report consists, in itself, of 138 pages, and includes not only the majority views, but three additional statements of separate views on various aspects of the bill, including a comprehensive statement of separate views which is really a minority report, by Representatives HOLIFIELD and PRICE, of 33 pages, covering 15 separate aspects of the bill, on which these two Members, at least, took strong and articulate exception.

Of the period during which the Senate has been considering this complex matter, approximately half was taken up with a discussion of one single collateral phase of this legislation, the Dixon-Yates contract. This phase was debated and then brought to a vote. In subsequent days other phases of this legislation have been debated and brought to a vote.

Here is a bill affecting the whole future of our national economy and one of

the most basic problems, indeed the most basic problem of our international relations. We get this bill, whose specific subject matter is completely new and strange to almost all of us and less than two weeks after the bill is actually reported. Now we are confronted with a motion to invoke cloture, to put debate under the severe limitations of rule XXII.

Mr. President, the forces of active opposition to this bill have included 3 of the 4 Democratic Senators on the joint committee, and, while I have not checked the actual record of debate in the House, there are at least 2 of the Democratic House members of the joint committee.

Is the desire on the part of some Members of the Senate to debate this bill carefully and intensively, to study it, to solicit the views of experts on it, unreasonable?

It should be pointed out that there were no hearings on the final version of this bill as reported to the Senate.

And finally, Mr. President, does the actual record of voting on the amendments to this bill reflect a desire to obstruct action, or rather does it reflect a concerted and determined desire to debate this bill fully and minutely, taking the time to study this bill while it is actually under consideration, time that should have been afforded us before this debate ever began, had it not been for the unseemly haste of the majority leadership to ram this bill through, with all its complexities, at this session of Congress, against an arbitrary adjournment deadline?

Some of us have offered to give quick consideration to the international features of this bill, and to vote upon it after seeking some amendments to it. But the majority leadership has been adamant in demanding all or nothing, and has resorted, first to grinding and punishing all-night sessions, to untimely motions to lay on the table, motions frequently made when many of our colleagues were home asleep, and now, finally, to this cloture motion under rule XXII.

Mr. President, I am a long-time advocate of a sound and sensible cloture rule. I have been urging appropriate amendments to rule 22, the so-called Wherry rule, ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. Both while my party was in the majority and since we have been in the minority, I have urged appropriate changes in rule 22, to make it a flexible, feasible, fair, and reasonable rule for limiting debate on any subject on which a Senate minority is determined to obstruct action and prevent a vote on a proposition desired by an overwhelming majority.

The present rule, the Wherry rule, is not such a rule. It is a rigid, inflexible, impracticable, and unrealistic rule. It is an unwieldly blunderbuss which has proved incapable of protecting and advancing the rights of minorities in the country, or of majority in the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I do not intend to lend myself to the invocation of a rule which has proved incapable of defending the rights of the people, for the purpose now of depriving the people of their inherent rights.

What narrow sophistry that would be, in my judgment, to give force to a bad rule to achieve an evil result, when those who now invoke it have steadfastly declined to support the amendment of that rule to permit it to achieve the result of assuring fundamental rights to all the people of our country.

If logic and consistency call for such a course of action, there is something wrong with logic and consistency.

But no, Mr. President, the logical course of action for those who would defend the peoples rights is to vote against the cloture motion and to send it down to the defeat it deserves. This cloture was conceived as a political gesture. Let it be disowned and defeated without glory.

Let those who seem now so intent on bringing this debate to an untimely close join with us in amending rule 22, so that cloture will be available for the defense of the peoples rights, as well as for the giveaway of the peoples heritage. Let that be a test of their sincerity.

Meanwhile, let us defeat this motion. Let us not be sophists, and confuse the letter of consistency with the spirit of what is right. Let us carry on, to the extent that we are capable, to the extent that is necessary, the fight to make this bill a good bill, consistent with the interests of our people and of the free world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in support of the motion for cloture. There can be no question in the mind of any reasonable person who takes an objective look at the proceedings of the past 2 weeks that a deliberate, obstructionist filibuster is in progress. The evidence to establish that fact is simple. The majority leader, time and time again, and, in fact, in connection with almost every amendment which has been submitted, has proposed a limitation of debate, and has even offered to let those who proposed them write their own ticket, so to speak, on the matter of the time limitation, but his offer has been refused.

Limitation of debate on many amendments which manifestly would have taken but a few minutes to discuss, and which were of small consequence, perhaps, in the operation of the bill, has been resisted. The limitation on time has been refused by the arbitrary action of a small group engaged in obstructionist tactics on the floor of the Senate.

Then the minority leader, backed, I am certain, by a substantial majority of the members of his own party, has offered a plan for the limitation of debate, which will not unduly curtail any Member in presenting the merits of his amendment or his proposition, and likewise will not prevent those who are opposed to the particular amendment from adequately discussing it.

His offers have been refused by those whose desire is not to reach a vote on the bill, but rather to prevent a vote, and to prevent passage of a bill which is, indeed, of far-reaching importance, and provides untold benefits to the American people, the American economy, and also our international relations in the future.

Mr. President, I think the philosophy of the individual should have some reasonable consistency. A great many of us have, from time to time in the past, supported cloture. I have never supported cloture until debate has reached the point of a filibuster.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask that I may have 1 additional minute.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Iowa; but since the rest of my time has been allotted, I cannot yield further.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have supported cloture when a filibuster has become evident. There are Senators who have been most vocal and vociferous against filibusters in the past, when measures to which they were opposed were being delayed, but who now find themselves strangely in the position of supporting the very thing which they have repeatedly called evil, in order to further their own purposes.

I hope the Senate will support the motion for cloture and will bring the debate to a close, with the reasonable safeguards which the motion proposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President——

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, a filibuster is designed for three purposes: To prevent a vote, to carry on debate, or to prevent discussion not pertinent to the issues. Any Member who has been present for the last 10 or 11 days knows that the discussion has been pertinent to the issue. He knows also that votes have been taken. There have been several year-and-nay votes taken since the debate began. If there had been any disposition not to have a vote, the votes which have been taken would not have been possible. As a matter of fact, we would have made much better progress if the cloture motion had never been filed. We were making headway. The amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] had been accepted. Several amendments offered by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] had been accepted.

The Senator from Minnesota was in process of securing an agreement with respect to some 15 of his amendments, whereby he would have withdrawn about 7, and 4 or 5 would have been modified in accordance with suggestions made by the able Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]. Some amendments have been presented as to which there was no possibility of compromise.

There was one amendment which dealt very extensively with the international situation, offered by the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. Was there any opportunity to debate that? Not one word; there was merely a motion to lay it on the table.

What a contrast that was to the previous situation. When my amendment was pending, there had been very ample and very strong debate from the other side of the aisle. Democrats were persuaded to vote against my amendment by those very arguments. But now those

Democrats are given the silent treatment, with no discussion at all from the other side of the aisle.

I intend to vote against the cloture motion. I have been an advocate of a liberalization of the cloture rule. I shall probably advocate such a procedure again. But I certainly do not intend to vote for cloture at any time to stop a discussion of this nature. There are many items left in the bill yet to be considered. I hope they will receive favorable consideration. Senators now do not offer amendments, for fear they will be promptly laid on the table, and there will not be any opportunity to consider them later.

The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has offered an improved amendment. Does he dare call it up? No, of course not, because it will be laid on the table.

The same thing is true of the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] relating to the patent section. That is now dead. It cannot be considered. These amendments cannot be disposed of properly. At the end of 30 minutes the Senate disposed of patent rights worth billions of dollars to American civilization. That is not the way the Senate should proceed.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the distinguished Senator from New Mexico think that if the cloture motion should be defeated, we could take the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi to separate the bill, the proposed amendment to the patent section, and perhaps amendments with respect to other provisions, and work out a schedule whereby reasonable discussion could be had, followed by a vote on the principal issues at stake?

Does the Senator from New Mexico think that that plan is feasible and would be acceptable to most of the Members on this side of the aisle?

Mr. ANDERSON. I think it would be. I think that if the minority leader would come forward with a program of that nature, to provide for ample discussion on that point, he would not have any trouble, and that it would not be necessary to continue around-the-clock sessions.

I believe we could then vote on these questions.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Presiden, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say to the Senator from New Mexico that the minority leader felt the other evening that a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, with modifications, and other suggestions, would result in attaining that very objective.

During the day, if the motion for cloture is defeated, the minority leader hopes that he may be able to get general agreement, at least on this side of the aisle, upon such a plan.

Mr. ANDERSON. I should be happy to assist in that sort of endeavor, because most Senators will not try to prevent a final vote on the bill. Although I do not like all the provisions in the bill, I did not sign the minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New Mexico has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time have I remaining, Mr. President?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield a minute and a half to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I believe that each Senator on the floor at this moment will acknowledge, in the beginning, that the bill before the Senate is a very important one. It needs discussion from many angles. The unfortunate position in which we find ourselves at present was brought about, I think, by some of the activities which have taken place on the floor. I fear that the majority leader, by action which he has taken in moving to lay amendments on the table, has brought about even further discussion of the bill.

I remind each one of my colleagues that a horse can be led to water but he cannot be made to drink. That is the attitude that has developed on the part of many Senators who have been fighting against this bill. I intend to vote against cloture at this time. I believe there are many amendments that should be fully discussed, and I do not believe that under the cloture rule they can be adequately explained.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield one-half minute to the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I shall vote against the cloture motion. I hope my vote will not be interpreted as a vote against the administration. I have long been opposed—in fact, even before I came to the Senate—to invoking cloture except in extreme emergencies. I do not feel there is such an emergency at the present time.

I have never during the 9½ years I have been a Member of the Senate objected to unanimous-consent agreements to control the time of debate, and I do not intend to in the future except in unusual conditions.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the pending cloture motion, though I have no illusions as to the outcome. Along with every other Southern Senator and many others, I supported the adoption of rule 22 in its present form, in the effort to secure a more workable rule. The Senate well knows that in its provisions exempting from cloture any motion to take up an amendment of the rules, and requiring 64 affirmative votes to make cloture effective, the new rule gives greater protection than heretofore against such a measure as a compulsory FEPC law, with all its grave implications upon the established social structure of an entire region and involving, as it would, grave questions of constitutionality, bitter conflict between Federal and State laws, and probable civil disorder and strife. At the same time the new rule is much more efficient than the old in that it makes subject to cloture all the parliamentary proceedings on any pending legislation, excepting only a motion to take up an amendment to the rules.

I have always regarded the new rule as a two-edged sword upon which I can and always will rely in opposing such measures as FEPC and similar vital measures which are wholly unacceptable to great regions of our Nation. At the same time I believe we have the right to use it in a proper case in enabling the Senate to come to a vote upon measures of less grave importance after they have been subjected to reasonable debate. In other words, I do not regard the present rule 22 as wholly defensive, but I regard it also as an effective offensive provision which should be used to end futile filibusters such as the pending one, which has been frankly described as such by one of the participants. Every Senator must in his own judgment decide what measures can be properly subjected to cloture and at what stage in the debate. For myself, I think that the pending measure should be subjected to cloture and that the debate has long since exceeded the limitations of reasonable argument.

The fact that this filibuster has been employed in the closing days of the second session of a Congress when many vital measures still await final action is a strong argument for the application of cloture. The farm bill, the social security bill, the tax revision bill, and others of great importance still require Senate action.

Aside from that, in this critical stage of world affairs it is particularly necessary that the Senate show its capacity to function on such important matters rather than to be held in a state of frustration and futility by the marathon talking of a decided minority. Any other course would hold us up to the ridicule of our own people and of the world at large, particularly the other free peoples who look to us for leadership and example.

Mr. President, I have been particularly distressed by the oft-repeated demands of the recalcitrant minority that all of the domestic features of this bill be stricken while the international features alone are enacted. Such a demand is apparently based upon profound distrust of the workings of our American free enterprise system in the field of electric power production, as well as equal distrust of the judgment of our executive department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the 16 distinguished members of our Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, all of whom are given effective supervisory powers under the pending act. It is unthinkable that the Senate would so forget its responsibility to our own people that it would grant to our allies important benefits arising from American discoveries in the field of atomic energy

while postponing or withholding from our own people the opportunity to adapt atomic power to great peacetime service.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The next 16 minutes of the time has been apportioned. The Senator from Alabama has asked for 5 minutes. If the Senator from Alabama is ready to take that 5 minutes, I will yield to him; and if it is possible for him to yield a part of his time, I will try to accommodate the Senator from Minnesota. This is the first time the Senator from Minnesota has requested the floor.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alabama, Mr. President.

Mr. HILL. It would be agreeable to me to yield the 2 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Minnesota 2 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to vote on this bill. I not only want to vote on the bill, but I want to vote on the amendments to the bill, within the normal legislative processes. I charge in the Senate that we have not had an opportunity to vote on very many amendments to this bill because of the procedural tactics which have been used by the majority and majority leader.

It is a very strange situation we see here. Practically all of the time of the Senate has been spent on arguing procedure rather than arguing substance. An examination of the RECORD will show that on every amendment which has been offered there has not been as much as 10 minutes' honest debate on the other side of the aisle on the part of those who are for this bill and against the amendments, with the exception of the Dixon-Yates proposal, which, by the way, was debated and voted upon and debated.

As to whether or not this is a filibuster, I think the fact has been stated that there have been nine yea and nay votes. If that is a filibuster it is a strange one. If it is a filibuster it is because the majority leader has driven us into all night sessions in the process of political attrition. I say to the majority leader that political attrition will not work. It will do only one thing—firm up the opposition of those of us who believe that this bill as it is now written is not in the public interest. Every speech that has been made by those of us opposed to this bill has been germane. Every speech has been, I think, pointed to the question.

I charge that the opposition, who support this bill without amendment, have never once engaged in a full discussion of the amendments, nor have they permitted us reasonably and intelligently to argue the amendments in the cross-current of debate.

Finally, Mr. President, I may say my position on the question of cloture is well known, but the right of cloture is one thing and the exercise of it is another. I happen to believe that this bill is so important and the public questions involved are so all-embracing that it is absolutely essential that we vote upon the amendments that are before us. I shall vote against closure in this instance.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished majority leader spoke of paralyzing the Senate. Mr. President, no one wishes to paralyze the Senate, but I insist that we should not change the character of the Senate as a deliberative body. We often proudly speak of the Senate as the greatest deliberative body in the world. There is no way to change the character of the Senate, there is no way to destroy the deliberative functions of the Senate, without also changing the Government of the United States, because the Senate is here as the citadel set up in the Constitution, the guardian of free speech for the protection of the rights, the interests, and the welfare of the people of the United States.

In the first place, this bill should never have been taken up, when it was. Here is a bill of 104 pages, with a report constituting some 138 pages. The bill was taken up almost before the report on the bill could get to the Senate from the Government Printing Office. It is a bill the magnitude and consequences of which no man now can properly estimate, a bill that may affect the life of the people of our country more than any other bill which has come before the Congress of the United States, certainly in recent times. The bill is filled with references and cross-references, with technicalities and complexities. It could not only fasten huge monopoly upon us but lead to a corporate state.

This bill, with all its weaknesses, with all its failures, with all its dangers, with all its iniquities, should have careful, deliberate consideration and debate by the Senate. But instead of the Members of the Senate having an opportunity to examine the bill and to weigh the bill carefully before it came to the Senate, it was thrust before us and we were told it had to be passed, and passed now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Two minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I will yield the Senator an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader spoke of the bill having had 11 days' consideration. There has not been 11 days of consideration of this bill. As a result of the long sessions, the around-the-clock continuous sessions which have been forced upon the Senate the Senators have been tired, they have been wornout, they have been fatigued, and there has not been deliberation, there has not been proper consideration. The Senate cannot deliberate, consider, and legislate, from cots. Instead of the Senate being a forum of intellect, of reason, of persuasion, of presentation of facts, we find the Senate turned into an arena of physical endurance to determine who has the physical strength to stick it out.

There has been no real deliberation on this bill since we adopted the Johnson amendment which came along in due process and in good time.

Let the Senate have the opportunity to proceed normally, and we will make progress on this bill. The cloture motion should be overwhelmingly defeated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to myself the remaining time.

Mr. President, I did not favor the cloture motion when it was filed. I do not favor it now. As I told the Senate at its last session, I do favor the determination of the basic issues at stake in this bill. The minority leader is heartened by the suggestion made by the able Senator from New Mexico that perhaps we can take 4 or 5 of the basic issues and agree to a reasonable discussion of those issues and then proceed to vote upon them. I had hoped, Mr. President, we could do that by unanimous consent.

I am glad that we came near reaching unanimous consent the other evening. Most of the Members, I believe, would favor the provisions carried in that agreement.

Since we cannot have unanimous consent, I hope we can have the consent of most of the Members on both sides to a reasonable discussion of important issues, followed by a vote.

I shall vote against the cloture motion and I believe we may actually save time by voting it down.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, how much time am I supposed to have?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California is entitled to 3 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed, under the theory of an equal division of the time, to have the 3 minutes which was allotted to our side.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, this debate at the present moment is on a motion to close debate, in compliance with the cloture rule.

The pending bill is a vital one, because it involves the use of atomic energy by the civilians of the United States, as well as by foreign governments or their citizens.

Mr. President, we are accused of not replying to the arguments submitted in the debate. The fact that we have been able to express ourselves clearly in a few minutes—as compared to the many hours used by Senators on the opposite side—should hardly be regarded as a reason for not closing debate at the present time. During the debate on the atomic-energy bill I submitted an amendment which I explained in remarks which occupy approximately one

page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, 137 pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD were required by the remarks made in opposition to that particular amendment.

We have spent nearly 137 hours on this bill. At 8 hours a day, that is approximately 23½ days. Mr. President, when the debates proceed for 6 hours on one amendment, and then the amendment is withdrawn, that is clear evidence, and beyond a reasonable doubt, that we are faced with obstruction, in an attempt to prevent voting on the amendments and on the bill.

I am willing to be tolerant, and I wish to be tolerant, of Senators who cannot express themselves on a particular item except in the course of hours of debate. We should be tolerant of those Senators, and we have been tolerant. But when we reach the point—and this has occurred, not only on a few occasions, but on a number of occasions—when up to 6 hours have been spent on one amendment, and then the amendment is withdrawn, Mr. President, if anyone can say that is evidence of a deliberative body, I do not know what a deliberative body is.

I think the people of the United States are having doubts that this is a great deliberative body, and the Senators upon this floor are bringing that doubt into the minds of the people.

Yes; we do want debate. We want to be able to express ourselves fully upon issues. But, Mr. President, I ask the Members of the Senate, cannot we do it in less time? Cannot we spend some time outside the Senate chamber, so that we can formulate our arguments upon issues, and actually have a deliberative body, instead of a talkathon contest?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from Michigan has expired.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has expired.

The hour of 11 o'clock, as modified by the unanimous-consent agreement, having arrived——

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment, please.

The hour of 11 o'clock, as modified by the unanimous-consent agreement, having arrived, under rule XXII, further debate is not now in order.

The Chair lays before the Senate the motion of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] that the Senate proceed to invoke cloture on Senate bill 3690, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

Under the rule, the clerk will call the role for a quorum.

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

Aiken	Capehart	Duff
Anderson	Carlson	Dworshak
Barrett	Chavez	Eastland
Beall	Clements	Ervin
Bennett	Cooper	Ferguson
Bowring	Cordon	Frear
Burke	Crippa	Fulbright
Bush	Daniel	George
Butler	Dirksen	Gillette
Byrd	Douglas	Goldwater
Gore	Kuchel	Reynolds
Green	Langer	Robertson
Hayden	Lehman	Russell
Hendrickson	Long	Saltonstall
Hennings	Magnuson	Schoeppel
Hickenlooper	Malone	Smathers
Hill	Mansfield	Smith, Maine
Holland	Martin	Smith, N. J.
Humphrey	Maybank	Sparkman
Ives	McCarran	Stennis
Jackson	McCarthy	Symington
Jenner	Millikin	Thye
Johnson, Colo.	Monroney	Upton
Johnson, Tex.	Morse	Watkins
Johnston, S. C.	Murray	Welker
Kennedy	Neely	Wiley
Kerr	Payne	Williams
Kilgore	Potter	Young
Knowland	Purtell	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate should be brought to a close? Under the rule, the clerk will call the roll. Those in favor will answer "yea" when their names are called, and those opposed will answer "nay" when their names are called.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] are absent on official business. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are absent on official business.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 44, nays 42, as follows:

YEAS—44

Aiken	Dworshak	Payne
Barrett	Ferguson	Potter
Beall	Gillette	Purtell
Bennett	Goldwater	Reynolds
Bowring	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Bush	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Butler	Holland	Smith, Maine
Capehart	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Carlson	Jenner	Thye
Cooper	Johnson, Colo.	Upton
Cordon	Knowland	Watkins
Crippa	Kuchel	Welker
Dirksen	Martin	Wiley
Douglas	McCarthy	Williams
Duff	Millikin	

NAYS—42

Anderson	Hennings	Mansfield
Burke	Hill	Maybank
Byrd	Humphrey	McCarran
Chavez	Jackson	Monroney
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Daniel	Johnson, S. C.	Murray
Eastland	Kennedy	Neely
Ervin	Kerr	Robertson
Frear	Kilgore	Russell
Fulbright	Langer	Smathers
George	Lehman	Sparkman
Gore	Long	Stennis
Green	Magnuson	Symington
Hayden	Malone	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Bricker	Flanders	Mundt
Bridges	Kefauver	Pastore
Case	Lennon	
Ellender	McClellan	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 44, the nays are 42. Two-thirds of the Members of the Senate having failed to vote in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

Mr. PASTORE subsequently said: Mr. President, I was unavoidably detained and could not be here at 11:15, when the vote was taken on the cloture petition. Had I been present, I would have voted in the negative. I desire to have the RECORD so indicate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The RECORD will so show.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9757) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent the following routine business was transacted:

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF STATE (S. DOC. NO. 147)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for the Department of State, in the amount of $900,000, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REVISION OF A PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, PAYMENT OF JUDGMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 146)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a revision of a proposed supplemental appropriation involving an increase of $78,102 in the amount necessary for payment of judgments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 148)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation for funds appropriated to the President, in the amount of $37,500,000, for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

APPORTIONMENT OF THE APPROPRIATION "FEES AND EXPENSES OF WITNESSES"

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the apportionment of the appropriation "Fees and Expenses of Witnesses," for the fiscal year 1955 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON APPORTIONMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE AUTHORIZATION OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

A letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, submitting, pursuant to law, a report on the apportionment of the administrative expense authorization of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year 1955

(with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON AUDIT OF RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Acting Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the audit of the Rural Electrification Administration, Department of Agriculture, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1951 and 1952 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF CERTAIN FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS BY LOCAL INTERESTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the operation and maintenance of certain flood-control projects by local interests (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CARLSON and Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Joint resolution rescinding a resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on income, inheritance, and gifts, adopted February 25, 1944, and rescinding and withdrawing the application to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing such amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the 168th legislature adopted a joint resolution in the following form:

"'Resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxes on incomes, inheritances and gifts

"'*Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey*, That application be and it hereby is made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"'ARTICLE —

"'SECTION 1. The sixteenth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States is hereby repealed.

"'SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several States, and without regard to any census or enumeration. The maximum aggregate rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect on, with respect to, or measured by, income, however, shall not exceed 25 percent. In the event that the United States shall be engaged in a war which creates a national emergency so grave as to necessitate such action to avoid national disaster, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of each House may, while the United States is so engaged, suspend, for periods not exceeding 1 year each, such limitation with respect to income subsequently accruing or received.

"'SEC. 3. The maximum aggregate rate of all taxes, duties, and excises which the Congress may lay or collect with respect to the devolution or transfer of property, or any interest therein, upon or in contemplation of or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after death, or by way of gift, shall not exceed 25 percent.

"'SEC. 4. Sections 1 and 2 shall take effect at midnight on December 31 following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax on, with respect to, or measured by, income for any period ending on or prior to said December 31 laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect.

"'SEC. 5. Section 3 shall take effect at midnight on the last day of the sixth month following the ratification of this article. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the power of the United States after said date to collect any tax with respect to any devolution or transfer occurring prior to the taking effect of section 3, laid in accordance with the terms of any law then in effect; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, requested to provide as the mode of ratification that said amendment shall be valid to all intents and purposes, as part of the Constitution of the United States, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States; and be it further

"'*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he hereby is, directed to send a duly certified copy of this resolution to the Senate of the United States and one to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States.'

"Whereas it is now desired to rescind such action and to withdraw the application made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the article set forth in said resolution as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States: Be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:*

"1. The action of the 168th legislature of the State of New Jersey in adopting the resolution hereinbefore set forth hereby is rescinded.

"2. The application made to the Congress of the United States of America to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the article therein set forth as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States hereby is rescinded and withdrawn.

"3. The secretary of state be and he hereby is directed to send 1 duly certified copy of this resolution to the United States Senate and 1 duly certified copy of this resolution to the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the State Bar of Texas, in convention assembled in San Antonio, Tex., commending the Government upon its refusal to agree to the admission of Red China into the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 1555. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes; together with minority views of Mr. KUCHEL (Rept. No. 1983).

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H. R. 8932. A bill to reclassify dictaphones in the Tariff Act of 1930 (Rept. No. 1984).

AMENDMENT OF TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (S. 3423) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, and I submit a report (No. 1982) thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the name of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the name of the Senator from North Dakota will be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 3810. A bill for the relief of William A. Kenny; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 3811. A bill for the relief of Tadeusz Gasowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 3812. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as Harney Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 3813. A bill for the relief of certain alien sheepherders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 3814. A bill for the relief of Teruo Juan Tsutsui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LEHMAN submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to Senate bill 3690, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1954—AMENDMENTS

Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. PAYNE) submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (S. 3052) to encourage a stable, prosperous and free agriculture, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Laurence B. Robbins, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Treasury;

W. Randolph Burgess, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs;

Glenn W. Sutton, of Georgia, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1960, vice George McGill, term expired;

Albert V. Becker, of Illinois, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., to fill an existing vacancy;

Raymond L. Rhodes, of New Jersey, to be comptroller of customs with headquarters at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy; and

Arthur Rogers, of Tennessee, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 43, with headquarters at Memphis, Tenn., in place of Abe D. Waldauer, resigned.

ATTACK BY CHINESE COMMUNISTS ON AMERICAN AIRCRAFT

Mr. KNOWLAND. Over the wire of the news ticker has come the following statement this morning:

The State Department announced that two United States naval carrier-based planes have shot down two Chinese Communist fighter aircraft off the Red Chinese coast.

The American Navy planes were searching for survivors of the Cathay Pacific (British) airline shot down by Communist fighter planes.

The two United States planes of the rescue type were attacked over the high seas by two Chinese Communist fighter aircraft, apparently of the same type that shot down the British airliner.

Three Americans were lost in the shooting down of the airliner on Friday and three others were saved in a daring rescue operation by United States planes.

When the attack on the American naval planes was made, "the United States planes returned the fire and the two Chinese Communist planes were shot down," Secretary Dulles said in a statement.

"There were no casualties on the United States side."

Dulles said the State Department will "protest most vigorously against this further evidence of Chinese Communist brutality and their belligerent interference with a humanitarian rescue operation being conducted over the high seas."

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I have just received over the telephone from the office of the Secretary of State the following official statement with regard to the incident referred to by the Senator from California:

STATEMENT FROM SECRETARY DULLES' OFFICE

As I announced on Saturday, July 24, the Secretary of Defense had ordered two United States aircraft carriers to proceed to the scene of the Chinese-Communist assault upon the British commercial airliner, which resulted in the death of three Americans and the wounding of three others. The mission as stated then of these ships and their planes was to conduct and protect further rescue and search operations in the vicinity of the tragedy.

This Government is now informed that two United States carrier-based planes of the rescue type while conducting their mission of mercy and seeking possible survivors were attacked over the high seas by two Chinese-Communist fighter aircraft apparently of the same type as shot down the Cathay Pacific commercial airliner. The United States planes returned the fire and the two Chinese Communist planes were shot down. There were no casualties on the United States side.

The United States plans to protest most vigorously against this further evidence of Chinese-Communist brutality and their belligerent interference with the humanitarian rescue operation being conducted over the high seas.

That is the end of the Secretary's statement. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Texas, the minority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the announcement just made by the distinguished majority leader is one of tremendous significance. We do not yet have enough information as to what happened to enable us to grasp the full meaning of this event. We only know that our aircraft were engaged on a mission of mercy when they were attacked by Chinese Communists. We do not yet have a sufficient grasp of the full significance of what occurred so that we may know just what our course of action should be.

But we must all know, Mr. President, that this is an hour for all America to unite. Regardless of what the facts may be, Chinese Communists are shooting at American boys. There can be no partisanship, or divided loyalties on an issue like this. We must, of course, await disclosure of the facts before we can determine what steps we must take. But meanwhile we should all resolve to remain cool, to act decisively, and to be ready as Americans first to always act as Americans do in the face of danger.

I thank the majority leader for yielding.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], last Saturday, I believe it was, at a time when few Senators were on the floor, announced the first news of the shooting down of the British commercial liner with Americans aboard I expressed a plea for our closing ranks. The loss of life as a result of that international atrocity on the part of the Chinese Communists calls for unity on the part of all of us. Therefore last Saturday the representative of the Independent Party took the floor of the Senate and made a brief statement, which I repeat because it is as applicable today as then. We cannot stand by, as a sovereign nation, and permit anyone anywhere in the world to transgress upon the sovereign rights of the United States. If that British commercial airliner with Americans aboard was where it had a right to be, and if it was in no way violating any rights of another sovereign country, we have to take whatever course is necessary to protect the sovereign rights of this Nation.

My feeling is exactly the same today as it was last Saturday except that it is even more intensified in regard to this latest atrocious incident. If the Red Chinese are now shooting at American military aircraft, and those aircraft are where they have a right to be, I agree, as I said last Saturday, we must close ranks in America whenever the sovereignty of this Nation is jeopardized.

We must make clear to any power, whether it is Communist Russia behind the Red Chinese, or the Red Chinese themselves, that the American people never in their history have permitted the American flag to be attacked when it was flying where it had the right to be, without our taking whatever course of action was necessary to protect the flag.

I do not want my remarks to be interpreted as the Independent Party saying "We should hasten into a war." I agree with the Senator from Texas that we have to get all the facts in regard to this matter. I understand the Red Chinese Government has admitted its fault and offered to make amends as best as can be done now under international law by paying damages and making diplomatic assurances against repetition of such incidents to the extent it can prevent them. However that will not bring back to life the Americans and others who were murdered by this atrocity. We must make very clear to our allies in the United Nations that we entered into a compact that contained, so far as NATO is concerned, for example, article 5, which clearly states that an attack upon one shall be considered an attack upon all.

In my judgment this is a worldwide principle so far as the allies are concerned. I think, without delay, we should find out whether or not the free nations of the world are going to make clear to the Red segment of the world that we are not going to permit further transgressions and aggressions upon the sovereign rights of the free nations of the world.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I rise to speak briefly on this important question. I think it demonstrates that in the Far East the agreement at Geneva did not settle the great dispute between communism and noncommunism. We note that even though a truce was signed, a vicious attack was made yesterday in Indochina south of the 17th parallel, the dividing line set up in the truce agreement. Then we had, prior to that, the attack upon the British plane in which several Americans were passengers, when the plane was over the high seas. Our citizens were shot down without justification, as is shown by the evidence.

Mr. President, two American planes from an airplane carrier which had been sent into those waters on a mission of mercy to try and rescue the survivors of this vicious attack, were also attacked.

This is a very important hour in our history. I hope, even though the Senate has decided not to vote cloture on the pending bill, that, as Senators of the United States, united, we can debate the issue on its merits, that the members of the Foreign Relations Committee may have time for the consideration of the matter that has now come before the Senate, before the American people, and before the world. We should ob-

tain the facts and then not act in haste, but act so that the American people will be proud of our action and so that the people of the world will be proud of America's action in this hour of peril.

I believe this is an hour of peril, an hour of peril because of the continued aggression of the Communist world against the free world.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request, but the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the former Secretary of the Air Force, has asked for 2 minutes to make a statement. Since we have had two statements on this side of the aisle, and the statement by the minority leader, I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished majority leader for his typical graciousness and courtesy.

Mr. President, on Wednesday last, to the best of my ability I presented on the Senate floor the growing strength of Communists in the air, on the sea, and on the land.

Mr. President, I would recommend that the facts I then set for, which to the best of my knowledge are accurate, should be studied by the White House, the Bureau of the Budget, the Appropriations Committee, and every Member of the Senate.

Based upon the news today, I repeat what I have said for many years. I do not believe that we are taking adequate and proper steps to defend ourselves against the great and growing strength of Soviet communism.

Mr. NEELY subsequently said: Mr. President, the dispatch which the distinguished majority leader has read to the Senate is more alarming and important than any other news heard on Capitol Hill since the conclusion of the Second World War. It should have an arousing and unifying effect on the American people.

In the absence of extenuating circumstances, the dispatch means that blood-red and bloodthirsty Communist China has deliberately made a murderous, warlike air attack on the United States.

If President Eisenhower promptly seeks redress for this infamous injury in the firm, courageous manner in which Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Theodore Roosevelt, or Franklin Roosevelt would have sought it, then every Democrat, Republican, and Independent in the land will, in this critical international matter, hold up the President's hands, work with him, march with him, and if the worse unfortunately becomes the worst, they will fight with him to the last ditch and the last man. With the beacon light of the cross that never grows dim before them and the flag of the Republic that never suffers defeat advancing with them, they will win over all the forces of wickedness that may rise against them a glorious victory that will once more make secure liberty, peace, and happiness throughout the world.

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and I ask that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Clerk will read the proposed agreement.

The proposed unanimous-consent agreement was read, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment 7-24-54-N to S. 3690, submitted by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding one-half hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided*, That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I have no objection, and I will go a step further in order to expedite the business of the Senate, and say that I discussed this amendment last Saturday. I do not want any more time. I am perfectly willing to have it voted on now.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. May I reserve the right to object in order to present very briefly some views on this proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and not take any more than 2 minutes?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unless the regular order is insisted upon, the Chair will entertain the reservation of the right by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on an amendment of such an important nature as this one, I will have no objection to a limitation of debate, provided adequate time is given for the debate. I respectfully say that debate on the whole international section of this bill, which is the heart of President Eisenhower's atomic-energy program, as I see it, has been most inadequate because, outside of the remarks made by the Senator from New York, and 2 or 3 rather brief comments by other Senators, there has been little discussion of the so-called international section of the atomic-energy bill.

I am perfectly willing to have a reasonable time limitation placed upon the debate on this amendment, with no commitment whatsoever on my part in regard to limitations on any other amendment.

I want to say to the Members of the Senate that I think this amendment is of the most vital importance. I believe the principle of this amendment certainly ought to be enacted into law at an early date. I am presently of the frame of mind that the international situation being what it is, we had better look at this amendment very carefully in order to make certain that we are not giving away some very important secrets which, from the standpoint of the security of this country, we better keep unto ourselves for a little while longer.

There has been a pretty strong attitude, and I think with great justification, on the part of many people, including many scientists, that until world conditions are more definitely peaceful than they are at the present time we better be very careful about opening to full view, even of some alleged allies, the secrets that we have in this whole atomic energy field. These secrets do have a way, Mr. President, of leaking out.

I think that when we have at this very hour increasing evidence of the nonpeaceful intentions of the Communist segment of the world, we should not debate an amendment such as this under a limitation of 30 minutes to a side.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I want to be reasonable, and I am willing to accept any reasonable recommendation. I understood that a limit of a half hour time would be agreeable to the author of the amendment. This is not the amendment he has on international control. It is the first of his two amendments. The author thought that that amount of time would be sufficient.

If there is a desire to increase the time to an hour, I shall be glad to modify my request accordingly. If there is a desire for an hour and a half to be used for this particular amendment, I shall be glad to agree, in the interest of arriving at cooperation and of proceeding with the public business. If there is a desire for 2 hours, I shall be glad to agree to that. The only point in my mind is that I should like to proceed with the amendment, if possible, so that we will at least be able to have some votes taken.

This is the procedure I attempted to follow last week. The next motion that would be open to me would be to lay the amendment on the table. I do not want to do that. I think we ought to get votes up or down on these amendments. I think it is the more orderly way to proceed.

I have an entirely open mind. I want to see if we cannot arrive at some agreeable arrangement with respect to time. If the Senator wants to increase the half hour to a reasonable extent, I should like to have the suggestion. If we can do that, I hope we can then start this bill moving again.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will permit me to complete my observations of the situation, which will not take very long, I shall then make a suggestion to the majority leader for an agreement as to the time on this amendment.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I am not greatly motivated to enter into any blanket consent agreement on this bill by any argument that we ought to proceed now with great haste to consider the bill because the international situation has worsened.

To the contrary, I think the very subject matter of the bill, and its importance to the defense of the country,

should cause us to go slower than before, in view of what has happened in connection with the world situation in recent hours. I think we had better take a long look at the bill before we start to follow any let-down in our very closely guarded security program in the the field of atomic energy.

If I am correctly informed by experts, if I have read aright, when I have read some of their warnings which have been issued, the atomic energy program cannot be separated into so-called military features and commercial features, because what are being dealt with are scientific laws and scientific principles, and they operate the same whether we seek to develop energy for commercial uses or for military uses.

I think we should take a look at this situation very, very carefully.

Also, I may say on that point, there is nothing which would stop us from displacing the atomic energy bill long enough to consider any new emergency which may come up, while the atomic energy bill is under discussion. But because it is my understanding that the amendment has great implications in it, I should think that a debate of at least an hour to a side on the amendment would be reasonable. If the Senator from California would be agreeable to that, I would have no objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I so modify my unanimous-consent request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from California, as modified?

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not understand the purport of the unanimous-consent request.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have modified my unanimous-consent request to the extent that on the pending amendment the time will be increased from the original 30 minutes to 2 hours, which will be equally divided, one hour to be controlled by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the other hour to be controlled by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask that my amendment be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 52 it is proposed to delete section 122 and renumber the succeeding sections accordingly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 1 hour. The Senate will be in order.

How much time does the Senator from New York yield to himself?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, since I spoke at considerable length on last Saturday, I shall take but very little time of the Senate today, but shall yield time to some of my colleagues.

My amendment proposes to delete section 122, on page 52, of the bill. Section 122 reads as follows:

SEC. 122. Policies contained in international arrangements: In the performance of its functions under this act, the Commission shall give maximum effect to the policies contained in any international arrangement made after the date of enactment of this act.

It is my understanding that the United States has in the recent past entered into a considerable number of international agreements with regard to the use of atomic products such as medical isotopes and also some very important agreements on some military aspects of atomic energy, the latter with such nations as Great Britain and Canada. These are highly important arrangements from the viewpoint of our relations with our friends and allies, although most of them are not important from a policy standpoint.

The fact that section 122 states that maximum effect shall be given to the policies contained in any international arrangement made after the date of enactment of the bill is, in my opinion, virtually serving notice that we must treat agreements entered into prior to the enactment of the bill in a different category and in a different way from those entered into after the enactment of this bill. I am told that the many arrangements and agreements entered into in the past are still of very great importance. I do not think that Congress should, by law, give the implication that our Government is to treat those agreements less seriously than or in a manner different from that in which we will treat agreements which will be reached after the enactment of this bill.

Therefore, since I believe this section may bring about great misunderstanding and confusion, and even grave difficulties in our international relations, I have offered this amendment to delete section 122 from the bill.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would not the Senator's amendment give validity to any agreement, express or implied, oral or written, which may have been made at Yalta or Potsdam, relative to sharing secrets and modern weapons at a time when we were allied with nations which are not now considered friendly to the United States?

Mr. LEHMAN. No; no more validity than our Government gives to such agreements at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. Certainly the atomic bomb was discussed at Potsdam, was it not?

At that time the United States was allied with Russia, and possibly other nations which are not now considered friendly to the American way of life. Is the Senator certain that his amendment would not give some validity to agreements which may have been made at Potsdam, whether those agreements were express or implied, or whether they applied specifically to atomic bombs, or to whatever they may have applied?

Mr. LEHMAN. There is nothing in nothing in section 122 which would vitiate or——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

There is nothing in section 122, as it now stands, which in any way vitiates previous agreements. Even if section 122 is approved, such agreements would still remain in effect, to the extent that they are in effect today. If Congress and the President feel that any agreements now in existence and effect should be disavowed, that may be done by appropriate executive action or legislation. But section 122, as it stands in the bill, does not in any way disavow such agreements, or does not in any way vitiate them or cancel them. It simply places the whole class of agreements, which have been entered into, including international agreements or arrangements entered into prior to the enactment of the bill, in a completely different category from those which may be entered into after the enactment of section 3690.

If the Senator from Vermont is fearful about agreements previously entered into, and if Congress and the President want to disavow agreements which we have previously entered into, then appropriate action can be taken and should be taken. But section 122 does not accomplish such a direct purpose. My amendment would not change that, either.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. If the Senator's statement is correct, the amendment would not recognize any previous agreement made in relation to atomic energy.

Mr. LEHMAN. Oh, no. The distinguished Senator from Michigan is misquoting me. I did not state that. I think that some of the agreements entered into prior to the enactment of the bill, if it shall be enacted, may be of great importance.

I simply said that if it is deemed wise, in the opinion of the Congress of the United States and the President, that we disavow those agreements entered into prior to the enactment of the act, then I think that is a different proposition.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is wrong with a declaration by the Congress of the United States that at least the Congress of the United States does not want to have itself put on record as recognizing previous secret or other agreements in relation to atomic energy when the act of 1946 did not authorize any such agreement?

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not think we are doing that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Then why does the Senator object to this provision?

Mr. LEHMAN. Because I believe there are many agreements, with Canada and with Great Britain, and with many other friendly countries—I am not familiar with the details of these agreements, for I am not on the Atomic

Energy Committee—that may be of very great value, and yet we are serving notice that those must be treated quite differently from the ones that are entered into after the enactment of this measure.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why should they not be treated differently when they are secret? They are not known to the Congress. Why should the Congress treat a secret agreement of which it has no knowledge in the same light as agreements it has authorized?

Mr. LEHMAN. I desire to make it very clear that I am not advocating that we endorse all previous agreements which are described by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] as secret and without authority. That is one thing. But I am not proposing that. But this bill says that all contracts, all arrangements, all agreements entered into prior to the enactment of this act must be treated in an entirely different manner from those that are entered into later.

Mr. FERGUSON. I do not read it that way at all. This provision does not recognize any previous agreements. As I understand the 1946 act, it did not authorize agreements with foreign nations, and therefore we are now starting anew to recognize some agreements with foreign nations. We say, "In the performance of its functions under this act"—who do we say "under this act"? Because this is the beginning; this is the authority for agreements with foreign nations—continuing—"the Commission shall give maximum effect to the policies contained in any international arrangement made after the enactment of this act."

We do not want to put ourselves in the position that we are recognizing secret agreements under some other administration which were not authorized by law. Is that not correct?

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Michigan that I am aware of the fact that in this bill under the definition of international arrangements it is specified that they must be those that have been entered into after the enactment of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Looking at the definition of the term "international arrangements" appearing on page 7 of the printed bill, subsection (k)——

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Mr. HOLLAND. In subsection (k), section 11, I note that—

> The term "international arrangement" means any international agreement hereafter approved by the Congress or any treaty during the time such agreement or treaty is in full force and effect, but does not include any agreement for cooperation.

Is it not true that that definition——

Mr. LEHMAN. I was in a colloquy with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] and I am afraid I did not hear the question. Will the Senator repeat it?

Mr. HOLLAND. I call the distinguished Senator's attention to the fact that the definition of the term "international arrangement" appearing on page 7 of the printed bill is limited to two kinds of actions by the Congress: First, international agreements approved by the Congress itself, that is, enacted by congressional act; and, second, any treaty as ratified by the Senate during the time such agreement or treaty is in full force and effect.

The provision looks prospectively because it speaks of the international agreement as being hereafter approved by the Congress.

The question I should like to ask is this: What conceivable reason is there that the section in question, section 122, which provides that the maximum effect must be given to those two kinds of agreements, one by treaty, the other by congressional act after this date, should not provide that those shall prevail as the latest declarations of policy legally made under our form of government, and shall have maximum effect in the operations under this particular pending act?

It seems to the Senator from Florida that that is the natural course which the Congress would want to give to the latest declarations of policy made in the strictest legal way and in each case approved by the Congress, one a treaty approved by the Senate and the other an enactment of the entire Congress after this date.

Mr. LEHMAN. If, as claimed by the Senator from Florida—and he has referred me to that part of the bill from which he has quoted—it is true that the international agreements are limited in the manner which he says and are limited only to those which are in the form of treaties or agreements approved by the Congress from this time on, after the enactment of this act, then what is the use of that section? There is no use in it at all.

If we agree to the provisions that have been quoted, then of course there is no legality for agreements entered into prior to the enactment of this bill.

I think under those circumstances the intent should be spelled out in clear language, or section 122 should be eliminated. That is why I offered my amendment. I think the section quite redundant, and very confusing.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator contend that the term "international arrangement" as appearing in section 122 has any broader meaning than that stated in subsection (k) of section 11 of the bill, on page 7, which reads, and I quote in full that subsection:

> The term "international arrangement" means any international agreement hereafter approved by the Congress or any treaty during the time such agreement or treaty is in full force and effect, but does not include any agreement for cooperation.

Does the Senator contend that the words "international arrangement" as appearing in section 122 have any different meaning or any wider meaning than as stated in the definition which I have just read into the RECORD?

Mr. LEHMAN. To me it is very confusing. The Senator refers to "maximum effect." It seems to me that is a relative term. It does not mean that an effect of a lesser degree cannot be given to arrangements made prior to the enactment of this act. I interpret the words "maximum effect" as a comparative and relative term.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield myself 2 more minutes, and then I will yield to some of my colleagues.

It seems to me that it presupposes or implies that while we want maximum effect given to contracts or agreements entered into after the enactment of this act, nonetheless we recognize the existence of the agreements entered into prior to that time, and they should have less than maximum effect. It seems to me to be entirely relative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. LEHMAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that the provisions which should have maximum effect should be the latest declarations under our form of government; that is, those by act of Congress passed through both Houses and approved by the President, or by the act of the Senate in ratifying a treaty? Should they not have the latest effect and the most powerful controlling effect upon any arrangement or group of arrangements we are making with other nations.

Mr. LEHMAN. The question addressed to me by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Michigan implied, insofar as my understanding is concerned, that we should not give consideration or recognition to agreements entered into prior thereto.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield, let me say we referred to no legislative recognition.

Mr. LEHMAN. Then why have the section in the bill at all? In the section the word "maximum" is used.

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, but the reference is to "any international agreement made after the date of enactment of this act." In other words, the meaning is that we shall not recognize legislatively any such arrangements made prior to the date of enactment of this act.

I do not know what agreements other countries might claim they have now—for instance, whether Russia might claim she now has secret agreements.

So I believe this section is a very important one, and should remain in the bill.

OFFICIAL ANSWERS TO FALSE PROPAGANDA AGAINST FOREIGN AID (S. DOC. NO. 149)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield 3 minutes to me, to permit me to make a statement at this time?

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to do so, provided I may have unanimous

consent to yield for that purpose without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, not long ago Mr. Dean A. Sisk, of Phoenix, Ariz., who serves as consultant and conciliator for a labor union, directed my attention to a communication that had been sent to labor organizations throughout my State. It is a circular letter, the opening and closing paragraphs of which I shall ask to have reprinted in order to expose a brazen attempt to propagandize Congress by dissemination among some 5,000 labor unions in the United States of false and misleading statements about legislation relating to foreign aid, which is at this time under active consideration by Members of the Senate. The author of the circular letter is Mr. James H. Dillon, who maintains himself as president and executive secretary of a corporation called the Construction Men's Association in New York City.

In this letter Mr. Dillon ignores four established facts:

First. That the people of Soviet Russia and the occupied nations of Eastern Europe are governed by a Communist dictatorship in Moscow which does not hesitate to use armed force to kill men who dare to oppose it.

Second. That it is the openly avowed purpose of that dictatorship to impose godless communism on all mankind.

Third. That at present the best available defense against this Communist aggression is the ability of American military aircraft to deliver atomic bombs over Moscow and Stalingrad from air bases located in Europe and North Africa in less than half the time that it would take to fly the bombs from the United States.

Fourth. That the defense and operation of these air bases requires the use of European manpower adequately armed and equipped by implementing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, details of which are given in letters that I have received from the Director of the Foreign Operations Administration, the Assistant Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State, all of which I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document, together with a letter to me from the President of the American Federation of Labor and the extracts from the circular letter to which I have referred.

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

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, at this time I yield 25 minutes to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator who is controlling the time for the other side whether it will be agreeable to him to yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, upon the conclusion of the 25 minutes just yielded by the Senator from New York to the Senator from Montana, I shall yield 15 minutes of my time to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I thank the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank both Senators.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, let me observe that it will not be necessary for the Senator from Montana to request that I yield, following the expiration of the 25 minutes yielded to him by the Senator from New York. Instead, it will be quite satisfactory to those of us on this side to have the Senator from Montana speak for 40 minutes without interruption.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of both Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 40 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Cole-Hickenlooper bill amending the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 is without a doubt one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation to be brought before the Congress in recent years. Its passage would have a profound influence on American life for many future generations, for it would set the pattern for peacetime use of a great new source of energy. Needless to say, it would have a particularly great effect on the future of the electric industry.

The method of presentation and the timing of this legislation are most unfortunate. The bill represents a complete rewriting of the McMahon Act—carrying over intact some provisions of the existing law, modifying others, and adding entirely new sections. Thus, the Congress is confronted, in the closing days of this session, with a single-package bill comprehending a bewildering array of technical matters. Some are timely; others could well be postponed. The form and wording of the bill, with its many new definitions and cross-referenced and interrelated sections, make it virtually impossible for the Congress to select the more urgent matters for action at this time. It is an all-or-nothing proposition.

During the past 10 days—night and day—the Senate Chamber has been the scene of an extremely long debate on the bill now before us revising the Atomic Enery Act of 1946. This extensive debate seems to be the only method by which the administration's scheme to convert the atomic-energy program into a private monopoly can be properly exposed. We have been accused of filibustering, but wrongly so. In that connection, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that this is my first speech in the course of this very lengthy and involved discussion.

We have discussed and examined only matters relative to the proposed legislation at hand. We have been accused of interrupting the President's program. It is said that we are obstructing the majority leader's adjournment goal of July 31. The President himself sparked this extended debate by ordering the Atomic Energy Commission to make a deal with a private utility combine to build a powerplant to supply electricity to the Tennessee Valley Authority. That is a bad deal, and we want to expose it as such. As to adjournment, there is no risk to the national welfare in having Congress fail to adjourn on July 31. Congress can stay in session through August and September, and even later, if necessary to get its work done. We must not forget that we are paid by the year.

Thus far, much of the Senate debate has centered about the so-called Dixon-Yates proposal, by which a private utility holding company combine would furnish 600,000 kilowatts of power to the TVA, as a replacement for power which TVA now furnishes the Atomic Energy Commission.

Under this arrangement, the AEC would be used as a broker to buy power for the TVA, even though TVA is already adequately furnishing the power requirements of the AEC. It has been estimated that under the Dixon-Yates contract the additional cost of power to the AEC would range from $3,685,000 a year to $5,567,000 a year. Moreover, the Federal Government would reimburse the Dixon-Yates combine for its payment of Federal income taxes—a scheme which is unprecedented in the history of our Government.

The independence and integrity of the Atomic Energy Commission as a Commission are seriously threatened not only from within, by the position of dominance assumed by the Chairman, but from without, by overriding orders of the President.

The nation has seen the unpleasant spectacle of the Commission's being ordered, against its better judgment, to enter into this 25-year contract with a private utility syndicate. The contract is not for the purpose of providing utility services to the atomic-energy program, but has all the earmarks of a clever maneuver, figured out in the White House and the Budget Bureau, to have the Atomic Energy Commission run interference for the private utilities in their contest with the TVA.

Again I wish to emphasize that the proposed new contract has nothing to do with the power needs of the atomic-energy program. In the words of Commissioners Smyth and Zuckert:

> The present proposal would create a situation whereby the AEC would be contracting for power not 1 kilowatt of which would be used in connection with the Commission's production activities.

The scheme is for the Commission to maintain its present firm contract for TVA power to run the Paducah plant while contracting for some 600,000 kilowatts of additional power to be delivered by the private-utility group to the TVA for service in the Memphis area, several hundred miles away from any atomic-energy installation. In other words, the AEC would become a power broker, purchasing power it does not need for an

area far removed from its activities. The TVA would be forced into buying the power from the private groups through AEC, instead of building its own plant to serve the Memphis area.

Over the life of the contract, the taxpayers would foot a bill of at least $90 million over and above the cost of power that the TVA itself could produce. The $90-million figure is the AEC's own estimate; the TVA estimate is that this new proposal would result in $140 million of added cost to the taxpayers.

When the members of the Commission and their General Manager went before the joint committee, they said in effect: "This proposal did not originate with us. We don't like it, but higher authority has decreed it, and we will be good soldiers and carry out orders."

A great deal is involved here, more than a simple controversy between private and public power. We must decide whether the Atomic Energy Commission, created by the Congress as an independent agency of Government to administer the vast atomic-energy program, which now represents a public investment of $12 billion, is to lay aside its collective judgment in deference to unrelated budgetary and power policies of the current administration. Who, may I ask, is in charge of the Atomic Energy Commission?

There is a line to be drawn between Presidential direction of the executive branch for good administration and Presidential usurpation of the authority of independent commissions. The members of the Atomic Energy Commission do not serve at the pleasure of the President. They are appointed by him, of course, but the Senate confirms the appointments, and the period of tenure is fixed by law. The President can remove a Commissioner only for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

The President has directed a reluctant Atomic Energy Commission to select a private utility combination, the Dixon-Yates Corp., without competitive bids to build a huge steam plant at West Memphis, Ark., and to sell to TVA at a stipulated contract price power equal to that which TVA is to supply to AEC plants. The capital is to be secured by private borrowing on the strength of a 25-year Government contract, but the AEC is to pay the Dixon-Yates taxes.

Is it good law or good policy for a Government agency to pay a private company's taxes?

The question of whether the Dixon-Yates power would cost the AEC—hence the taxpayer—more than if TVA did the job has been debated over and over again here on the Senate floor and I think that whatever figure is taken, the results will show that the private contract would cost more than service by TVA.

This private arrangement makes extraordinary use of the Atomic Energy Commission's authority to let 25-year contracts. AEC would be concerned very indirectly indeed. Only by stretching interpretations to the limit can it be said that the private West Memphis plant—which would rule out the TVA Fulton steam plant—would replace TVA power furnished to the Atomic Energy Commission 250 miles away.

In regard to the proposed steam plant at Fulton, Tenn., I wish to say that I have received a letter, as many Senators have, from Walter von Tresckow, financial and economic consultants. This letter states that a group of firms have made an offer to finance, design, build, and operate a steam generating station at Fulton. The estimated cost of this power would be practically the same as that produced by TVA. This offer would cost the Government between $90 million and $150 million. If the administration is so determined to bring private companies into the power program, why have not we heard anything about consideration being given to this proposal? This proposal as stated in the letter would take the AEC out of the power business except for providing its own needs. In addition this group proposes to supply the same benefits of low-cost power to the consumer as does TVA.

At this point in my remarks I wish to have printed the letter from Walter von Tresckow, financial and economic consultants, dated July 19, 1954.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

WALTER VON TRESCKOW FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSULTANTS,
New York N. Y., July 19, 1954.

Hon. MIKE MANSFIELD,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MANSFIELD: We, the undersigned, have made an offer to finance, design, build, and operate a steam-generating station at Fulton, Tenn., to supply the power needs of the TVA in the Memphis area. The cost of this power is to be 3½ mills per kilowatt-hour or less. This is practically at the same rate as power produced by the TVA. Our offer will cost the Government between $90 million and $150 million less than any alternative proposal you have for consideration.

We are repeating this offer, made to TVA and other governmental agencies concerned, to you and to every other Senator and Representative. We are now adding to this offer as follows:

"We will build steam-generating stations on the same basis wherever they are needed in the TVA area. Power from these generating stations will also be available to the private utility companies in the adjacent territory at the same rates as TVA."

We respectfully ask that you interest yourself in the consideration of this offer by the proper Government agency, for the following reasons:

It is best for the Government because it saves $90 to $150 million; it eliminates the need for the AEC to make a power contract to supply the needs of TVA; it takes the AEC out of the power business; it eliminates need for further Government appropriations for the construction of TVA generating stations.

It is best for TVA because the Authority can continue to make its own power contracts for its own needs; it enables the TVA to supply all the power the AEC needs at the cheapest price; the Authority retains its ability to meet the growing needs of its own customers; the cost of power remains the same to its present customers; the great benefits, brought by TVA to the area it serves in 7 States, are maintained through private money and private initiative.

It is best for the private utility companies in the territory adjacent to TVA because it enables them for the first time to obtain power at TVA rates and to compete with TVA on a price basis.

It is best for the consumer because his monthly bill for electricity in the TVA area remains the same and will be substantially less than he is paying now in the adjacent territory.

It is best for the country because it spreads the benefits of low-cost power over a vastly greater territory to a larger number of people.

Respectfully yours,

WALTER VON TRESCKOW

(For Walter von Tresckow, New York City; Burns & McDonnell Engineering Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Salomon Bros. & Hutzler, investment bankers, New York City; Long Construction Co., Kansas City, Mo.; Robert W. Larrow, Burlington, Vt.; Harvey Weeks, New York City; George H. Schwartz, Zelig R. Nathanson, Schwartz-Nathanson-Cohen, New York City; John N. Mitchell, Caldwell, Marshall, Trimble & Mitchell, New York City).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to say that I have no information whatever about this particular concern but certainly they advance some interesting proposals which I think should be brought to the attention of the membership of the Senate.

Before turning to another phase of the atomic energy bill I would like to comment about the specifications for the new plant which show every indication of being "rigged" to favor the private Dixon-Yates combine. The fact has been brought out in the hearings, however, that the Dixon-Yates group did not even have the specifications at the time it submitted its proposal in April. The specifications later drawn, which had the effect of discouraging other bidders, conformed to the Dixon-Yates proposal. The result of the contract would be that a private company would own a plant built with substantial Government help, with the Government assuming much of the risk, and the power rate would be materially in excess of the TVA standard.

It is still difficult for me, as well as for millions of Americans, to understand why the Dixon-Yates concern was selected from among all other concerns interested in the possible production of electricity from atomic energy in reactor plants? Why was the Dixon-Yates concern selected and given this juicy plum, although the representatives of the Dixon-Yates group who appeared before the joint committee had to admit, in the course of their testimony before the joint committee, that they did not know what the specifications of the contract were? Why was this particular concern given that particular bonanza? I have my suspicions, but I would prefer that the administration would clear this up, if they feel that it is truly justified contract.

Although the Dixon-Yates controversy is extremely important, particularly from the standpoint of the future of TVA, there are some extremely important power and related provisions of the atomic energy legislation which have been largely obscured from public view.

One of the important provisions of this bill deals with patents. Testimony

presented to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on May 12, 1954, described the patent provisions of the identical bills then before the committee (S. 3323 and H. R. 8862) as affording "opportunity for the creation of a monopoly on a scale never before known in America."

The atomic energy bill broadens the permissible area of private patenting and authorizing others to have access to the patented inventions or discoveries under certain conditions. The fact that a few large industrial corporations, as contractors to the Atomic Energy Commission, have acquired an overwhelming head start on would-be competitors by virtue of technical know-how acquired on the inside, is enough to warrant the utmost care on the part of the Congress in legislating patent privileges.

The President's proposal for compulsory patent licensing until such time as interested industrial concerns are on a more equal footing in their acquisition of skills and experience in atomic technology is fine. But, I believe both the President and the sponsors of this bill are unduly optimistic in the hope that a period of 5 years will suffice to reach that stage.

Incidentally, I may say that in the House of Representatives on last Friday, on the basis of the Cole amendment, even this 5-year period on patents was knocked out. The result is, of course, that this bill is made worse than ever. It will take at least 5 years to construct a sufficient number of reactors for making comparative evaluations of performance, and it will take at least 5 years more to accumulate the economic and engineering data for these evaluations. Perhaps it would be better to leave open the time for legislative removal of compulsory licensing. The Congress could then enact the necessary legislation at such time as a broadened industrial base for atomic energy became evident.

The patent provisions of this bill are very complicated and need a great deal of study. In addition, the procedures to be followed by the Commission in compulsory licensing are not well defined, and the way is open for favoritism in the granting of exclusive patents.

Labor strikes at the Oak Ridge and Paducah plants of the Atomic Energy Commission at the very time when comprehensive legislation to revise the Atomic Energy Act is before Congress, serves to highlight an area of legislative concern which the bill has completely ignored.

Chronic discontent and frequent strife are attributes of employment in atomic occupations. I am told that labor unions in these occupations believe they are unduly handicapped by the use of secrecy and security as a weapon of management to bludgeon their members into submission and to distort or nullify the procedures of collective bargaining.

Whether or not legislative provisions can be written to alleviate the persistent sore spots in atomic labor-management relations, certainly the legislation can at least provide for more effective labor-management representation in the councils of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The fields of interest and attention on the part of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee would encompass more than assistance in promoting healthier attitudes toward collective bargaining problems in an area hedged in by difficult security requirements.

The whole difficult area of personnel security, which would involve, under this bill, investigations by the Civil Service Commission and the FBI of the "character, associations, and loyalty" of privately employed persons having access to restricted data might well come under the continued scrutiny of a Labor-Management Advisory Committee.

Assistance could be provided in the application of safety standards, adequate workman's compensation provisions, and other protective measures in licenses for new and hazardous atomic occupations.

Studies and preparatory steps could be undertaken to minimize the impact of atomic enterprises in industries or areas whose populations depend on competing activities for a livelihood. The economic distress of the coal-mining industry, for example, might become even worse by the substitution of atomic fuel for coal in generating electrical power.

The administration bill proposes that private electric utilities be allowed to move into the field of producing electricity from atomic reactors.

There is nothing wrong with this in principle. The Government obviously should not claim a monopoly in producing electricity from atomic piles. Private utilities, which now furnish electricity from steam plants or hydroelectric operations, have a proper place in the atomic field.

The trouble with the administration's bill is that it provides no safeguards against private-utility monopoly. The American taxpayers have put up some $12 billion so far to advance atomic research and experiment to the place at which relatively small reactors, producing electricity at commercially competitive rates, seem feasible.

Are these taxpayers supposed to treat their $12 billion investment as a pure subsidy to which the private utilities have some special rights? So far as the administration bill provides, the answer seems to be "Yes."

The bill as presented to Congress would give some favored utility in each section of the country an effective monopoly in the field of atom-produced electricity. And there would be no Government-controlled yardstick by which to test prices to be charged by the utilities to the ultimate consumers.

The private utilities did not put up any part of the $12 billion to advance the atomic program, but they are proposed as the companies eligible to demand AEC private-power licenses without paying a penny for the privilege.

Two amendments to the administration bill would cure many evils, but not all. One would provide that any utility licensed by the AEC would have to follow the historic public-preference clause, thus assuring cooperatives and municipalities of first rights to electricity produced from privately owned and licensed atomic reactors.

The second would allow the AEC itself to build its own reactors, check costs and fair prices, and provide a true yardstick by which to measure the price schedules decided on by private utilities. The Johnson amendment which was adopted by the Senate provides these safeguards. Even if we could be assured that the Johnson amendment would survive the conference, there would still be a lot of things too difficult to digest in this bill.

For all practical purposes, the Atomic Energy Commission and other Federal agencies are prohibited from building nuclear reactors for the commercial generation of electric power.

I fail to see, Mr. President, why the Atomic Energy Commission should be enjoined from producing atomic power for commercial use when it would be given broad authority to license others for such production. If the Nation is to realize the maximum power benefits from its investment in this new resource, a positive program of atomic power production by the Federal Government is essential. The history of electrical-power development in this country affords ample evidence that a reasonable balance between public and private power serves as the most important check on monopoly control in the vital field of energy resources. The very magnitude of economically feasible nuclear power-plants persuades me to believe that the balance will be thrown heavily in favor of private monopoly unless provision is made for Federal development of atomic power, particularly where supply is desired by public or cooperative systems.

This does not seem much for the people to ask in return for their $12 billion investment in atomic research.

The President and his leadership in Congress have been very insistent upon pushing through the atomic-energy bill intact, despite its questionable provisions. The more thought I give to this matter the more I feel that there is only one really important section which needs congressional approval immediately, and that is the international section. There is not the slightest reason why this section could not be separated from the domestic issues.

The domestic power section, even if it should be pushed through, would remain a sore spot to many and would cause trouble later. The proper thing to do is to postpone these revisions of the Atomic Energy Act until early next year, when there is ample time to give thorough consideration to these matters.

I am in full agreement with the proposal made by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] which would separate the bill by taking the most important part, the part which the President has in reality requested and to give the Senate a chance to act on that much-needed part of the present bill under consideration. Such a proposal would implement the President's proposal, made before the United Nations General Assembly, for an atomic pool of resources to encourage peacetime accord on atomic armaments. I see no compelling reason why the legislative requirements to facilitate an exchange of atomic information with friendly nations, whether for purposes of mutual defense or peacetime endeavor, have to be coupled with the granting of private ownership and patent rights in atomic

energy to domestic corporations. Defense of the free nations and world peace demand more urgent attention than the desire of a few industrial and utility companies to own and operate atomic reactors.

We should enact the international provisions now, and then later on we should take a long, hard look at the pending proposals to confer private ownership and patent rights in the atomic field.

The plan proposed by my distinguished colleague, Senator LEHMAN, deletes everything from the bill, with the exception of the international section. There would be no consideration given to the Dixon-Yates contract, a fantastic arrangement whereby the company receives a guaranty to build a power project without even the submission of plans; the Government would pay their taxes, and there would be absolutely no risk involved. If this contract should become effective, it would destroy much of the usefulness of TVA, open the door of exploitation, and would give away this great asset which the people of this Nation paid for.

The American people can rightly take pride in the careful manner in which the Congress, over the past 50 to 75 years, has developed legislation which protects for all Americans their rights to natural resources. We are at the threshold today of developing for the benefit of many future generations an entirely new source of energy. Depending upon the manner in which we of the Senate act upon the pending legislation, this energy source, holding such bright potentialities for the future, can either be developed for the benefit of all Americans, or it will become the tool of relatively few.

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

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I must call to the Senator's attention the fact that we are operating under a unanimous-consent agreement, with the time allotted. If a quorum is called, it must come out of the time allotted to the Senator. The Senator has only 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. President, I must also call to the attention of the Senator from Montana the fact that he has been allowed 15 minutes from the time controlled by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], but that was for the purpose of explaining the bill rather than for the purpose of a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana is continuing, and he has until 12:42, under the agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the time allotted to me by the Senator from Iowa, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I must respectfully call to the Senator's attention the fact that that is not provided for in the unanimous-consent agreement, and the time was allotted to the Senator from Montana by the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, who controls the time on this side at the present moment?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may I be informed as to how much time the Senator from New York has remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixteen minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. How much time has the majority side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-five minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Does the majority side care to take any of its time now? We will try to get the Senator from New York back on the floor.

Mr. THYE. The majority has allotted 16 minutes to the Senator from Montana, and the Senator was operating on that 16 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is correct, but we do not have any more speakers.

Mr. THYE. But the Senator from Montana still has time that was allotted to him by the majority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the acting minority leader is trying to ascertain from the acting majority leader if anyone on the majority side wants to speak. If no one on the majority side desires to speak, and no one on this side desires to speak, then we can terminate the debate on the amendment and have a quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair wishes to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota if he desires to yield back the remainder of the time on behalf of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. THYE. Am I to understand that the question is whether the acting majority leader objects to the Senator from Montana yielding back the remainder of the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. As the Chair understands, the acting minority leader has stated that if the Senator from Iowa will yield back the remainder of his time, then all time will have expired, and we can proceed with the quorum call and the vote.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I cannot answer for the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Iowa is not on the floor. I have sent for him, and he should be here momentarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the minority leader yield to someone?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement entered into, in the absence of the minority leader, who controls the time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York has 16 minutes, and the Senator from Iowa has 45 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Who has the floor, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from New York, who is the author of the amendment, has 16 minutes remaining, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator from Iowa has 45 minutes remaining. I have no authority to yield the time of the author of the amendment, as has been implied by the Chair. If it is agreeable to the Senators who are on the floor at this time, I suggest that the Senator from Florida be permitted to make a brief statement, with which he is prepared to proceed. It is agreeable to the minority leader, until the author of the amendment can be summoned to the floor, to yield time, by unanimous consent, and with the approval of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], to permit the Senator from Florida to proceed for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Texas, but I may say that it probably will take me longer than 5 minutes; it will probably take 10 or 15 minutes.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have the floor, and the Chair had been addressing me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Chair continue his statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question which the Chair desires to propound to the Senator from Montana is this: The Senator from Montana has until 12:42. If he desires to yield that time to the Senator from Florida, the Chair will recognize the Senator from Florida.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I simply thought——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. THYE. If the Senator from Montana will yield to me momentarily, I should like to suggest that if the Senator from Montana would yield the remainder of his time to the Senator from Florida, the acting majority would yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida, providing the Senator from Florida might be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield the remainder of his time to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I shall be delighted to do so.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for the remainder of the time yielded by the Senator from Montana, and for 5 minutes yielded by the Senator from Minnesota.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF PUERTO RICAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, yesterday, July 25, the people of Puerto Rico celebrated the second anniversary of their commonwealth status, and I believe it is fitting and proper that we pay tribute to them for the remarkable strides which they have made under this form of self-government.

Progress under the commonwealth status is a monumental achievement, both on the part of the peoples of Puerto Rico and of the United States. They no longer seek statehood, nor what was once the only alternative, independence, but a continuation of commonwealth status.

This was accomplished when they were granted a Commonwealth status, a

pattern of political freedom which permitted the peoples of this island to virtually pull themselves up by the bootstraps from poverty and despair to a sound status, economically, culturally, socially, educationally, and judicially. It is a pattern of self-government which strengthens them, making it possible for them to play a larger and ever-increasing role in their own self-defense while at the same time making a marked contribution to the defense of the free world.

Theirs is a government which is a perfect example of the progress which can be made in all these fields of endeavor under the democratic way of life.

When Puerto Rico attained its self-governing status, the President of the United States informed the United Nations of a decision of the United States not to continue reporting on the social, economic, and educational development of Puerto Rico, as is required pursuant to the provisions of article 73 of the Charter of the United Nations, for all dependent areas. There the question of it becoming a self-governing political entity was fully debated, and the achievements of the people of Puerto Rico and the United States fully recognized. This was a marked demonstration to the peoples all over the world that the United States did not embrace any ambition to become a colonial power. On the contrary, it was evidence that its policy is one to continue to help its dependent areas to achieve full self-government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on November 27, 1953, after a full discussion was had with respect to the United States granting Puerto Rico its Commonwealth status.

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

CESSATION OF THE TRANSMISSION OF INFORMATION UNDER ARTICLE 73 E OF THE CHARTER IN RESPECT OF PUERTO RICO—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AT ITS 459TH PLENARY MEETING ON NOVEMBER 27, 1953

Sponsors: Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama, Peru.

Vote: 26 in favor, 16 against, with 18 abstentions.

The General Assembly—

Considering that, in Resolution 222 (III) of November 3, 1948, the General Assembly, while welcoming any development of self-government in non-self-governing territories, considers it essential that the United Nations be informed of any change in the constitutional status of any such Territory as a result of which the government responsible for the transmission, under article 73 e of the charter, of information in respect of that Territory thinks it unnecessary or inappropriate to continue such a practice.

Having received the communications dated January 19 and March 20, 1953, informing the United Nations of the establishment of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, as a result of the entry into force on July 25, 1952, of the Constitution of Puerto Rico, and stating that, in consequence of these constitutional changes, the Government of the United States of America would cease to transmit information under artice 73 e of the charter.

Having studied the report[1] prepared by the Committee on Information From Non-Self-Governing Territories, during its session of 1953, on the question of the cessation of the transmission of information on Puerto Rico, and presented to the General Assembly in conformity with paragraph 2 of resolution 448 (V) of December 12, 1950,

Having examined the communications of the Government of the United States of America in the light of the basic principles embodied in chapter XI of the charter and of all the other elements of judgment pertinent to the issue,

Considering that the agreement reached by the United States of America and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, in forming a political association which respects the individuality and the cultural characteristics of Puerto Rico, maintains the spiritual bonds between Puerto Rico and Latin America and constitutes a link in continental solidarity,

Bearing in mind the competence of the General Assembly to decide whether a non-self-governing territory has or has not attained a full measure of self-government as referred to in chapter XI of this charter.

1. Takes not favorably of the conclusions set forth by the Committee on Information From Non-Self-Governing Territories in its resolutions;

2. Recognizes that the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by expressing their will in a free and democratic way, have achieved a new constitutional status;

3. Expresses the opinion that it stems from the documentation provided that the association of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico with the United States of America has been established as a mutually agreed association;

4. Recognizes that, when choosing their constitutional and international status, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have effectively exercised their right to self-determination;

5. Recognizes that, in the framework of their constitution and of the compact agreed upon with the United States of America, the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have been invested with attributes of political sovereignty which clearly identify the status of self-government attained by the Puerto Rican people as that of an autonomous political entity;

6. Considers that, due to these circumstances, the declaration regarding non-self-governing territories and the provisions established under it in chapter XI of the charter can no longer be applied to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

7. Takes note of the opinion of the Government of the United States of America as to the cessation of the transmission under article 73e of the Charter of Information on Puerto Rico;

8. Considers it appropriate that the transmission of this information should cease;

9. Expresses its assurance that, in accordance with the spirit of the present resolution, the ideals embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, the traditions of the people of the United States of America and the political advancement attained by the people of Puerto Rico, due regard will be paid to the will of both the Puerto Rican and American peoples in the conduct of their relations under their present legal statute, and also in the eventuality that either of the parties to the mutually agreed association may desire any change in the terms of this association.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, self-government is not necessarily synonymous with independence or statehood. In the case of Puerto Rico, its a status which means government by the people with full recognition of the right of the people to self-government. It is a status which means self-determination, embracing the democratic way of life in association with the United States. It is a political entity which is not subordinate in any way, but rather a partnership with equal dignity and respect.

With an area of only 3,423 square miles and a population of approximately 2,210,000 people, Puerto Rico has made almost miraculous strides under the commonwealth type of government. It afforded to the people of this island dynamic potentialities for growth since it was one which in itself attained the highest ideals of human dignity. As a commonwealth, Puerto Rico has increased its national income one-third and has raised the standard of living so that now it is the highest in the Caribbean.

There is a fundamental bond of union between the people of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the people of the United States. This fundamental bond is that of common citizenship with mutual interests in common defense, as well as a common international relationship in economic union and judicial integration. Through economic union our markets are open to them and their markets are open to us with reciprocal protection. This provides for a sound relationship commensurate with the strength and potentialities of the overseas areas, which is to the mutual benefit of all concerned.

Puerto Rico is unquestionably our Gibraltar in the Caribbean. It is a Latin American country comprised of good citizens of these United States. It is no wonder then that our defense establishments in Puerto Rico are surrounded by loyal, freedom-loving, patriotic people, who are earnest believers in the democratic way of life. Their good citizenship and patriotism was amply demonstrated whenever an emergency situation arose. In the Second World War, and in the Korean war, the number of volunteers from Puerto Rico in these wars of aggression made it almost unnecessary to implement the Selective Service Act in the islands. Their combat record in both these wars is an outstanding one, and one in which the people of Puerto Rico and the United States can take just pride. Their good citizenship was further demonstrated by the quick and effective way in which their Government refuted Communist propaganda which attempted to depict the United States as an imperialistic colonial power. It was also demonstrated by the manner in which the people and their Government, with all the power at their disposal, repudiated the nationalist fanatics. By their very acts they have more than amply demonstrated that they desire to continually associate themselves with us in their self-governing commonwealth status. I am confident that it is also our desire to forever continue such association of mutual understanding and good will with them.

Last year Puerto Rico purchased almost one-half billion dollars of goods from the United States. In line with our policy of providing a free market no customs are collected on American goods

[1] See Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Supplement No. 15, pt. I, sec. VII.

going into the Islands, and at the same time foreign merchandise imported into Puerto Rico is subject to the same tariff rates as though imported into these United States.

Puerto Rico pays for the expenses of its self-government with its own taxes and though we maintain a military establishment and Federal agencies in Puerto Rico to carry out Federal functions, the residents of Puerto Rico are not called upon to support these institutions. In other words, the people of Puerto Rico help support the United States Government only to the extent which is commensurate with their participation in the United States Government. Therefore the people of Puerto Rico pay taxes to the United States only on income earned outside of Puerto Rico, either in the United States or in foreign countries. They are represented in the United States Congress by a Resident Commissioner, who though he has no vote, possesses all the other privileges of a Member of the Congress.

Under United States grants-in-aid laws, joint programs are being developed in Puerto Rico, the costs of which are shared both by the United States and Puerto Rico. These programs are carried out both in the local and national interest. Under these joint programs, Puerto Rico has developed a fine system of public roads; it has advanced public health and it has an excellent school-lunch program. They have moved far ahead in housing; their mortality rate has gone down to less than 9 per 1,000 a year from about 18 per 1,000 of 2 decades ago. They have a modern waterworks system all over the island, and they are rapidly industrializing, thereby coping with the unemployment problem and making their island more attractive so that emigration may not provide the only escape from poor living conditions.

Self-government in Puerto Rico in political association with the United States, in a position of equal dignity, and of mutual esteem, is demonstrating to the world the progress that can be accomplished by pursuing the democratic way of life. Freedom, democracy, respect for the dignity of man, the American way of life, once more have proved their worth. Puerto Rico is a splendid example of what a devoted and industrious people can do amidst almost unsurmountable difficulties.

Puerto Rico, the show window of American freedom at the crossroads of the New World—in the Caribbean—is a neighbor of which Florida continuously grows more proud. We are united by history, by friendship, and above all, by common loyalties.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to congratulate the people of Puerto Rico for having made such a fine selection in choosing their representatives. Resident Commissioner, A. FERNÓS-ISERN has been their Representative in the Congress since 1947, and in that capacity has done a wonderful and most effective job in handling Puerto Rican problems before the Congress. Although he has no vote, he has said on frequent occasions that he has the votes of 435 Members of the House of Representatives and 96 votes in the United States Senate. It was he who was chairman of the constitutional convention which drafted the constitution of Puerto Rico. It was he who was chosen as a member of the United States delegation to the United Nations when the President of the United States informed the United Nations of Puerto Rico's self-governing status. In his capacity as Resident Commissioner he has earned the admiration and respect of every Member in both Houses of the Congress.

In Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín, Puerto Rico has a most outstanding chief executive, for it was during his administration that efforts were made and success obtained in industrializing Puerto Rico so that more people obtained more jobs which provided them with an increased standard of living.

It was through the leadership of these men that the progress of Puerto Rico has advanced and is continuing to advance under a truly self-governing associated status with the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial entitled "Puerto Rican Anniversary," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 25, 1954.

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

PUERTO RICAN ANNIVERSARY

The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico celebrates today the second anniversary of a relationship with the United States which warrants at once a keen sense of pride among the people of the mainland and a high feeling of hope for the future among the people of the island. Puerto Rico, which became an American dependency a little more than a half-century ago, achieved in 1952, by act of Congress, and by ratification of its own people, full self-government within the American political system. For its own political and economic reasons, Puerto Rico desired neither statehood nor complete independence. It chose, instead, a commonwealth status—full local autonomy with full citizenship in the United States along with a recognition of American sovereignty in foreign affairs.

The relationship is a statesmanly adaptation to the facts of Puerto Rico's contemporary life. The chief architect of this relationship, Puerto Rico's first elected governor, Luis Muñoz Marín, had this to say about it in an article in the current issue of Foreign Affairs: "Puerto Rico is not asking for statehood. Puerto Rico is not demanding independence. Puerto Rico is dead-set against colonialism. In other words, Puerto Rico is developing a new pattern of political freedom."

In a time when colonialism has come into widespread disrepute and other sovereignties have been slow to grant the demands of dependent people for political liberty, the United States can point proudly to the Puerto Rican story. The parent nation, in this case, helped the colonials to grow to political maturity and when they were ready for self-government granted it to them gladly, recognizing at the same time their economic problems and continuing to extend a helping hand in the solution of them. Puerto Rico stands as an examplar of American principles. We congratulate the people of the island on their progress and rejoice in the testimony of their impressive Governor:

"No matter how sincerely a man may have been bemused by propaganda aimed against the United States, the things that he sees in Puerto Rico and the realization that on 5 occasions within 6 years our people have voted overwhelmingly against independence, against statehood, against colonialism and in favor of this joint experiment in statesmanship—this constitutes a massive answer to that propaganda. In this connection, the creative relationship that has been worked out between the American Union and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is an eloquent manifestation of a goodness and a greatness in the spirit of the United States."

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I understand we have 11 minutes remaining. If it is agreeable to the Senator from Iowa, we yield back all that time with the exception of 3 minutes, which we will yield to the Senator from New York.

Would the Senator from Iowa care to comment on the amendment? The Senator from New York will be right back, and then we will be finished on this side.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. How much time do I have, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield myself as much time as may be necessary. I expect to use 4 or 5 minutes and then to yield back practically all the time that may remain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I had 40 minutes. I said I would yield myself such time as may be necessary.

Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from New York would strike section 122, which has been read by him, and which provides as follows:

In the performance of its functions under this act, the Commission shall give maximum effect to the policies contained in any international arrangement made after the date of the enactment of this act.

That is in general keeping with the present provisions of the law and is the exact language of the present law except for the addition of the words "made after the date of enactment of this act."

Mr. President, an examination of the proposed act shows that there is a definition of the words "international arrangement." It is chapter 2, section 11 (k):

The term "international arrangement" means any international agreement hereafter approved by the Congress or any treaty during the time such agreement or treaty is in full force and effect, but does not include any agreement for cooperation.

Mr. President, this provision is in the bill to protect the Congress and the people of the United States against secret agreements which may be pulled out of somebody's archives or safe, and which may commit the United States to some action which Congress has never passed upon and which we do not now know to be in existence.

I can give one very glaring and startling example. The nefarious and, I

think, unconscionable agreement that was made at Quebec in which the British were given an absolute veto over the use by the United States of the atomic bomb at any time in the future at any place, is an arrangement or agreement which would not be tolerated by this provision.

Under the definition of "international arrangement," so far as I know, there has been no international arrangement or agreement which has been put into effect in the past with the approval of both Houses of Congress. So this would have no effect on anything past that comes under the definition of international arrangement.

This is a protective safeguard against unknown and secret agreements which have been made heretofore, and which have not had the benefit of examination by the Congress, and have not even been reported to the Congress. I think it is a very important provision to remain in this proposed law.

The joint committee considered this provision at length and, so far as I recall, there was no objection to it in the committee and it was adopted unanimously in the committee as a needed provision in this bill.

As I said a moment ago, it is substantially a carry-over from existing law.

I do not think I have anything further to say about the matter at the moment. From our standpoint, from the standpoint of the committee which unanimously approved it—it was approved by the joint committee after long consideration—it is considered to be an essential part of this bill and very helpful and very protective to the rights of the American people and to the responsibilities of the Congress.

I think, Mr. President, that is about all I care to say about the subject.

If there are questions, I shall be glad to attempt to answer them. Otherwise, I am prepared to yield back all but 3 minutes of the time.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that we may yield back the remainder of our time, that we may have a quorum call and then that the Senator from New York may speak 3 minutes——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator was reserving 3 minutes, and I shall reserve 3 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be glad to have the quorum call and have the right to speak for 3 minutes after the quorum call.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I had already agreed with the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wonder if we could arrange for the Senators to consume whatever time they propose to consume, and then have the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised that by unanimous consent, Senators can yield back amounts of their time and save 3 minutes and use that after the quorum.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So far as I am concerned, Mr. President, I would just as soon yield back all of my time, and have a quorum call and proceed to vote. However, I am perfectly sympathetic to the desire of the Senator from New York to have 3 minutes reserved. If he wants to reserve 3 minutes, in order that I might comment on anything that may come up, I should like to reserve 3 minutes myself. I do not like to yield all of my time and then have no time left. If both sides yield back all of their time, I am perfectly prepared to yield mine all back and have a quorum call and proceed to vote. But I will abide by the desires of the Senator from New York on that score.

Mr. LEHMAN. I shall be very glad indeed to yield back all but 3 minutes of my time, with the understanding that those 3 minutes can be used by me, if so desired, after the quorum call, giving, of course, the identical right to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request that each side yield back all of their time except 3 minutes; that there be a quorum call; and after the quorum call each side will be permitted to use 3 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Goldwater	Millikin
Anderson	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Green	Morse
Beall	Hendrickson	Murray
Bennett	Hennings	Neely
Bowring	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bridges	Hill	Payne
Burke	Holland	Potter
Bush	Humphrey	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Reynolds
Byrd	Jackson	Robertson
Capehart	Jenner	Russell
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Crippa	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Kuchel	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Upton
Eastland	Long	Watkins
Ervin	Magnuson	Welker
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT in the chair). A quorum is present.

Under the time limitation on debate, 6 minutes remain, 3 of which are available to the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and 3 to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

What Senator wishes to be recognized?

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, my amendment is a very simple one. It would delete section 122, on page 52 of the bill, reading as follows:

SEC. 122. Policies contained in international arrangements: In the performance of its functions under this act, the Commission shall give maximum effect to the policies contained in any international arrangement made after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. President, in my opinion this amendment would do 1 of 2 things: It would either place all agreements and arrangements made prior to the enactment of this measure in a subordinate position, as compared to agreements or arrangements made after enactment of this measure; or it would vitiate and repudiate, sight unseen, all agreements and arrangements made before the enactment of this measure.

Mr. President, I do not know exactly to what agreements or arrangements this section of the bill relates, but I have been informed that many agreements and arrangements concerned with atomic energy and atomic weapons have been made in the past, with our trusted allies—notably, with Great Britain and Canada, and possibly with others. I believe it would be an act of bad faith if in this bill we were to imply that we were repudiating those agreements which had been entered into in good faith with our allies.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I am sorry, but I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. President, we have no specifications regarding the agreements to which this section refers. We have no idea with whom they were entered into, what the purpose was, or what the contents were. This section of the bill would either put them into a subordinate position or—and I believe this to be much more serious—would vitiate and repudiate them. I do not think we can afford to do that in the case of agreements and arrangements about which we in Congress know absolutely nothing.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me say that I believe this section of the bill is quite unnecessary.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as I pointed out a moment ago, the amendment of the Senator from New York would, in my judgment, do violence to this bill. This section of the bill is carried over verbatim from existing law, except for the words "international arrangement made after the date of the enactment of this act."

An international arrangement is defined by the proposed law as an international agreement which has been submitted to both Houses of Congress and approved. We do not know what secret agreements have been made heretofore. Two or three have come to light. I use only one illustration—the nefarious agreement made at Quebec, in which unfortunately our people gave the British the right to veto our use of the atomic bomb any time they pleased. That is a secret agreement that did not come to light until long after it was made.

Other agreements are alleged to have been made, to which we have no access. We do not know what secret agreements might rise up to smite us. The proposed law provides that international arrange-

ments, which mean agreements, which have been submitted to and approved by both Houses of Congress, shall be given maximum effect hereafter; that is, that arrangements which are made hereafter shall be given maximum effect by the Commission.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy unanimously approved this provision of the proposed law. There was not the slightest objection to the provision as it now appears, and, Mr. President, I earnestly hope that in the interest of legislation on this subject, and in support of the careful consideration given to this matter by the joint committee, and its unanimous approval of the provision as it is, the pending amendment may be defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired, and the question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], designated "7-24-54-N."

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 18, nays 65, as follows:

YEAS—18

Anderson	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Gore	Kilgore	Neely
Hennings	Langer	Sparkman
Hill	Lehman	Stennis

NAYS—65

Aiken	Frear	Millikin
Barrett	Fulbright	Pastore
Beall	George	Payne
Bennett	Goldwater	Potter
Bowring	Green	Purtell
Bridges	Hendrickson	Reynolds
Burke	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Bush	Holland	Russell
Butler	Ives	Saltonstall
Byrd	Jenner	Schoeppel
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kennedy	Smith, N. J.
Cordon	Kerr	Symington
Crippa	Knowland	Thye
Daniel	Kuchel	Upton
Dirksen	Long	Watkins
Douglas	Magnuson	Welker
Duff	Malone	Wiley
Dworshak	Mansfield	Williams
Ervin	Martin	Young
Ferguson	Maybank	

NOT VOTING—13

Bricker	Gillette	McCarthy
Case	Hayden	McClellan
Cooper	Kefauver	Mundt
Ellender	Lennon	
Flanders	McCarran	

So Mr. LEHMAN's amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, earlier today, I proposed an amendment to the pending bill to establish an electric power liaison committee within the Atomic Energy Committee, to be composed of representatives of the various Government agencies which are concerned with our great regional power developments and with the energy supply of the Nation. The amendment I am proposing would insert a new section 27 on page 15 of the bill. In order that Senators may be thinking of it, I ask that it be read. I believe I sent it to the desk earlier today and it is now lying on the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The legislative clerk read Mr. MURRAY's amendment, as follows:

On page 15, line 4, add the following new section 28 and renumber present sections 27 and 28 as 29 and 30:

"SEC. 28. Electric Power Liaison Committee: There is hereby established an Electric Power Liaison Committee consisting of—

"a. A chairman, who shall be the head thereof and who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for the chairman of the Military Liaison Committee; and

"b. A representative of the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwest Power Administration, the Southeast Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and such other Government agencies as the President may from time to time determine. The chairman of the committee may designate one of the members of the committee as acting chairman to act during his absence. The commission shall advise and consult with other Government agencies, through the committee, on all atomic energy matters which relate to electric power applications of atomic energy, including the development, manufacture, and use of atomic reactors for power purposes, the allocation of special nuclear material for such purposes, the technical, economic, and accounting relationships between production of special nuclear material and atomic energy for electric power and for atomic weapons, appropriate policies to govern the production and distribution of electric power from atomic energy in order that the benefits of such power shall be widely distributed and maximum revenues shall be returned to the Federal Treasury, and the integration of atomic power policies and administration with other power activities of the Federal Government; and shall keep other Government agencies through the committee, fully and currently informed of all such matters before the commission. Other Government agencies, through the committee, shall have the authority to make written recommendations to the commission from time to time on matters relating to civilian applications of atomic energy as they deem appropriate."

Mr. KNOWLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, has this amendment been printed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment has not been printed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement, and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement, as follows:

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment to S. 3690 submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided*, That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to call attention to the fact that my remarks will take considerable time. They will take at least an hour.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to modify the agreement to make the time 2 hours, one-half to be controlled by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the other half to be controlled by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California modified his request.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I do not think an hour would be sufficient to permit me to cover the matter I am going to discuss. I would like an hour and a half.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will modify the agreement, Mr. President, to make it 3 hours, to be equally divided.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The proposed unanimous-consent agreement has now been modified to make it 3 hours, with an hour and a half to each side. Is there objection to the proposed agreement, as modified?

Mr. MORSE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to have the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] on the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator will wait a moment, I should like to make an explanatory statement.

I do not like to be speaking for other Senators. A group of us have just come out of a meeting, in which we were trying to prepare an adjustment of some of the difficulties. Suggestions were made as a result of that meeting. I think they are now being considered with the minority leader. That is my hunch. I do not know that to be a fact, but seeing so many Senators absent from the floor, and knowing the way Senate conferences operate, I have a hunch that is true. I wish that we could have some

delay on this unanimous-consent agreement until the leaders are back on the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I believe that to be a reasonable request. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to ask for a quorum call without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Goldwater	McCarran
Anderson	Gore	Millikin
Barrett	Green	Monroney
Beall	Hayden	Morse
Bennett	Hendrickson	Murray
Bowring	Hennings	Neely
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Burke	Hill	Payne
Bush	Holland	Potter
Butler	Humphrey	Purtell
Byrd	Ives	Reynolds
Capehart	Jackson	Robertson
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Crippa	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Kuchel	Symington
Duff	Langer	Thye
Dworshak	Lehman	Upton
Eastland	Long	Watkins
Ervin	Magnuson	Welker
Ferguson	Malone	Wiley
Frear	Mansfield	Williams
Fulbright	Martin	Young
George	Maybank	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that, for the information of the Senate, that the clerk reread my proposed unanimous-consent request as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the unanimous-consent agreement as modified.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment to S. 3690 submitted by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided*, That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reserving the right to object, in order to keep the RECORD clear, the agreement applies specifically only to this amendment, does it not?

Mr. KNOWLAND. It applies only to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The time will be controlled by the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Iowa. The Senator from Montana has 1 hour and one-half. The Senator yields himself how much time?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield myself an hour and 15 minutes, if I can finish in that time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator yields himself an hour and 15 minutes.

The Senator from Montana is recognized for an hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the sole purpose of this amendment is to create a committee, chosen from the agencies of Government which are concerned with our energy supply and with regional developments and economic development, to sit as advisers to the Atomic Energy Commissioners as this great new force comes into being.

There is a Liaison Committee on Military Application of the Atom. This would establish a similar liaison committee of experienced people—public servants with experience in the field—on electric power phases. It would make available to the Atomic Energy Commissioners, through the agencies, the finest men in the Government in the power and resources development fields.

Mr. President, I am proposing this amendment in the sincere hope that it is one upon which we can agree. Without some sort of planning, without some sort of approach to the problem of management and use of this great new source of energy, there may be piecemeal development which will concentrate industry in a single area to the detriment of the people in that congested area, and to the detriment of other regions that need some industrial development. Without some sort of planning there can be power gluts in one area and power shortages in another.

Mr. President, the Democratic 79th Congress enacted a law of the most basic and fundamental importance to the present and future economy of the Nation. I refer to the Employment Act of 1946.

The declaration of intention, which is found in section 1021 of that act, reads as follows:

> The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work, and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

I want to emphasize a portion of that quotation which I consider to be especially pertinent to the pending measure, S. 3690, to amend the Atomic Energy Act:

> The Congress declares that it is the continuing responsibility of the Federal Government * * * to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of maintaining * * * maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

This means, Mr. President, that in our consideration of the Atomic Energy Act, one of the guides we should have before us is how to assure that this great new source of energy we are concerned about can be utilized to promote national welfare, maximum employment, and maximum prosperity.

All our scientific knowledge concerning the development of nuclear energy is the property of the people of the United States. This new source of energy can, under the direction of Congress, be used to provide abundant electrical energy to stimulate the expansion of our economy, bring about better standards of living, and create limitless opportunities for our people.

Or, if the Congress so wills, it can be given away improvidently to special-interest groups for exploitation and private profit, controlled by them to maintain a scarcity of electric energy to be sold at excessive prices, thus providing only a minimum contribution to the national welfare and prosperity.

Mr. President, in these perilous times, when democracy is on trial and is being observed by the entire world—when people in many sections of the earth are choosing between democracy and totalitarianism—the greatest service we could render our country would be to utilize this unique scientific discovery for the advancement of the welfare of all our people. Nothing could win these people in other parts of the world to our way of life more effectively than an economy of abundance, of full employment, and high living standards in America. Mr. President, we are in the midst of an extended debate in which some of us feel very deeply that this may prove to be the most important legislation of our generation—legislation which may determine whether our generation and those that follow us will travel the road of abundance, maximum employment, and prosperity; or whether selfish, shortsighted monopolists will control and exploit this great natural resource.

When I spoke some time ago on this subject, I outlined with some care how policies have been developed in the regulation and control of our great, publicly owned water-power resources. I believe that the self-same policies offer us splendid guidelines for the development and use of nuclear-energy resources. I refer especially to the guidelines contained in the Federal Water Power Act.

We have had a vast experience, dating back over 50 years, which we should keep in mind as we consider this Atomic Energy bill. One of the vital fields of planning in which the Federal Government has, by logic and necessity, taken the role of leadership for a half-century is that of hydroelectric-power development. That was one of the most important steps the Government of this country has ever taken, as is indicated by the vast expansion of business, industrial, and agricultural development.

We have come to realize that by proper planning and programing of great, multiple-purpose river projects, and by comprehensive development and management of our hydroelectric energy resources in our great river systems, we can establish the foundations for vast economic growth—for new industries, new payrolls, new jobs, constantly expanding opportunity for free, competitive enter-

prise. We have done it. We have brought about tremendous economic growth in the Tennessee Basin, spectacular growth in the Columbia Basin, and substantial growth in other areas. We know that the vision and statesmanship, the engineering skill, and the management experience which we have brought to bear to develop and harness our great river systems for the general welfare—and not just for the particular welfare of the few—are realized and deeply valued by the American people.

Now we have, as a supplement to our other resources, the tremendous capabilities of atomic energy. Unfortunately, it has not come to us with directions for use attached. We must fit it into our existing economic, social, and political structure, so it will help us achieve our great goals of continuing full employment and national prosperity.

Section 7 (b) of the McMahon Act called for a report by the Atomic Energy Commission to the President, the Congress, and the people whenever this great nuclear resource approached economic utilization. The AEC report was to give us the best possible picture of the social, economic, and political consequences which might be expected from this fabulous discovery.

Lacking that report, it is not clear to us today whether actual economic utilization of atomic energy is still many years away, or whether it may burst upon our social and economic structure at an early date, with almost the disrupting effect of the A-bomb itself. There are those who fear that it will end coal mining. There are those who fear that some of our existing power sources may, in the course of time, become impractical as competitors. There are those who tell us that it will be 5 or 10 years before power is available from nuclear generators which will compete with existing systems of electric power production, even in high-cost areas, for commercial markets.

The only thing that appears clear to many of us is that, whatever this great force is, whenever it shall come into practical use, we should apply all our ingenuity, all our scientific skill, all our engineering capabilities, all our management experience, all our vision and statesmanship, to see that in the commercial peacetime fields it enriches our economy and does not exploit it.

Mr. President, the underlying philosophy of free and responsible citizens of our Republic in approaching and dealing with resources generally, and in dealing with the complexities of the interrelationship of energy and resources to our human life, can be stated no better than it was stated by former President Theodore Roosevelt, the Bull Moose Republican father of our great conservation and reclamation movements, when he transmitted to the Congress the 1908 report of the Inland Waterways Commission.

President Roosevelt was dealing with river resources, but the philosophy and the concept are just as valid today if we add references to nuclear energy to his words. I quote from his letter:

> The report rests throughout upon the fundamental conception that every waterway should be made to serve the people as largely and in as many different ways as possible. Every stream should be used to its utmost. No stream can be so used unless it is planned in advance. When such plans are made we shall find that instead of interfering, one can often be made to assist another. Each river system, from its headwaters in the forest to its mouth on the coast, is a single unit and should be treated as such. The first condition of the successful development of our waterways is a definite and progressive policy. The second is a concrete general plan prepared by the best experts available, covering every use to which our streams can be put.

The 1912 report of the same Commission said:

> In the nature of the case, so comprehensive a policy could be administered only by the Federal Government, and consequently the eventual desirability of Federal control is easy to predict.

Since the beginning of the conservation movement 50 years ago, we have, step by step, been building our programs of power and river development within the broad framework of the policy I have just quoted. The declaration of intention contained in the Employment Act of 1946 was, in a considerable degree so far as resources development is concerned, simply an exposition of the Theodore Roosevelt statement that resources—"should be made to serve the people as largely and in as many ways as possible."

It put into specific terms the doctrine of full employment and maximum economy. Beyond the application of technical, scientific, and engineering knowledge employed to derive the ultimate benefit from a resource, lie the goals of economic, social, and cultural advance of all the people, maximum employment, maximum income, prosperity, and ever-improving standards of living.

We must keep these goals constantly before us during our consideration of the pending measure. We must determine how nuclear energy can best be utilized to improve our society—how it can best be developed to bring about great regional advances, supplementing the resources of areas which are lacking in adequate fuels or hydroelectric power.

Instead of hurriedly making a gigantic giveaway of the atom, amidst a hectic legislative scene, we ought to apply all the principles, all the basic concepts, and all of the knowledge we have regarding harnessing resources for the greatest human good.

But, Mr. President, as I have previously stated, we do not even have from the Atomic Energy Commission, as required by law, a report on the social, economic, and political consequences of the development of electric power through the utilization of atomic energy. Therefore, it would be well if this bill could be set aside, and a commission of our finest experts appointed to study this problem and report to us early next year. However, in view of the existing legislative situation, there would appear to be no possibility of creating such a commission. So I believe the most we can hope to accomplish is to arrange for planning within the framework of the Atomic Energy Act.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], in discussing atomic possibilities with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], brought out that the people of the middle Missouri Basin hope for atomic generators to firm up the power from their great dams. Atomic generators may very possibly be needed as a supplement to hydroelectric power in many areas; they may be needed as the backbone generating capacity in other areas lacking an adequate supply of low-cost fuels.

I observe that the authors of Senate bill 3690 themselves took cognizance of one such use problem when they directed that a preference should be given areas of scarce and costly power in the location of the first generators.

That is an approach to just one of the problems of integration which we shall have as this new power becomes available. It is just one relatively small problem that will present itself, for the future of atomic energy clearly will affect the life of people in every hamlet and on every farm in America.

I have a strong impression that atomic generators can become a great supplement to hydroelectric power—an energy resource that can make regional development possible in watersheds where hydroelectric potentialities amount to little or nothing in areas lacking in rainfall or natural dam sites.

I fear that in the approach to licensing of power generators contained in the bill—an approach which leaves planning entirely to licensees, and does not make provision for the great regional agencies to build atomic generators—we shall turn the clock back 50 years, and ignore all the regional development and economic development knowledge we have acquired. There are, therefore, included in the liaison committee proposed in this amendment representatives of the regional agencies, including not just TVA and Bonneville, but also the Southwest Power Administration and the Southeast Power Administration, as well as the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers.

I can conceive that these agencies, together with the REA, Federal Power Commission, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, can help guide the Atomic Energy Commission in the granting of licenses so regional development will be supplemented as much as is possible.

Without this sort of unified and integrated approach to the problem of basic resources management and use—and atomic energy is a new basic resource which should be included with others in planning future economic growth in any of our agencies—some of our regions, without aggressive public or private agencies, might not share in the new energy, and therefore would cease to be a source of economic stimulation. Their ability to provide expanding opportunities for constantly increasing population might come to a halt. People dependent on employment from resources now declining might be stranded in blighted areas; and as private enterprise faced such diminishing outlets for new investment, so would material sources and public income dry up, living standards drop, and the entire Nation would be adversely affected.

But if our present knowledge, resources, and ability to stimulate regional development can soon be supplemented with economical new energy, and if our knowledge is properly applied, every region in the Nation should be capable of becoming secure and productive, and a greater contributor to our total national economic goals set forth in the Employment Act of 1946.

Mr. President, one of the agencies that is suggested as a member of this Electric Power Liaison Committee is the Federal Power Commission.

In the printed hearings we find that the Power Commission has rendered some very valuable advice to the Atomic Energy Commission and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning safeguards that should be included in licenses for construction of electric powerplants.

The advice of a Power Commission representative could be a great protection to the public interest, for that Commission has had a great deal of experience in the field.

Mr. President, before we complete consideration of the bill, it is my hope that we shall have included in it, by legislation, several of the safeguards which we have thrown around our hydroelectric resources. Regardless of whether we do, the advice of the Federal Power Commission would be important with regard to including such safeguards in the conditions of licenses to be granted, or in the matter of administering the required safeguards.

One of the primary safeguards which should be included in this act is found in section 7 (b) of the Federal Water Power Act. The Atomic Energy Act should contain a similar provision. This section reads as follows:

SEC. 7. (b) Whenever, in the judgment of the Commission, the development of any water resources for public purposes should be undertaken by the United States itself, the Commission shall not approve any application for any project affecting such development, but shall cause to be made such examinations, surveys, reports, plans, and estimates of the cost of the proposed development as it may find necessary, and shall submit its findings to Congress with such recommendations as it may find appropriate concerning such development.

This section recognizes the public's right to develop its own resources. It is intended to prevent private utilities from taking resources that are essential to a great regional development, and thereby making them uneconomical or unsound, or thereby disrupting integrated development.

In the case of atomic energy, the great regional development agencies ought to have the first right to build any new nuclear generators that are going to be located in areas where they need additional power, especially to firm up their hydroelectric energy. Certainly, licenses should not be permitted to become the device by which our regional agencies are disrupted.

I have been provided an analysis of pertinent provisions of the Federal Water Power Act which should be made applicable to atomic power resources of the people. This analysis was made by Mr. Leland Olds, a former member of the Federal Power Commission and an eminent authority in this field. He cites this section, safeguarding the rights of the people themselves to make use of their energy resources, through their great Federal agencies, first in his analysis.

Continuing, the analysis of the act says:

The act has previously provided, in section 4 (a), that the Federal Power Commission is authorized and empowered to make investigations concerning, among other things, "whether the power from Government dams can be advantageously used by the United States for its public purposes, and what is a fair value for such power, to the extent necessary or useful for the purposes of this act."

The act further assumes that a State or any of its subdivisions may legitimately engage in the business of developing, transmitting, utilizing or distributing power. In fact, it provides, in section 7 (a), that in issuing preliminary permits or licenses for the development of any waterpower resources, "the Commission shall give preference to applications therefor by States and municipalities" provided the plans of such public agencies are equally well adapted to meeting the requirements of the act for full use of water resources.

The full text of section 7 (a) of the act reads as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) In issuing preliminary permits hereunder or licenses where no preliminary permit has been issued and in issuing licenses to new licensees under Section 15 hereof the Commission shall give preference to applications therefor by States and municipalities, provided the plans for the same are deemed by the Commission equally well adapted, or shall within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Commission be made equally well adapted, to conserve and utilize in the public interest the water resources of the region; and as between other applicants, the Commission may give preference to the applicant the plans of which it finds and determines are best adapted to develop, conserve, and utilize in the public interest the water resources of the region, if it be satisfied as to the ability of the applicant to carry out such plans."

In its definition of the word "municipality," the act recognizes the legitimacy of public ownership in the field of electric power. It says: "Municipality" means any city, county, irrigation district, drainage district, or other political subdivision or agency of a State competent under the laws thereof to carry on the business of developing, transmitting, utilizing, or distributing power.

Further recognizing the prior right of the people to employ public agencies for the development of waterpower resources, the act provides not only for limited term licenses but also, in Section 14, for the right of the Federal Government to recapture private hydroelectric developments at the conclusion of the license period. This section provides in part:

"Upon not less than 2 years' notice in writing from the Commission the United States shall have the right upon or after the expiration of any license to take over and thereafter to maintain and operate any project or projects as defined in section 3 hereof; and covered in whole or in part by the license, or the right to take over upon mutual agreement with the licensee all property owned and held by the licensee then valuable and serviceable in the development, transmission, or distribution of power and which is then dependent for its usefulness upon the continuance of the license, * * * upon the condition that before taking possession it shall pay the net investment of the licensee in the project or projects taken, not to exceed the fair value of the property taken, plus such reasonable damages, if any, to property of the licensee valuable, serviceable, and dependent as above set forth but not taken, as may be caused by the severance therefrom of property taken, and shall assume all contracts entered into by the licensee with the approval of the Commission."

Beyond this, the act provides in section 7 (a) and section 15, taken together, that States and municipalities may again exercise their preference at the termination of a license to a private power undertaking if the Federal Government does not decide to take over the project or projects.

Still further safeguarding the public right to the development and use of such resources on a nonprofit basis, the act, in section 14, specifically reserves the right of the United States or any State or municipality to take over, maintain, and operate any licensed project at any time by condemnation proceedings.

As a final indication that Federal power policy, as embodied in the Federal Power Act, considers it in the public interest to foster nonprofit development and use of such energy resources, I refer you to section 10 (e) providing that a licensee shall pay to the United States reasonable annual charges to cover (a) reimbursement for the cost of administering the act; (b) recompense for the use, occupancy, and enjoyment of Government lands; (c) expropriation of excessive profits until the States have made provision for preventing such profits or themselves expropriating them; and (d) charges for the use of Government dams.

This section of the act contains a proviso specifically exempting States and municipalities holding licenses from such charges, to the extent that such power is sold to the public without profit, or is used by them for State or municipal purposes. The proviso reads:

"That licenses for the development, transmission, or distribution of power by States or municipalities shall be issued and enjoyed without charge to the extent that such power is sold to the public without profit or is used by such State or municipality for State or municipal purposes."

Subsequently, I shall discuss briefly the fundamental importance of such provisions in any legislation governing the use of a public-energy resource, whether hydro or atomic, for the development of electricity. Here I would simply urge: (a) that the Nation has a parallel situation to deal with as we consider the rules which should apply to the opening up of atomic energy to development of atomic-electric power; (b) that, along with provision for licensing non-Federal development of such power, there should be similar safeguarding of the prior right of the people to have the resource developed by an agency of the Federal Government for public purposes; (c) that this should apply whether the power development is to be associated with Federal investment in the reactor or the entire atomic-electric power undertaking is to be financed as a unit; and (d) that, should the decision of the competent Federal body not favor Federal development, States and municipalities, as defined in the Federal Power Act, should enjoy a preference, provided their plans are equally sound.

Before turning to a discussion of sections of the Federal Power Act, which should be considered to safeguard the public interest where licenses are issued to non-Federal, and particularly private, interests to develop atomic-electric power, I shall refer briefly to other Federal power legislation which reflects the evolution of the principles which I have already noted.

BOULDER DAM ACT ADOPTS PRINCIPLES BY REFERENCE

The act of Congress, approved December 21, 1928, providing for the construction of Boulder Dam, now called Hoover Dam, in the Colorado River, explicitly directs that determinations as to use of the energy of the falling water or the power derived therefrom shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act, giving preference to public agencies.

Dealing with the authorization to the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for "the use of water and necesssary privileges for the generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy or for the sale and delivery of electrical energy," the Boulder Dam Act (sec. 5 (c)) continues:

"In case of conflicting applications, if any, such conflicts shall be resolved by the said Secretary, after hearing, with due regard to the public interest, and in conformity with the policy expressed in the Federal Water Power Act as to conflicting applications for permits and licenses, except that preference to applicants for the use of water and appurtenant works and privileges necessary for the generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy, or for the delivery at the switchboard of a hydroelectric plant, shall be given, first, to a State for the generation or purchase of electric energy for use in the State, and the States of Arizona, California, and Nevada shall be given equal opportunity as such applicants."

The Boulder Dam Act provides further:

"That no application of a State or a political subdivision for an allocation of water for power purposes or of electrical energy shall be denied or another application in conflict therewith be granted on the ground that the bond issue of such State or political subdivision, necessary to enable the applicant to utilize such water and appurtenant works and privileges necessary for the generation and distribution of hydroelectric energy or the electrical energy applied for, has not been authorized or marketed, until after a reasonable time, to be determined by the said Secretary, has been given to such applicant to have such bond issue authorized and marketed."

In the last 2 years there has been considerable talk about return to the principles of the Boulder Canyon Act, in providing for the potential power associated with Federal investment in dam and reservoir projects. Former President Herbert Hoover, now chairman of the Commission on Government Operations, has made this plea in a number of public statements. It was also set forth by the House Appropriations Committee in its report on the Interior Department Appropriations Bill for the fiscal year 1954.

The inclusion of similar provision for preference to States and their political subdivisions, as well as to rural electric cooperatives, would seem a sound embodiment of public policy in connection with legislation providing for the development and marketing of atomic-electric energy.

As in the case of the power in the falling water of their streams, the people have a proprietary interest in atomic energy and their nonprofit agencies should have first call upon its use as a source of supply for their most vital public service business.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY ACT AFFIRMS THE SAME PRINCIPLES

Section 10 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 provides this same preference for nonprofit agencies in connection with the sale of power generated at the Authority's projects. It reads, in part, as follows:

"SEC. 10. The Board (TVA Board of Directors) is hereby empowered and authorized to sell the surplus power not used in its operations, and for operation of locks and other works generated by it, to States, counties, municipalities, corporations, partnerships, or individuals, according to the policies hereinafter set forth; and to carry out said authority the Board is authorized to enter into contracts for such sale for a term of not to exceed 20 years, and in the sale of such current by the Board it shall give preference to States, counties, municipalities, and cooperative organizations of citizens or farmers, not organized or doing business for profit, but primarily for the purpose of supplying electricity to its own citizens or members."

Here it may be noted that the enumeration of "States, counties, municipalities, corporations, partnerships, or individuals," in that order, as potential customers of power made available through Federal investment, tends to clarify the intent of an act dealing with this public business and might well be adopted in connection with legislation dealing with the application of atomic energy to the electric power field.

The Tennessee Valley Authority Act includes important statements of the objectives which shall govern the sale of power. In accordance with section 11, power projects are to be considered "primarily as for the benefit of the people of the section as a whole and particularly the domestic and rural consumers to whom the power can economically be made available and accordingly that sale to and use by industry shall be a secondary purpose, to be utilized principally to secure a sufficiently high load factor and revenue returns which will permit domestic and rural use at the lowest possible rates and in such manner as to encourage increased domestic and rural use of electricity.

Furthermore, the last proviso in section 10 of the act authorizes and directs the Tennessee Valley Authority Board of Directors "to make studies, experiments, and determinations to promote the wider and better use of electric power for agricultural and domestic use, or for small or local industries, and it may cooperate with State governments, or their subdivisions or agencies, with educational or research institutions, and with cooperatives or other organizations, in the application of electric power to the fuller and better-balanced development of the resources of the region."

These are important public purposes. As I shall suggest at the conclusion of this part of my statement, they must be considered and safeguarded in any sound atomic-electric power legislation. Here I simply summarize the principles which Congress has deemed important in connection with hydroelectric power.

OTHER LAWS ARE CONSISTENT

The Bonneville Act of 1937, in section 2 (b), authorizes and directs the Bonneville Administrator to construct, operate, and maintain a transmission system, interconnecting other Federal projects, publicly owned power systems now or hereafter constructed, and markets. The object of this provision is threefold: (a) To encourage the widest possible use of all electric energy that can be generated; (b) to provide reasonable outlets for the energy; and (c) to prevent monopolization of such energy by limited groups.

The act provides further, in section 4 (a), that in order to insure that the facilities for the generation of electric energy at the Bonneville project shall be operated for the benefit of the general public and particularly of domestic and rural consumers, the Administrator shall at all times, in disposing of electric energy generated at said project, give preference and priority to public bodies and cooperatives.

The act, in section 4 (c), follows the Boulder Dam Act in assuring public bodies and cooperatives a reasonable time in which to authorize and market securities necessary to enable them to enter into the public business of selling and distributing the electric energy. But in section 4 (d) it goes even further, providing as follows:

"SEC. 4. (d) It is declared to be the policy of the Congress, as expressed in this act, to preserve the said preferential status of the public bodies and cooperatives herein referred to, and to give to the people of the States within economic transmission distance of the Bonneville project reasonable opportunity and time to hold any election or elections or take any action necessary to create such public bodies and cooperatives as the laws of such States authorize and permit, and to afford such public bodies or cooperatives reasonable time and opportunity to take any action necessary to authorize the issuance of bonds or to arrange other financing necessary to construct or acquire necessary and desirable electric distribution facilities, and in all other respects legally to become qualified purchasers and distributors of electric energy available under this act."

The Bonneville Act, in sections 6 and 7, establishes fairly precise principles governing the rates to be charged for sale of the electric energy generated at the project. They shall be fixed "with a view to encouraging the widest possible diversified use of electric energy." They may be uniform throughout prescribed transmission areas "in order to extend the benefits of an integrated transmission system and encourage the equitable distribution of the electric energy developed at the Bonneville project." They shall be drawn "having regard to the recovery (upon the basis of the application of such rate schedules to the capacity of the electric facilities of the Bonneville project) of the cost of producing and transmitting such electric energy, including amortization of the capital investment over a reasonable period of years." They shall be based on an allocation of costs of this multiple-purpose project.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. The Senator has just mentioned the sale of securities. Did the distinguished Senator know that in May the Francis I. duPont & Co., issued a circular dealing with atomic energy, apparently feeling that this law is going to be passed?

Mr. MURRAY. I know that such a circular was issued, but I am not entirely familiar with what it contained.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield further to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Did the distinguished Senator know that not only did the issue tell what great profits could be made by various corporations, but they also told their clients to buy this particular stock because of the fact that apparently the bill was going to become law? Is the Senator familiar with that?

Mr. MURRAY. I read that in the press. I have no direct information about it, but I believe such a suggestion was made.

Mr. LANGER. Would the Senator be interested in having the Senator from North Dakota mention some of the corporations who suggested they were going to get into the atomic energy field

and advised people to go ahead and buy some of this stock?

Mr. MURRAY. I suppose there has been some effort along that line, but it seems to me they are proceeding a little precipitately before the bill has become a law. It seems to me they should wait until the bill is finally passed, before beginning to finance a program based on the assumption that they are going to be favored as a result of this legislation.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Of course, if they could buy stock now, at a cheap price, and the private corporations, as a result of the act, made terrific profits, the value of the stock would go up.

Mr. MURRAY. That is the usual course in promotions of that kind.

Mr. LANGER. Does the distinguished Senator believe that Francis I. duPont & Co., issued the circular to their clients with the expectation that the bill would be passed, and that if their clients bought stock, they would make a large profit on their investment?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes, of course. The Du Pont people, who were in close contact with Atomic Energy Commission activities, probably were better informed than anyone else in the United States with reference to the matter, and probably felt assured that the bill would pass.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I am very glad to yield.

Mr. LANGER. I do not desire to impose upon the time of the distinguished Senator now, but I wish to ask him if he does not believe it would be well for the Senator from North Dakota to make that list public, by spreading it upon the RECORD, together with the statement issued last May by Francis I. duPont & Co., about the stock?

Mr. MURRAY. I think it would be interesting to have the public know about their activities. I think the Senator should make the information public.

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

Mr. MURRAY. I yield for a final question.

Mr. LANGER. Does not the distinguished Senator believe that the Government should be prohibited from granting a license to any person or corporation which was previously convicted of violating the antitrust laws, is now under indictment for a violation of the antitrust laws, or which has plead nolo contendere to such an indictment?

Mr. MURRAY. It seems to me it would be very appropriate to take such matters into consideration.

I thank the Senator from North Dakota for his contribution to the discussion.

I continue to read from the report:

Substantially the same provisions protecting the public interest in the use of electric energy derived from a public water resource are found in the Fort Peck Dam Act of 1938.

Both the Bonneville and Fort Peck Acts have identical definitions of "public bodies" and "cooperatives," accorded a preference in securing power from the respective projects. The term "public body" or "public bodies," "means States, public power districts, counties, and municipalities, including agencies or subdivisions of any thereof." The term "cooperative" or "cooperatives," "means any form of non-profit-making organization or organizations of citizens supplying, or which may be created to supply, members with any kind of goods, commodities, or services, as nearly as possible at cost."

The Flood Control Act of 1944 extended substantially the same principles to the marketing of power by the Secretary of the Interior from all reservoir projects under the control of the War Department. In view of the fact that, since 1906, electric power developed at all projects constructed under the reclamation acts had been marketed with a preference to public bodies, the legislation covering a period of nearly 50 years had established a substantially uniform pattern for protecting the public interest in our waterpower resources, based on the prior right of the people to public development, public marketing, and public distribution through any level of government.

Meanwhile, in 1936, Congress had established the Rural Electrification Administration for the purpose of extending financial and technical assistance in connection with the construction and operation of generating plants and electric transmission and distribution lines or systems for the service of the people of rural areas not then receiving central station electricity. The act authorizes the Administrator to make loans for this purpose to private, cooperative, and public agencies but provides that, in making such loans he "shall give preference to States, Territories, and subdivisions and agencies thereof, municipalities, people's utility districts, cooperative, nonprofit, or limited dividend associations, the projects of which comply with the requirements of this act."

Many States amended their laws to enable cooperative nonprofit organizations to undertake rural-electric service.

AN ANTIMONOPOLY POLICY

It is of unquestionable importance to the country's future that, before any legislative steps are taken to provide for development of atomic-electric power for civilian use, this structure of local, State, and Federal power policy law be carefully studied and the Federal provisions applying to waterpower be adapted to bringing the electric-power phases of atomic progress within the control of that policy.

Since President Theodore Roosevelt, the evolving Federal power policy has been recognized as an antimonopoly policy. It may be recalled that in his James River veto message President Theodore Roosevelt esteemed it his duty "to use every endeavor to prevent this growing [power] monopoly, the most threatening which has ever appeared, from being fastened upon the American people." Gifford Pinchot and George W. Norris have echoed these words.

So far I have been discussing power-policy legislation safeguarding the right of the people to choose public generation, transmission, and distribution of electric energy. I have discussed this phase of the necessary legislative approach to the civilian use of atomic energy as a source of electric power first because, as consistently affirmed by Congress, it is a prior right.

But I have not intended thereby to suggest that development of atomic-electric power be limited to public agencies. I intend next to discuss the legislative framework necessary to protect the public interest in connection with the licensing of private corporations to develop this new form of power generation.

Before undertaking that discussion, however, I will summarize briefly the objectives of Federal power policy, which stand out clearly in my foregoing analysis. This will provide an outline of the objectives which legislation, opening the way to atomic-electric power taking its place with hydroelectric power and thermal power generated with conventional fuels in the service of the Nation, must safeguard. These objectives may be considered "public purposes," as the term is used in the Federal Power Act.

In the first place, Congress has clearly recognized that nonprofit operation of a portion of the electric power business is desirable in the public interest for it has not only provided a preference to public bodies in the development of waterpower resources and to both public and cooperative bodies in the marketing of power from Federal hydroelectric developments, but has specifically exempted nonprofit public hydroelectric developments from the charges assessed by the Federal Power Commission against other developments.

In the second place, Congress has affirmed the objectives of this policy to include (1) encouragement of the widest possible diversified use of electric energy; (2) prevention of monopolization of the electric energy by limited groups; (3) extension of the benefits of an integrated transmission system; (4) equitable distribution of the electric energy among States, counties, and municipalities within transmission distance; (5) benefit to the general public and particularly domestic and rural consumers; (6) encouragement of increased domestic and rural use of electricity at the lowest possible rates; (7) promotion of the wider and better use of electric power for agricultural and domestic purposes as well as for small or local industries; and (8) application of electric power to the fuller and better balanced development of the resources of the region.

All these are vital public purposes involving the standards of living and future well-being of the American people. They are of as vital importance in connection with the development of atomic-electric power as with hydroelectric power. Any sound legislation providing the policy framework within which atomic-electric power will be developed must take them into account.

These public purposes will not be taken into account if the development is predominantly by privately owned power systems, even if subject to the normal processes of utility regulation. I shall support this statement after a brief analysis of the necessary conditions which should be attached to licenses for development of atomic-electric power by privately owned electric utilities.

THE FEDERAL POWER ACT AND PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

The Federal Power Act provides a complete set of principles and procedures for protecting the public interest in connection with the licensing of non-Federal waterpower development and, more particularly, of private development of waterpower resources. I shall select some of these for purposes of illustration, but all of them should be reviewed to determine their applicability to the licensing of the development of atomic-electric power by privately owned electric utility systems.

In the first place, in order to safeguard the preference right of States and municipalities, the act makes it mandatory for the Commission to give written notice of a private application for a preliminary permit or a license to any State or municipality likely to be interested in or affected by such application. A preliminary permit may be sought to maintain a priority of application for a license during the period required to make the examinations, surveys, and financial arrangements necessary to support the license application.

In the second place, the act provides the basic conditions which shall be attached to all licenses, including the following:

(1) The project must be best adapted to a comprehensive scheme for use of the resource for all purposes, including development of power.

(2) No substantial alteration or addition to the project shall be made without prior approval of the Commission.

(3) The licensee shall maintain the project works in an adequate condition of repair, including all necessary renewals and replacements and shall establish and maintain adequate depreciation reserves.

(4) After the first 20 years of operation, the licensee must put a specified portion of any excess profits over a fair return upon actual legitimate investment in the project in an amortization reserve to be held until termination of the license, or applied from time to time in reduction of net investment.

(5) The licensee shall pay the United States certain specified annual charges.

(6) Combinations, agreements, arrangements, or understandings to limit the output of electricity, restrain trade, or to fix, maintain, or increase rates are prohibited.

In the third place, the act provides in section 19 that a private licensee engaged in public service shall agree as a condition of the license to abide by reasonable regulation of its services, rates, and security issues either by a State commission or, where there is no State regulation, by the Federal Power Commission. It provides further, in section 20, that when project power or any part thereof enters interstate or foreign commerce the rates, charges, and the service rendered by any such licensee, or by any subsidiary corporation, the stock of which is owned or controlled directly or indirectly by such licensee, or by any person, corporation, or association purchasing power from such licensee for sale and distribution or use in public service, shall be reasonable, nondiscriminatory, and just to the customer.

All unreasonable, discriminatory, and unjust rates or services are prohibited and declared to be unlawful and, lacking State commission jurisdiction, the Federal Power Commission is given jurisdiction over such rates and services as constitute interstate or foreign commerce.

In the fourth place, by the final paragraph of section 20, a licensee is precluded from claiming any value for its project or projects for ratemaking purposes in excess of net investment or fair value, whichever is the least. In section 3 of the act "Net investment" is defined as follows:

" 'Net investment' in a project means the actual legitimate original cost thereof as defined and interpreted in the 'classification of investment in road and equipment, of steam roads, issue of 1914,' Interstate Commerce Commission, plus similar costs of additions thereto and betterments thereof, minus the sum of the following items properly allocated thereto, if and to the extent that such items have been accumulated during the period of the license from earnings in excess of a fair return on such investment: (a) unappropriated surplus, (b) aggregate credit balances of current depreciation accounts, and (c) aggregate appropriations of surplus or income held in amortization, sinking fund, or similar reserves, or expended for additions are betterments or used for the purpose for which such reserves were created."

From the above it is crystal clear that, in addition to providing a prior right of public development by either Federal, State, or municipal governments, together with the right of condemnation at any time or recapture for public operation at the conclusion of the license term, the authors of the Federal Water Power Act in 1920 were determined to set up every possible regulatory safeguard for the public interest in good service at the lowest possible rates.

To assure the Federal Power Commission the necessary accounting tools to enforce this strict regulation, section 4 (f) of the act authorizes and empowers the Commission, irrespective or whether or not the licensee is engaged in interstate commerce, to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of a system of accounts and for the maintenance thereof by licensees.

In this connection the Commission is further authorized and empowered "to examine all books and accounts of such licensees at any time; to require them to submit at such time or times as the Commission may require statements and reports, including full information as to assets and liabilities, capitalization, net investment, and reduction thereof, gross receipts, interest due and paid, depreciation and other reserves, cost of project, cost of maintenance, and operation of the project, cost of renewals and replacements of the project works, and as to depreciation of the project works and as to production, transmission, use, and sale of power; also to require any licensee to make adequate provision for currently determining said costs and other facts."

These illustrations from the Federal Power Act are sufficient to indicate the safeguards for the public interest which the authors of the Federal Power Act deemed it wise to throw around the private development of the Nation's hydroelectric resources, to provide power supply for a public service industry. These terms were hammered out of a period of consideration which extended over many years and had its roots in the conservation movement initiated by President Theodore Roosevelt.

Clearly, Congress then recognized that, in dealing with a source of power supply for a public service industry, it was dealing with something which involved the public interest beyond that associated with the ordinary commodity offered for sale by a variety of producers in a competitive market.

Use of the Nation's atomic-electric power resource by privately owned public utility corporations as a part of their power supply involves the public interest in at least the same degree, and legislative provision for the licensing of such use should include similar safeguards.

In short, arrangements for the use of the Nation's atomic energy resource to produce commercial electric power should be brought within the four walls of Federal power policy.

PROTECTION FOR NONPOWER FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITIES

This is not to ignore the fact that the use of atomic energy to produce electric power must be under legislation which also safeguards the relationship of such use to other aspects of atomic development, including those for which the Atomic Energy Commission must retain full responsibility. But, as I have already pointed out, the Federal Power Act is full of provisions which safeguard a corresponding responsibility of the United States Corps of Engineers for maintaining the navigability of the Nation's streams.

For instance, section 4 (d) of the Federal Power Act, authorizing and empowering the Federal Power Commission to issue licenses for hydroelectric power development, provides among other things, "that no license affecting the navigable capacity of any navigable waters of the United States shall be issued until the plans of the dam or other structures affecting navigation have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War."

Numerous other provisions of the act are designed to require the licensee to protect or enhance the navigability of the waterway affected by any proposed project. Section 18 is a case in point, which provides among other things, "that the operation of any navigation facilities which may be constructed as a part of or in connection with any dam or diversion structure built under the provisions of this act, whether at the expense of a licensee hereunder or of the United States, shall at all times be controlled by such reasonable rules and regulations in the interest of navigation, including the control of the level of the pool caused by such dam or diversion structure as may be made from time to time by the Secretary of War."

Corresponding provisions, including provisions to that effect in H. R. 8862, the bill before us, could safeguard the concern and responsibility of the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with what would otherwise be power-policy legislation.

PUBLIC COMPETITION AS AN ELEMENT IN THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

At the beginning of my discussion of the necessary legislative safeguards to protect the public interest in connection with the licensing of private development of a great public-energy resource, I stated that such protection would be inadequate if development is turned over predominantly to private-power systems, subject only to the normal processes of utility regulation. I now turn to the portion of my statement supporting that conclusion.

To present a full picture, it is necessary to discuss briefly two points: (a) the importance of keeping open the public or cooperative alternative as a supplement to regulation of privately owned power systems and (b) the necessity for the Federal Government to play a part in keeping that alternative open.

"The first point rests on the fact that regulation is not an effective substitute for competition in assuring people the maximum use of their resources at the lowest rates consistent with sound business principles.

The second rests on the fact that, without Federal assistance, modern power supply technology would ultimately enable far-flung private-power systems to strangle existing public and cooperative systems, as well as rendering new efforts to substitute public ownership practically impossible.

The result of failure to maintain the conditions which will keep the opportunity for public competition open will be a private monopoly so gigantic, with such a stranglehold on the American economy, as to threaten the dynamic character of our civilization.

Let me briefly support these general statements.

First, I will deal with the ineffectiveness of regulation. This was brought out by two well-known authorities at a symposium on power costs staged by the American Society of Civil Engineers in 1937. The speakers were Prof. Alden B. Thresher, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Vice President Leverett S. Lyon, of the Brookings Institution.

Thresher definitely attributed the direction taken in broadening Federal power policy during the 1930's to the inadequacy of regulation. He suggested that the accepted scheme of regulation in the United States is, by its very nature, static and ill-adapted to the economical and technical changes characteristic of the power industry. He said:

"It is more accurate, therefore, to regard the Federal power program, whatever its merits or defects, as a response to a long-standing maladjustment, not as a punishment meted out to malefactors. The machinery of State regulation is often said to have 'broken down.' More strictly speaking, it has always lagged behind the situation with which it strove to grapple. This was true even in the days of local power units, because of the rapid rate of technical change. It is doubly true now that regional interconnections extend over areas beyond the jurisdiction of regulative authorities."

Lyon attributed the introduction of the Federal yardstick policy to the lack of any satisfactory cost basis for fixing rates under regulation.

Lyon pointed out that in a competitive field, as contrasted with the monopolistic utility business, the costs of an individual company may have no direct relation to the prices at which it can sell its product; that it does high-cost companies no good to complain that their costs will not permit them to compete profitably; that, in such a situation a high-cost manufacturer has no choice but to forget part of his costs, closing his eyes to some of his fixed charges and accepting the fact that his investment is not worth as much as he thought it was.

He stated that a buyer should be in a position to purchase, at any time, at as low a price as anyone will offer, if the resources of the Nation are to be used so as to give the greatest possible output for the smallest possible input. He held that the theory that prices should cover costs is in conflict with this objective and provides no incentive to keep costs down.

Mr. Lyon then asserted that in the field of power, because it is a natural monopoly, the competitive method of price determination will not apply and that, since a monopoly cannot be trusted to create prices in the public interest, social regulation of rates has been established in every State. He continued:

"Since the commissions which have been given this responsibility have no competitive tests they have groped none too happily, in an effort to relate costs to prices. * * *

"It is the raising of such issues of costs as these which has introduced the now much-discussed yardstick as a proposed method of determining what prices should be. Of course, the so-called yardstick is not a new idea. Every method that can be applied to determining what prices shall be—even competition—is a yardstick; but the great extension of Government operations as a means of comparing costs does offer, in size at least, something new."

Putting the two statements together, we see that the inadequacy of utility regulation is due to the fact that (a) without competition it has no cost standards to go by and (b) it is static.

Just a word or two as to what is meant by the statement that regulation is static. Rate regulation has always proceeded mainly by determining whether a public-utility company is making more or less than a fair return on some rate base. This is determined in terms of an accounting analysis of the last full year for which complete figures are available. Thus, utility rates never reflect the lowering of costs which would result from enterprising sales objectives. Instead, it promotes a lazy monopoly attitude toward the business.

Most unit costs in the electric-power business come down rapidly as average consumption of electricity goes up. If a private power company would make rates based on such low costs and then put on a campaign to achieve the sales objectives which would make them profitable, we would have more justification for the privately owned segment of the power industry. I need only quote an editorial from Electrical World, the journal of the industry, to make clear what I mean. The McGraw Hill editor, writing in the June 26, 1943, issue, said:

"In a competitive business there is the same eagerness to secure a fair return on invested capital, but the approach is different. Return in competitive business comes from expansion of sales—from volume. * * *

"In a competitive business one does not start with a rate that will produce a return and struggle to build business at that price. Just the opposite; one sets a goal and then finds out what price is necessary to reach that figure. The costs are adjusted to make the price bring a return on the estimated volume.

"What is the difference? Just this, that growth under the monopolistic concept is necessarily slower than under the competitive concept. Rates in one case are protective of investment, while in the other they are volume creative."

Regulation does not produce these expansive results. Public or cooperative competition does.

Examples of the effect of actual or potential public competition in bringing down electric rates where regulation has failed show these things:

The lowest electric rates in the Northeast are in close proximity to the Ontario frontier on the other side of which are the low rates and large average consumption of the public Ontario hydroelectric system and become higher in proportion to the distance from the border.

The lowest rates in Ontario were for many years in Ottawa, where for a generation a private system operated in competition with the public system, maintained rates far lower than the TVA yardstick rates and consistently made 9 percent on its net investment.

The small public system in the borough of Westmount in Montreal, Canada, consistently pulled the rates down for customers of the entire Montreal Light, Heat & Power Co.

The Consolidated Edison Co., in New York City, blocked through court action a public service commission order to reduce rates, insisted it was entitled to rate increases, and then reduced rates when Mayor LaGuardia came forward with a complete plan for a municipal yardstick plant. The result was hailed as highly satisfactory by the company's chief executive.

The New York power companies all made drastic cuts in their charges for serving rural customers when the farmers of Seneca County, with the help of the New York Power Authority, prepared to go forward with a rural electric cooperative.

The decision of the city of Auburn, N. Y., to hold a referendum on the question of establishing a municipally owned system led to two rate reductions which the private company serving the city offered to its entire service area.

The 250-kilowatt-hour residential bills of the Central Illinois Light Co., go up from $5.22 in the vicinity of Springfield, Ill., where it competes with a well-managed municipal plant, to $5.78 some 60 miles away in Peoria, and again to $7, in DeKalb, Ill., 150 miles away from such competition.

The lowest electric bills charged by private companies in the country as a whole reflect the presence of competitive areas such as those served by TVA and Bonneville Power Administration.

Rural electric cooperatives secure their wholesale power supply from private companies influenced by the presence of public competition at about half the cost which similar cooperatives pay where there is no competition or threat of competition.

High average consumption reflects the same influence. The private companies stimulated by public competition are doing as well as or better than their fellows who are content with high rates and low use.

Finally, TVA's low-cost power supply to the Atomic Energy Commission stimulated the private power companies into devising new methods of financing power stations which will greatly reduce their power costs. Although, due to management problems, they are still unable to meet TVA rates, this offers an outstanding example of how public competition rather than regulation brings low electric rates.

This brief summary should be sufficient to suggest why public or cooperative competition must supplement regulation if the people are to have the widest use of electricity at the lowest possible rates.

Analysis of the evolution of the electric power industry makes the second point equally clear. By the end of 1882, the birth-year of central station electricity, there were already four publicly owned electric systems. By 1923 the number had reached more than 3,000, but dropped to 2,300 in 1927 and to around 2,000 in 1951.

Writing in 1929 on the Changing Character and Extent of Municipal Ownership in the Electric Light and Power Industry, Prof. H. B. Dorau, chairman of the department of public utilities of New York university, and sometime consultant to the Edison Electric Institute, commented on the decline. He said that the large-scale, centralized production of electricity, the development of long-distance transmission, and interconnection of central supply stations "appears to have been the most important condition affecting the character and extent of municipal ownership of electrical establishments."

In other words, the reduction in the number of publicly-owned electric systems following 1923 was not due to a change in public opinion but to the fact that small-scale local generating stations were ceasing to be an economical source of power supply as compared with great power supply networks linking together combinations of large generating plants. Until the Federal Government entered the power supply picture, as a partner with local municipal and cooperative systems, this meant that such community systems became increasingly dependent for their power supply on their private competitors and as a result were required to pay excessive rates for such supply.

This means that in the future the survival of effective public or cooperative competition will depend upon Federal or State assistance to communities in securing the low-cost power supply necessary to meet the expanding requirements which low electric rates stimulate and which are the true objectives of this public service.

In considering proposals for legislation to establish the conditions under which atomic-electric power is to be produced and marketed, it should be clear that the Federal Government must provide either for the construction of large scale atomic powerplants, interconnected with Federal river basin hydroelectric plants, or for the development of such economical small atomic powerplants as will provide municipalities or rural areas, which choose public or cooperative power, their supplies of energy at as low wholesale rates as would be possible from a publicly-owned interconnected system.

Only in this way can the people of this country get the returns to which they are entitled on their great investment in this new energy resource. For the dividends must come in the form of an abundance of electricity at the lowest possible rates. The people must have the opportunity to take advantage of the low fixed charges, associated with the use of their own credit, to secure the wholesale power supply required to meet the expanding needs of their public and cooperative systems.

This must be the interpretation placed on a statement made by Chairman Lewis L. Strauss of the Atomic Energy Commission, in the course of his April 28, 1954 speech in New York City. Addressing the Brand Names Foundation, he said:

"Do not infer from this that the sum spent on atomic energy is lost as is the case with most other expenditures.

"It is true the taxpayer has put up $11 billion thus far, but the American people now own a vast industrial complex which, at today's replacement value, is probably worth in excess of its cost. The major product which has been produced, that is to say

the fissionable material in atomic weapons, can be just as well used for power, if it is ever safe to do so—safe, that is, in the international political sense. It is not perishable. Viewed in this light, therefore, we have used our $11 billion to build a capital plant and to stockpile uranium 235, plutonium, and other special materials as enormous reserves which may ultimately return their cost to us—perhaps far more than that—in the production of economical electrical energy."

Mr. President, in order to get an idea of what yardstick rates would mean in savings to the Nation as a whole, I requested the Federal Power Commission early this year to make up a table for me of the sort that John Rankin, former Congressman from Mississippi, supplied for the RECORD, from Federal Power Commission statistics, once each year.

I got caught in the economy wave. My request to the Commission brought the reply that the Commission was trying to save money and that, therefore, this revealing table could not be prepared as it had been prepared in the past for the Congressman.

The best indication of the enormous sums that might be saved the people of this Nation if public power rates were prevalent everywhere are the 1950 statistics—the last that Congressman Rankin supplied us.

We know that electric power use has increased mightily since 1950. Mr. Rankin's tables show a total consumption of 370 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity in 1950. I introduced a table in the RECORD, compiled from Federal Power Commission reports, which shows that 1952 power consumption was 463 billion kilowatt-hours—an increase of close to 100 billion kilowatt-hours, or in the neighborhood of 25 percent. So the 1950 figures supplied to Congressman Rankin, and by him to Congress, may show potential savings that are far less—25 percent less—than the reality today.

But even the 1950 figures are stupendous. They show that for 1950 the estimated sales of electricity in the Nation were 280 billion kilowatt-hours (some was generated by industries for their own use). The electric customers were charged $5,086,000,000 for this power. The table then shows that if the customers had been able to buy this power at TVA rates, they would have paid only $2,626,000,000. And they would have saved $2,400,000,000.

If the electric consumers of the Nation had been able to get all this power at the rates charged in Tacoma, Wash., they would have paid $2,267,000,000 instead of $5,086,000,000. The savings would have been more than half, or $2,818,000,000. Remember, that is a municipal electric plant at Tacoma.

If the electric consumers of the Nation had been able to get their power at the rates charged by the great Bonneville Power Administration, they would have paid $3,064,000,000, with a savings of $2,022,000,000.

Or if they had lived in Ontario, Canada, where there is a great Provincial power authority, they would have paid $2,705,000,000 for the power instead of $5,086,000,000. Their saving would have been $2,380,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table reflecting these comparative rates by States printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE 1.—*Total electric sales, 1950*

State	Estimated sales data for 1950			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority [1]		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration [2]		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	725,075	6,995,918,000	$73,049,300	$45,893,184	$27,156,116	$38,453,937	$34,595,363	$52,771,786	$20,277,514	$47,959,017	$25,090,283
Arizona	203,846	1,667,592,000	27,056,400	13,588,111	13,468,289	12,143,478	14,912,922	16,232,327	10,824,073	14,133,391	12,923,009
Arkansas	465,181	2,065,118,000	39,257,000	21,147,085	18,109,915	17,912,560	21,344,440	24,501,203	14,755,797	22,186,421	17,070,579
California	3,667,001	23,234,462,000	373,889,500	256,355,298	117,534,202	218,284,203	155,605,297	297,816,297	76,073,203	269,068,994	104,820,506
Colorado	408,098	1,620,517,000	39,248,100	20,529,275	18,718,825	18,113,730	21,134,370	24,167,063	15,081,037	20,877,559	18,370,541
Connecticut	660,854	3,484,864,000	85,051,000	38,579,163	46,471,837	33,429,260	51,621,740	44,997,462	40,053,538	39,320,846	45,730,154
Delaware	101,525	591,065,000	12,828,500	5,645,415	7,183,085	4,905,222	7,923,278	6,600,654	6,227,846	5,793,843	7,034,657
District of Columbia [3]											
Florida	852,650	3,754,920,000	97,371,100	39,615,488	57,755,612	35,705,779	61,665,321	46,962,163	50,408,937	39,275,370	58,095,730
Georgia	823,224	4,879,843,000	84,834,400	45,283,831	39,550,569	39,914,588	44,919,812	53,176,851	31,657,549	45,577,653	39,256,747
Idaho	196,266	1,890,774,000	22,935,800	14,564,928	8,370,872	12,773,236	10,162,564	17,022,962	5,912,838	14,598,169	8,337,631
Illinois	2,653,133	17,306,945,000	340,098,900	170,311,173	169,787,727	145,084,098	195,014,802	197,868,627	142,230,273	177,536,588	162,562,312
Indiana	1,267,181	8,165,388,000	157,234,800	78,216,765	79,018,035	66,849,190	90,385,601	90,743,682	66,491,118	80,790,588	76,444,212
Iowa	849,577	3,499,536,000	85,420,600	40,882,949	44,537,651	35,806,524	49,614,066	47,826,730	37,593,870	41,343,290	44,077,310
Kansas	604,949	2,647,908,000	60,324,000	29,540,136	30,783,864	25,647,492	34,676,508	34,475,231	25,848,769	30,152,106	30,171,894
Kentucky	717,357	3,830,635,000	68,899,800	37,716,271	31,183,529	32,237,381	36,662,419	43,657,517	25,242,283	38,721,691	30,178,109
Louisiana	670,917	3,488,607,000	62,109,200	29,700,942	32,408,258	25,906,753	36,202,447	34,764,432	27,344,768	30,322,301	31,786,899
Maine	311,427	1,340,542,000	30,087,700	13,895,286	16,192,414	12,102,414	17,985,286	16,180,984	13,906,716	13,975,297	16,112,403
Maryland and District of Columbia	836,659	5,585,014,000	107,349,800	56,083,866	51,265,934	48,034,269	59,315,531	65,548,546	41,801,254	59,079,356	48,270,444
Massachusetts	1,533,260	6,534,798,000	174,177,500	74,144,968	100,032,532	63,533,515	110,643,985	85,925,028	88,252,472	76,027,683	98,149,817
Michigan	1,993,871	13,241,267,000	263,052,000	122,864,464	140,187,536	107,458,670	155,593,330	143,951,439	119,100,561	124,566,596	138,485,404
Minnesota	971,404	4,057,338,000	102,861,700	48,948,420	53,913,280	43,058,490	59,803,210	57,282,755	45,578,945	48,962,994	53,898,706
Mississippi	449,514	1,617,056,000	35,530,300	17,984,797	17,545,503	15,823,539	19,706,761	21,064,126	14,466,174	18,044,799	17,485,501
Missouri	1,179,436	5,477,229,000	113,015,500	60,253,099	52,762,401	52,803,055	60,212,445	70,811,568	42,203,932	61,552,511	51,462,989
Montana	181,282	2,351,265,000	24,824,300	14,909,028	9,915,272	12,647,874	12,176,426	17,249,414	7,574,886	15,506,837	9,317,463
Nebraska	403,416	1,513,151,000	35,304,300	19,200,892	16,103,408	17,215,447	18,088,853	22,666,226	12,638,074	18,984,307	16,319,993
Nevada	49,616	449,668,000	7,427,900	3,750,060	3,677,840	3,380,897	4,047,003	4,485,771	2,942,129	3,843,011	3,584,889
New Hampshire	198,639	831,435,000	20,386,800	9,609,194	10,777,606	8,301,846	12,084,954	11,167,184	9,219,616	9,723,346	10,663,454
New Jersey	1,602,970	8,023,122,000	189,160,500	84,523,403	104,637,097	73,313,697	115,846,803	98,725,614	90,434,886	86,714,864	102,445,636
New Mexico	166,775	643,10,000	16,359,600	7,037,044	9,322,556	6,993,511	10,066,089	8,328,583	8,031,017	7,076,859	9,282,741
New York	4,790,289	26,266,922,000	540,279,400	231,010,654	309,268,746	206,261,865	334,017,535	275,264,415	265,014,985	237,394,063	302,885,337
North Carolina	1,048,053	6,401,531,000	102,365,198	58,437,639	43,927,559	49,617,649	52,747,549	67,482,258	34,882,940	60,420,506	41,944,692
North Dakota	166,088	479,559,000	17,332,300	7,175,516	10,156,784	6,646,746	10,685,554	8,578,200	8,754,100	6,846,262	10,486,038
Ohio	2,475,250	19,318,066,000	336,846,400	171,244,838	165,601,562	145,359,931	191,486,469	198,235,975	138,610,425	178,386,562	158,459,838
Oklahoma	641,175	2,292,417,000	54,766,500	27,603,955	27,162,545	23,890,887	30,875,613	32,199,061	22,567,439	28,315,924	26,450,576
Oregon	503,182	5,903,567,000	58,999,700	42,006,751	16,992,949	37,064,060	21,935,640	49,322,570	9,677,130	42,213,519	16,786,181
Pennsylvania	3,137,845	23,747,217,000	425,310,200	212,915,349	212,394,851	178,766,532	246,543,668	245,528,714	179,781,486	223,288,998	202,021,202
Rhode Island	258,423	1,135,797,000	30,301,800	12,993,828	17,307,972	11,064,066	19,237,734	15,044,126	15,257,674	13,477,690	16,824,110
South Carolina	504,618	3,082,218,000	46,638,002	27,062,338	19,575,664	22,997,277	23,640,725	31,275,787	15,362,215	27,937,719	18,700,283
South Dakota	178,870	513,191,000	17,330,600	6,699,996	10,630,604	6,156,146	11,174,454	8,004,004	9,326,596	6,515,556	10,815,044
Tennessee	824,339	10,236,478,000	84,450,400	64,972,139	19,478,261	55,459,902	28,990,498	75,051,016	9,399,384	66,230,563	18,219,837
Texas	2,124,857	10,625,148,000	207,066,700	109,494,036	97,572,664	95,175,000	111,891,700	128,531,724	78,534,976	113,521,652	93,545,048
Utah	200,816	1,066,684,000	19,860,000	11,388,785	8,471,215	9,973,952	9,886,048	13,290,905	6,569,095	11,379,602	8,480,398
Vermont	124,895	511,574,000	13,427,800	6,280,526	7,147,274	5,432,001	7,995,799	7,292,193	6,135,607	6,354,285	7,073,515
Virginia	811,003	4,324,771,000	85,169,200	43,919,067	41,250,133	38,414,634	46,724,566	51,479,896	33,689,304	44,591,325	40,577,875
Washington	760,026	13,018,717,000	92,180,600	69,039,364	23,141,236	60,173,369	32,007,231	80,803,127	11,377,473	70,232,172	21,948,428
West Virginia	522,903	4,420,396,000	67,486,600	34,020,496	33,466,104	28,012,093	39,474,507	38,916,369	28,570,231	36,220,358	31,266,242
Wisconsin	1,106,656	6,075,079,000	128,734,400	64,933,550	63,800,850	56,575,450	72,158,950	76,160,221	52,574,179	66,816,241	61,918,159
Wyoming	81,903	329,735,000	8,772,900	4,030,695	4,742,205	3,665,346	5,107,554	4,810,884	3,962,016	4,026,768	4,746,132
United States total	44,986,294	280,538,654,000	5,086,465,000	2,626,004,057	2,460,460,943	2,267,871,580	2,818,593,420	3,064,243,670	2,022,221,330	2,705,886,052	2,380,578,948

[1] Based on rates applicable in Tupelo, Miss.
[2] Based on rates applicable in McMinnville, Oreg.
[3] Included in Maryland data.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the figures I have just given are the overall figures, composed of the varying rates paid by residential consumers, commercial consumers and industrial consumers combined.

The breakdown in these potential savings is important, for they reflect the amount of overcharges paid by our homeowners, by big and little business houses, and by factories.

The residential consumers—37½ million of them—paid a total of $1,931,000,000 for electricity during the year. If they had been able to get that power at the Tennessee Valley rates, it would have cost them only $1,015,000,000. The savings would have been $915 million.

At Tacoma, Wash., rates, the residential users would have paid $950 million for their electricity and saved $950 million. Again, I remind Senators that Tacoma is a municipal plant.

At Bonneville Power Administration the residential users of the Nation would have paid $1,830,000,000 instead of $1,931,000,000. They would have saved $748 million.

If they had lived in Ontario, Canada, the residential users would have been billed $848 million and they would have saved $1,083,000,000.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the table on residential rates by States printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TABLE 2.—*Residential electric service, 1950*

State	Estimated sales data for 1950			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority [1]		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration [2]		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	556,857	1,166,277,000	$24,847,900	$15,902,656	$8,945,244	$14,883,892	$9,964,008	$18,511,686	$6,336,214	$13,268,779	$11,579,121
Arizona	173,375	351,972,000	10,008,900	4,824,290	5,184,610	4,514,014	5,494,886	5,614,993	4,393,907	4,023,578	5,985,322
Arkansas	329,347	377,354,000	14,215,400	6,951,331	7,264,069	6,510,653	7,704,747	8,088,563	6,126,837	5,799,883	8,415,517
California	2,932,202	5,054,935,000	130,238,200	82,831,495	47,406,705	77,621,967	52,616,233	96,506,506	33,731,694	69,156,484	61,081,716
Colorado	322,752	513,639,000	16,494,200	8,692,443	7,801,757	8,131,641	8,362,559	10,127,439	6,366,761	7,257,448	9,236,752
Connecticut	577,552	1,057,759,000	32,763,300	16,348,887	16,414,413	15,300,461	17,462,839	19,035,477	13,727,823	13,629,533	19,133,767
Delaware	86,562	138,653,000	5,156,200	2,232,635	2,923,565	2,093,417	3,062,783	2,603,881	2,552,319	1,861,388	3,294,812
District of Columbia [3]											
Florida	734,750	1,425,248,000	45,869,100	19,953,059	25,916,041	18,714,593	27,154,507	23,255,634	22,613,466	16,650,483	29,218,617
Georgia	731,207	1,520,584,000	36,799,900	20,939,143	15,860,757	19,614,347	17,185,553	24,398,334	12,401,566	17,479,953	19,319,947
Idaho	161,944	651,737,000	11,090,000	6,864,710	4,225,290	6,432,200	4,657,800	8,006,980	3,083,020	5,733,530	5,356,470
Illinois	2,173,401	3,570,825,000	100,885,700	59,997,592	49,888,108	56,261,478	53,624,222	69,997,191	39,888,509	50,107,879	59,777,821
Indiana	1,044,074	1,955,688,000	57,442,600	29,525,496	27,917,104	27,629,891	29,812,709	34,408,117	23,034,483	24,642,875	32,799,725
Iowa	667,929	1,147,551,000	39,072,200	18,207,645	20,864,555	17,074,551	21,997,649	21,216,205	17,855,995	15,199,086	23,873,114
Kansas	479,936	698,370,000	25,230,000	12,362,700	12,867,300	11,580,570	13,649,430	14,406,330	10,823,670	10,319,070	14,910,930
Kentucky	590,136	877,791,000	26,444,500	15,046,921	11,397,579	14,094,919	12,349,581	17,532,704	8,911,796	12,561,138	13,883,362
Louisiana	570,439	694,593,000	25,363,900	12,225,400	13,138,500	11,439,119	13,924,781	14,229,148	11,134,752	10,196,288	15,167,612
Maine	265,289	408,758,000	14,344,000	6,368,736	7,975,264	5,967,104	8,376,896	7,430,192	6,913,808	5,321,624	9,022,376
Maryland and District of Columbia	686,293	1,129,629,000	34,076,400	17,871,338	16,205,062	16,713,470	17,362,930	20,813,571	13,262,829	14,895,029	19,181,371
Massachusetts	1,333,498	1,714,244,000	67,790,100	29,556,484	38,233,616	27,726,151	40,063,949	34,437,371	33,352,729	24,675,596	43,114,504
Michigan	1,751,669	3,581,400,000	101,759,600	53,729,069	48,030,531	50,269,242	51,490,358	62,582,154	39,177,446	44,875,984	56,883,616
Minnesota	812,260	1,517,036,000	47,422,300	23,568,883	23,853,417	22,051,370	25,370,930	27,457,512	19,964,788	19,680,255	27,742,045
Mississippi	365,558	567,795,000	16,362,900	8,426,894	7,936,006	7,903,281	8,459,619	9,817,740	6,545,160	7,036,047	9,326,853
Missouri	975,399	1,483,819,000	44,872,100	21,993,760	19,878,340	23,378,364	21,493,736	29,121,993	15,750,107	20,865,527	24,006,573
Montana	156,186	378,135,000	10,216,000	5,342,968	4,873,032	5,005,840	5,210,160	6,231,760	3,984,240	4,464,392	5,751,608
Nebraska	332,391	600,549,000	18,080,100	9,907,895	8,172,205	9,275,091	8,805,009	11,535,104	6,544,996	8,262,606	9,817,494
Nevada	39,579	168,370,000	3,205,600	1,503,426	1,702,174	1,407,258	1,798,342	1,753,463	1,452,137	1,256,595	1,949,005
New Hampshire	172,709	265,021,000	9,353,900	4,265,378	5,088,522	3,994,115	5,359,785	4,976,275	4,377,625	3,563,836	5,790,064
New Jersey	1,382,187	1,980,454,000	71,132,800	33,788,080	37,344,720	31,654,096	39,478,704	39,336,438	31,796,362	28,168,589	42,964,211
New Mexico	140,728	207,703,000	7,569,300	3,232,091	4,337,209	3,027,720	4,541,580	3,761,942	3,807,358	2,694,671	4,874,629
New York	4,075,226	5,703,095,000	199,192,300	92,624,420	106,567,880	86,648,651	112,543,649	107,763,034	91,429,266	77,286,612	121,905,688
North Carolina	876,795	1,534,512,000	40,967,596	21,794,761	19,172,835	20,401,863	20,565,733	25,358,942	15,608,654	18,189,613	22,777,983
North Dakota	140,021	257,236,000	9,834,200	4,445,058	5,389,142	4,159,867	5,674,333	5,182,623	4,651,577	3,707,493	6,126,707
Ohio	2,075,875	3,919,420,000	112,122,100	60,321,690	51,800,410	56,397,416	55,724,684	70,188,435	41,933,665	50,342,823	61,779,277
Oklahoma	520,378	576,222,000	24,[illegible]08,000	11,041,464	13,066,536	10,342,333	13,765,668	12,873,672	11,234,328	9,233,364	14,874,636
Oregon	423,089	1,998,211,000	29,022,200	19,357,807	9,664,393	18,109,853	10,912,347	22,550,249	6,471,951	16,136,343	12,885,857
Pennsylvania	2,658,905	4,456,001,000	143,349,100	70,527,757	72,821,343	65,940,586	77,408,514	82,139,034	61,210,066	58,773,131	84,575,969
Rhode Island	225,674	262,205,000	11,078,300	4,763,669	6,314,631	4,464,555	6,613,745	5,550,228	5,528,072	3,977,110	7,101,190
South Carolina	422,169	738,839,000	18,665,004	10,265,752	8,399,252	9,612,477	9,052,527	11,964,268	6,700,736	8,567,237	10,097,767
South Dakota	146,743	240,020,000	9,014,900	3,763,228	5,246,672	3,533,841	5,481,059	4,399,271	4,615,629	3,146,200	5,868,700
Tennessee	737,974	2,476,824,000	36,606,500	27,235,236	9,371,264	25,514,731	11,091,769	31,774,442	4,832,058	22,732,637	13,873,863
Texas	1,701,700	2,320,854,000	78,855,300	40,137,348	38,717,952	37,535,123	41,320,177	46,761,193	32,094,107	33,513,503	45,341,797
Utah	180,809	403,553,000	9,413,800	5,488,245	3,925,555	5,139,935	4,273,865	6,391,970	3,021,830	4,575,107	4,838,693
Vermont	103,310	175,748,000	6,540,800	2,760,218	3,780,582	2,583,616	3,957,184	3,218,074	3,322,722	2,302,362	4,238,438
Virginia	687,575	1,272,834,000	36,576,700	19,019,884	17,556,816	17,812,853	18,763,847	22,165,480	14,411,220	15,874,288	20,702,412
Washington	651,012	3,061,426,000	39,432,900	29,732,407	9,700,493	27,839,627	11,593,273	34,661,519	4,771,381	24,803,294	14,629,606
West Virginia	426,588	568,820,000	19,290,100	9,625,760	9,664,340	9,008,477	10,281,623	11,207,548	8,082,552	8,924,682	11,265,418
Wisconsin	862,828	1,736,137,000	46,311,300	25,471,215	20,840,085	23,850,320	22,460,980	29,685,543	16,625,757	21,256,887	25,054,413
Wyoming	69,678	122,581,000	4,207,600	1,939,704	2,267,896	1,817,683	2,389,917	2,259,481	1,948,119	1,619,926	2,587,674
United States total	37,532,549	67,030,427,000	1,931,695,800	1,015,782,028	915,913,772	950,984,621	980,711,179	1,183,289,709	784,406,091	847,710,758	1,083,985,042

[1] Based on rates applicable in Tupelo, Miss.
[2] Based on rates applicable in McMinnville, Oreg.
[3] Included in Maryland data.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, now we come to the commercial electric service rates—the rate charged stores and businessmen.

There were 5,466,000 customers in this class. They paid out $1,333,000,000 for their year's supply of electric current.

If these businessmen had been in the Tennessee Valley they would have paid $580 million for their electricity and saved $753 million, on which they could have paid their own income taxes. Instead, the power companies paid the income taxes on the $753 million, but only after they had collected the taxes from the businessmen.

If these businessmen could have had electricity at the same rates as charged by the municipal plant at Tacoma, Wash., the cost would have been $554 million and they would have saved $779 million.

In the Bonneville service area, the cost would have been $744 million and the savings $589 million.

Over in Ontario, the cost would have been $608 million and the savings $665 million.

I have been using round figures in my comparisons. The tables, actually compiled at the Federal Power Commission for Representative Rankin, give the statistics in much greater detail, so I ask that the commercial table be printed in the RECORD at this point, showing these comparisons by States, as well as totals for the United States.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 3.—*Commercial electric service, 1950*

State	Estimated sales data for 1950			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority [1]		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration [2]		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	62,013	521,231,000	$10,948,200	$6,185,733	$4,762,467	$5,912,028	$5,036,172	$7,959,341	$2,988,859	$7,160,123	$3,788,077
Arizona	28,247	752,053,000	11,075,500	5,294,089	5,781,411	5,061,504	6,013,996	6,789,282	4,286,218	1,102,601	4,972,899
Arkansas	45,350	357,285,000	10,086,400	4,175,770	5,910,630	3,984,128	6,102,272	5,345,792	4,740,608	4,811,213	5,275,187
California	544,696	4,460,981,000	100,264,100	56,950,009	43,314,091	54,343,142	45,920,958	72,691,473	27,572,627	65,271,929	34,992,171
Colorado	49,138	517,515,000	12,611,400	5,649,907	6,961,493	5,397,679	7,213,721	7,213,721	5,397,679	6,469,648	6,141,752
Connecticut	78,397	637,649,000	21,487,000	7,692,346	13,794,654	7,348,554	14,138,446	9,884,020	11,602,980	8,874,131	12,612,869
Delaware	12,758	143,373,000	3,619,600	1,317,534	2,302,066	1,259,621	2,359,979	1,686,734	1,932,866	1,512,993	2,106,607
District of Columbia [3]											
Florida	109,602	972,225,000	32,843,300	11,396,625	21,446,675	10,871,132	21,972,168	14,582,425	18,260,875	13,071,633	19,771,667
Georgia	89,257	981,814,000	24,672,700	10,584,588	14,088,112	10,091,134	14,581,566	13,569,985	11,102,715	12,188,314	12,484,386
Idaho	25,376	284,473,000	5,518,200	2,979,828	2,538,372	2,841,873	2,676,327	3,802,040	1,716,160	3,410,248	2,107,952
Illinois	322,323	2,528,369,000	81,370,500	33,361,905	48,008,595	31,815,866	49,554,634	42,882,254	38,488,246	38,569,617	42,800,883
Indiana	141,975	1,196,688,000	32,734,700	14,894,289	17,840,411	14,206,860	18,527,840	19,051,595	13,683,105	17,120,248	15,614,452
Iowa	109,324	665,079,000	21,000,900	9,114,391	11,886,509	8,694,373	12,306,527	11,655,500	9,345,400	10,479,449	10,521,451
Kansas	71,945	485,509,000	15,103,500	6,222,642	8,880,858	5,950,779	9,152,721	7,974,648	7,128,852	7,159,059	7,944,441
Kentucky	70,177	512,777,000	13,603,500	6,339,231	7,264,269	6,053,558	7,549,942	8,121,290	5,482,210	7,291,476	6,312,024
Louisiana	76,713	683,498,000	19,599,700	7,153,891	12,445,809	6,820,696	12,779,004	9,133,460	10,466,210	8,192,675	11,407,025
Maine	37,965	225,709,000	6,809,400	2,621,619	4,187,781	2,499,050	4,310,350	3,336,606	3,472,794	2,989,327	3,820,073
Maryland and District of Columbia	105,842	942,437,000	26,263,800	14,059,948	12,203,852	13,417,310	12,846,490	18,073,357	8,190,443	16,250,263	10,013,537
Massachusetts	185,773	998,670,000	38,969,100	13,171,556	25,797,544	12,548,050	26,421,050	16,834,651	22,134,449	15,081,042	23,888,058
Michigan	217,630	2,425,046,000	68,777,700	28,336,412	40,441,288	27,029,636	41,748,064	36,314,626	32,463,074	32,600,630	36,177,070
Minnesota	112,963	832,244,000	26,856,500	10,259,183	16,597,317	9,802,623	17,053,877	13,132,829	13,723,671	11,790,004	15,066,496
Mississippi	42,439	366,727,000	9,446,300	3,939,107	5,507,193	3,759,627	5,686,673	5,044,324	4,401,976	4,524,778	4,921,522
Missouri	137,618	1,290,453,000	33,469,100	15,529,662	17,939,438	14,826,811	18,642,289	19,914,115	13,554,985	17,905,969	15,563,131
Montana	21,813	218,721,000	5,290,600	2,587,103	2,703,497	2,470,710	2,819,890	3,311,916	1,978,684	2,973,317	2,317,283
Nebraska	53,163	440,316,000	10,219,100	4,935,825	5,283,275	4,711,005	5,508,095	6,325,623	3,893,477	5,692,039	4,527,061
Nevada	8,803	190,336,000	3,169,000	1,448,233	1,720,767	1,381,684	1,787,316	1,850,696	1,318,304	1,663,725	1,505,275
New Hampshire	22,117	123,394,000	4,168,200	1,650,607	2,517,593	1,575,580	2,592,620	2,113,277	2,054,923	1,896,531	2,271,669
New Jersey	210,823	1,630,075,000	52,688,800	18,915,279	33,773,521	18,072,258	34,616,542	24,236,848	28,451,952	21,760,474	30,528,326
New Mexico	19,947	202,906,000	5,477,800	2,108,953	3,368,847	2,010,353	3,467,447	2,695,078	2,782,722	2,421,188	3,056,612
New York	691,447	8,242,425,000	221,126,500	79,605,540	141,520,960	76,067,516	145,058,984	102,602,696	118,523,804	92,209,751	128,915,749
North Carolina	99,499	827,593,000	19,778,799	9,632,275	10,146,524	9,197,142	10,581,657	12,282,634	7,496,165	11,016,791	8,762,008
North Dakota	24,304	166,989,000	6,183,100	2,170,268	4,012,832	2,071,339	4,111,761	2,776,212	3,406,888	2,491,789	3,691,311
Ohio	275,373	2,516,527,000	67,984,100	31,612,607	36,371,493	30,184,940	37,799,160	40,586,508	27,397,592	36,507,462	31,476,638
Oklahoma	71,487	462,455,000	13,751,700	5,995,741	7,755,959	5,720,707	8,030,993	7,659,697	6,092,003	6,875,850	6,875,850
Oregon	63,545	1,100,187,000	15,493,500	10,163,736	5,329,764	9,698,931	5,794,569	12,983,553	2,509,947	11,651,112	3,842,388
Pennsylvania	405,007	2,906,121,000	83,564,500	34,261,445	49,303,055	32,673,720	50,890,780	43,954,927	39,609,573	39,526,009	44,038,491
Rhode Island	30,423	173,433,000	6,686,500	2,400,454	4,286,046	2,286,783	4,399,717	3,062,417	3,624,083	2,768,211	3,918,289
South Carolina	47,907	398,470,000	9,011,301	4,433,560	4,577,741	4,226,300	4,785,001	5,659,097	3,352,204	5,073,362	3,937,939
South Dakota	26,297	192,542,000	6,307,800	2,100,497	4,207,303	2,005,880	4,301,920	2,687,123	3,620,677	2,409,580	3,898,220
Tennessee	77,756	815,135,000	13,444,300	9,357,233	4,087,067	8,927,015	4,517,285	11,938,538	1,505,762	10,715,107	2,729,193
Texas	248,782	2,707,303,000	63,751,600	29,198,233	34,553,367	27,859,449	35,892,151	37,422,189	26,329,411	33,597,093	30,154,507
Utah	17,906	186,368,000	4,722,200	2,162,768	2,559,432	2,063,601	2,658,599	2,771,931	1,950,269	2,488,599	2,233,601
Vermont	14,035	96,419,000	2,756,700	1,124,734	1,631,966	1,072,356	1,684,344	1,430,727	1,325,973	1,284,622	1,472,078
Virginia	88,687	970,831,000	24,181,000	10,301,106	13,879,894	9,817,486	14,363,514	13,202,826	10,978,174	11,848,690	12,332,310
Washington	811,132	1,452,914,000	21,712,600	15,068,544	6,644,056	14,395,454	7,317,146	19,389,352	2,323,248	17,435,218	4,277,382
West Virginia	57,559	322,518,000	9,361,500	4,278,206	5,083,294	4,090,976	5,270,524	5,495,201	3,866,299	4,933,511	4,427,989
Wisconsin	121,205	1,190,562,000	32,511,000	16,353,033	16,157,967	15,605,280	16,905,720	20,969,595	11,541,405	18,856,380	13,654,620
Wyoming	9,643	129,364,000	3,281,800	1,391,483	1,890,317	1,329,129	1,952,671	1,778,736	1,503,064	1,598,237	1,683,563
United States total	5,466,181	50,445,709,000	1,333,755,100	580,487,728	753,267,372	554,051,628	779,703,472	744,181,465	589,573,635	668,522,018	665,233,082

[1] Based on rates applicable in Tupelo, Miss.
[2] Based on rates applicable in McMinnville, Oreg.
[3] Included in Maryland data.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the final category is the great industrial users.

These comparisons in terms of full employment, in terms of a good economy and abundance, are very important. As power becomes an important cost factor, it determines whether or not an industry can be started, or stay in business, or compete with other like enterprises. These comparisons are very significant in terms of stimulation of industrial activity—or discouragement of industrial activity. It should be remembered that some great industries generate their own electricity—they do not buy. It is indicated that about 65 billion kilowatt-hours were produced in the year in question, 1950, by industries for their own use.

The remaining power-buying industries actually paid in 1950 $1,821,000,000 for electric energy. Had they had the advantage of TVA rates, it would have cost them only $1,029,000,000. They would have saved $791 million and they could have paid their own income taxes on that, instead of the power companies.

If all these industries had enjoyed the rates charged by the Tacoma, Wash., municipal plant, they would have paid only $762 million for power, and they would have saved $1,058,000,000—around 60 percent of all the money they paid out for electric energy.

If the industries had been in the Bonneville area, getting their power at Bonneville rates, it would have cost them $1,136,000,000, and they would have saved $684 million.

Over in Ontario, their cost would have been $1,189,000,000, and their savings would have been $631 million.

I ask unanimous consent that the industrial comparisons be printed in the RECORD at this point, so that Senators may study the figures for their own States.

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

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services, 1950*

State	Estimated sales data for 1950			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority [1]		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration [2]		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings
Alabama	106,205	5,308,410,000	$37,253,200	$23,804,795	$13,448,405	$17,658,017	$19,595,183	$26,300,759	$10,952,441	$27,530,115	$9,723,085
Arizona	2,224	563,567,000	5,972,000	3,469,732	2,502,268	2,567,960	3,404,040	3,828,052	2,143,948	4,007,212	1,964,788
Arkansas	90,484	1,330,479,000	14,955,200	10,019,984	4,935,216	7,417,779	7,537,421	11,066,848	3,888,352	11,575,325	3,379,875
California	190,103	13,718,546,000	143,387,200	116,573,794	26,813,406	86,319,094	57,068,106	128,618,318	14,768,882	134,640,581	8,746,619

[1] Based on rates applicable in Tupelo, Miss.
[2] Based on rates applicable in McMinnville, Oreg.

TABLE 4.—*Industrial and other electric services, 1950*—Continued

State	Estimated sales data for 1950			Estimated revenues and consumer savings if services were rendered under basic rates in effect in—							
	Number of customers	Kilowatt-hours	Revenues	Area served by Tennessee Valley Authority [1]		Tacoma, Wash.		Area served by Bonneville Power Administration		Ontario, Canada	
				Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings	Revenues	Savings [2]	Revenues	Savings
Colorado	36, 208	589, 363, 000	$10, 142, 500	$6, 186, 925	$3, 955, 575	$4, 584, 410	$5, 558, 090	$6, 825, 903	$3, 316, 597	$7, 150, 463	$2, 992, 037
Connecticut	4, 905	1, 789, 456, 000	30, 800, 700	14, 537, 930	16, 262, 770	10, 780, 245	20, 020, 455	16, 077, 965	14, 722, 735	16, 817, 182	13, 983, 518
Delaware	2, 205	309, 039, 000	4, 052, 700	2, 095, 246	1, 957, 454	1, 552, 184	2, 500, 516	2, 310, 039	1, 742, 661	2, 419, 462	1, 633, 238
District of Columbia [2]											
Florida	8, 298	1, 357, 447, 000	18, 658, 700	8, 265, 804	10, 392, 896	6, 120, 054	12, 538, 646	9, 124, 104	9, 534, 596	9, 553, 254	9, 105, 446
Georgia	2, 760	2, 377, 445, 000	23, 361, 800	13, 760, 100	9, 601, 700	10, 209, 107	13, 152, 693	15, 208, 532	8, 153, 268	15, 909, 386	7, 352, 414
Idaho	8, 946	954, 564, 000	6, 327, 600	4, 720, 390	1, 607, 210	3, 499, 163	2, 828, 437	5, 213, 942	1, 113, 658	5, 454, 391	873, 209
Illinois	137, 409	11, 207, 751, 000	148, 842, 700	76, 951, 676	71, 891, 024	57, 006, 754	91, 835, 946	84, 989, 182	63, 853, 518	88, 859, 092	59, 983, 608
Indiana	81, 132	5, 013, 012, 000	67, 057, 500	33, 796, 980	33, 260, 520	25, 012, 448	42, 045, 052	37, 283, 970	29, 773, 530	39, 027, 465	28, 030, 035
Iowa	72, 324	1, 686, 906, 000	25, 347, 500	13, 560, 913	11, 786, 587	10, 037, 610	15, 309, 890	14, 955, 025	10, 392, 475	15, 664, 755	9, 682, 745
Kansas	53, 068	1, 464, 029, 000	19, 990, 500	10, 954, 794	9, 035, 706	8, 116, 143	11, 874, 357	12, 094, 253	7, 896, 247	12, 673, 977	7, 316, 523
Kentucky	57, 044	2, 440, 067, 000	28, 851, 800	16, 330, 119	12, 521, 681	12, 088, 904	16, 762, 896	18, 003, 523	10, 848, 277	18, 869, 077	9, 982, 723
Louisiana	23, 765	2, 110, 516, 000	17, 145, 600	10, 321, 651	6, 823, 949	7, 646, 938	9, 498, 662	11, 401, 824	5, 743, 776	11, 933, 338	5, 212, 262
Maine	8, 173	706, 075, 000	8, 934, 300	4, 904, 931	4, 029, 369	3, 636, 260	5, 298, 040	5, 414, 186	3, 520, 114	5, 664, 346	3, 269, 954
Maryland and District of Columbia	44, 524	3, 512, 948, 000	47, 009, 600	24, 152, 580	22, 857, 020	17, 903, 489	29, 106, 111	26, 661, 618	20, 347, 982	27, 934, 064	19, 075, 536
Massachusetts	13, 989	3, 821, 884, 000	67, 418, 300	31, 416, 928	36, 001, 372	23, 259, 314	44, 158, 986	34, 653, 006	32, 705, 294	36, 271, 045	31, 147, 255
Michigan	24, 572	7, 234, 821, 000	92, 514, 709	40, 798, 983	51, 715, 717	30, 159, 792	62, 354, 908	45, 054, 659	47, 460, 011	47, 080, 982	45, 424, 718
Minnesota	46, 181	1, 708, 058, 000	28, 582, 900	15, 120, 354	13, 462, 546	11, 204, 497	17, 378, 403	16, 692, 460	11, 890, 486	17, 492, 735	11, 090, 165
Mississippi	41, 517	682, 534, 000	9, 721, 100	5, 618, 796	4, 102, 304	4, 160, 631	5, 560, 469	6, 202, 062	3, 519, 038	6, 483, 974	3, 237, 126
Missouri	66, 419	2, 702, 957, 000	34, 674, 300	19, 729, 677	14, 944, 623	14, 597, 880	20, 076, 420	21, 775, 460	12, 898, 840	22, 781, 015	11, 893, 285
Montana	3, 283	1, 754, 409, 000	9, 317, 700	6, 978, 957	2, 338, 743	5, 171, 324	4, 146, 376	7, 705, 738	1, 611, 962	8, 069, 128	1, 248, 572
Nebraska	17, 862	472, 286, 000	7, 005, 100	4, 357, 172	2, 647, 928	3, 229, 351	3, 775, 749	4, 805, 499	2, 199, 601	5, 029, 662	1, 975, 438
Nevada	1, 234	90, 962, 000	1, 053, 300	798, 401	254, 899	591, 955	461, 345	881, 612	171, 688	922, 691	130, 609
New Hampshire	3, 813	443, 020, 000	6, 864, 700	3, 693, 209	3, 171, 491	2, 732, 151	4, 132, 549	4, 077, 632	2, 787, 068	4, 262, 979	2, 601, 721
New Jersey	9, 960	4, 412, 593, 000	65, 338, 900	31, 820, 044	33, 518, 856	23, 587, 343	41, 751, 557	35, 152, 328	30, 186, 572	36, 785, 801	28, 553, 099
New Mexico	6, 100	233, 001, 000	3, 312, 500	1, 696, 000	1, 616, 500	1, 255, 438	2, 057, 062	1, 871, 563	1, 440, 937	1, 961, 000	1, 351, 500
New York	23, 616	12, 321, 402, 000	119, 960, 600	58, 780, 694	61, 179, 906	43, 545, 698	76, 414, 902	64, 898, 685	55, 061, 915	67, 897, 700	52, 062, 900
North Carolina	71, 759	4, 039, 426, 000	41, 618, 803	27, 010, 603	14, 608, 200	20, 018, 644	21, 600, 159	29, 840, 682	11, 778, 121	31, 214, 102	10, 404, 701
North Dakota	1, 763	55, 334, 000	1, 315, 000	560, 190	754, 810	415, 540	899, 460	619, 365	695, 635	646, 980	668, 020
Ohio	124, 002	12, 882, 119, 000	156, 740, 200	79, 310, 541	77, 429, 659	58, 777, 575	97, 962, 625	87, 461, 032	69, 279, 168	91, 536, 277	65, 203, 923
Oklahoma	49, 310	1, 253, 740, 000	16, 906, 800	10, 566, 750	6, 340, 050	7, 827, 848	9, 078, 952	11, 665, 692	5, 241, 108	12, 206, 710	4, 700, 080
Oregon	16, 548	2, 805, 169, 000	14, 484, 000	12, 485, 208	1, 998, 792	9, 255, 276	5, 228, 724	13, 788, 768	695, 232	14, 426, 064	57, 936
Pennsylvania	73, 933	16, 385, 095, 000	198, 396, 600	108, 126, 147	90, 270, 453	80, 152, 226	118, 244, 374	119, 434, 753	78, 961, 847	124, 989, 858	73, 406, 742
Rhode Island	2, 326	700, 159, 000	12, 537, 000	5, 829, 705	6, 707, 295	4, 312, 728	8, 224, 272	6, 431, 481	6, 105, 519	6, 732, 369	5, 804, 631
South Carolina	54, 551	1, 944, 909, 000	18, 961, 697	12, 363, 026	6, 598, 671	9, 158, 500	9, 803, 197	13, 652, 422	5, 309, 275	14, 297, 120	4, 664, 577
South Dakota	5, 830	80, 629, 000	2, 007, 900	831, 271	1, 176, 629	616, 425	1, 391, 475	917, 610	1, 090, 290	959, 776	1, 048, 124
Tennessee	8, 609	6, 944, 519, 000	34, 399, 600	28, 379, 670	6, 019, 930	21, 018, 156	13, 381, 444	31, 338, 036	3, 061, 564	32, 782, 819	1, 616, 781
Texas	174, 375	5, 596, 991, 000	64, 459, 800	40, 158, 455	24, 301, 345	29, 780, 428	34, 679, 372	44, 348, 342	20, 111, 458	46, 411, 056	18, 048, 744
Utah	2, 101	476, 763, 000	5, 724, 000	3, 737, 772	1, 986, 228	2, 770, 416	2, 953, 584	4, 127, 004	1, 596, 996	4, 315, 896	1, 408, 104
Vermont	7, 550	239, 407, 000	4, 130, 300	2, 395, 574	1, 734, 726	1, 776, 029	2, 354, 271	2, 643, 392	1, 486, 908	2, 767, 301	1, 362, 999
Virginia	34, 741	2, 081, 106, 000	24, 411, 500	14, 598, 077	9, 813, 423	10, 814, 295	13, 597, 205	16, 111, 590	8, 299, 910	16, 868, 347	7, 543, 153
Washington	27, 882	8, 504, 377, 000	31, 035, 100	24, 238, 413	6, 796, 687	17, 938, 288	13, 096, 812	26, 752, 256	4, 282, 844	27, 993, 660	3, 041, 440
West Virginia	38, 756	3, 529, 058, 000	38, 835, 000	20, 116, 530	18, 718, 470	14, 912, 640	23, 922, 360	22, 213, 620	16, 621, 380	23, 262, 165	15, 572, 835
Wisconsin	122, 623	3, 148, 380, 000	49, 912, 100	23, 109, 302	26, 802, 798	17, 119, 850	32, 792, 250	25, 505, 083	24, 407, 017	26, 702, 974	23, 209, 126
Wyoming	2, 582	77, 790, 000	1, 283, 500	699, 508	583, 992	518, 534	764, 966	772, 667	510, 833	808, 605	474, 895
United States total	1, 987, 564	163, 062, 518, 000	1, 821, 014, 100	1, 029, 734, 301	791, 279, 799	762, 835, 331	1, 058, 178, 769	1, 136, 772, 496	684, 241, 604	1, 189, 653, 276	631, 360, 824

[1] Included in Maryland data.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, many Senators will remember John Rankin, of Mississippi. He was for public power. He knew the value of yardstick rates to the economy of his own home town of Tupelo, Miss.; and he was unselfish about it. He wanted the whole Nation to have the advantage of low rates; he wanted the whole Nation to enjoy the economic well-being that low rates had stimulated in his home country.

John Rankin was not a Socialist. He will be remembered as the very vigorous chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee for many years.

When Mr. Rankin put these tables in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD several years ago, he had some very vigorous things to say. I should like to read a few paragraphs of his statement at that time:

Both the enemies of the TVA and the Columbia River development are always shouting socialism when they refer to public power.

The truth of the business is that the power business is public business. Electricity has become a necessity of our modern life, and it must be handled by a monopoly. It would be an absolute waste of money to have a half-dozen concerns supplying electricity to the same city, town, or community. The overhead charges would be so great the people could not pay them.

I want to get electricity to every farmhouse that can be reached by the draft of wartimes, or that the tax collector can find in times of peace. As late as 1933, less than 10 percent of our farmers even had an electric light. We now have more than 85 percent of our farms electrified. The farmers of this Nation, their wives and children, are enjoying conveniences, and are living on standards, of which they never dreamed 50 years ago.

But the opposition tells us that this is socialism, and that we should turn all the waterpower of this Nation and our rural electrification programs over to the Power Trust and give the private-power interests complete control.

I predict that if the Congress goes to sleep and lets the Power Trust get a monopoly in this country, the rates will skyrocket by leaps and bounds, and the chances are that many farmers will have the electricity taken out of their homes, just as was done by the telephone monopoly when it got control.

John Rankin will long be remembered for his valiant fights for adequate power for the people of America. His predictions of higher power rates if the utilities ever gained a monopoly have been proved true, even without their taking over the yardsticks.

Recently I read an illuminating article by Judson King, whom many of us know as the long-time Director of the National Popular Government League—a man who has devoted a useful lifetime to power for the people. In the article, Mr. King finds that public-power systems—the 2,400 municipal plants and the great public projects—have kept their rates down in recent years, while the great monopoly power companies have been increasing rates.

Mr. King wrote:

For many years now—30 that I can easily recall—the American people have been assured of the superiority of "privately owned but publicly regulated" power systems over municipal and Government systems. Of late the cordial radio spokesman for the companies, who accompanies Corliss Archer and her boy friend in their romantic adventures, constantly informs us that electric service is the cheapest thing in the family budget.

I am possessed of a trustful disposition, hence it was disconcerting when studying the annual statistical number of Electrical World (Jan. 17), voice of the private industry, to come across a page titled "Regulation" and filled with tables which, when analyzed, showed that during the past 6 years State commissions had made 333 "grants" to private companies which upped private rates to a total annual collection by around $316 million.

More specifically, the "known" increases from 1948 to 1953, inclusive, were $216 million. It is not out of line to add $100 million for the 123 "unknown," hence the above figure. There were 34 applications pending as of December 31, of which the 24 "known" totaled $52 million and if we add a modest $20 million for the 10 "unknown" we have a further uppage of around $72 million in 1954.

My curiosity was aroused. For years it has been legendary that public rates have been far below private rates as a general

rule. But expenses had gone up, perhaps rates had also. Calling up the editor of Public Power, I was promptly informed that with minor exceptions there had been no such general increase in retail rates among the 2,400 municipal plants of the Nation. Official reports and personal inquiry disclosed the same fact respecting Federal and State power systems, public power districts, and the REA co-ops.

Then the question came: Why this startling contrast? It lay, of course, principally in two different systems of finance. Public systems set rates to meet fixed charges and operating expense on the actual cash spent on the projects and to amortize the investment; private systems in the past have been found to contain watered stock, and even today none of them amortize.

I reflected that for a quarter-century and longer private utility spokesmen had been warning us against the Federal Government increasing the national debt by spending the money of the Nation's taxpayers on projects like TVA, leaving the distinct impression that no repayments were being made, and that millions of people believe this shameless falsehood.

I began to wonder how much the United States Treasury had gotten back on these so-called "spending sprees." I put the question to a top expert in the Department. He replied that no such cumulative figure was available. It was a huge amount, but would take weeks to figure it.

Blocked there, I sought a few samples to get some idea of the amount of actual cash entered on the books as repayments. Following are official figures on four projects much in the headlines:

Tennessee Valley Authority: "In the fiscal year (June 30, 1953), TVA paid $10 million into the United States Treasury general fund and retired $5 million in bonds, bringing total repayments of power investment to more than $81 million. * * * TVA is ahead of schedule on repayments." (Annual report, p. 9.) A statement on January 15, 1954, showed the grand total from power proceeds to be $93,600,000. But, in addition, $214 million of said power proceeds, not tagged "repayments," had been plowed back into new construction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 6 minutes more.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I read further from the article by Mr. King:

Columbia River power system: Repayment of the Federal investment in the power system continues well ahead of schedule. Total cash receipts of $292,782,000 returned to the Treasury through June 30, 1953, have covered operation and maintenance expenses of $74,865,000 and interest expense of $72,060,000, leaving $145,857,000 repaid on the capital investment * * * 19.6 percent of the power capital investment on the Columbia Basin project. (1953 report, p. 11.)

Boulder Canyon project: The repayment record for the Boulder Canyon project shows that for the 15-year period through May 31, 1952, approximately $70,456,000 has been repaid to the United States Treasury. * * * This is, of course, after paying operation and maintenance expenses of $35,380,000 and payments to the States of Arizona and Nevada and to the Colorado River Development Fund, totaling $16,500,000. (Special statement by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.)

Rural Electrification Administration: As of January 1, 1954, the amount due from 1,079 borrowers stood at $407,100,000. Total repaid, $468,500,000. That is, the farmers are $61,400,000 ahead of contract requirements. (Official figures not yet printed. See also Statistical Bulletin No. 152, October 1953.)

So, right there I had a handy figure and could say to any doubting Thomas: "Don't let them kid you. These 4 projects alone, each of which has been operating less than 20 years, have already returned $443,200,000; all will be repaid within 40 years from the dates the various plants began functioning. If you don't believe it, ask Lindsay Warren's boys at the United States General Accounting Office. They audit the books."

Now, although statistics are not as interesting as radio music or love stories or magazine ads, bear with me a little longer. Thirty years ago I learned from research experts in Ontario that an electrified home would enable a housewife to do her work in one-half the time and with one-third the bone labor she would expend without such aid. Since I have always been interested in the Nation's health problem and home security, I verified this statement by many interviews with housewives and it remains fixed in memory.

So, when scanning the 1952 report of the Ontario hydroelectric power system, which began operating in 1910 with 14 municipalities connected, I found that a large majority of the 324 now connected were out of debt. This public system has been amortizing for over 40 years. And what are the benefits to consumers from the effects of amortization, and the absence of watered stock and other antics of business managers too numerous to mention? Well, 20 years ago, in 1934, the average industrial and commercial costs were already less than one-half our private costs, and domestic service had dropped below 2 cents per kilowatt-hour, when our national average stood at 7.4 cents. Further, since 1946 the domestic average has been at 1.04 cents or less for the Province, but many of the largest and longest connected places reported the domestic average to be from 6 to 9 mills.

Turning to the 1952 Statistical Bulletin of the Edison Electric Institute (p. 43), I found that American railroads were paying private companies 1.05 cents—that is 10.5 mills—to run their trains and shops, with large industries also at 1.05 cents. The residential average stood at 2.77 cents.

There emerged the startling fact that many thousands of Canadian housewives are paying less for service from their public system than American railroads and big industries pay private utilities.

How about the United States? We are on our way. Years ago when investigating the how and why of low Ontario rates I used to say to their engineers: "Our Government power systems when in operation will soon catch up with you." The prediction is coming through faster than I expected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time the Senator alloted himself has expired. The Senator has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. MURRAY. I will yield to myself 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I continue with the quotation:

For example, last year homemakers in the cities and towns of the Tennessee region paid an average of 1.3 cents per kilowatt-hour for electricity; out on the Columbia, 1.34 cents; down on the Colorado, 2.1 cents. As to farmers, the national average for REA co-ops was already down to 3.4 cents; for TVA farmers, 2 cents, with 1 cent as the fighting objective of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, for all America, which is why they fight for cheap Government wholesale power.

The human side of the picture is this: Two hundred and fifty kilowatt-hours will partially and 500 kilowatt-hours will fully electrify the average home, exclusive of heating. Many millions of middle-class and low-income families can afford that service when the costs are from $3 to $5 per month, but the lady of the house cannot balance her budget if she has to pay from $8 to $15. What this means to the health, happiness, culture, and security of the family and the Nation, our many public and private health agencies should sharply consider.

Balance-sheet minds which think only in terms of dollar profits will complain that this article does not tell the whole story. True. It would be worse for them if it did, including the truth about taxes. Kindly remember that I set out to demonstrate three things only: Private rates are going up by millions; public rates remain relatively stable, and Uncle Sam is getting his money back. Done.

Finally, the American people might reflect that when all municipal and Federal powerplants are amortized and rates are still lower, that they have paid and will continue to pay to kingdom come dividends on the $25 billion which enterprising gentlemen claim to have invested in privately owned electric facilities today.

In closing, Mr. President, I want to pay tribute to a Member of the House of Representatives who is entitled to the gratitude of every citizen of this land.

That is Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, of California.

Congressman HOLIFIELD has done a stupendous job of analyzing, of debating, of seeking modifications—and getting some of them—and of informing the public about this Atomic Energy Act.

I believe that the work he has done, supported by Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, has been one of the outstanding jobs I have seen in my career in the Congress. Regardless of self, he has burned the lights into the early mornings to keep informed, to gather information, to see that this legislation, which may prove one of the most important acts in all the history of our economy, received the consideration it deserves.

Few men have worked as hard in this session of the Congress as the Congressman from California. Few men have given of themselves as CHET HOLIFIELD has given of his great talents.

Someday the people of America will do the honor he deserves to the man who for days and weeks and even months fought this fight ceaselessly. It has been a historic fight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum cannot be called unless one of the Senators controlling the remaining time is willing to yield for that purpose.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. If the Senator from Montana cares to have a quorum call in the remaining minutes he has, I will yield sufficient of my time to complete the calling of the quorum, but I do not want the quorum call taken entirely out of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield the remainder of his time? There are 5 minutes remaining, I believe, of the time of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield from my time whatever may be necessary to complete the quorum call if the remaining time of the Senator from Montana is not sufficient.

Mr. MURRAY. I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Can I ask for a quorum call and ask unanimous consent to have it all taken out of our time?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask unanimous consent that there be a quorum call to be taken out of the time of neither side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Anderson	Gore	McCarran
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bowring	Hennings	Murray
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Neely
Burke	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Reynolds
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kennedy	Smathers
Crippa	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Kuchel	Stennis
Duff	Langer	Symington
Dworshak	Lehman	Thye
Eastland	Lennon	Upton
Ervin	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams
George	Martin	Young
Goldwater	Maybank	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PAYNE in the chair). A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Iowa yield to himself?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield myself 15 minutes.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SOIL CONSERVATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield 1 minute to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the text of a statement issued by the legislative committee of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts, Southeastern Area, made at Panama City, Fla., July 12, 1954, by W. M. Hodgson, chairman; and also the text of a pamphlet entitled the "Why, What, and How of Soil Conservation Districts."

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

STATEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS, SOUTHEASTERN AREA, PANAMA CITY, FLA., JULY 12, 1954

Your legislative committee reviewed pending and needed State and Federal legislation to help soil-conservation districts exercise more fully their responsibilities for conservation, development, and self-government. Your committee also considered carefully the authenticated reports that the so-called Missouri balanced-farming plan is being proposed for other States. The committee concluded from the evidence available that the Missouri balanced-farming plan was instigated to prevent the organization of the farmers' own soil-conservation districts.

Grave concern also was expressed because the Secretary of Agriculture has not yet announced the appointment of the Advisory Soil Conservation Committee which he mentioned at our national association convention in New Orleans.

Your committee asks that our southeastern vice president, A. D. Holmes, Jr., be instructed to send immediately the following telegram to Secretary of Agriculture Benson:

"Southeastern area meeting of soil-conservation districts here yesterday and today deeply concerned lest the nationwide adoption of Missouri's balanced-farming plan become acutely competitive with and a costly duplication of our program. Also wondering about current status Soil Conservation Advisory Committee mentioned by you at New Orleans convention February 23 and to our board of directors at Washington on May 7. Would appreciate your early and frank reply to both points, addressed to me at Gallion, Ala."

Passed by convention without dissenting vote July 13, 1954.

W. M. HODGSON,
Chairman.

BAY MINETTE, ALA.

THE WHY, WHAT, AND HOW OF SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

OUR FIGHT

Do you know what soil-conservation districts are?

And what we are fighting for?

Almost 200 years ago, Americans in 13 colonies organized a Revolution and fought King George III.

In World War I we fought the German Kaiser and imperialism.

Not long ago we fought Mussolini and fascism.

We fought Hitler and the Nazi idea.

Now we are fighting again—against the Communist aggression that threatens us from both the East and West.

From the beginning, Americans have fought for a great principle—the principle that freemen can govern themselves successfully, without a dictator, king, or fuhrer. We have fought and are still fighting for personal liberty and the dignity of the individual. We are determined that our families shall have the opportunity to live in peace and safety, without threats of violence or fear of compulsion.

Our Government is founded on the principle that we—all of us together—have the spirit and the ability to decide for ourselves the actions we want to take together in our joint interest and common welfare. This is what we fight for. This is a representative self-government—the best government and the best society that men and women have ever enjoyed on earth. This is the kind of government and society that offers the greatest advantages in personal liberty and the greatest opportunities for accomplishment.

This is the form, the spirit, and the practice of soil-conservation districts.

Freemen can govern themselves

Americans have decided they want to protect their land and water resources. But there is no man in Washington who can order all the people to apply modern soil-conservation measures. So we have organized ourselves, freely and voluntarily, to do the job according to the principle of self-government in watersheds, counties, and communities all over the country.

Our organization is the soil-conservation district—free, local, representative self-government in the best tradition of America.

The farmers and ranchers of a soil-conservation district decide for themselves what they want to do in their district about soil and water conservation, when they want to do it, where they want to do it, who they want to help them, and how they want to do it.

Freemen can organize

A soil-conservation district is organized by the citizens of a watershed, county, or community under the provisions of State law. It is a subdivision of the State government. But the soil-conservation district is not directed by the governor, the State legislature, or any agency of the State government. And it is not directed by the Federal Government in any way.

A soil-conservation district is directed only by the citizens of the district—the landowners and operators who organized it in the first place. Through an elected governing body, usually called a board of district supervisors, composed of citizens of the district, they direct and manage their own soil-conservation programs and affairs.

The soil-conservation district is American self-government.

And the right to continue American self-government is one of the great rights for which we work and fight and sacrifice. It is one of the rights Americans have died for in the past and now, again, are defending with their lives and all their resources.

WHY SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS?

Never have the people of a free country faced a greater challenge to their resourcefulness and ability than the challenge of soil and water conservation. Here is a real test of self-government.

Our land and water resources, as we know, are the very foundation of our fabulous industrial and agricultural strength. They are the principal source of our wealth. Our great cities, with all their complex activities, are dependent directly on these resources. Our material standard of living—highest on earth—is built largely on the abundance and fruitfulness of American land and water.

Over the years, though, our use of these resources has been accompanied by accelerated soil erosion, ruinious floods, sedimentation of our reservoirs and harbors, and other forms of severe damage to land and water. Our agricultural productive capacity has been reduced by this damage—and is still being reduced. It now costs us more—more in fertilizer, seed, machinery, equipment, and labor—to produce a bushel of wheat or a bale of cotton than it did before we hurt our land.

Modern farming methods and new plant varieties, like hybrid corn, are holding our production at high levels, it is true. But what if we had not damaged our land? Modern developments would have brought us unparalleled increases in production per acre and per farm at litle rise in cost. If we do not stop damaging our land and water resources, our very ability to produce adequately for our ever-increasing needs will be threatened. Most certainly the cost of production will go up and up.

Some alternatives

With so much at stake, the temptation was to use the power of the Federal Government, or the State governments, to compel the control of erosion and put a halt to excessive

land and water exploitation. There are still people in the country who say we should—people who say the job is so urgent and so important we cannot afford to wait for the process of self-government to function.

But in all parts of the country there were farmers and ranchers who said they were both willing and able to take on the job. Soil-conservation leaders in Washington and elsewhere agreed they should. There was a certain amount of experience to indicate they would. And always there was the fact that in a free country like America, the farmers and ranchers themselves own the land they cultivate and graze. Still, the alternatives of State or Federal Government on the one hand, or responsible, local self-government on the other, remained.

Time for decision

In the early 1930's, the pyramid of mounting soil erosion, floods, and land damage was topped by monstrous dust storms, sweeping soil from the Plains over large areas of the country. Coupled with the depression, thousands of farm families were faced with poverty and forced to move.

By the middle 1930's, the time for decision grew near. Conservation leaders studied the wind-erosion-control districts of Texas and the grazing districts of Montana. They studied the Miami and Muskingum Conservancy Districts of Ohio. They analyzed the experience of the Soil Conservation Service with its early erosion-control projects and the Civilian Conservation Corps camp areas. Everywhere it was apparent that really effective soil-conservation work was done faster and better when the farmers themselves took a large and active part in the job. Where Government men did the job, farmers didn't understand what was being done or why. And when the Government men left, the farmers didn't maintain the work.

Out of all this experience the soil-conservation-district idea was born. The men most concerned with conservation realized that as long as land was used by free people, the people themselves must organize to use it safely and permanently. They understood that, though the soil of America is of concern to all Americans, no agency of government—even one with police powers—could bring proper land use to our farms, forests, and ranges. State and Federal agencies could help, but the users of the land themselves would have to shoulder a heavy part of the burden.

Enabling legislation

With these ideas in mind, on February 26, 1937, President Roosevelt wrote the governors of all the States. He asked that each State legislature pass enabling acts permitting, but not forcing, local land owners and occupiers to join together legally into soil-conservation districts. With that letter he enclosed what was called "A Standard State Soil Conservation Districts Law." None of the States passed the standard law verbatim; they made modifications to suit local conditions, and many of them have since been amended.

By May 1947, each of the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, had passed laws permitting, by vote of the local people, the formation of soil-conservation districts. By 1951, 2,330 soil-conservation districts had been organized. They covered more than 75 percent or America's farmland.

This phenomenal growth is a tribute to the basic concepts of soil-conservation districts—that our land must be kept permanently productive and the people themselves must assume the main responsibility for doing the job.

WHAT ARE SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS?

Erosion has a chain of reactions. Soil washes off a field and finally piles up in a reservoir behind a manmade dam. A gully creeps up the slope without regard to fences, property lines, county lines, or State lines. Dust from a bare field buries a neighbor's wheat. Water rushes off overgrazed pastures to flood the land and towns below.

The only American answer to these problems is for people to cooperate in their solution. The machinery for such cooperation is a soil-conservation district.

The wording of the laws permitting the formation of soil-conservation districts varies from State to State. But the State laws do follow a general pattern. The administration of the laws is in the hands of State soil-conservation committees, boards, or commissions. The men who make up these committees are usually State agricultural department heads, or active farmers or ranchers, or both. They receive no Federal funds nor are they under any form of Federal control.

How districts are formed

To form a soil-conservation district, a group of farmers or ranchers petitions the State committee. The petition gives the need for the formation of the district and its proposed boundaries. The State committee then holds public hearings to decide if there is enough local interest to form a successful district. If the State committee finds that many local people want a district, it holds a referendum. This referendum is similar to any other special election. Each landowner and operator is entitled to vote "yes" or "no" on whether he wants a district. If enough vote "yes," the district is established. It is granted a certificate of organization by the State. It then becomes a unit of government similar to counties, cities, and drainage or irrigation districts.

An important difference between soil-conservation districts and other units of government is that districts nowhere have the power of eminent domain. And only in Colorado and California may they levy taxes.

Funds for operating soil-conservation districts come from State appropriations and voluntary contributions from interested citizens or groups. Some districts develop other sources, such as the renting of machinery.

More than half of the States have provisions in their laws permitting districts to adopt land-use regulations. Opponents of soil-conservation districts distort these possible regulations out of all reason. In every instance, they are self-regulations. They can be adopted only by the people of the district themselves. The people vote on the exact wording of the proposed regulations. And they vote only after public hearings. The people themselves have the power to say how the land shall be treated just as they have the power to mortgage themselves by bond issues. So far, land-use regulations have been adopted by the people in only a few districts in three States. But the right to adopt them is in more than half of the State laws for use when and if the people believe they are needed.

How districts are governed

Soil-conservation districts are governed by local citizens. The members of the governing bodies are called supervisors in most States. In some their title is commissioner or director. Generally, supervisors donate their time and pay their own expenses. In some States they do receive a small per diem and travel allowance out of local or State funds. In no case are they on the Federal payroll.

Most State laws provide that each soil-conservation district shall have five supervisors. The usual provision is that 3 shall be elected locally and 2 appointed by the State soil-conservation committee. The supervisors must be local citizens. Uusually they must also be active landowning farmers or ranchers.

Through their district governing body, local people formulate their own soil-conservation program. This governing body—usually called a board of supervisors—directs the activities of the district. It also coordinates the conservation efforts of various State and Federal agencies and other organizations. Where funds permit district-owned equipment, the governing body controls the use of it. The governing body also handles the district's money and signs the checks.

In brief, soil-conservation districts are a true example of local self-government. The people of a community join together voluntarily and legally to solve their own problems in their own way.

HOW SOIL-CONSERVATION DISTRICTS OPERATE

After the governing body of a new soil-conservation district takes office, it appoints and calls together committees of farmers. These committees make studies of the agricultural and economic conditions within the district. They get the advice and assistance of Government and private agencies. Then they develop their own plan of action.

Reports of these committees are published as the district's program and plan of work. Since no two districts are exactly alike, the programs and plans all differ from each other. But each of them represents the opinions and plans of the local people. And each can be amended by the local people when they see the need.

How districts get technical assistance

Soil-conservation districts soon discover that the successful management of land is closely related to water management. They also discover that both present problems that only skilled technicians can solve. To secure the needed technical assistance, soil-conservation districts normally apply to the United States Department of Agriculture for the facilities of the Soil Conservation Service. The Soil Conservation Service furnishes technical help to the district on the basis of an agreement with the governing body. This agreement includes a promise that Soil Conservation Service technicians will be removed from a district on 60 days' notice from the governing body. This provision protects soil-conservation districts from bureaucratic control. But so far it has never been necessary to invoke this safeguard.

In addition to Soil Conservation Service technical assistance, districts get educational and other kinds of help from other local, State, Federal, and private sources. Each has its place in helping the work of the district.

The application for assistance

The district furnishes assistance only to farmers or ranchers who apply for it. The application is made to the district governing body. The way of granting this assistance is a matter for the district to decide. In the interest of efficiency, applications for individual farmers or ranchers are tabled by some districts until groups of them have an opportunity to join together. Other districts give first priority to areas in critical need of protection from floods. Such decisions are made by the district governing bodies in the best interests of whole districts.

The land-capability inventory

After the district governing body approves a farmer's application, it requests the Soil Conservation Service to make a scientific inventory of the farmer's land. This is done by a specially trained, experienced technician. On an aerial photograph of the farm, he makes a map that shows the soil, slope, degree of erosion, land use, and other important physical features. Using this inventory, the farmer and the farm conservation planner of the Soil Conservation Service together work out a conservation plan for the farm. They decide how each field, pasture, and woodlot should be treated and managed to conserve the land and at the

same time accomplish the most desirable, sustained production.

The cooperative agreement

The conditions shown by the land inventory, what the farmer or rancher agrees to do about them, and what help the district will supply are all written down on what is known as a cooperative agreement. It is also the farm or ranch conservation plan. Each has a copy of the photographic map and a map showing what conservation work the farmer or rancher intends to do over his entire unit. Such an agreement becomes effective only after the approval of the district governing body. The only ones who sign the cooperative agreement are the landowner and operator and the offices of the district. There is no compulsion involved. The district agrees to furnish the technical help to carry out the conservation practices. These are the practices the farmer or rancher himself says he needs to protect and improve his land. If he doesn't do his part, the district simply cancels his name off the list of those receiving assistance. That is the only penalty involved.

These complete farm and ranch conservation plans are becoming more and more popular every year. On January 1, 1951, more than 851,000 were in effect on more than 237,800,000 acres. Another 200,000 farmers and ranchers, owning about 60 million acres, were then on the waiting list of soil conservation districts. The limited facilities of the Soil Conservation Service are all that prevent their land and millions of other acres from being benefited by this detailed planning and application of scientific conservation measures.

Why are Districts popular?

There are two main reasons for the tremendous demand for the facilities of soil conservation districts—pride and profit. Farmers and ranchers are fast becoming ashamed to own a gully or a blowing sand dune. They are as proud of the new conservation agriculture as their wives are of new kitchens with all the modern equipment.

And these modern soil conservation farming programs put money in the farmers' and ranchers' bank accounts. Crop, grazing, and timber yields of soil conservation district cooperators have increased about 35 percent, on the average, while production costs have generally declined. Then, too, farming scientifically according to the conservation plan saves money for the owner by insuring that the practices are applied correctly the first time. There is no need to pay for costly mistakes caused by bad guesses.

Through soil conservation districts the landowners of America are keeping the land in good, productive condition to meet the requirements of their country in war and peace—and also for future generations. They are protecting the very base of their own and the Nation's prosperity.

In the years ahead soil conservation districts offer America the greatest opportunity it has had in modern times to strengthen its ideal of self-government and solve at the same time one of the most fundamental problems—the protection of its vital land and water resources.

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana is purely, simply, and entirely an amendment designed to put the Federal Government exclusively into the production of power from atomic sources from now on.

It would exclude private enterprise from participating in this venture, and would make the Federal Government the sole producer and sole dispenser of electricity generated from atomic sources.

Unfortunately, the amendment is not printed, and therefore is not on the desks of Senators. But I call the attention of the Senate to its provisions. It provides for the creation of an electric power liaison committee, consisting of a chairman and representatives from the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwest Power Administration, the Southeast Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and such other Government agencies as the President may, from time to time, determine.

The amendment then provides that the committee shall consult, investigate, and pass on to other Government agencies information in connection with the allocation of nuclear material and of such other things necessary for the production of electric power, especially nuclear material used in connection with atomic weapons.

The amendment simply opens to the complete domination by the Federal Government of the whole electric power field, to the exclusion, Mr. President, of any private venture or the American private-enterprise system. There is no provision in the amendment for any representation of the American private-enterprise system in the group which will preempt and take over this great field.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield.

Mr. BUSH. Does not the Senator think the amendment is highly restrictive, in that it provides that the Atomic Energy Commission shall advise and consult with other Government agencies through this committee? In other words, the amendment is literally so worded as to take away from the Atomic Energy Commission the privilege of consultation with other agencies of the Government, and to require that the Commission shall discuss such matters only through the proposed committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from Connecticut is exactly correct.

I have had Members tell me that they thoroughly misunderstood the provisions of the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], an amendment which put the Atomic Energy Commission into the business of commercial power production.

So that there may be no mistake about it, the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana is a complete and exclusive public-power amendment. If the amendment shall be adopted and remain in the bill, the Federal Government will be the exclusive producer of power from atomic sources from this time forward. So that there may be no misunderstanding about the issue, that will be the effect of the amendment.

Mr. President 1 or 2 Members on this side of the aisle have asked me to yield time. This is all I shall have to say about the amendment. I have stated what it will accomplish, when it is uncloaked, unmasked, and its bare bones are laid out.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 10 minutes to me?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. After I have made a final statement, I shall be prepared to yield for as long as Senators desire to speak; and then I shall yield back the remainder of my time. I do not wish to foreclose any Senator who opposes the amendment from having adequate time to discuss it.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, the statement by the distinguished Senator from Iowa about the amendment causes me to read to the Senate an editorial entitlel "Socialization's Filibuster," published in the Detroit Free Press of Saturday, July 24, 1954, as follows:

SOCIALIZATION'S FILIBUSTER

Socialism versus private enterprise is the stake in the Senate filibuster over the administration's atomic-energy bill.

Those opposing the administration want atomic energy for civilian purposes kept as a Government monopoly. Further, they don't want any private power producer to compete with the TVA in supplying electricity to Government atomic-energy plants.

Oratory about giving away something which belongs to the public is sheer demagoguery. Atomic power represents nothing whatever but conversion of a raw material to a useful product. It is as senseless to say that this particular branch of manufacture should be a Federal monopoly as it is to insist that wheat be milled to flour only by the Government, or steel smelted only in Government furnaces.

Nor does that fact that atomic energy was first evolved as a weapon in Government nuclear arsenals have any bearing. The issue today is not a military application of atomic energy but a vast new source of power—something capable of bettering the lot of man just as have steam, electricity, and internal combustion.

To say that because it emerged under Government auspices demands that it be kept there in all its aspects is as illogical as to insist that better growing processes discovered by the Department of Agriculture must not be used by farmers, but applied only on some kind of a system of Federal farms.

That is sheer nonsense. It also is sheer nonsense to say that fundamentally the Senate fight is anything but a conflict between exponents of a socialization not a whit different than Britain's socializing of steel and those who comprehend democracy's reliance upon private initiative for survival in a world drifting left.

Apparently we never learn the lessons of history. We have had in this country for the past 20 years a whole series of adventures in Government action. Prior to January 1953, during the preceding 20 years, the heart of these adventures was the gradual moving of Government in Washington into the control of the economic life of our Nation. I am sure many perfectly well-intentioned and patriotic Americans believe that there is something good in all this, and they think also that it is something new.

History, Mr. President, shows that it is neither good nor new.

I am certain that most Americans would be surprised to be told that what we have been doing in the United States in the past 20 years is almost precisely what was done in Germany between 1870 and 1914. It was done by Bismarck. Bismarck was no Socialist. But it is one of the curiosities of history that socialism in its early stages is promoted and advanced often by conservative elements who are foolish enough to suppose that they are engaged in reform, that they are bringing about something new. They do not realize that they are going back to the feudal system, when they are actually engaging in creeping, reactionary revolution.

At the end of the Franco-Prussian War Germany was sitting on top of the world in a sense. For once in history a nation emerged from a war without a debt. Germany got from France an indemnity which equalled 4 billion marks and Bismarck after uniting the German States into an empire set out for business with money in the bank. But about this time the great Marxian revolution began to express itself in Germany more than any place else. The Socialist movement worried Bismarck. Indeed it worried him so much that he actually declared that he, the arch conservative and reactionary, could do all the things that the Socialists could do and do them better. As a result, he took over the railroads of Prussia. The other German States began to acquire their own railroads. The cities took over the street railways, the electric powerplants and Bismarck himself in Prussia acquired either for Prussia or for the empire a dozen different industries operated by the government. Here was the great reactionary statesman actually pushing Germany into socialism on the incredible theory that he was saving it from the Socialists.

But even this was not enough to satisfy the appetities he had created. He could not produce jobs for all, as he said, and to do this he turned to militarism. Most people imagine that Germany went in for conscription—universal military service—because the Germans loved arms and the military. They did but Bismarck's real reason for promoting militarism was to provide jobs—jobs for all as he promised. There were several hundred thousand men in the army instead of being idle and there were five times as many men employed in the armament industry all of which had to be paid for with taxes. Many people think that militarism in Germany was the dream child of the Junkers—the soldiers—the warriors. Actually, every attempt made to cut down appropriations in Bismarck's Germany for military purposes was opposed most furiously by the farmers. There was a reason for this. The reason for this was because the biggest arm of the military was the cavalry and the farmers supplied the horses and the feed and every attempt made to cut down on this was opposed by the farmers. Militarism became the big business of Germany and when the Czar of Russia proposed disarmament and Bismarck sent the proposal to the Kaiser he wrote across it, "who will hire Krupp's men?"

But to do all these things Germany which started out without a debt had to go into debt year after year until 1913 dawned—the year before the war—the Finance Commission of Germany warned the Kaiser that Germany's debt was threatening Germany with bankruptcy and that no subject could be discussed without debating the terrible problem of the debt.

The result was that as has happened over and over again in history. The monarchs and the statesmen, trapped into fiscal and unemployment problems and the crushing debts of their nations and not knowing which way to turn, have turned to war as an escape. However, the point I am trying to make is that in every country in Europe, including England and France, most of the spade work for the coming of socialism has been done by men who are not really Socialists—who did not realize the gravity of what they were doing—who would never vote for socialism but who were perfectly willing either out of good hearts or for political results to add first one and then another Socialist apparatus to the machinery of the state.

In a sense the same thing happened in Britain. In the early days of his parliamentary career Lloyd George was an ardent and eloquent defender and promoter of various Socialist schemes which did not seem like socialism but just as reform measures—reform measures which chopped off the system of free enterprise and added it to the state machine. The war of 1914 was over and Lloyd George was confronted with the rise of the Socialist movement and a Socialist actually the Prime Minister of England, Ramsay MacDonald, wailed and wept crocodile tears and he said—quoting him roughly, that it was as it said in the Bible in the days before the flood they were eating and drinking and knew not that the deluge was approaching.

I now ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a portion of an article written by David Lawrence, and published in today's Washington Star.

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

There is always a plausible excuse given by the filibusterers. This time it is that they wish to prevent what they call a giveaway of certain atomic-energy developments by the Government to private industry, though Government-owned channels in radio and television have long been awarded to private companies which make profits thereon. It's an age-old controversy between Government ownership and private ownership, between state socialism or Communist socialism and private enterprise. The steady pressure for an all-powerful state, in which a political bureaucracy shall dispense favors to its political henchmen, has never let up since the New Dealers and Fair Dealers began to apply the scheme in various pieces of legislation.

The American people are really behind President Eisenhower in his drive to get the Government out of business and to give the people the opportunity to earn their own living and to conserve their savings and invest them in business enterprises, but the minority in the Senate uses the specious argument that the issue isn't fully understood—as if the voluminous record of millions of words spoken in several days of continuous debate will ever be read by anybody except the official stenographers.

The issue is well understood already. It is the difference between freedom of initiative and the stifling of initiative, between private enterprise and Government ownership or control of every business, every retail store, and every doctor's office, with no incentive to service and no competition to insure the quality of the product at the lowest price.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator from Montana yield 4 or 5 minutes to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. In reply to the distinguished Senator from Michigan, I desire to quote the words of Senator Vandenberg from the book edited by his son, Arthur W. Vandenberg, Jr., which completely refute the argument of the Senator from Michigan. I quote from page 354, answering the charge of socialism and communism or anything like them. I have not time to read it all, but I will read this paragraph:

Until we have completed the peace treaties and until we have negotiated a competent international agreement to outlaw the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes, it is absolutely vital—in my opinion—that public ownership and public control of atomic energy should be as completely airtight and foolproof as it is possible to make it. Anything less would be a surrender to the greatest hazard of the ages. We cannot hope for these final treaties and for this international agreement short of another couple of years, in all probability. During this time I know—and I am very dogmatic about it—that I am best serving my country when I provide the tightest possible public control of atomic energy in the United States.

I quote now from page 356, and I particularly commend the attention of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to this statement:

We, the Congress, have declared by law that the control of atomic energy must be the tightest Government monopoly ever set up in the United States—pending the day when the destructive use of atomic energy shall be outlawed for keeps. We solemnly and unavoidably decreed that Government ownership and management, no matter how much we dislike it in other aspects of our national economy and life, is an indispensable public necessity for the sake of national security in respect to the control of atomic energy.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield 1 minute to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan for 1 minute?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, what my late distinguished colleague said was that in the early stages of the atomic discovery and when we were developing it as a weapon for the security of the United States, it had to remain a public monopoly, and I agree wholeheartedly with that statement. But now we are endeavoring to take a step out of that field and to make atomic energy available for civilian use, and therefore we

should not keep it as a Government monopoly. What has been read by the Senator from North Dakota does not dispute my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for 10 seconds to me?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. The statement of the late Senator Vandenberg was made on February 17, 1947, which was long after the beginning of what the distinguished Senator was describing.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President——

Mr. MURRAY. I yield a minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I merely want to support the statement of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] to what Mr. Vandenberg really said. What he said was that until we had completed the peace treaties, which we have not completed, Mr. President, until we had negotiated a competent international agreement to outlaw the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes, it was absolutely essential that public ownership and public control of atomic energy should be as completely airtight and foolproof as it was possible to make it.

I ask the Senator from Michigan, has he any inside information that we have an international agreement on atomic energy? If he has, I wish he would tell the Senate about it. Does he have any inside information that we have signed the peace treaties? If he has, I wish he would give it to the Senate.

Finally, all I got out of the statement of the Senator from Michigan was that we ought not to have a general running the country. He kept talking about Bismarck. It seems to me that leads to a lot of trouble.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I want just 1 moment to say that these remarks of my late distinguished colleague from Michigan were made when America and the American Government had a monopoly of atomic energy for military purposes, but we have moved from that field and have come to the time when we believe it is safe to venture into civilian production for the whole community instead of using atomic energy exclusively for weapons of war.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I think my views with respect to public versus private power are reasonably well known. For the purpose of this short statement I will reiterate my belief in private enterprise.

I believe, however, Mr. President, that the people of the United States can still govern themselves, and the majority of them have a right to determine whether they desire service from private sources or whether they desire to serve themselves cooperatively.

In connection with the future development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, there are people who have cooperative, self-serving, electrical devices, whether for the generation and transmission of electricity or for its transmission and distribution without generation. I believe that there is an obligation on the Government to make available to those people adequate information so that they may utilize electric power from atomic energy whenever it becomes available or usable.

However, when that time comes—and it is not here yet and will not be for several years—it will be necessary for the Government of the United States, through the Atomic Energy Commission, under the direction of a sound and well-planned and well-thought-out law, to provide for the handling of these new sources of energy, in such a way as, first, to protect the source of the energy and, second, to protect the safety of the people in the areas where it is used. Therefore it will be necessary, Mr. President, to have well thought out and stringent safeguards and rules and regulations.

I believe that in due time it will be necessary for Congress to give attention to that matter. I cannot agree to the creation of a liaison committee such as is envisioned in the pending amendment, or as being the answer to that need.

Such a committee would be made up of representatives of various agencies and departments and divisions of departments of the Government, serving ex officio. In my humble opinion, when the time comes to provide the information, as well as the usability of atomic energy, not only to public bodies but to private enterprise, it will be necessary to create some type of agency of Government to enforce the application of the rules and regulations which will emanate ultimately from the Atomic Energy Commission.

We have adequate time to work out that sort of thing. There should be no hurried effort in that field. Certainly the Atomic Energy Commission should have a free hand, so far as the present handling and the present supervision and the present control of atomic energy is concerned. It should have a free hand to seek its information direct from any department of Government and from any source, not through the office of any other committee. I think we are attempting to advance, before we have equipped ourselves with the necessary knowledge to do the kind of job that is requisite in this field. I shall oppose the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I intend to vote against the amendment. I am afraid we are becoming a little confused as to what Senate bill 3690 proposes to do. This bill has nothing to do with the generation of power or with the distribution of power. The pending bill, if I read it correctly, and if I understand the intent of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is to allow American private know-how and American private money to make an investment in the development of atomic energy. For what reason, may I ask?

Not for the manufacture of atomic bombs, but for the manufacture of electric power, to be used in our peacetime industry.

What are we doing to protect the $12 billion that have been invested by the American public in developing the fundamental science of the atom?

I repeat what I said some days ago, namely, that we are just as far away today in the science of the actual practicability of using atomic energy as Franklin was from Edison. We are only at the dawn of this venture. We are at the beginning, where we are inviting American capital to come in and take its part in this great venture.

If we are to win the race against Russia, if we are to develop atomic energy for industrial purposes, we must protect it with proper safeguards, and of course we must defend the public interests. We cannot say to the American stockholder "You invest your dollars in the development of atomic energy science, and then you will be confronted with all these public agencies under this amendment that will make the various policies and tell you what you should do.

I say to the distinguished Senator from Montana the highest power rates in the whole country are in the New England States. We do not have a Tennessee Valley Authority, or a Bureau of Reclamation, or a Bonneville project, or a Southwestern Power Association, or a Southeastern Power Administration.

What are we going to do for the people in the country where the rates are so high? The only chance they have is to allow their private industry to become a partner in this venture by investing their money, so they will be able to realize the dream of producing the same electric power that is now being produced from coal and oil, which is very, very expensive in the part of the country from which I come.

When we get down to a discussion of who is going to distribute the current, we are getting outside the four corners of this bill.

The first phase of the bill has to do with the research and development that is necessary in order to get to the practicability of the development. After that has been established, we come to section 103, whereby licenses will be issued to people for the development of the reactors.

However, we are just as far away from that now as anyone can possibly imagine. According to the testimony that was adduced by our committee, we will not get close to that stage for another 10 or 15 years, and all of that is speculative to the *n*th degree.

I say to Members of the Senate, if we want to emasculate the bill we should vote for the pending amendment. If we do not want to have private enterprise come in, we should vote against the bill.

However, if Senators say to me that they want private enterprise in this

country—and I am in favor of all projects like TVA and Hells Canyon and Bonneville, and if I had had an opportunity to vote for them I would have voted for them—then this amendment should be voted down.

We are becoming a little confused. If we want private industry to come into this development—with the proper safeguards, of course, so as not to create a private monopoly of the kind that the Government enjoys with reference to the development of atomic energy in the manufacture of war weapons—and if we want a partnership, and if we want to make it attractive enough to private industry, we must not engage in this emotional approach, which has a very attractive appeal to many people, but does not get us anywhere.

I say as sincerely as I can say it that we should stop misunderstanding the bill. If we are against private industry coming into this field, we should vote against the bill. However, if we want private industry to come into this venture—and it must, if we are to get the benefit of all the know-how of private industry—then we should not adopt the amendment, because no one will invest a nickel in it.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I have a minute and a half remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). The Senator from Montana has one and a half minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. I have a minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct; one and a half minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. I shall make my remarks very short. I wish to observe that the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] have not stated the facts with reference to the amendment. There is nothing in the amendment that would exclude private enterprise from participating in this program. It would merely set up a liaison committee to consult with the Atomic Energy Commission and advise them with reference to the various sections of the country where programs may be undertaken.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the distinguished Senator yield?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. MURRAY. I only have a half a minute.

It seems to me that the committee the amendment proposes to create is absolutely proper to assist the Atomic Energy Commission in determining the questions of where these plants will be located; otherwise, you may have them concentrated in congested areas and not in areas where they are really needed. We want, of course, private enterprise in this program. We want some of these plants built down in the area where the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island lives; we want them in every part of the Nation where it is appropriate and possible to locate them. We are not opposing private enterprise from participating in this program, and this amendment does not exclude private enterprise in any manner, shape, or form.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield a minute?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 1 minute.

Mr. PASTORE. The one thing that is significant in this amendment, and we must not misunderstand it, is the fact that this liaison committee will influence the policy. If it does not influence the policy, then it is not worth the paper it is written on, and if it has that function, then it will set the policy.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. If the things the Senator from Rhode Island has said are accurate—that we are still years away from any practical application of this bill—what, in the name of sound, good sense, or reason, would justify our trying to rush the bill through the Senate in the face of, as described by the Senator from Rhode Island, misinterpretation, misunderstanding, lack of knowledge, and lack of debate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Rhode Island has expired.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I have 5 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield the Senator from Rhode Island some time.

Mr. PASTORE. I will answer that very simply. I ask the Senator: Who is able to run before he was able to walk? Who is able to walk before he was able to creep? And I say unless we pass this bill, when will we get started? The sooner the better, because already Russia has devised a reactor that will produce 20,000 kilowatts of electricity; so we have a challenge today, the challenge is at our door now, not tomorrow, not next session—but now. And unless we get started, we are going to be beaten in this race, and what a sorrowful day it will be for this country and the free world—the day that Russia beats us in this race of producing reactors to give to mankind the benefits of atomic energy for industrial purposes.

That is why we reported the bill to the Senate. That is why we are having all of these discussions on this floor. But the time is of the moment. Now is the time for us to start, and unless we get started the day will never come that humanity will enjoy the benefits of this great secret.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. LEHMAN. It is true, is it not, that the Senator from Rhode Island has described the great confusion, the great uncertainty, and the misunderstanding that have arisen in the debate on this bill—misunderstanding that is entirely logical because of the complexities of this bill, and because there were no hearings on the bill?

Now, certainly, I cannot conceive that under those circumstances——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That statement is utterly erroneous.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I can take care of myself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island has the floor by consent of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island can take care of himself and can answer any question.

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

Mr. PASTORE. I will yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that although there were hearings on the original bill which was considered, but when a revised bill was introduced, a number of organizations, great organizations, asked to be heard and they were told, "No, we cannot give you a hearing now. We are re-revising this revised bill and when it is ready we will have hearings at which time you can appear."

And will the Senator from Rhode Island deny that those hearings were refused?

Mr. PASTORE. Oh, I do not want to say it categorically that way, but let me answer the Senator from New York by putting it in the affirmative. So far as I know, no one who desired to present his case to the committee was denied that privilege.

Mr. LEHMAN. The organizations I have in mind certainly were denied the privilege of presenting their cases and their views.

Mr. PASTORE. I do not know of the instance.

Mr. LEHMAN. The bill as it is now before the Senate is a bill confused, insufficiently debated and insufficiently studied. There is no question about that. The Senator from Minnesota read into the RECORD 2 or 3 days ago the statements of a number of organizations to that effect.

Mr. PASTORE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New York that I do not agree with every single sentence of it. Surely, when a bill 104 pages long is written, necessarily many compromises have to be made. As a matter of fact, not a single piece of important legislation passes either branch of the Congress that is not the result of some compromise, unless it is steamrollered through, and that does not happen in the Senate of the United States—not if we can help it.

I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from New York that we had months and months of hearings. The hearings started last fall, 1953. In the heat of summer we heard all the witnesses who cared to appear before the committee. I do not say the bill is a perfect document. I admit it needs some refinement, and that process has gone on on the floor of the Senate. I am not arguing that a filibuster is going on. I am not alluding to that at all. But certainly it cannot be charged that this bill is the product of haste. The last charge that can be made against it is that it is the product of haste. But I say to the distinguished Senator from New York the question involved in this amendment is a very simple one—do we want private industry to come into this field, or do we not want private industry to come into it? If we do not want it to come into it, then vote for this amendment. If we want it to come into it and share the

know-how in the development of this great power of nature, then vote against the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Is the Senator supporting the amendment, or opposing it?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am supporting the amendment.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then I cannot yield the Senator from Minnesota any time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa declines to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Is it possible to amend the amendment of the Senator from Montana?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No time would be gained by doing so, because all amendments to the amendment would be included in the overall time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall remember that when the next consent agreement is proposed.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Rhode Island has very well expressed one of the fundamentals involved in this amendment. With reference to the statement made a moment ago by the Senator from New York in which he charged flatly that no hearings had been held on this bill, I do not know how that charge could have been made.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Is it not a fact that there were no hearings held on the bill as it is now presented to the Senate of the United States?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. It is not a fact.

I hold in my hand the hearings, 1,124 pages of hearings on this bill. I agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that, so far as I know, no witness who had any connection with this matter and who desired to testify was refused the opportunity to testify. I have heard repeatedly in this debate the statement that no hearings were held on the bill, but it is not a fact and those who make it are uninformed.

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

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

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield first to the Senator from Minnesota, and then I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not dispute the fact that hearings were held on a bill, but if there were hearings on Senate bill 3690 will the Senator tell me where are the hearings. I have hearings on S. 3323 and H. R. 8862, but not on the bill before us which is S. 3690. I do not deny that the Senator is most likely right when he said that there were hearings held on the bill, but where are the hearings?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator, Mr. President, is indulging in what I think is called "thimble rigging," because he well knows that the two bills were introduced in the respective Houses and hearings were held on them. The substance of those bills in great measure is found in the pending bill. The committee merely rewrote certain provisions and adopted the amendments, as a result of the hearings, so as to make what is called a clean bill. So the bill before the Senate is in fact the bill that went to the Atomic Energy Commission with the recommended amendments in the form of a clean bill, rather than with portions of the text marked out and amendments substituted, as is sometimes done.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I appreciate the Senator's answer and on my own time, under some other amendment, I shall make my comments because I want to get back to the record.

I would like to ask the Senator one question with reference to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], referring now to the liaison committee. Does the Senator from Iowa interpret his amendment which reads: "The Commission shall advise and consult with other agencies through the committee," to mean that the committee shall set the policy, shall issue licenses, and so forth, or does he interpret it to mean merely that it shall advise and consult?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I interpret it to mean what I think it means and what I think it is intended to mean.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What is that?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That this so-called liaison committee would stand between the Commission and the general operation in the economic field of atomic energy, and that, in effect, it would be the policymaking body instead of the Atomic Energy Commission.

I should like to call the Senator's attention to the representatives on this committee as provided by the amendment—representatives from "the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwest Power Administration, the Southeast Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and such other Government agencies as the President may, from time to time determine." With that kind of a setup, it would give private enterprise just about as much chance to be considered as the proverbial snowball when it gets near the fire. It would give the business to private enterprise, without any question, and it is so designed, in my judgment.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota for a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Does the Senator have any evidence to indicate that, other than the mere assertion? Does the Senator realize that today, in the field of development of hydroelectric energy, for every dollar the Federal Government has put into it, industry has put in $15? Does the Senator realize that 87 percent of all electric power generated in the United States of America last year was generated by private utilities, and 13 percent by public utilities, and that of the 13 percent, 9 percent was purchased by private companies? Where is the truth of the statement that private industry would be dealt a fatal blow under a provision calling upon the Commission to advise and consult with certain Government agencies?

Finally, I should like to ask, Who better has the right to represent the public than the Government? If I had my choice of being represented by a corporation or by the Government, I would pick the latter, because at least I have one vote in Government. Who better has the right to represent the public?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I would prefer to have the Congress of the United States represent the public than bureaucrats. I wish to make a comparison, and I do not mean to have it be an odious one from a political standpoint, but under the proposal in the amendment, private venture would have about as much chance as would the free world if representatives of Poland, Latvia, and Czechoslovakia were to arbitrate disputes between Russia and the free world—just about as much chance.

Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. HUMPHREY addressed the chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. IVES in the chair). Does the Senator yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall come back to the Senator from Minnesota, I assure him, after I yield to the Senator from New York. I shall be glad to give the Senator 2 minutes, if he has some purpose. I do not want to give him too much time to be "kicking" my position. I yield to the Senator from New York for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. I may say that the Senator from Minnesota has already covered the point I want to make, which is that the hearings before us at this time do not cover S. 3690, but S. 3323 and H. R. 8862. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if the hearings were held. If he assures me they were, I will have no doubt that they were. But where are the hearings?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The hearings are before the Senator; he has just had them in his hand. The numbers of the bill contained on the hearings were arbitrary numbers placed on the proposed legislation in order to give the Senate a clean approach.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Is it not a course which is followed in a number of instances when a committee is considering a bill, whether it be the Foreign Relations Committee, the Committee on Armed Services, or any other committee, which involve long hearings? Sometimes a clean copy, so to speak, of the bill is reported, dealing with the subject matter, covering most of the parts of

the other bills, so as not to have the situation so complicated as it otherwise would be?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes. I will say every provision of S. 3323 and H. R. 8862, which happened to be an arbitrary number for the hearings, was considered. The bill was subject to thorough hearings, and the pending bill, S. 3690, is merely a cleaned-up copy of those provisions after eleven or twelve hundred pages of hearings on them. Any statement or assertion that no hearings have been held on S. 3690 is erroneous. The Senator is mistaken. Twelve hundred pages of hearings were held on the provisions of S. 3690.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I not correct in saying, from the remarks of both the Senator from Iowa and the majority leader, that reference was made to most of the provisions?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I said all the provisions.

Mr. LEHMAN. I understood the Senator to say most of them.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then I shall correct the RECORD and say all the provisions. Hearings were held on the identical bill. One of the bills was introduced in the Senate and one in the House, which is the reason for two different numbers. The point is that all the provisions of the bill were subject to exhaustive hearings.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont for a question.

Mr. AIKEN. In looking over part 1 of the hearings I find in the list of witnesses the following names:

Solomon Barkin, Textile Workers Union of America;

Andrew J. Biemiller, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor;

Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary, Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church;

James Finucane, associate secretary, National Council for Prevention of War;

William A. Higinbotham, executive committee, Federation of American Scientists;

Miles D. Kennedy, of the American Legion;

Theodore S. Kenyon, chairman of the atomic energy committee of the New York Patent Law Association;

Murray S. Levine, secretary, New York Committee on Atomic Information, Inc.;

Murray D. Lincoln, president, Farm Bureau Insurance Companies, Ohio;

Angus MacDonald, speaking on behalf of James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union;

Samuel B. Morris, chairman, atomic power policy committee, American Public Power Association;

Leland Olds, on behalf of the Public Affairs Institute;

Benjamin C. Sigal, attorney at law, on behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Now, did they or did they not testify before the committee?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They did, and many more.

Mr. AIKEN. Did not the chairman of the committee invite them to testify, in pursuance to the President's message with the following objectives in mind:

First. Widened cooperation with our allies in certain atomic-energy matters;

Second. Improved procedures for the control and dissemination of atomic-energy information; and

Third. Encouragement of broadened participation in the development of peacetime uses of atomic energy in the United States.

In other words, were they not entitled to "cover the waterfront" in the testimony?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The entire provisions were covered.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of witnesses representing private companies and organizations at the hearings, as shown in part 1 of the hearings.

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

LIST OF WITNESSES

(Pt. I contains statements of witnesses representing private companies and organizations)

Francis L. Adams, Chief, Power Division, Federal Power Commission.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Represented by Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman; Henry D. Smyth, Commissioner; Thomas E. Murray, Commissioner; Eugene M. Zuckert, Commissioner; Joseph Campbell, Commissioner; K. D. Nichols, General Manager; William Mitchell, General Counsel; H. L. Price, Deputy General Counsel; Edward R. Trapnell, Assistant to the General Manager.

C. R. Bradshaw, Assistant Chief Counsel, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

Lucius E. Burch, Jr., of Burch, Porter & Johnson, attorneys at law, Memphis, Tenn., accompanied by Walter Von Tresckow.

Joseph Campbell, member, Atomic Energy Commission.

R. W. Cook, Director of Production, Atomic Energy Commission.

Hon. John Foster Dulles, Secretary of State, Gerard Smith, and T. B. Morton, Department of State.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS, a Representative in Congress from the State of Arkansas.

Hon. ALBERT GORE, a United States Senator from the State of Tennessee.

R. A. Kampmeier, Assistant Manager of Power, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Hon. JOHN F. KENNEDY, a United States Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

Hon. JOHN M. MCCLELLAN, a United States Senator from the State of Arkansas.

William Mitchell, General Counsel, Atomic Energy Commission.

Thomas E. Murray, member, Atomic Energy Commission.

Kenneth D. Nichols, General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

Harold L. Price, Deputy General Counsel, Atomic Energy Commission.

Hon. Donald A. Quarles, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Development; accompanied by Jack L. Stempler, Assistant General Counsel, Office of Secretary of Defense; Maj. Gen. Howard G. Bunker; Maj. Gen. Harry McK. Roper; Rear Adm. George Wright; Maj. Gen. Alvin R. Luedecke.

J. Lee Rankin, Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice, accompanied by Nathan Siegel, Office of Legal Counsel, Department of Justice.

Henry D. Smyth, member, Atomic Energy Commission.

Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.

G. O. Wessenauer, Manager of Power, Tennessee Valley Authority; and R. A. Kampmeier, Assistant Manager of Power, Tennessee Valley Authority.

Eugene M. Zuckert, member, Atomic Energy Commission.

GOVERNMENT AGENCIES REPRESENTED AT THE HEARINGS

Atomic Energy Commission.
Members of Congress.
Department of Defense.
Federal Power Commission.
Department of the Interior.
Department of Justice.
Department of State.
Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of witnesses and correspondents represented at the hearings, as shown at the beginning of volume 2 of the hearings.

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

LIST OF WITNESSES AND CORRESPONDENTS

(Pt. II contains statements of Government witnesses)

Ed M. Anderson, chairman, legislative committee, the National Editorial Association.

Solomon Barkin, Textile Workers of America.

Wm. K. Beard, Jr., president, the Associated Business Publications.

Andrew J. Biemiller, member, national legislative committee, American Federation of Labor.

Lyle B. Borst, professor of physics, University of Utah.

Bennett Boskey, lawyer, Volpe, Boskey & Skallerup, Washington, D. C.

Charles F. Boss, Jr., executive secretary, Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church.

Walter L. Cisler, president, the Detroit Edison Co.

Karl Cohen, president, Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, Inc.

Wilson M. Compton, on behalf of the United States Chamber of Commerce; accompanied by Richard Smith, Milton Smith, and Warren Nystrom.

Chester L. Davis, attorney at law.

E. H. Dixon, chairman of the committee on atomic power of the Edison Electric Institute, and president, Middle South Utilities, Inc.

Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, accompanied by Charles Fain and Robert Kabor, staff members, NRECA, Virgil Hanlon, manager, East River Electric Power Co-operative, Madison, S. Dak., and Marlin S. Stewart, manager, Chugach Electric Cooperative, Anchorage, Alaska.

James Finucane, associate secretary, National Council for Prevention of War.

John J. Grebe, director of nuclear development, The Dow Chemical Co., Midland, Mich.

M. D. Griffith, executive vice president, New York Board of Trade, Inc.

C. Willard Hayes, patent lawyer, Washington, D. C., and chairman, committee on laws and rules of the American Patent Law Association.

William A. Higinbotham, member, executive committee, Federation of American Scientists.

Alfred Iddles, president, the Babcock & Wilcox Co.

Harry E. Jordan, secretary, American Waterworks Association, Inc.

Miles D. Kennedy, the American Legion.

Theodore S. Kenyon, chairman of the atomic energy committee of the New York Patent Law Association.

Andrew A. Kucher, director, Scientific Laboratory, Ford Motor Co.

Murray S. Levine, secretary, New York Committee on Atomic Information, Inc.

Murray D. Lincoln, president, Farm Bureau Insurance Companies, Ohio.

Dr. L. C. Longarzo, chairman, New York Committee on Atomic Information, Inc.

Jerome D. Luntz, editor, Nucleonics, McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

Angus MacDonald, speaking on behalf of James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union.

Francis K. McCune, general manager, atomic products division, General Electric Co., accompanied by Stuart MacMackin, counsel.

Paul W. McQuillen, chairman, legal committee, Dow Chemical—Detroit Edison and Associates atomic power development project.

John R. Menke, president of Nuclear Development Associates, Inc., White Plains, N. Y.

Samuel B. Morris, chairman, atomic power policy committee, American Public Power Association.

Leland Olds, on behalf of the Public Affairs Institute.

R. J. S. Pigott, president, Engineers Joint Council.

Blucher A. Poole, chairman, sanitary engineering division, American Society of Civil Engineers.

Alden A. Potter, of Montgomery County, Md.

Stanley B. Roboff, manager, industrial coordination, atomic energy division, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.

Oscar M. Ruebhausen, chairman, special committee on atomic energy, of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.

Thorndike Saville, president, Engineers Joint Council.

Benjamin C. Sigal, attorney at law, on behalf of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Dr. Chauncey Starr, North American Aviation Corp.

E. Blythe Stason, dean, University of Michigan Law School, appearing on behalf of the American Bar Association special committee on atomic energy.

Newton I. Steers, Jr., president, Atomic Development Mutual Fund, Inc.

William A. Steiger, chairman, committee on patents of the National Association of Manufacturers.

C. G. Suits, chairman, committee on research of the National Association of Manufacturers.

Gilmore Tillman, attorney at law of Los Angeles, Calif., representing the American Power Association, and Department of Water and Power of the city of Los Angeles, Calif.

Jerry Voorhis, executive director, Cooperative League of the USA, 343 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

J. R. Wiggins, chairman, the American Society of Newspaper Editors.

Eugene P. Wigner, Palmer Physical Laboratory, Princeton University.

E. Raymond Wilson, of the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Woodrow L. Wroble, Dynamics Design Co.

COMPANIES AND ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT THE HEARINGS

American Bar Association.
American Federation of Labor.
The American Legion.
American Patent Law Association.
American Power Association.
American Public Power Association.
American Society of Civil Engineers.
The American Society of Newspaper Editors.
The American Water Works Association.
The Associated Business Publications.
Association of the Bar of the City of New York.
Atomic Development Mutual Fund, Inc.
The Babcock and Wilcox Co.
Chugach Electric Cooperative.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Cooperative League of the United States of America.
The Detroit Edison Co.
Dow Chemical Co.
Dow Chemical-Detroit Edison and Associates atomic power development project.
Dynamics Design Co.
East River Electric Power Cooperative.
Edison Electric Institute.
Engineers Joint Council.
Farm Bureau Insurance Cos.
Federation of American Scientists.
Ford Motor Co.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
General Electric Co.
Los Angeles (Calif.) Department of Water and Power.
Methodist Church, Board of World Peace.
Middle South Utilities.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Council for Prevention of War.
National Editorial Association.
National Farmers Union.
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
New York Board of Trade, Inc.
New York Committee on Atomic Information, Inc
New York Patent Law Association.
North American Aviation Corp.
Nuclear Development Associates, Inc.
Nucleonics (magazine), McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.
Princeton University.
Public Affairs Institute.
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Textile Workers Union of America.
United States Chamber of Commerce.
Utah, University of.
Volpe, Boskey and Skallerup.
Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, Inc.

WORLD CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR CONVENTION—SPEECH BY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 9 minutes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield 9 minutes to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, there was a very significant speech made yesterday to the World Christian Endeavor convention held in Washington. It called attention to a matter that has been generally overlooked by far too many Americans and peoples of the world in the great crisis which now confronts all the nations of the world. The President of the United States, in talking to the young people, put his finger on one of the greatest powers that the free nations of the world could use if they but had the desire and the will to do so. In this memorable address, he declared:

> Because, my friends, though today we must remain strong, we must remain strong in all the economic and the scientific affairs of the world, we must remain strong militarily for the protection of our firesides and our rights to prevent domination by those who would seek to enthrall us, yet bullets and guns and planes and ships, all the weapons of war can produce no real or lasting peace.
>
> Only a great moral crusade, to determine that men shall rise above this conception of materialism, rise above it and live as people who attempt to express in some faint and feeble way their conceptions of what the Almighty would have us do, that is the force that will win through to victory, and the world will have prosperity and peace—prosperity beyond all imaginings of the past. And science will be developed and devoted to the happiness, the welfare of man, and not to his destruction, and all of us can live together peacefully and happily.

This speech of the President's should rank with his great state papers. Few have ever stated more clearly the great truth that all the scientific weapons of modern war cannot produce a real or lasting peace. In the din of worldwide news of great moment, and in the sounds of filibustering debate over a measure providing for the peaceful use of one of the great weapons of modern times, the President's great message seems to have been lost.

In a sense, his is a "voice crying in the wilderness." Yet in these peril-laden, momentous times, his is a message that the world desperately needs to hear and to heed, lest the forces of destruction set loose in the world today carry man and twentieth century civilization across the brink of an Armegeddon in which those who rely only on the sword and the H-bomb will perish by those weapons and international chaos and misery may be the result.

The President's message is not that of a misguided pacifist nor an appeaser. He plainly states that in a world of strife and tension, we must remain strong militarily to protect our firesides and our rights as free men. But it is significant that he, one of the world's greatest military leaders, has seized the real meaning of the message brought by the Carpenter of Nazareth and preached by earnest Christians and laymen and leaders of other religious sects for the past 2,000 years. "Yet bullets and guns and planes and ships, all the weapons of war can produce no real or lasting peace," declared President Eisenhower.

Beginning with Christ, this simple truth has been uttered many times over the centuries. Yet we who profess to follow the Man of Nazareth must admit that, for the most part, this basic message has fallen on deaf ears. Today, after three world conflicts in less than a half-century, we see the world engaged in a feverish arms race with the most destructive weapons ever devised by man. We have an armed truce in Korea and another in Indochina. On the open seas, for the first time in many years, airships engaged in a mercy rescue mission are fired upon by planes of a country whose leaders are not only anti-Christ, but whose armed minions are engaging in repeated acts of brutality and aggression that make them a threat to world peace and order throughout a large part of the globe.

The President's message is one that should be dinned out over free radio stations set up to penetrate the fear-clogged recesses behind the Iron Curtain in Europe and Asia. It is a message that people everywhere will be able to appreciate, regardless of the propaganda to the contrary that has been forced upon them by their oppressors. It is a message so starkly different from those emanating from the war lords of Russia

and Red China that is is bound to gain attention and to demand respect for its obvious honesty and sincerity.

The President has told the world the basic truth that more of us should give heed to and live the teachings of Christ. It is that simple. It is that profound.

He has said that while we must remain strong; the only real salvation of the world is not a military crusade but a moral crusade, in which every man and woman who aspires to world peace and security can contribute.

In these troubled times, I urge each American to read and study this great historic speech by President Eisenhower, and to lend support to a moral crusade to save the world from self-destruction.

Let us keep our sword ready and at hand, and our powder dry, lest international bandits strike at our hearth and our home. But let us be militant crusading Christians, seeking earnestly to convert those who would transgress against moral laws and world peace, and recognizing that a victory for peace and Christian living would restore hope again to the world and let peace and prosperity reign for the good of all mankind.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in this part of my remarks the entire text of the speech delivered by President Eisenhower to the World Christian Endeavor convention.

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

Dr. Poling and friends: It is indeed a very great honor to be invited to come here to extend to you, on behalf of this Government, a greeting to the Capital of the United States. Those of you who come from our own country, and those who come from abroad, are met here in a fellowship from which we naturally expect much, and because of which we extend to you a greeting that is more than usually sincere.

While I am talking about this matter of just meeting you, I should like to ask each of you a favor. You will return soon to your homes, and I should like for you, whether you live abroad or in America, to take to all your associates personal good wishes, a personal expression of hope from me and from this Government, that all of your labors, all of your meetings, all of your endeavors, will lead toward, ever toward, that closer bond of brotherhood and friendship without which this poor old world is indeed in trouble, and which I believe that the young people of this world can do so much to promote.

Now, when we talk about such high moral efforts in this world today, we sometimes encounter in the diplomatic field the statement that an international relationship does not use moral standards, that it is based upon expedience, or upon practical solutions to practical problems of the moment. And mayhap this is sometimes true, in the temporary sense. But it cannot possibly be true in the permanent sense, if we are to win that security, that peace, for which all mankind so desperately longs.

We must remember the spiritual base that underlies man's existence, and the spiritual base that underlies all free government, else we shall surely fail.

A SPIRITUAL BASE

That there is a spiritual base to all free types of government is not difficult to demonstrate, of course. Free government makes as its cornerstone the concept, or the idea, that men are equal, they are equal before the law, they have equal rights and equal opportunities in the governments maintained to protect them.

Now we know that men and women are not equal among themselves, physically; they are not equal among themselves mentally. Consequently, they must be equal if free government has any validity; they must be equal in some way that has nothing to do with the physical or intellectual makeup of man. And that can be only his spiritual side.

If we do not promote, therefore, if we do not believe in the spiritual character of man, we would be foolish, indeed, to be supporting the concept of free government in the world; free government as opposed to dictatorship. But so long as we do recognize the spiritual values in man, and his spiritual side, and recognize the dependency of free government upon these spiritual values, then everything that we are trying to do makes sense. Then the words "the dignity of man" assume real meaning. We work for it with our whole hearts; we may work for true brotherhood among men without any qualification whatsoever, except doing everything honorable to achieve success.

In the great conflict that is going on in the world today one side upholds the freedom and dignity of man, and therefore recognizes the spiritual character. The other lives by something it calls the materialistic dialectic, meaning only that it denies all the kinds of values that you young people support. It says there are no values in life except the material ones, what you can see or express in the material or intellectual way.

ONLY GOVERNMENTS ARE STUPID

And this, of course we know to be false. So not only do you people get the satisfaction that comes to every human in this world as he labors for the benefit of his brothers and his sisters, you know that in laboring to promote an understanding of these spiritual values, to raise them even higher in our calculations of everything we do, that you are working for a permanent, lasting, durable peace among all the men of the world who so desperately thirst for it.

And I should like, of course, to give you this one conviction of my own: That all men, all masses, do truly long for peace. They want you to win the struggle you are waging. It is only governments that are stupid, not the masses of people. Governments may seek for power, for the right to dominate, to extend their authority over others. Free people do not seek that.

So your task is to help every man realize that he himself, because he has been born in this world, is valuable. He is meaningful. He is important to you, because as you defend his rights you are defending your own.

And then we must make them understand that people who believe that way must unite among themselves if they are to meet successfully the opposition which is united by force, by the threat of the MVD, by the threat of the police, the threat that comes about when a child is asked to inform upon its parents, when there is no sanctity left in family life, or in community life, in anything, indeed except slavish devotion to the head of the state.

A BIG INVESTMENT

Most of you are still young. You have your whole lives to live. You have, in other words, a 60-or-70-year investment in this old earth. People my age, if they are lucky, have 10 or 15 years still invested in it. This earth is very much important to you then, possibly, than it is to us elders.

I say to you this, as possibly the only worthwhile word I can bring to you: If you remain ever true to the principles lying behind the organization to which you belong, if you believe in them with all your heart if you live them, and if you get countless others to join with you in supporting those values, then, indeed your lives will be fruitful and happy ones, and all those that come after you will be the beneficiaries of your great work.

Because, my friends, though today we must remain strong, we must remain strong in all the economic and the scientific affairs of the world, we must remain strong militarily for the protection of our firesides and our rights to prevent domination by those who would seek to enthrall us, yet bullets and guns and planes and ships, all the weapons of war can produce no real or lasting peace.

Only a great moral crusade, to determine that men shall rise above this conception of materialism, rise above it and live as people who attempt to express in some faint and feeble way their conceptions of what the Almighty would have us do, that is the force that will win through to victory, and the world will have prosperity and peace—prosperity beyond all imaginings of the past. And science will be developed and devoted to the happiness, the welfare of man, and not to his destruction, and all of us can live together peacefully and happily.

To each of you, wherever you go, I say: Good luck and may God bless you.

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has 27 minutes left. All time has expired on the other side.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I not accurate in stating that the considerable list of public interest organizations appearing at the hearings is a list of those appearing at the first hearing held in May, and is shown in part I of two parts?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Part I and part II. I put in both.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I not correct in that, in the first place?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is right.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I not reading accurately from the record of part II, which reads as follows——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator state the page?

Mr. LEHMAN. Page 561:

After the bill had been introduced for a relatively short period of time, executive hearings were held with the Commission, representatives of the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and then later on public hearings were conducted, and in all of those hearings criticisms were voiced, suggestions were made, with the result that H. R. 8862 was revised to meet many of the objections. The revised edition of H. R. 8862 has again been transmitted to the agencies of Government, including the Atomic Energy Commission, and it is for that purpose that we have met this morning renewing the open meetings of this Committee for consideration of H. R. 8862, as revised.

May I ask the Senator from Iowa whether at that meeting any public interest groups testified or were invited to testify?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Will the Senator repeat the question, please?

Mr. LEHMAN. May I ask the Senator from Iowa whether in the second hearing which took up a revised version of the bill, as the result of the first hearing, there were any public interest groups present, or invited to be present, or which testified?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That hearing was only the first of many. Hearings were held repeatedly, and 1,200 pages of hearings were held after that.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. LEHMAN. I have before me the list of witnesses for part II. I wonder whether the Senator from Iowa could point out the witnesses who represented any public interest group, who appeared or testified at those hearings.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In part II?

Mr. LEHMAN. Part II, yes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The list of witnesses speaks for itself. I am looking at the list.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I now call the attention of the Senator to part II, the contents of which lists Government agencies represented at the hearings:

Atomic Energy Commission.
Members of Congress.
Department of Defense.
Federal Power Commission.
Department of Interior.
Department of Justice.
Department of State.
Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. LEHMAN. I refer to public-interest groups.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What does the Senator mean by "public-interest groups"?

Mr. LEHMAN. Any large organizations—labor organizations.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They were heard in part I.

Mr. LEHMAN. I refer to rural-electrification groups, the reclamation organizations and organizations of that sort. I think the term "public-interest groups" is quite clear.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Every group which asked to be heard was heard. Nobody was refused the opportunity.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I call attention to page 302.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. My attention has been called to page 302 of the testimony. That is volume I, which shows the REA representatives were there. There is a list of them.

Mr. LEHMAN. I was talking about part II.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They all had a chance in part I. There were dozens of them.

I would like to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks another list of witnesses at hearings held in 1953, which was last year. It consists of four pages of witnesses and organizations.

There being no objection, the list of "witnesses and correspondents" was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIST OF WITNESSES AND CORRESPONDENTS

J. L. Atwood, president, North American Aviation, Inc.

J. H. Aydelott, vice president, Association of American Railroads (submitted).

Robert F. Bacher, California Institute of Technology.

William E. Barbour, Jr., president, Tracerlab, Inc. (submitted).

S. D. Bechtel, of the Bechtel Corp.

J. G. Beckerley, Director of Classification, Atomic Energy Commission.

Manson Benedict, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (submitted).

Andrew J. Biemiller, member of the national legislative committee of the American Federation of Labor.

Robert Blum (submitted).

Calvin M. Bolster, Chief of Naval Research, accompanied by Maj. Gen. Ernest M. Brannon, Judge Advocate General of the Army, and Comdr. D. H. Dickey, patent counsel for the Navy.

M. W. Boyer, General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission.

C. R. Braun, manager, atomic power section, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.

Arnold K. Brown, executive vice president, American Machine & Foundry Co.

L. E. Brownell, University of Michigan (submitted).

Oliver E. Buckley, member, General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.

John C. Bugher, Director, Division of Biology and Medicine, Atomic Energy Commission.

Joseph Campbell, Commissioner, Atomic Energy Commission.

Clark E. Center, Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Co.

Walker L. Cisler, president, Detroit Edison Co.

J. E. Coats, president, Patent Law Association of Los Angeles (submitted).

Karl Cohen, vice president, Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, Inc.

F. R. Collbohm, director, the Rand Corp.

J. M. Costello, executive vice president, South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. (submitted).

W. L. Davidson, Director, Office of Industrial Development, Atomic Energy Commission.

C. E. Davies, secretary, the American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

Chester L. Davis, attorney at law (submitted).

Gordon Dean, Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission (term expired June 30, 1953).

Edgar H. Dixon, chairman, committee on atomic power, Edison Electric Institute; president, Middle South Utilities, Inc., accompanied by Paul Hallingby, Jr., assistant to the president, Middle South Utilities, Inc.

R. L. Doan (submitted).

Alton P. Donnell, coordinator, Dow-Edison project.

Dale E. Doty, member, accompanied by Francis L. Adams, Chief, Bureau of Power, and Howard E. Wahrenbrock, General Counsel, Bureau of Law, Federal Power Commission.

Clyde T. Ellis, executive manager, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

J. F. Fairman, vice president, Consolidated Edison of New York.

Malcolm P. Ferguson, president, Bendix Aviation Corp.

Enrico Fermi, University of Chicago (submitted).

Philip A. Fleger, Duquesne Light Co.

John Anson Ford, board of supervisors, county of Los Angeles (submitted).

Willis Gale, chairman, accompanied by Murray Joslin, vice president, Commonwealth Edison Co.

Tyrone Gillespie, general counsel, Dow Chemical Co.

Dr. John Grebe, Dow Chemical Co.

C. H. Greenewalt, president, E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.

Arthur S. Griswold, assistant to the president, Detroit Edison Co.

W. P. Gwinn, general manager, Pratt & Whitney Division, United Aircraft Corp. (submitted).

Dr. Lawrence R. Hafstad, Director of the Reactor Division, Atomic Energy Commission.

Broderick Haskell, Combustion Engineering, Inc.

Fred R. Haviland, Jr., director of market development, Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. (submitted).

Willard C. Hayes, chairman, committee on laws and rules, American Patent Law Association (submitted).

J. H. Hayner, Henry J. Kaiser Co.

James A. Hootman, technical assistant to the director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

L. A. Hyland, vice president (engineering), Bendix Aviation Corp.

Alfred Iddles, president, The Babcock & Wilcox Co.

Fred C. Kellogg, president, Pioneer Service & Engineering Co.

Walter E. Kingston, general manager, atomic energy division, Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.

Ernest O. Lawrence, University of California.

Robert LeBaron, Assistant to the Secretary of Defense (atomic energy).

David E. Lilienthal, former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission (submitted).

Elmer Lindseth, president, Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co.

Eugene S. Loughlin, president, National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, and chairman, Connecticut Public Utilities Commission.

Hon. GEORGE W. MALONE, United States Senator from the State of Nevada.

J. W. McAfee, president, Union Electric System, the North America Co., the Electric Energy, Inc. (by Edwin Putzell).

F. K. McCune, general manager, accompanied by Stuart MacMacklin, counsel, Atomic Products Division, General Electric Co.

Hon. Douglas McKay, Secretary of the Interior.

John R. Menke, president, Nuclear Development Associates, Inc.

Clarence R. Miles, Chamber of Commerce of the United States (submitted).

Vice Adm. Earle W. Mills, president, Foster Wheeler Corp.

Samuel B. Morris, chairman, Atomic Power Policy Committee, accompanied by Alex Radin, manager, American Public Power Association.

R. H. Morse, Jr., president, Fairbanks, Morse & Co. (submitted).

E. V. Murphree, president, Standard Oil Development Co. (submitted).

Homer S. Myres, president, Radioactive Products, Inc. (submitted).

John V. Neumann, University of California.

James R. Newman, former counsel to the Senate Special Committee on Atomic Energy.

Leland Olds, Public Affairs Institute (submitted).

Casper Ooms, former United States Patent Commissioner and Chairman of the AEC Patent Compensation Board.

Prof. William J. Pierce, Law School, University of Michigan.

R. J. S. Pigott, president, Engineers Joint Council.

Sumner T. Pike, chairman, Public Utilities Commission, State of Maine.

K. S. Pitzer, dean, College of Chemistry, University of California (submitted).

Gwilym A. Price, president, Atomic Power Division, Westinghouse Electric Corp.

B. E. Proctor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Edwin J. Putzell, Jr., secretary, Monsanto Chemical Co.
I. I. Rabi, Chairman, General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.
Walter Raleigh, executive vice president, New England Council.
R. G. Rincliffe, president, Philadelphia Electric Co.
Edward R. Rowley, production manager, National Lead Co.
Oscar M. Ruebhausen, chairman, special committee on atomic energy, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York.
Beardsley Ruml.
Hudson R. Searing, Consolidated Edison Company of New York.
Carleton Shugg, electric boat division, General Dynamics Corp. (submitted).
Benjamin C. Sigal, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Walter Bedell Smith, Under Secretary of State.
Dr. Henry D. Smyth, Commissioner, Atomic Energy Commission.
Philip Sporn, president, American Gas & Electric Co. (submitted).
Dr. Chauncey Starr, director, atomic energy research department, North American Aviation, Inc.
William A. Steiger, vice chairman, committee of patents, National Association of Manufacturers.
R. S. Stevenson, executive president, by C. R. Braun, manager, atomic-power section, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.
Lewis L. Strauss, Chairman (effective date July 2, 1953), Atomic Energy Commission.
Dr. C. G. Suits, chairman, subcommittee on atomic energy of the committee on research of the National Association of Manufacturers.
Elwood D. Swisher, international president, United Gas, Coke, and Chemical Workers of America, CIO.
Edward Teller, radiation laboratory, University of California (submitted).
R. W. Thomas, vice president, Phillips Petroleum Co. (submitted).
K. C. Towe, president, American Cyanamid Co.
Jerry Voorhis, executive director, Cooperative League of the U. S. A. (submitted).
Dr. Eric Walker, dean, school of engineering, the Pennsylvania State College.
J. Carleton Ward, Jr., Vitro Corporation of America (submitted).
Robert C. Watson, Commissioner, United States Patent Office, Department of Commerce (submitted).
Charles H. Weaver, manager, atomic-power division, Westinghouse Electric Corp.
Dr. George L. Weil, former Assistant Director, Reactor Development Division, Atomic Energy Commission.
Alvin M. Weinberg, technical director, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Atomic Energy Commission.
Eugene P. Wigner, professor of physics, Princeton University.
Hon. Walter Williams, Under Secretary of Commerce.
Charles S. Wilson, chairman, patent committee, Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc. (submitted).
Walter H. Zinn., Director, Argonne National Laboratory Commission.

COMPANIES, GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, AND ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTED AT THE HEARINGS OR REPLYING TO INVITATION TO SUBMIT VIEWS

Aircraft Industries Association of America, Inc.
Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co.
American Bar Association.
American Cyanamid Co.
American Federation of Labor.
American Gas & Electric Co.
American Machine & Foundry Co.
American Patent Law Association.
American Public Power Association.
American Society of Mechanical Engineers.
Department of the Army.
Association of American Railroads.
Association of the Bar of the City of New York.
Atomic Energy Commission.
Argonne National Laboratory.
Oak Ridge National Laboratory.
The Babcock & Wilcox Co.
Bechtel Corp.
Bendix Aviation Corp.
California Institute of Technology.
University of California.
Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Co.
Chamber of Commerce of the United States.
University of Chicago.
Combustion Engineering, Inc.
Department of Commerce.
Commonwealth Edison Co.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Connecticut Public Utilities Commission.
Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.
Cooperative League of the U. S. A.
Department of Defense.
Detroit Edison Co.
Dow Chemical Co.
Duquesne Light Co.
Edison Electric Institute.
E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.
Electric Boat Division, General Dynamics Corp.
Electric Energy, Inc.
Engineers Joint Council.
Fairbanks, Morse & Co.
Federal Power Commission.
Foster Wheeler Corp.
General Advisory Committee to the Atomic Energy Commission.
General Electric Co.
Department of the Interior.
Henry J. Kaiser Co.
Board of Supervisors, Los Angeles County.
Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
University of Michigan.
Middle South Utilities, Inc.
Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co.
Monsanto Chemical Co.
National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.
National Association of Manufacturers.
National Associaton of Railroads and Utilities Commissioners.
National Lead Co.
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.
Department of the Navy.
New England Council.
North American Aviation, Inc.
The North American Co.
Nuclear Development Associates, Inc.
Patent Law Association of Los Angeles.
The Pennsylvania State College.
Phillips Petroleum Co.
Pioneer Service & Engineering Co.
Princeton University.
Public Affairs Institute.
State of Maine Public Utilities Commission.
Radioactive Products, Inc.
The Rand Corp.
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co.
Standard Oil Development Co.
Department of State.
Sylvania Electric Products, Inc.
Tracerlab, Inc.
Union Electric System.
United Aircraft Corp., Pratt & Whitney Aircraft Division.
United Gas, Coke & Chemical Workers of America, CIO.
Vitro Corporation of America.
Walter Kidde Nuclear Laboratories, Inc.
Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There are many public-interest groups listed there.

I would like also to place into the RECORD some statistics. The committee held 91 meetings on this subject matter, and developed 4,643 pages of record, executive and public. We indeed spent a lot of time on this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator want the statistics printed in the RECORD?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Only my statement of the figures. The rest of it is extraneous.

I will yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Iowa.

I may say this is a very refreshing experience we are having today. We are discussing the issues. I think as a result we will undoubtedly be able to make some progress. I should like to direct my attention to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. I do so primarily to clarify the RECORD. Each Senator has his own point of view on this amendment. I think I have a pretty good idea of what is going to happen to it. Nevertheless, I want it to be quite clear, insofar as my own point of view of it is concerned.

No. 1, this amendment establishes a liaison committee on electric power to advise with the Atomic Energy Commission, just as there is a military liaison committee for military matters to advise with the Atomic Energy Commission. A person can look at this bill and make all the interpretations he wishes, Mr. President, but when he is all through there is one basic feature of this bill which is new, and that new feature is the licensing and the patent feature, as related to the use of atomic energy for the development of electric energy. It is just that simple.

This is an electric-power bill basically, insofar as the new features are concerned. Therefore, it seems appropriate we should be considering measures and amendments which relate to the distribution and generation and the sale of electrical energy.

I remind my good friend from Iowa, who has been very considerate in this debate, that we did adopt the Johnson amendment. The Johnson amendment was not in the original bill, but the Senate adopted it. We put the Atomic Energy Commission in the power business. Some people may not like it, but that is what we did.

Since we put the Atomic Energy Commission into the power business, it seems to me that the amendment of the Senator from Montana is most germane and most to the point. This does not mean that we deny private industry the right to get patents and licenses; not at all. Private industry will have its opportunity, but private industry will have its opportunity in the full realization that atomic energy is a government monopoly.

I hope that no Senator is prepared to change that. Atomic energy belongs to the Government. The use of atomic energy may be licensed to private industry. If private industry gets a license, it ought to be subject to rules and regulations such as we have had laid down for 50 years in the distribution and sale and generation of electrical energy.

This is no more new than Ben Franklin's Almanac, so let us not act as if something all at once happened and a great new socialistic plot were coming upon the country. This is as socialistic as Teddy Roosevelt and root beer. That is about how socialistic it is.

Now, Mr. President, I remind my colleagues that we also have, on page 23, section 44, what is known as the byproduct energy provision. That was in the committee bill—byproduct energy, as an incidental of the Atomic Energy Commission's research and development projects.

That byproduct energy is to be sold. That byproduct energy is to be distributed; and it is to be distributed as the bill provides:

If the energy produced is electric energy, the price shall be subject to regulation by the appropriate agency, State or Federal, having jurisdiction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] have expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY. How times does fly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, with reference to the statements made by the Senator from Minnesota as to what is American and what is not, it is my conception that America, in its greatness and its strength, is still based upon the private free-enterprise system, and not upon the dead hand of bureaucratic operation of the American economy. The camel got his head under the tent in the Johnson amendment, and the pending amendment is the neck or the front quarters of the camel getting under the tent of the American system of free enterprise so far as the development of electric power and the electrical activities of the Atomic Energy Commission and the whole atomic energy program are concerned.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa yielded his time back; unless he wants to take his time back, he has yielded. All time for debate has expired.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. I want to ask unanimous consent——

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yielded for a question.

Mr. MURRAY. The distinguished Senator from Iowa yielded for a question.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time for debate has expired, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to modify my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana asks unanimous consent that he be permitted to modify his amendment. The Senator has that right.

Mr. MURRAY. At the end of subparagraph (a) I desire to strike out the word "and" and insert "three representatives of the private utilities to be appointed by the President and."

I ask that that modification be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be modified as indicated.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Goldwater	Maybank
Anderson	Gore	McCarran
Barrett	Green	Millikin
Beall	Hayden	Monroney
Bennett	Hendrickson	Morse
Bowring	Hennings	Murray
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Neely
Burke	Hill	Pastore
Bush	Holland	Payne
Butler	Humphrey	Potter
Byrd	Ives	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Reynolds
Carlson	Jenner	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kennedy	Smathers
Crippa	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Knowland	Sparkman
Douglas	Kuchel	Stennis
Duff	Langer	Symington
Dworshak	Lehman	Thye
Eastland	Lennon	Upton
Ervin	Long	Watkins
Ferguson	Magnuson	Welker
Frear	Malone	Wiley
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams
George	Martin	Young

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk may read the amendment, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment, as modified, will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 4, add the following new section 28 and renumber present sections 27 and 28 and 29 and 30:

"SEC. 28. Electric Power Liaison Committee: There is hereby established an Electric Liaison Committee consisting of—

"a. A Chairman, who shall be the head thereof and who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall receive compensation at the rate prescribed for the Chairman of the Military Liaison Committee; three representatives of the private utilities, to be appointed by the President, and

"b. A representative of the Federal Power Commission, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southwest Power Administration, the Southeast Power Administration, the Corps of Engineers, and such other Government agencies as the President may from time to time determine. The Chairman of the Committee may designate one of the members of the Comittee as Acting Chairman to act during his absence. The Commission shall advise and consult with other Government agencies, through the Committee, on all atomic energy matters which relate to electric power applications of atomic energy, including the development, manufacture, and use of atomic reactors for power purposes, the allocation of special nuclear material for such purposes, the technical, economic, and accounting relationships between production of special nuclear material and atomic energy for electric power and for atomic weapons, appropriate policies to govern the production and distribution of electric power from atomic energy in order that the benefits of such power shall be widely distributed and maximum revenues shall be returned to the Federal Treasury, and the integration of atomic power policies and administration with other power activities of the Federal Government; and shall keep other Government agencies, through the Committee, fully and currently informed of all such matters before the Commission. Other Government agencies, through the Committee, shall have the authority to make written recommendations to the Commission from time to time on matters relating to civilian applications of atomic energy as they deem appropriate."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would note "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 30, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—30

Burke	Hill	Magnuson
Chavez	Humphrey	Mansfield
Clements	Jackson	Maybank
Douglas	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Eastland	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Frear	Kennedy	Murray
Fulbright	Kerr	Neely
Gore	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hayden	Langer	Symington
Hennings	Lehman	Young

NAYS—56

Aiken	Capehart	Ferguson
Anderson	Carlson	George
Barrett	Cooper	Goldwater
Beall	Cordon	Green
Bennett	Crippa	Hendrickson
Bowring	Daniel	Hickenlooper
Bridges	Dirksen	Holland
Bush	Duff	Ives
Butler	Dworshak	Jenner
Byrd	Ervin	Johnson, Colo.

Knowland	Payne	Smith, N. J.
Kuchel	Potter	Stennis
Lennon	Purtell	Thye
Long	Reynolds	Upton
Malone	Robertson	Watkins
Martin	Saltonstall	Welker
McCarran	Schoeppel	Wiley
Millikin	Smathers	Williams
Pastore	Smith, Maine	

NOT VOTING—10

Bricker	Gillette	Mundt
Case	Kefauver	Russell
Ellender	McCarthy	
Flanders	McClellan	

So Mr. MURRAY's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 7-24-54-G, as modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 82, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 170. No contract entered into under the authority of this act shall provide, and no contract entered into under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, shall be modified or amended after the date of enactment of this act to provide, for direct payment by the Commission of any Federal income taxes on behalf of any contractor performing such contract for profit, or for any payments to any such contractor as reimbursement for any Federal income taxes paid by such contractor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send a proposed unanimous-consent agreement to the desk, and ask that the secretary may read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The secretary will read the proposed unanimous-consent agreement.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment 7-24-54-G to S. 3690 submitted by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: Provided, That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. GORE. I do not expect to address the Senate for more than a period of 30 minutes.

The issue involved by this amendment which I have presented is simple. The discussion of it should not require very long.

I would expect to resist the temptation to address the Senate for more than an hour, but I would not like to address the Senate for any period of time under a threat that the amendment which I have offered will be laid on the table without consideration; therefore, I am not prepared to give my consent to the unanimous consent of the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Senator withhold his objection for one moment while I make a statement?

Mr. GORE. I will withhold the objection.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I want to say earlier in the day I understood the Senator [Mr. GORE] thought half an hour would be sufficient to make the presentation on his side of the case, and I understand that the Senator from Iowa feels half an hour would be sufficient to make it on the other side. However, if the distinguished Senator from Tennessee feels that an hour is not sufficient time, I am prepared to modify my request to make it an hour and a half or to make it 2 hours, if the Senator desires. I will hereby modify my request to make it 2 hours instead of 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to the request as modified?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object.

The distinguished majority leader is a man of great capacity in whom all Members have faith. He is a man possessed of many fine attributes.

I have thought during this debate that his many fine attributes have been exemplified.

I have wondered, though, if he did not lack just a little in the human equation. Perhaps I am in error.

I remember a few nights ago that he sought a unanimous-consent request. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] desired to speak on an amendment and asked for a modification of only an additional 30 minutes. The distinguished majority leader advised the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that the senior Senator from California could not modify.

To serve in this body as an individual Member requires flexibility, the ability to make adjustments to meet situations. It seems that the position of leadership requires even more the capacity to be flexible and to modify. If the junior Senator from Tennessee must now offer an amendment and discuss it under the threat of having it laid on the table without consideration—and a meritorious amendment, in his opinion—the junior Senator from Tennessee would prefer not to address the Senate. The majority leader need not undertake to bargain by increasing the time to 2 hours or to 20 hours. In the opinion of the junior Senator from Tennessee, no one on this side of the aisle desires to speak on the amendment except himself.

If the majority leader who occupies the mighty chair of the majority leader, and who has the votes to lay an amendment on the table, will just keep still in that mighty seat, I believe that this amendment can be disposed of in less than 1 hour, but if he insists upon being obstinate, then—well, I do not wish to go any further. I trust that the distinguished majority leader can operate with some confidence in his colleagues.

Earlier in the week some of us on this side gave him a gentlemen's agreement.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I remember that.

Mr. GORE. That gentlemen's agreement—further reserving the right to object——

Mr. JENNER. I want to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. You want to object?

Mr. JENNER. I want to object.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I hope the Senator will not try to take the Senator from Tennessee off his feet.

Mr. JENNER. I want him to talk as long as he wants to. I do not want to take him off the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor if he wants to hang onto it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as I understand it, I have a unanimous-consent request here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California yielded for that purpose, but in the meantime the Senator from Tennessee took the floor.

Mr. GORE. Is the junior Senator from Tennessee recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senator is recognized to the extent that the Senator from California has yielded the floor to the junior Senator from Tennessee to object.

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. Members on this side of the aisle, as the RECORD will show if anyone desires to read it, gave to the distinguished majority leader a "gentleman's agreement" that we would assist in bringing to a vote the Anderson amendment, and the Ferguson amendment on a day certain. We not only assisted, we succeeded.

I wish to assure the distinguished majority leader that if he will show a little faith in a considerable number of his colleagues and realize that the rules of the United States Senate are not bad rules; if he will show a little trust, a little flexibility, then we will assist in bringing this amendment to an issue, I believe, within an hour. But under all the circumstances the junior Senator from Tennessee does not like to offer an amendment and then have to consent to a limitation of debate in order to enjoy the privilege of addressing the Senate with the implied threat that otherwise his amendment will be laid on the table without consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee object or does he not object?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I again want to say to the distinguished Senator that if he feels a half hour would be insufficient, I have suggested doubling the time. If the Senator feels 3 hours is required, I want to be fair and reasonable about it. However, I call attention to a statement which came over the wire services a few minutes ago, which reads:

MORSE—

Speaking of the junior Senator from Oregon—

who sat in on the Democratic caucus—

It was not; I understand it was a caucus of the group that has been engaged in this discussion, or filibuster—

told newsmen that he has not abandoned his all-out battle against the bill. He said he will object to all unanimous consent requests involving the limitation of debate on matters that he considers important.

I want to say to the Senator it is not pleasant to sit here and be told that the

majority leader lacks certain human qualities. I have certainly tried to lean over backwards, and I think most Senators will bear me out. I have tried to the best of my ability to work out the schedule so the Senate can conduct its business. I do not like night sessions. They are wearing and tiring on all Senators. I know the heavy responsibility on them as a result of these all-night sessions. But I am trying to expedite the public's business. We are now in a situation where we have spent the equivalent of 17 eight-hour days on the bill up to 10 o'clock this morning. It does seem to me under all those circumstances that if the majority leader, carrying out his responsibilities, some of them unpleasant, has agreed to double the time, has agreed to treble the time, he is not being arbitrary and he is not being unreasonable.

This has not been done without prior notice to the Senate earlier that if we could not succeed in the cloture vote, which we did not do, and I do not complain about it, because, frankly, I was under no illusion I could get 64 votes for cloture. However, I have the responsibility to break the filibuster some other way if it could not be broken in that manner.

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. It might very well be that there are only two Senators in the Chamber who wish to speak on the amendment. Would not the Senator entertain inquiring whether there are any other Senators who wish to speak on the amendment besides the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Iowa? It could well be that those are the only two Senators present who wish to speak on it. If that is true, we certainly——

Mr. KNOWLAND. In the spirit of trying to cooperate with the other side of the aisle, and on the assurances made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, and despite the fact that I have been more or less served notice indirectly in regard to this matter, without stating a precedent for any other amendment, I will withdraw my unanimous consent request and suggest that the Senator proceed to debate his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized and has the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I now wish to advise the distinguished majority leader that the junior Senator from Tennessee did not say the Senator from California was lacking in any of the fine human qualities. He said rather that he had wondered about this during the course of this debate. I now wish to resolve those doubts and say he is possessed of all of them.

Mr. President, I ask for the ayes and nays on my amendment.

The ayes and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I now wish to ask unanimous consent that the clerk reread the amendment for the information of the Senate, and then I shall address the Senate for no more than 20 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator asked for unanimous consent and I reserve the right to object.

Mr. GORE. I asked for the ayes and nays. That does not require a unanimous consent request. However, I yield to the junior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Tennessee will withdraw the remark he made a little while ago about the majority leader.

Mr. GORE. I withdrew it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was a clear transgression of the rules.

Mr. GORE. I had already retracted it. I withdraw it and apologize.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the amendment being read?

Mr. GORE. I ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 82, between lines 19 and 20, it is proposed to add a new section as follows:

SEC. 170. No contract entered into under the authority of this act shall provide, and no contract entered into under the authority of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, shall be modified or amended after the date of enactment of this act to provide, for direct payment by the Commission of any Federal income taxes on behalf of any contractor performing such contract for profit, or for any payments to any such contractor as reimbursement for any Federal income taxes paid by such contractor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendment is not directed to any particular contractor, nor is it added to a particular section of the bill. The amendment adds a new section to the bill. It would prohibit the Atomic Energy Commission, under the authority of the bill, to make a contract by which it is agreed that the Atomic Energy Commission will reimburse a corporation or person contracting with the Government for profit for the payment or repayment of its Federal income tax.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to that last qualification, the corporation or person contracting with the Government for profit, I take it that the contract with the TVA, which has a similar provision in it, would not be affected by the provision?

Mr. GORE. This applies to Federal income taxes levied against citizens and corporations throughout the United States.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does that apply only to income tax?

Mr. GORE. Only to Federal income tax.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It would not apply to local or property tax?

Mr. GORE. It would not. As I originally introduced the amendment, it would have. I realized that there are precedents for that in cost-plus contracts. There are no precedents for reimbursement of income tax.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Do I understand there is no precedent in any cost-plus contract for reimbursement of Federal income taxes?

Mr. GORE. For reimbursement of Federal income taxes. I am advised there is no such precedent.

Mr. BUSH. I am aware of 1 such contract between 2 private companies.

Mr. GORE. I am not speaking of a contract between two private companies; I am speaking of a contract between the Government and a private company. I have asked the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office to give me whatever information they have with regard to the question. Neither one could come up with a precedent. I have precedents showing that such reimbursement was denied, going back to 1919.

I will say to the distinguished Senator, and also to the rest of my colleagues, that if such a contract or contracts are permitted, then the Senate Finance Committee should consider that. This is a tax matter involving the question of whether certain corporations with Government contracts under certain conditions should have reimbursement of their taxes. The distinguished junior Senator from Colorado and the eminent senior Senator from Georgia ought to report such a matter to the Senate from the Finance Committee. This is an attempt to alter our Federal tax policy. I merely offered an amendment to provide that they could not be reimbursed for Federal income taxes. I trust that the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa will accept the amendment. I see no justification——

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With respect to the Senator's statement about the lack of precedents, I say to the Senator from Tennessee that there are two very pertinent precedents where exactly that has been done. One is the OVEC and the other is the EEI contract, in which Federal income taxes are taken into consideration in calculating the cost, which is the same thing as reimbursement. In the Dixon-Yates contract it is not a reimbursement, but it is taken into consideration in calculating the basic costs. There is no substantial difference in the Dixon-Yates proposed contract with respect to Federal income taxes than there is today in the Ohio Valley Electric contracts or the Electric Energy contract group, located at Joppa. I will say to the Senator, I discovered that fact just a very short time ago, really while the last controversy was going on. The Senator will find that the Dixon-Yates contract with respect to the Federal income taxes provision follows the same pattern as in the OVEC and the EEI contracts made in 1952.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate that statement.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I shall attempt to get the Senator a little more detailed information on it. I shall try to get it by telephone now. I have my information by telephone confirmed from two different sources.

Mr. GORE. I think the distinguished senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] may well find that in those cases there is not actual repayment of Federal income tax or reimbursement of taxes paid, but rather that the income taxes paid, and to be paid, are taken into consideration in the contract, and in the rate structure.

I say to the able Senator it would be a very unwise precedent indeed for us to start reimbursing a corporation for its taxes. That means that no matter how much we may have to raise taxes on other people in the future, this particular concern or particular person having such a contract would not have to pay any additional burden, and would not have any additional burden during the life of the contract.

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

Mr. GORE. I will yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will say it is my understanding that the pattern and the formula proposed to be used in the Dixon-Yates contract for the calculation of basic costs upon which the rate structure depends follow the same pattern as the EEI and OVEC contract. I do not understand that it is proposed for the Government or the Atomic Energy Commission to write a check in reimbursement of the taxes, but it is considered and mentioned that way so that the financial structure of the company vis-a-vis its rates charges can be calculated. I think the pattern is the same. That is my understanding.

Mr. GORE. Well, if the pattern is the same then it was not so described to the committee of which the distinguished Senator is vice chairman.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think the Chairman is correct, substantially, on that. I think there was perhaps an unfortunate or ill-advised use of words. I may be wrong about that.

Mr. GORE. Why does the distinguished Senator not accept this amendment, then? There may have been a misuse of words, but the Congress is on notice that such a proposal has been made contrary to any precedent in American history. I say it would be very bad.

If we start reimbursing people for the taxes they pay, where is the private enterprise to pay taxes?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of course, this contract has not been made yet. It is in the process of negotiation.

Mr. GORE. No. But it is proposed and submitted to the Congress. Instead of adding an amendment to the particular section, I have added a new section so that it will not have limited application to just one concern, but to all concerns.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is aware of the fact, is he not, that at no place in the Dixon-Yates proposal is the matter referred to as a reimbursement of Federal income taxes? The word "reimbursement" crept in in the Bureau of the Budget analysis, and they used the term "reimbursement."

The Dixon-Yates people, so far as I could find, did not use the word "reimbursement" of Federal income taxes, but used the general reference to that, and the actual Federal income taxes which they might have to pay, because of the equity capital situation, which would be part of the basic cost structure upon which the rate was based.

Mr. GORE. Whether it is reimbursement or repayment, I think it amounts to the same thing.

I would like to read to the Senate the position the Government has taken throughout the years in this matter. I read from a summary of cases arising out of World War I. This is January 31, 1919. Here is the summary and here is the position:

> Federal income and excess property taxes cannot be allowed as part of costs under Navy cost-plus-profit contracts, even when the contracts include "taxes of all kinds, including munitions tax," because the statute commands the contractor to pay such taxes from profits.

Therefore it is clear. I can read case after case of the General Accounting Offices cases. I have other books I can cite. In no instance has the profit made from a contract or any portion of the taxes levied on that profit been allowed to be deducted as an operating cost of the contract. I say that it would be most unwise, whether the word "reimbursement" is used or "repayment" is used.

How are you going to levy a tax on a person making $30 a week? How are you going to levy a tax on other corporations in the country if you start to have Uncle Sam reach down in his pocket and repay one particular concern or several particular concerns for the taxes they have paid?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President.

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

Mr. GORE. I do not want to exceed 20 minutes. Will the Senator make it brief?

Mr. KILGORE. I regret very much that the Senator said "20 minutes," because a few things on this item deserve more than 20 minutes.

Mr. GORE. I only said that in a desire to cooperate.

Mr. KILGORE. I know. We have had hearings in the Appropriation Committees on windfalls in which the airlines collected back more than the income tax paid and stuck it in their pockets. We have had those things.

If you talk about windfalls, we have had those.

In this case how many Members of this body or of the Congress knew about these contracts for power and knew about the fact that the rates were fixed so as to reimburse them for all the income tax and give them more than any States public utility commission would give them by way of normal profit? It would give them more than that after the payment of taxes. That has been done under the guise of classified contracts.

Are we going to permit that to go on? That is the question I want to ask the Senator. This is the first time it has come out in the open and come out to congressional view, shall I say?

May I say to the Senator from Tennessee: Is it not necessary that the Congress take a logical view and treat these special companies the same as we treat other people in the United States of America?

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I say this: If you are going to accord this treatment to one corporation with a Government contract, then how are you going to deny it to others? No matter what emergency might arise in the future, which would require a reimposition of excess-profit taxes or require us to raise taxes on other corporations and other people, a person or a firm with this kind of contract would bear no heavier burden. He would be insulated. He would have tax immunity. It is not fair. It is not right. It is not wise.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. Assuming that the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] would apply to the proposed Dixon-Yates contract, will the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] advise the Senate what the overall effect on the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority would be from the adoption of this amendment?

Mr. GORE. None at all.

Mr. AIKEN. There would be none at all?

Mr. GORE. It applies only to the payment or repayment or reimbursement of Federal income taxes by the Government on behalf of and to persons or private corporations.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] does not believe, then, that the proposal of the Government to pay these taxes was for the purpose of enabling the Tennessee Valley Authority to get lower rates?

Mr. GORE. The TVA is not involved in this.

Mr. AIKEN. All right.

Mr. GORE. I have tried not to direct it to Dixon-Yates in particular. If such a contract is seriously proposed, then I think the Congress ought to take a position on it. The Government has never had such a contract, so I am advised by the Library of Congress and the General Accounting Office.

I do not think it would be wise to have such a contract. Since the Senate is on notice that such has been proposed, I think the Senate should take a position.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator feels it would have no effect whatsoever on the operation of the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. GORE. None at all.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. I have a few questions and in those questions I think I can show my attitude of seeking information on this.

First, do I understand one basis of the objection of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] to the particular language of the bill which he seeks to amend now by his amendment is that he feels the language in the bill really constitutes tax

legislation and being tax legislation it ought to go to the Senate Committee on Finance? Is that the Senator's position?

Mr. GORE Well, if we are to set up certain conditions under which corporations will be reimbused for the taxes they pay then surely it ought to be considered by the tax writing committee. We should not allow it to go on by way of a contract.

Mr. MORSE. Is it then the Senator's position that because he thinks this is tax language and therefore it results in tax legislation we ought to have the judgment of the Committee on Finance before we write into this bill what may be a very bad tax precedent which will rise to plague the Committee on Finance later when it comes to consider tax legislation?

Mr. GORE. Well, I agree with the Senator. I think I have fairly well presented it.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Has the Senator finished?

Mr. GORE. I am sorry. I thought the Senator had finished.

Mr. MORSE. I wanted to find out what the theory of the Senator is. I understood from some of the Senator's remarks the Senator was objecting because he thought it was an encroachment on the province of the Finance Committee, because it was tax language. I just wanted to make certain.

Mr. GORE. It is certainly a tax matter.

Mr. MORSE. My next questions is: If that is true, does the Senator know what the position of the Finance Committee is in respect to this kind of tax legislation? Has the Finance Committee in the past rejected this kind of a proposal?

Mr. GORE. I know of no time when the Congress has taken the position of exempting anyone from taxes on income except by a rule that applies to all. The standards are set out and everybody is measured by the same yardstick. I am saying this would be a special situation.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator answer this question: To the extent that the cost-plus contract to which the Senator has referred and the other contracts which have been entered into by the Government and private concerns in this country are involved, is it not true that those contracts have been in respect to war contracts and defense contracts and not so-called business or commercial contracts, which really are involved in this legislation, because the type of contract we are talking about really is a contract for commercial operations and not defense operations? Am I wrong about that?

Mr. GORE. Well, I am trying to present an amendment without specific reference to the proposed Dixon-Yates contract. I think it is broader than that, though it will apply to it also. If the Senator has referred to the Dixon-Yates contract then that is not a defense contract. I think that a national defense contract would have priority over one which was not. This is a broad provision applying to all.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point. It is a very broad provision, and it is a provision so broad that it can be applied to so-called commercial operations by one of the contracting parties who enters into an arrangement with the Government that has nothing to do with defense or war plants in that contract; so what I am trying to find out is whether or not I am correct, because I have not had a chance to study this in detail, that whatever tax provision we have had in any prior contract with the Government related, after all, to contracts that had to do with defense and war operations, and not with commercial operations; and if I am right about that, then my next question, I think, becomes very pertinent: Is there not a danger here that we are laying down language in this bill, if the language of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] is not adopted, which is going to have the effect of taking a certain group of American corporations or individuals, setting them apart from all the other taxpayers in this country, and giving them some tax benefits that the rest of us do not enjoy, as far as Federal income tax is concerned?

And, if that is true, then, really, does it not provide for a most unjust and unfair, discriminatory principle in this bill in the field of taxes?

Mr. GORE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator that I believe I have so said. I appreciate his further emphasis.

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

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Apropos of what the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has stated, today I discussed his proposed amendment with the distinguished ranking minority member of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. He told me that he favored the inclusion in this bill of such an amendment.

And, Mr. President, the minority leader had further conferences with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], who is also a member of the Finance Committee, and the ranking member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, one of the senior members on the Senate side. He very strongly favors an amendment of this kind, as do all the Democratic Senate members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. They are unanimous in their view that such an amendment to this bill should be adopted. I am very hopeful that the distinguished vice chairman would agree to take this amendment to conference.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I am concerned about one point. As I say, I said to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] a moment ago, and if he will accept my word for it——

Mr. GORE. I will accept the Senator's word for anything he says.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have it by telephone from good sources in the Atomic Energy Commission, who have access to it, that the OVEC and the EEI contracts for Paducah and Portsmouth do contain a formula for the recognition of Federal income taxes in the cost structure upon which the rate charged is based. That is one of the factors.

Now, I take it that the Senator from Tennessee does not deny that the question of income taxes is a part——

Mr. GORE. Of the rate structure.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Of the cost structure and the rate structure.

Mr. GORE. I realize it must be, and have no objection to that.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. And the Senator from Tennessee is attempting to reach in this amendment—I am trying to get the Senator's position clear.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is attempting to reach in this amendment which, as I understand it, says, and I will begin reading line 5 of the amendment, if I have the amendment correct, and I have an interlined amendment here: "for direct payment by the Commission of any Federal income taxes on behalf of any contractor performing such contract for profit, or for any payments to any such contractor as reimbursement for any Federal income taxes paid by such contractor." That is my understanding as to the language of the amendment.

Mr. GORE. That is right.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. As I understand the Senator's amendment, he is trying to avoid what he believes to be a precedent of direct reimbursement by the Federal Government of income taxes as a specific item.

Mr. GORE. That is right.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Well, Mr. President, I just want to say that so far as I am concerned, with that understanding, I do not believe we are so far apart. I think we can shorten this matter up unless someone else——

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I will say, while I am on my feet, that I am perfectly willing to accept the amendment then.

Mr. GORE. I yield the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I have no objection to withdrawing the request for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous consent for withdrawing the request for the yeas and nays? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have only 2, 3, or 4 minutes to comment on this amendment.

I want to say that I heartily endorse the amendment, as I understand its purpose. I tried to bring out that understanding in a series of questions I asked the Senator from Tennessee.

I want to say that if the Senator from Iowa has been correctly informed by the Atomic Energy Commission as to what they have done in connection with the other two contracts he has men-

tioned, all the more reason, Mr. President, why we should put this legislative check on the Atomic Energy Commission. If they are entering into some contracts for which we can find no precedent in the records of the General Accounting Office, for which no one in high position, in the Government, who has knowledge of the whole field of taxation is able to cite to the Senator from Tennessee a single precedent and for which the Congressional Library could not find a single precedent. I say if that is true, Mr. President, and now in the last minutes of the debate on this particular amendment, the Atomic Energy Commission advises the Senator from Iowa that they are doing this in a couple of contracts they have let, then we had better put a legislative check on them, and in a hurry. Why do I say that, Mr. President? I think the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] used a very apt phrase when he said that this constitutes a type of hidden windfall.

Now, I believe in taxation in accordance with ability to pay. We cannot reconcile this kind of discriminatory favoritism for certain selected corporations and businesses with the principle of ability to pay.

My fear is, Mr. President, that what is being done by certain language in this bill is to set up a tax windfall for a favored few corporations in this country. This amendment is essential if we are to have uniformity of tax liability in this Nation. I am shocked if it is true that the Atomic Energy Commission is giving tax advantages to some corporations with which it is entering into contracts.

Mr. President, I cannot reconcile that with any justice to the ordinary masses of our people. There is no reason why we should be taxing the rank and file of our people under the Federal income-tax law on the basis of the principle of uniformity, but have a group of favored corporations or business operators getting what amounts, in effect, to a tax exemption.

The next point I want to make is that we are talking about an amendment in relation to an atomic energy bill that is pointed toward commercial operations, and not defense and war operations. I do not think we should ever lose sight of that.

The objection many of us have to this bill is that it gives for commercial purposes to big business really a monopolistic control over the atomic energy program, at least in respect to the development of electric power from atomic energy. Now, to add to that, Mr. President, tax favortism makes this bill nauseating, in my opinion. That must be the feeling of everyone who believes that we ought to stand for sound American principle of a uniform application of tax principles to all our people in respect to peacetime operations and particularly commercial operations.

In emergency situations, in time of war, when defense needs are great, when the very security of our country is at stake, I think a case can be made for granting some special privileges to business corporations that are using their facilities in order to develop war materials required for the security of the Nation. But that is not what we are talking about in connection with the particular language in the bill to which we are objecting.

We are talking, Mr. President, about a tax formula or principle that is going to apply in respect to what amounts to commercial operations by American business concerns.

It is not helped any, in my judgment, by saying, "Well, it is going to apply only to contracts between the Government and business concerns," because these contracts are not going to relate to war needs. They are going to relate at best, it seems to me, if I understand the situation correctly, to contracts in the field of electric power supply—of supplying the electric power for the needs of various agencies of the Government.

But, be that as it may, I think there is no answer to my argument that what we are doing here is establishing a tax principle of favortism or, as the Senator from West Virginia called it, the granting by law of a tax windfall to certain favored corporations and businesses.

That is one of the things which has engendered so much fear on the part of many of us as to what is really embodied in a bill of 104 pages, which has not had adequate analysis in the course of the debate.

If the Atomic Energy Commission is doing what the Senator from Iowa says it is doing, I think at this point we must insist that it be checked by law. I believe the language proposed by the Senator from Tennessee does check it and brings a halt—at least I hope it does—to this kind of favoritism.

Let me say something about taking the amendment to conference. I am perfectly willing that it be taken to conference, and I want it to be taken to conference.

In view of the very strong differences of opinion that exist on the floor of the Senate on the part of very sincere Senators on both sides of the argument, I believe nothing should be taken to conference unless it is clearly understood that a vigorous fight will be made for it in conference. The idea of just taking something to conference and kicking it out after little debate in conference should not be the basis on which any amendment is taken to conference.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I believe that this is an amendment that should be adopted. I for one am in favor of the amendment. I assure the Senator from Oregon that I will be just as critical as anyone else if, after the conferees have worked on the amendment, they bring a bill back without having properly considered the amendment.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do want to join in expressing the hope that the distinguished Senator from Iowa will take the amendment to conference, as he has indicated he will. I believe this tax question is basically one for the Committee on Ways and Means of the House and for the Committee on Finance of the Senate to consider. The fact that there are two contracts which furnish a precedent, having been first negotiated in 1952, under a prior administration, does not necessarily mean to me that the precedent is a good one.

Secondly, I think that either a remission of or offset for the Federal income taxes is a matter, certainly, about which I have grave doubts. I think, as a matter of public policy, that it is unsound. I do not know, Mr. President, if we once start down that road, where we will draw the line, whether in the atomic energy field or the field of defense plants, or other fields.

Therefore, I hope that the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who has said he would take the amendment to conference, will take it to conference, and that the Senate will vote for it. So far as I am concerned, this is no empty gesture.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] for supporting the thesis that I am seeking to defend in my speech.

I wish to finish the point I was discussing. I do not believe that any amendment should go to conference by way of any understanding we reach in the course of the remaining part of this debate, unless there is a sincere determination to fight for the position the Senate takes on the amendment.

If any Senator feels that an amendment should not go to conference and be fought for in conference, we ought to fight out the question on the floor and vote the amendment up or down. We are trying to compose our differences on this bill, and I think a very valiant effort has been made by the Senators on both sides of this bill to find some basis for composing our differences. Unless we mean to fight for these amendments in conference then we should not adopt them as a parliamentary tactic to close this debate.

But here again I want to make it very clear that I will not fly under any false colors as to what my position is.

The Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] read a ticker tape report a few minutes ago as to the position that the press quoted me as having taken on objecting to unanimous consent agreements.

I stand on that press report, with this interpretation of it. I was called out by the press, and I was asked if I had gone along with any agreement on the part of any group in the Senate that I would not raise objections to unanimous-consent proposals to limit debate on various amendments.

I said that, to the contrary, I made it very clear to the group this morning that I was not going to bind myself by any commitment. I want it to be perfectly clear that I have very deep convictions about this bill. We are dealing with a bill that will affect our people for many years to come. If it should be attempted

to pass the bill in its present form, without some amendments being added to it—and this happens to be one of the amendments we consider to be very vital—so far as I am concerned I would fight to beat the bill as long as I can stand up on the floor of the Senate and speak.

That is what I said, and I believe the press was justified in interpreting my remarks as being what the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] read from the ticker.

I do not know how the majority leader could have received any finer cooperation than I have attempted to give him all day long. I believe that on both sides of the issue there is a sincere effort to try to compose our differences. I was asked by the press as to what the greatest stumbling block was that existed with reference to this bill. It is the unrestricted principle in this bill in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract. Some of us feel called upon to say very strongly that if we do not place any restrictions upon that particular part of the bill we will, in effect, create the great possibility of scuttling TVA, and we will create the great possibility of scuttling the whole public power yardstick program.

I know that honest men differ with me. Some say, in the first place, it will not have that effect; others say, in the second place, if it does have that effect, that is exactly what they want. That is what the conflict over this bill is all about.

I still feel that there is a good opportunity and a good chance that we can compose our differences if we try to approach the issues with reason. The attempt to use a parliamentary bludgeon to force the minority to accede to the demands of the majority should stop.

The last point I wish to make is this—and the Senator from California alluded to it—the language the amendment seeks to correct is tax language. It falls within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. It has no place in this bill. I think it is an encroachment upon the Committee on Finance. I think we are entitled to have hearings before the Committee on Finance and to have the judgment of the Committee on Finance as to the desirability of this part of the bill.

As the Senator from California has pointed out, and as I had previously mentioned, there are the precedents which at the last minute are announced to us by the Atomic Energy Commission. We had better stop the Atomic Energy Commission from entering into such tax windfall contracts. They are contracts which, in our judgment, do not provide uniformity in connection with taxes but which grant to certain groups rank favoritism that is not enjoyed by the rest of the taxpayers who are not within those favored groups.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be printed.

This proposed amendment in the nature of a substitute is designed to accomplish a purpose similar to that sought by my amendment numbered 7-20-54—B, which is also in the nature of a substitute. This amendment, like the earlier one, seeks to separate the international aspects of the pending bill from those more extensive and controversial provisions dealing with the development of atomic power within the United States.

My previous amendment numbered 7-20-54—B would substitute for the present bill those provisions dealing with the international exchange of atomic information, both military and industrial, as recommended by President Eisenhower in his special message of February 17. The language of that amendment is identical with the language of the amendment drafted by the Atomic Energy Commission and recommended by President Eisenhower, to meet the immediate need of facilitating the exchange of atomic information with our friends and allies.

The amendment I am introducing today would accomplish virtually the same purpose but would use the provisions already included in S. 3690 as the base, but would make therein essential changes needed to free President Eisenhower and the State Department from the shackles which would be imposed under the terms of the present language contained in S. 3690. This present amendment would incorporate the changes recommended by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] which he submitted to the Senate in the form of an amendment to S. 3690—an amendment tabled on July 23.

My present amendment would permit the negotiation and agreement with groups of nations as well as with single nations or regional defense organizations.

This proposal is, of course, a complete substitute for S. 3690 and would have the effect of enacting the necessary provisions covering international relations but would leave to more leisurely and comprehensive study the complex provisions in S. 3690, dealing with licenses, patents, and the other provisions which have the effect, in my judgment, of giving away the public's rights in atomic energy to a few huge corporations.

The basic pattern of my amendment is the same as that originally approved by the Atomic Energy Commission and recommended by President Eisenhower.

Special provisions are incorporated in this amendment to insure that existing agreements between the United States and other nations on atomic matters—a wide range of agreements, some of them without policy importance but of great importance to the conduct of our foreign relations, will not be abrogated or endangered.

I have drafted this amendment in consultation with experts who have been working on this matter for years. There may be technical imperfections, but the major sections are quite clear in their intent.

That intent is to overcome the handicaps presently existing to the freer exchange of nonmilitary atomic information with our friends and allies and the relaxation of the inflexible restrictions which now prevent us from telling our allies, and their military forces, essential information about the handling of atomic weapons. The latter inflexibility has placed severe handicaps on the operation of the joint defense command provided for under NATO.

This substitute clearly contains the necessary authorization to permit the President to proceed with the project for the establishment of an international atomic pool for peacetime purposes—whether or not the Soviet agrees to participate in such a group undertaking.

This substitute contains all the necessary safeguards requiring congressional supervision of those aspects of atomic energy exchange with our allies which clearly involve the extension and delegation of congressional authority, but retains in the hands of the Chief Executive and the State Department the conduct of diplomatic affairs, including the making of arrangements with foreign governments. The right of the Senate to consent and advise as to treaties on atomic energy is expressly retained.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 5 (a) (3) (C) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows: '(C) directly or indirectly engage in the production of any fissionable material outside of the United States, except (i) under an agreement for cooperation made pursuant to section 8 (d), or (ii) upon authorization by the Commission after a determination that such activity will not be inimical to the interest of the United States.'

"SEC. 2. Section 5 (d) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting before the period a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That nothing contained in this subsection (d) shall be construed to prohibit the Commission from cooperating with any nation or group of nations by distributing fissionable source, or byproduce materials pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation to which such nation or group of nations is a party and which is made in accordance with section 8 (d).'

"SEC. 3. (a) Section 8 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 8. (a) Definitions: As used in this act, (1) the term "international arrangement" means any international agreement approved, after the date of enactment of the Atomic Energy Act Amendments of 1954, by the Congress or any treaty during the time such agreement or treaty is in full force and effect, but does not include any agreement for cooperation; and (2) the term "agreement for cooperation" means any agreement with another nation, group of nations, or regional defense organization authorized or permitted under this act, and made pursuant to section 8 (d).'

"(b) Section 8 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(d) Cooperation with other nations: Cooperation with any nation, group of nations, or regional defense organization pursuant to this act may be undertaken if—

"'(1) the Commission or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 10 (a) (3) (B), the Department of Defense has approved the proposed agreement for cooperation, which proposed agreement shall include (1) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; (2) a guaranty by

the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained; (3) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose; and (4) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any restricted data (as defined in section 10 (b) (1)) to be transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement for cooperation;

"'(2) the President has approved and authorized the execution of the proposed agreement for cooperation, and has made a determination in writing that the performance or the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and

"'(3) the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with the approval and the determination of the President, has been submitted to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and a period of 30 days has elapsed while Congress is in session (in computing such 30 days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days): *Provided*, That nothing contained herein shall be construed to prohibit cooperation with any nation, group of nations, or regional defense organization if such cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement existing on the date of enactment of the Atomic Energy Act Amendments of 1954.'

"SEC. 4. (a) Section 10 (a) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by inserting ', except as provided in paragraph (3) of this subsection, or' immediately following 'That.'

"(b) Section 10 (a) (3) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) (A) The President may authorize the Commission to cooperate with another nation or group of nations and to communicate to that nation or group of nations restricted data on—

"'(i) refining, purification, and subsequent treatment of source material;

"'(ii) reactor development;

"'(iii) production of fissionable material;

"'(iv) health and safety;

"'(v) industrial and other applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes; and

"'(vi) research and development relating to the foregoing:

Provided, however, That no such cooperation shal involve the communication of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons: *And provided further*, That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement for cooperation entered into in accordance with section 8 (d), or is undertaken pursuant to an agreement existing on the effective date of the Atomic Energy Act amendments of 1954.

"'(B) The President may authorize the Department of Defense, with assistance of the Commission, to cooperate with another nation, a group of nations, or with a regional defense organization to which the United States is a party, and to communicate to that nation, group of nations, or organization such restricted data as is necessary to—

"'(i) the development of defense plans;

"'(ii) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

"'(iii) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons,

while such other nation, group of nations, or organization is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security:

Provided, however, That no such cooperation shall involve communication of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons except with regard to external characteristics, including size, weight, and shape, yields and effects, and systems employed in the delivery or use thereof but not including any data in these categories unless in the joint judgment of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense such data will not reveal important information concerning the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon: *And provided further*, That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 8 (d).'

"(c) Section 10 (b) (1) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The term "restricted data," as used in this act, means all data concerning (A) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (B) the production of fissionable material, or the use of fissionable material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the restricted data category pursuant to subsection (d) of this section.'

"(d) Section 10 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"'(d) Classification and declaration of restricted data:

"'(1) The Commission shall from time to time determine the data, within the definition of restricted data, which can be published without undue risk to the common defense and security and shall thereupon cause such data to be declassified and removed from the category of restricted data.

"'(2) The Commission shall maintain a continuous review of restricted data and of any Classification Guides issued for the guidance of those in the atomic-energy program with respect to the areas of restricted data which have been declassified in order to determine which information may be declassified and removed from the category of restricted data without undue risk to the common defense and security.

"'(3) In the case of restricted data which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military utiliation of atomic weapons, the determination that such data may be published without constituting an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security shall be made by the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly, and if the Commission and the Department of Defense do not agree, the determination shall be made by the President.

"'(4) The Commission shall remove from the restricted-data category such data as the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine relates primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons and which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine can be adequately safeguarded as security information: *Provided, however*, That no such data so removed from the restricted-data category shall be transmitted or otherwise made available to any nation, or group of nations, or regional-defense organization, while such data remains security information, except pursuant to an agreement for cooperation entered into in accordance with subsection 10 (a) (3) (B).

"'(5) The Commission shall remove from the restricted-data category such information concerning the atomic-energy programs of other nations as the Commission and the Director of Central Intelligence jointly determine to be necessary to carry out the provisions of section 102 (d) of the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, and can be adequately safeguarded as security information.'

"SEC. 5. This act may be cited as the Atomic Energy Act Amendments of 1954.'"

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New York will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments to S. 3690. One provides that no patent or license under this act shall be granted to any individual or firm which at any time in the immediately preceding 10 years has been convicted of or held in violation of the antitrust laws or antimonopoly laws, has pleaded nolo contendere to such charges, or has been held in violation of the antitrust laws by the Federal Trade Commission.

The other amendment provides that patents granted under this act and held by any individual or company, or controlled by any individual or firm, which is convicted of or held in violation of the antitrust or antimonopoly laws shall automatically become the property of the Federal Government, available to the public without royalty fee or other charge. It further provides that in the case of decisions by the Federal Trade Commission any subsequent rulings of the courts in relation to a Federal Trade Commission decision shall be controlling.

I submit the amendments on behalf of myself and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment 7-24-54-Q, in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi desire to have the amendment stated at this time, or does he desire to have it printed in the RECORD at this point?

Mr. STENNIS. It will not be necessary to read it, if it is printed in the RECORD.

The amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by Mr. STENNIS is as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert the following:

"SECTION 1. Section 5 (a) (3) af the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(3) Prohibition: It shall be unlawful for any person to—

"'(A) possess or transfer any fissionable material except as authorized by the Commission;

"'(B) export from or import into the United States any fissionable material, except as provided in section 5 (d) (1);

"'(C) directly engage in the production of any fissionable material outside of the United States, except subject to the limitations and conditions contained in section 10 (a) (3), as authorized by the Commission; or

"'(D) indirectly engage in the production of any fissionable material outside of the United States except either subject to the limitations and conditions contained in section 10 (a) (3), as authorized by the Commission, or upon a determination by the

President that such activity will not be inimical to the interest of the United States.'

"SEC. 2. Section 5 (d) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) distribute any fissionable material to—

"'(A) any person for a use which is not under the jurisdiction of the United States except pursuant to the provisions of this section;

"'(B) any foreign government, except that notwithstanding any limitation of any provision of this section the President may authorize the Commission to enter into direct agreements with the government of any other nation for the distribution of fissionable material to such government for research or industrial use: *Provided, however,* That no fissionable material shall be distributed to any foreign government unless the proposed agreement includes:

"'(i) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the agreement;

"'(ii) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement will be maintained;

"'(iii) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purposes; and

"'(iv) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to the agreement will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement; and

Provided further, That no fissionable material shall be distributed to any foreign government until:

"'(i) the President has approved and authorized the execution of the proposed agreement, and has made a determination in writing that the agreement and the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and securtiy; and

"'(ii) the proposed agreement, together with the approval and the determination of the President, has been submitted to the joint committee and a period of 30 days has elapsed while Congress is in session (in computing such 30 days, there shall be excluded the days in which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days); or

"'(C) any person within the United States, if the Commission finds that the distribution of such fissionable material to such person would be inimical to the common defense and secruity.'

"SEC. 3. Section 7 (c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by striking the period at the end thereof, inserting a comma, and the following: 'except that the Commission may issue licenses for activities to be conducted in connection with agreements made pursuant to section 5 (a) (3) (C) or (D), section 5 (d) (1), or section 10 (a).'

"SEC. 4. Section 10 (a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Policy: It shall be the policy of the Commission to control the dissemination of restricted data in such a manner as to assure the common defense and security. Consistent with such policy, the Commission shall be guided by the following principles:

"'(1) Until Congress declares by joint resolution that effective enforceable international safeguards against the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes have been established, there shall be no exchange of restricted data with other nations, except that the President may authorize:

"'(A) the Commission to enter into arrangements for the communication to the government of another nation of restricted data necessary to assist another nation in the development of industrial and nonmilitary applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes, including restricted data on—

"'(i) refining, purification, and subsequent treatment of source material;

"'(ii) reactor development;

"'(iii) production of special nuclear material;

"'(iv) health and safety;

"'(v) research and development relating to the foregoing:

Provided, however, That no such arrangement shall involve the communication of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons; or

"'(B) the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Commission, to enter into arrangements for the communication of restricted data to the government of another nation, if it is participating with the United States in the defense of the free world, or a regional defense organization of which the United States is a party, such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in order to assist in:

"'(i) the development of defense plants;

"'(ii) the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons; and

"'(iii) the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons:

Provided, however, That no such communication shall involve restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons except with regard to external characteristics, including size, weight, and shape, yields and effects, and systems employed in the delivery or use thereof, but not including any data in these categories unless in the joint judgment of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of Defense such data will not reveal important information concerning the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon.

"'(2) The dissemination of scientific and technical information relating to atomic energy should be permitted and encouraged so as to provide that free interchange of ideas and criticism which is essential to scientific and industrial progress and public understanding and to enlarge the field of technical information.

"'(3) No communication of restricted data authorized by this section shall be undertaken until—

"'(A) The Commission, pursuant to section 10 (a) (1) (A), or the Department of Defense pursuant to section 10 (a) (1) (B), has approved an agreement with such government or regional defense organization, which proposed agreement shall include:

"'(i) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the agreement;

"'(ii) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement will be maintained;

"'(iii) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any restricted data to be transferred pursuant to section 10 (a) (1) (A) will not be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose; and

"'(iv) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any restricted data to be transferred pursuant to the agreement will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement;

"'(B) The President has approved and authorized the proposed agreement, and has made a determination in writing that the proposed agreement and the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and

"'(C) The proposed agreement, together with the approval and the determination of the President, has been submitted to the joint committee and a period of 30 days has elapsed while Congress is in session (in computing such 30 days, there shall be excluded the days on which either House is not in session because of an adjournment of more than 3 days).'

"SEC. 5. Section 10 (b) (1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The term "restricted data" as used in this section means all data concerning the theory, design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons, the production of fissionable material, or the use of fissionable material in the production of power, but shall not include any data which the Commission from time to time determines may be published without undue risk to the common defense and security: *Provided, however,* That, in the case of data which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons, the determination that the data may be published without constituting an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security shall be by the Commission and Department of Defense jointly, and if the Commission and the Department of Defense do not agree, the determination shall be made by the President: *And provided further,* That the Commission shall remove from the restricted-data category such data as the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine relates primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons and which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine can be adequately safeguarded as defense information, except that no such data so removed from the restricted-data category shall be transmitted or otherwise made available to any nation or regional defense organization while such data remain defense information, unless such transmittal or other communication is carried out pursuant to an agreement authorized under this section.'"

Mr. STENNIS. I am asking for recognition to speak on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous consent request and ask that the clerk may read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the proposed unanimous consent request.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment 7-24-54—Q to S. 3690, offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided,* That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I should like to say in explanation, that this agreement has been prepared on a 1-hour basis, but I understand the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has a speech to make, which would run considerably longer than that, so obviously an hour would not be an adequate amount of time. I am prepared to modify the unanimous-consent request on any basis the distinguished Senator from Mississippi might suggest, in the hope that we can arrive at an area of agreement.

As a starter, I would modify it myself to read 3 hours, an hour and a half to each side, if that would take care of

the situation so far as the Senator from Mississippi is concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. Reserving the right to object, I should be very glad to state my views on the matter. This is an important amendment, Mr. President. It reflects largely the views of the President of the United States on the so-called international agreement, or international pool of atomic energy as amended by the joint committee. I have in my hand remarks in a specially prepared document, and I will not take over 20 minutes.

Mr. President, if unanimous consent is the price to pay to get to speak at all on this amendment, I am not prepared to pay that price to the Members of the United States Senate. But if there is no threat of a motion to table if I do not agree to something, I am willing to cooperate with the majority leader, the minority leader, or anyone else with regard to some reasonable amount of time. I think 2 hours to a side, which may not be used, would be a reasonable amount of time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That would be perfectly agreeable so far as I am concerned.

Mr. STENNIS. So far as I know, no Senator is going to speak on it in addition to the author, except the Senator from New Mexico, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is in opposition. But if the price of being able to speak at all is having to agree to something, I will not agree.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am sure the Senator knows that is not the situation, and he knows there are very few members of this body for whom I have a higher regard than I have for the Senator from Mississippi.

Not too long ago I, at the invitation of the Senator from Mississippi, visited his State, really for the first time, to spend some time among the people, and to talk to what I suppose corresponds to a State chamber of commerce of agriculture. I was tremendously impressed with the developments in his area. I think his State has a great future. I think the Senator is a very able representative, not only of his State, but the country as a whole. He can be proud of it. So I know the Senator is aware there is certainly nothing personal involved.

Mr. STENNIS. Let me thank the Senator for his kind remarks about Mississippi. We certainly enjoyed and appreciated his visit there. He made a very fine impression, and he made many friends. We want him to come back.

I knew there was nothing personal about this, but I am talking about the proposition of having to pay a price to get to speak on an important amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am merely trying to explore, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi, the situation. This is an important amendment, and we want it fully discussed. We realize there are different points of view. No one can be dogmatic, a doctrinaire on the subject, and so long as there can be debate on it that will be satisfactory. I merely wanted to explore and see how far apart we were on the general time, and based upon the precedent of the last discussion on the floor and the fact that things worked out very successfully, I am prepared to withdraw my unanimous consent request and let nature take its course and see whether we can make progress as rapidly as some of us hope.

Mr. STENNIS. I think so far as the Senator from Mississippi is concerned, progress can be made upon that basis. Certainly I believe we will move along.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California is certainly willing that the Senator from Mississippi should proceed.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. LEHMAN. I do not know whether I shall want to speak on this amendment or not. I shall certainly support it wholeheartedly, and I may want to say a few words. If I speak at all it will be brief.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from New York very much.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. With the understanding that the Senator does not lose his right to the floor, I should like to say, Mr. President, that I think the handling of the last amendment showed very clearly the desirability of having a discussion of the pros and cons of amendments, because I surmise that 5 hours ago, if a majority of our colleagues had been asked in the cloakrooms if they thought the Gore amendment would be adopted, they would have said "no", and yet, when debate was had on both sides of that question, we know what happened.

With regard to this particular amendment I happen to be one who thinks that those of us who are supporting it really are supporting the President's program on the international phases of the atomic energy program; in my opinion, the Stennis amendment is the President's program, and I think it ought to be written into this bill.

I am glad the majority leader withdrew the request for a unanimous consent agreement because had it not been withdrawn, I would have objected to it. I was on my feet to object, because here we are dealing with, I think, one of the major features of this entire bill and it ought to be argued pro and con. I do not believe the debate will last very long, but something should develop during the discussion by the Senator from Mississippi that would cause a debate that would last for several hours, I think it would be for the best interests of the country to have that kind of a debate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Walter Hamilton, a member of the staff of the joint committee may sit near me in the seat of a Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this amendment is presented solely because of considerable sentiment among a number of Senators who have thought all along—and more have been thinking the same way, I understand, since the debate started—that we ought to enact that part of the bill now before the Senate that pertains to the international pooling agreement as outlined by the President in his speech to the United Nations last December; let that become law; let the machinery be set up; get it in motion, and pass over or defer action on the rest of this bill which is not related to these Presidential powers. That is the purpose and the only purpose of this amendment. It is highly technical in its language, of course, but the amendment has been prepared at the request of a member of the joint committee by Mr. Walter Hamilton and his associates, so the language is vouched for in that way.

The general purpose is to provide all the power that was requested by the President.

Further, along that line, Mr. President, in February of this year, the Atomic Energy Commission submitted a draft of proposed language to the joint committee which was intended to provide for international exchange of information in the peacetime fields and with NATO and other military allies in the military uses of atomic energy. This proposed language was intended to implement 2 out of 3 objectives set forth in the President's special message to the Congress on atomic matters.

Mr. President, all the way through, this amendment traces and tracks the recommendation of the administration, the recommendations of the Atomic Energy Commission, and, further, it traces and brings before the Senate, the recommendations of the joint committee on the administration bill. That is all there is to the amendment. It does not go into any other field. It does not restore any other power, and it does not limit any other program, but it is right down the alley, so to speak.

The joint committee examined the proposed language with considerable care, and came to the conclusion that it did not provide sufficient safeguards on the exchange of information vital to our national security. The language sent to the joint committee has been proposed as an amendment in the nature of a substitute by the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN].

Since I knew that the language proposed by the Commission for the administration was unacceptable to the members of the joint committee, I have endeavored to place before the Senate another amendment, also in the nature of a substitute, which does contain the safeguards and machinery which the joint committee worked out to cover international exchange as requested in the President's message. The language used in my proposed amendment is identical with that contained in S. 3690, except that it is necessary to repeat the safeguards with slight variations where they apply to the activities of individuals, the transfer of materials to foreign governments, and the exchange of information of a restricted nature.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico. May

I express to him my appreciation, before I yield, for the time and assistance that he has devoted to this subject, as well as to related subjects in this bill. I am most grateful, and I am sure the Senate is most grateful to him for his very fine service.

Mr. ANDERSON. Would I not be correct in saying that what the amendment proposes to do is take all the provisions of S. 3690 which relate to the international field, which the President presented originally to the Congress, and to incorporate them in a substitute so that all the international aspects of the bill may be considered separately, and that wherever those provisions as contained in S. 3690 needed to be changed because of other provisions of the bill, they have been changed?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is entirely correct. The amendment and the changes in language were prepared by experts who know the subject and who participated in writing the original bill. Therefore, I do not think the Senate is taking any chance with reference to the language of the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON. Everyone recognizes that the whole international field is an exceedingly important one.

Mr. STENNIS. Of course.

Mr. ANDERSON. Therefore, I wanted to ask the Senator if it is not true that because of the nature of the subject, the language of his substitute has been carefully considered, that it is based upon long hearings and upon long study by the committee itself, and represents long deliberation by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is eminently correct. It is the result of the original planning of the President, and of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the viewpoint of the joint committee is reflected in the language presented.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. So that we may resolve the question of whether or not there is a controversy on that point, I will say the Senator's amendment is indeed carefully prepared. It is prepared exactly on the basis of the bill which the joint committee drew on the international phases of the matter. I am vigorously opposed to the Senator's amendment because of the violence it does to the rest of the bill, but the verbiage, so far as the international phases are concerned, is part and parcel of the bill presented by the committee. I am not in any way attempting to give the Senator aid and comfort for the adoption of the amendment, because I think it is a sectionalized approach to the matter. I have no quarrel with the verbiage. It will do what the Senator wants it to do.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator from Iowa's contribution.

Mr. ANDERSON. Following what the Senator from Iowa has said, would it not be fair to say that the purpose of the Senator was to omit the domestic sections of the bill, leave them for further study, and incorporate the international section of the bill? It does frankly drop out all the other sections.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator has correctly stated the situation. I do not happen to agree with that position. So far as the Senator's draft regarding the international phases of the bill is concerned, I can say it is structurally all right to accomplish his purposes. I shall point out why I do not think the amendment should be adopted. If the whole bill is adopted, what is contained in the amendment would be contained in the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I appreciate the Senator's remarks and his very frank and helpful statement about my proposal.

Mr. President, it has been agreed by the Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Iowa, and I want to add my statement, that it is my belief that the proposed amendment would accomplish every purpose with reference to the objectives outlined by the President in his message to the Congress with reference to the international information and assistance programs. Exactly to the extent the bill before the Senate would carry out those objectives, the amendment would also do so. I wish to discuss the amendment briefly, because I think a discussion of the international provisions of the bill is deserved.

Section 1 of the proposed amendment relates to section 5 (a) (3) of the McMahon Act. In subsections (C) and (D) of my amendment provision is made to allow Americans to engage in atomic activities in foreign countries under certain conditions.

First, American engineers and firms would be permitted to go to those countries with which the United States had entered into agreements for peacetime atomic assistance programs, and do business within the terms of those agreements.

To illustrate my point, any company such as General Electric, after getting permission, of course, could go into any other country and help with reference to building an atomic powerplant, but it could do so only if American assistance to that country had been made a matter of some agreement between our country and the other nation.

The countries involved could not use or transmit to the other country any restricted data in the atomic-energy business which was not authorized to be transmitted under the intergovernmental agreement.

None of those things could happen until the President was satisfied with the intergovernmental agreement.

Secondly, this section of the proposed amendment would permit private individuals to go to foreign countries to assist indirectly in the production of atomic energy. Under the present McMahon Act, an American professor who wants to go to the University of Birmingham in England, or some other foreign university during his year of leave from his American post, cannot do so if there is even the remotest possibility that by doing so he would free another professor in the foreign country for work in that foreign country's atomic-energy plants. If he does so, it is at his own peril. As a result, even unclassified scientific exchange has virtually ceased. My amendment would permit such Americans to go abroad to teach, lecture, or consult where it can be shown to the satisfaction of the President and his advisors that the activity is in general keeping with the interests of the United States; in other words, to quote the language of my amendment, "will not be inimical to the interests of the United States."

I next call attention to section 2 of my amendment, which relates to the conditions and safeguards under which the United States would be allowed to transmit fissionable material to a foreign government. Fissionable material, as we all know, is the explosive material in the heart of atomic weapons just as much as it is the fuel for peacetime atomic powerplants. For this reason, it is essential that there be adequate protection and machinery to insure that no fissionable materials are sent to any foreign government except under carefully worked out safeguards. The provisions of my amendment are the safeguards worked out by the joint committee. They provide that the President may authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to enter into agreements with foreign governments for the sending of fissionable material for peacetime uses only under certain stipulated conditions.

First, the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the agreement must be set up in writing. I call attention to the fact that the terms of such an agreement could, and in all probability would, include many of the protective measures which we cannot now spell out in detail in the law.

Secondly, the agreement must contain a guaranty by the cooperating foreign government that the security safeguards and standards set forth in the agreement will be maintained. I would call attention to the fact that the McMahon Act now allows exchange of information—not material—on a similar condition. Unfortunately, the McMahon Act language requires that the Atomic Energy Commission and the President guarantee the adequacy of the security safeguards and standards of the foreign nation. It should be completely obvious that no American, no matter how well intentioned, can make such a guaranty.

In other words, the limitation now is the equivalent of a prohibition. The President of the United States cannot give an absolute guaranty that every phase of security in some other nation will be carried out, unless he is allowed to send a Secret Service Agency or FBI to operate in that country, which is something which cannot be done.

Under this plan, the President would be authorized to accept the guaranties he or his advisers considered sufficient in carrying out the program.

As a result of this provision in the present law, there has been almost no exchange of information with any foreign government. My proposed amendment will place the burden for maintaining this guaranty exactly where it belongs and where it will have meaning. If the proposed bill, S. 3690, does actually accomplish the President's objective of permitting American assistance to foreign countries in the building and fuel-

ing of atomic reactors, my proposed amendment does so also.

Because of the nature of the subject matter itself, some persons might be a little skeptical and hesitant about granting authority which confers so much power. The amendment does not seek to confer any more power than proposed along those lines in the bill itself.

In addition, my proposed amendment requires the cooperating foreign government to guarantee that no material will be transferred to unauthorized persons, and that none of the material will be used in connection with weapon development, weapon production, or for any other military purpose. The language "for any other military purpose," incidentally, catches such things as submarine atomic power development, development of atomic-powered aircraft, and other nonweapon devices of military importance. There can be no doubt that no fissionable material could go to a foreign government for military use under my proposed amendment any more than such a thing would be permitted in S. 3690 itself. This is indisputable, because my amendment contains exactly the same language as the proposed bill.

Unlike the substitute amendment offered by the Senator from New York, which is identical with the language proposed by the Commission last February, my amendment and the proposed bill would both require the President to make a finding in writing that these international agreements with foreign governments "will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security." I would like to point out the reasoning behind this language. The present organic law requires that any such exchanges in the field of information will not endanger the common defense and security. Now, here again it is completely obvious that no one can make such an absolute finding. Any international agreement into which our Nation enters involves some degree of calculated risk. No matter how friendly a nation is today, there is always the possibility that at some time in the future, during the life of the agreement, that foreign government will be less friendly to the United States. Now, this is obviously more true of some countries than of others. Yet in a large number of cases where it might very well be to the advantage of the United States to cooperate in the development of atomic energy for peacetime uses, in order to win over a nation more completely and to demonstrate still again our cooperative attitude toward our friends and those whom we would like to be our friends, we can have no assurance in advance that those nations may not slip away from our circle of friends for reasons now completely unforeseen. The language of my proposed amendment has the advantage of being reasonable, workable, and of not imposing on our Chief Executive a responsibility he cannot possibly carry.

Mr. President, we are not expecting any immediate startling developments along the lines of carrying the benefits of atomic energy to any of these remote countries now. It is not necessary to pass this bill for that purpose. That is not what we are striking at.

The purpose is to try to lay the groundwork, the foundation, and to give the President of the United States a framework, something definite and tangible, whereby word can be sent to other peoples throughout the world that we are planning something definite and positive; that whatever the fruits of that plan are they are going to share in them; that they are being considered; that we are not trying to corner all of the atomic power of the world; that we are trying to put it to constructive uses; that we are thinking in those terms, and we are thinking in terms of their problems.

Of course, no President is going to rush forth and transmit material or secrets or anything else to any group of nations or any particular nation until fully satisfied as to the safety of such a course and its practicality.

But I think, as the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] said, the message of the President of the United States last December, with its constructive note of hope, came nearer being heard around the world than anything which has happened along that line in many years. This is a plan to implement that program, not for immediate accomplishment, but by way of preparing the groundwork for accomplishment in years to come.

Suppose the Soviet Union should beat us to such a plan. Suppose they should make the first lasting impression on the minds of the other peoples of the world. This is not a matter of delivering something tangible now; it is a question of evolving and inaugurating a plan which will be first to capture the interest of those people and make them see that the peaceful use of atomic energy is something in which they are going to have a share, a chance, an opportunity.

Finally, Mr. President, this section of my proposed amendment would require that the proposed agreements, and the President's determination, would have to be submitted to the joint committee for 30 days while Congress is in session. If the members of the committee have any reason to suspect that the agreement is not in the best interest of the United States, they will thus have the opportunity to come before the Congress with legislative recommendations to call a halt to the particular agreement proposed. Now many of these agreements themselves, if they are to be really meaningful, will have to contain highly technical and even classified information. My natural inclination would be to have such agreements lie before the entire Congress, but I agree with the members of the joint committee that the most expeditious way to consider these matters is to have them submitted directly to the only body of Congress which has the competence to examine them and pass judgment on them. We have never had any cause to doubt the competence of the joint committee to evaluate these matters. I therefore believe that this is a workable, a sound, and a good provision.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. KILGORE. Does the Senator realize that only within the last 24 hours has Congress been apprised of some of these contracts? For instance, in the case of the Portsmouth project, although I was very much interested in the location of the project, I had no realization of the type of contract being signed, nor did I have any realization of the fact that the contract had been signed. Those facts were kept as classified information.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. KILGORE. It seems to me we should protect the people of the country.

What would happen, for instance, if we should say to the steel companies, "We will do the same thing for you"? We would practically break the Government. All we have given to the steel companies and other manufacturing companies is a right to amortization of the plant.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. KILGORE. In this case there is 225 percent profit and the plant is left to the company at the end of the period.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

The section which the Senator from Mississippi was trying to rewrite at that time pertained to American firms which the President had authorized to go into foreign countries.

Section 3 of my proposed amendment will permit the Commission to license American individuals and firms to assist in carrying out the provisions of the revised bill which would permit exchange of restricted data and transfer of fissionable material to foreign governments. This is a vital provision of my proposed amendment, for without it we would be requiring the Atomic Energy Commission itself to conduct all of the technical and engineering assistance arranged for in these agreements with foreign governments.

Section 4 of my proposed amendment is the section which spells out the areas in which the Commission can operate with foreign governments for peacetime ends. It also sets out the mechanism which must be employed before such agreements can be consummated. All of the provisions contained here are an evolutionary product from the existing McMahon Act provisions contained in section 10 (a) (3). My proposed language in this section is identical with that contained in Senate bill 3690. It will allow the Commission to cooperate with foreign governments "in the development of industrial and nonmilitary applications of atomic energy for peaceful purposes." This is the section which allows the exchange of information, as distinguished from the shipment of fissionable material which I have already discussed. I would call your attention to the proviso at the end of section 10 (a) (1) (A) which prohibits the communication under this section of any restricted data related to "the design or fabrication of atomic weapons." This is an absolute prohibition.

The second part of this section relates to the so-called exchange of military information with NATO and other nations

with whom the United States has mutual military assistance agreements. Again, I am proposing exactly the same language as is contained in S. 3690. The provisions of this section allow the exchange of military atomic data relating to the development of defense plans, the training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and the evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons.

The first of these provisions is intended to allow the Department of Defense to work with our military allies to insure that our atomic stockpile can be used effectively in our defense plans. Naturally foreign countries seriously concerned about resisting Communist aggression cannot be expected to rely on the flat assurance of the United States that atomic weapons will be available for their defense. Such a simple and flat statement is almost meaningless to them. They need to know the conditions under which such weapons can be employed, and roughly how much of this great force will be available for their defense.

Mr. President, in that connection, the Senator from Mississippi has visited a number of the bases in foreign countries. They are thought of as our first line of defense, the first line of a quick retaliation, should that become necessary; which we pray God it never will.

But the Senators would have to get on the ground there to realize how dependent our Nation is upon the host countries. We have no police power there and cannot expect to have any surrendered to us. We are not there by right; we are there by license. We cannot plan any program. We cannot carry out any measure or any plan. General LeMay, as he sits in Omaha, as the Chief Officer of the Strategic Air Command, is absolutely helpless, so far as any base anywhere beyond the confines of our Nation is concerned, except through the active cooperation and the license of the foreign countries where our bases are, where our men are, where our planes are, and where much of our ammunition is. That is what made me realize we cannot say, "No; we will hold back everything."

I know something of the restiveness—and the reasonableness of it—on the part of those responsible for the government and policies of those countries when we do not let them know the real basis and the real heart of these plans and do not give them to some extent an opportunity to participate in carrying them out, particularly when they are right under the guns, one might say, of the potential enemy.

The second of these provisions is intended to permit our military forces to assist in the training of foreign allied troops and cadres in the art of atomic warfare. Soldiers who know nothing about atomic warfare cannot be relied on to act wisely and surely in an atomic war. If foreign allied troops are to play their maximum and effective role in defense of freedom, they are entitled to know what this new concept of warfare is all about.

Senators cannot go to those same bases—I shall not name them or say anything about what weapons I saw there—and they will realize how dependent we are on those skilled men for a cooperative program.

The third provision is simply intended to permit our military forces to cooperate with our allies in evaluating the atomic warfare capabilities of our mutual enemies or potential enemies. We know just how much of a threat Soviet atomic weapons are today. Our allies have to take this knowledge on trust. They undoubtedly have confidence in our overall intelligence judgment. But in the unhappy event that an actual atomic war should start, these allies need to know how to detect the telltale signs of Soviet atomic tactics and strategy. They need to know where and how the enemy can strike with atomic weapons, on what scale, and for how long. These are decisions foreign field commanders will have to know how to make on their own. Without this sort of information, they might turn tail and run under some conceivable circumstances simply because they did not understand what was happening. Under others, they might believe it safe to hold their ground and as a result subject themselves to unnecessary annihilation.

If we are to make the best use of our atomic and thermonuclear weapon stockpiles in the defense of the entire free world, it is essential that these provisions of the proposed legislation be enacted in this session of the Congress.

The provision included in my proposed amendment is the same as the proviso contained in S. 3690. It would limit the military atomic information which could be transmitted to a military ally or to NATO. No information relating to the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of atomic weapons can be transmitted.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I will be glad to yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is absolutely important, is it not, that the international provisions be enacted at this session of Congress? Would the Senator not agree that there is a fight on parts of the domestic program that threaten the bill, but that these sections should be enacted at this time?

Mr. STENNIS. That is one of the prime factors in the mind of the Senator from Mississippi, and I feel it is one of the prime factors in the mind of the Senator from New Mexico, based on conversations with him.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. I would like to see many of the domestic sections enacted also, but there is a fight on the licensing provisions and patent provisions. Those things might wait. Does not the Senator think the international sections cannot wait?

Mr. STENNIS. That is the opinion of the Senator from Mississippi. I think they constitute the urgent part of the bill, not that a great deal is going to be accomplished in a few months, but the passage of the international sections of the bill would give assurance that has been lacking all through these years, and I think those of us on the Armed Services Committee feel somewhat the result of such lack of assurance because of our failure to supply other nations, especially those where our bases are, with proper and adequate information.

The guaranties contained in section 10 (a) (3) of my proposed amendment parallel those provided for transfer of fissionable material. Again, these are the same guaranties provided in S. 3690. The mechanism requiring the President to make a determination in writing that the "proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security" is also taken from the proposed bill, S. 3690. And finally the agreement and the determination must be submitted to the joint committee for 30 days while the Congress is in session. These guaranties and provisions must be restated in my approach to amendment of the McMahon Act, whereas in the proposed S. 3690, it was possible to arrange the language so as to avoid repetition. Yet, since my amendment does incorporate these safeguards in each pertinent place in the McMahon Act, it does accomplish the same objectives as S. 3690, and it does so under the same terms, with the same safeguards, and to the same degree that S. 3690 accomplishes those objectives.

Section 5 of my proposed amendment will relieve some of the congestion now caused by language in the McMahon Act in the handling of military atomic information of a classified nature. It puts the Commission and the Department of Defense into partnership to insure protection of secrets commensurate with their character and sensitivity. The second proviso should be noted especially since this prevents the inadvertent transfer of military atomic data to foreign government through this transclassification route. All of the language contained in section 5 of my proposed amendment is taken directly from the proposed bill, S. 3690, and is inserted in the appropriate spot in the McMahon Act.

There can be no question but that the amendment which I have discussed here goes as far as is possible to implement the international cooperation objectives of the legislation under consideration. It does so without touching the problem of domestic development which has proved so controversial. I believe my proposed amendment would go far to accomplish in this session of the Congress those things which we all agree must be accomplished now. It leaves those matters on which we can apparently not reach agreement for a later session of the Congress.

Mr. President, let me emphasize, that the adoption of this amendment would end the debate on this bill. Virtually there would then be only the formality of passing the bill, as amended.

This is a certain, safe, sound way to proceed forward with this proposed legislation and dispose of it in a matter of, perhaps, a few hours.

Here is a certain, definite, well-known way to move forward in a constructive, affirmative way with a program that is on all fours with that which the President of the United States requested in his address to the United Nations last December. It is implemented in this

carefully prepared amendment, which has been combed through and slightly modified as to safeguards by the joint committee.

This amendment eliminates all controversial matters. There are some of us who favor certain of the so-called domestic provisions of the bill; there are others who favor certain other provisions. Some object to provision X, others object to provision Y. The objections are valid, and are very substantial, and there is little chance to get them reconciled in the present state of the calendar and the time of the session.

But here is the affirmative, forward-looking part of the bill that the President actually wants.

It is even in the form in which it was sent to the Congress in the Presidential message.

This is the President's plan, as he laid it before the people of the world last December. I submit that it is the one clear-cut, forward-looking, positive way to carry out his recommendations. Vested with the power of law, let the policy be applied to other nations under sound restrictions, and we will have made a very, very fine contribution; and no one, no group, will be prejudiced one bit with reference to the many other problems the bill now presents.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The distinguished Senator from Mississippi has made a very able and intelligent address.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORE. Is it the Senator's firm contention that the adoption of the amendment which he has offered would embody the proposals and the requests of the President of the United States with respect to atomic-energy legislation at this session?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the Senator from Mississippi is satisfied of that, not only based on his study, but on the most expert advice of experienced legislators, staff members, and, in fact, the Senator from Iowa, being straightforward, as he always is, and helpful in debate, has agreed in a statement here on the floor that this amendment moves forward all the pertinent provisions of the bill we have under consideration on this particular subject matter.

Mr. KENNEDY. If this amendment were carried, would the Senator from Mississippi agree that the whole question of the domestic provisions would be carried over for another year?

Mr. STENNIS. Exactly. The amendment, without striking down the domestic provisions, but merely takes them out of the bill, and gives the breath of life to the so-called international provisions, and the others would automatically be carried over. There is no direction with reference to them, they would be left for another bill.

Mr. KENNEDY. It would permit all of the questions that have been brought out to be taken under consideration during the next few months?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Those matters would automatically be carried forward without prejudice so far as the adoption of this amendment is concerned. It is clean and it is clear cut. I thank the Senator for his timely questions.

I want to say also, Mr. President, that the thinking and the work of the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on this same subject, has been very helpful. The amendment he offered carried exactly the same major provisions that are contained in this amendment. This amendment is different with reference to language, because I made it conform to some technique that was adopted by the joint committee.

Mr. LEHMAN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi yields the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as I said some time ago when the Senator from Mississippi began his discussion, this amendment of his is lifted bodily out of the bill we are considering. It is the international section of the pending bill.

I have no quarrel with the general verbiage of the Senator's amendment, because it is a part of the international section of the bill, and it would accomplish what he wants to accomplish, so far as international operations are concerned.

But, Mr. President, this is a fantastic approach to the atomic-energy problem so far as I am concerned, and I am quite sure, so far as the overwhelming majority of the joint committee are concerned, because in a nutshell here is exactly what the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi would do: It would authorize and direct the Atomic Energy Commission to give information to countries abroad for the construction of reactors and powerplants using atomic energy, but, otherwise, it would leave the law the same as it is now, and deny American business and American citizens in this country the opportunity to explore this field of development.

It is unthinkable, Mr. President, that we should adopt this amendment as a substitute for the atomic energy bill. So far as consideration of the subject is concerned, it has been given long consideration. Hearings were held last year on this matter and hearings have continued this year. I put the statistics into the RECORD a short time ago. We held 91 hearings on this measure. It illustrates exactly why the joint committee combined all the needed corrections in the Atomic Energy Act into one bill.

The subject of international exchange of information is a very important one. However, by the same token, the opening up of atomic energy in its domestic phases to American business and American operations is, in my judgment, far more important than the donation of our know-how and techniques and ability to foreign countries, especially in view of the fact that it would at the same time prohibit our people in this country from doing the same things that we would be aiding and abetting foreign countries in doing. I cannot conceive of that kind of situation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Does not the Senator from Iowa believe, if the amendment should be adopted, that before there was any actual activity under the phase of the bill he is discussing, with respect to giving information to companies or firms in foreign countries, we would have a program enacted with respect to our own people, and that the main purpose of the amendment is not to reach individual firms or people in foreign countries, but to proceed, first, from the military standpoint and military cooperation? Is that not the main part of the President's message on that phase of the subject?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. No; I will say to the Senator that I do not think that is the main part. It is a part of it, but the industrial exchange of information is another equally important part.

When the Senator from Mississippi says that another year or so would not matter, I call attention to the fact that we have been greatly concerned recently by the claims that Russia, for instance, is getting ahead of us in atomic energy matters, and that other countries are going forward in this field.

If we give foreign countries another head start, while we prohibit American business and American firms and American people from enlarging this field and experimenting in it and developing it, I do not know how I could apologize to the American people for such action.

We have heard criticism time and time again about the amounts of money we have already spent abroad and taken out of the blood, sweat, and tears of the American people. Yet, here—and I do not think the Senator intends to do it—is an amendment which does just that. It places foreign countries in a position of advantage in atomic development, while denying it to the American people and American industry.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator knows this subject backward and forward. Does he think that either under the provisions of the amendment or under the provisions of the bill there will be any information given to individuals in foreign countries within perhaps a year or two after the passage of this bill?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; I believe there would be, if the Senator's amendment were adopted. I believe it would be a direction to our officials to begin the process of giving away this information. For the past several years we have heard a great deal about giveaways. To me this program would be one of the most colossal giveaways I can think of.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Iowa is supporting the bill, is he not?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes; I am supporting the bill. However, I am also supporting giving American industry and

American genius the same opportunity to go forward on this matter. I do not want to give away this information to other countries and lock the door on American development.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that one point?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I refer to the giving of information to foreign concerns or individuals. The Senator says that there is a direction for our officials to proceed. As a matter of fact, the bill is entirely discretionary, is it not, and the President does not have to proceed under any circumstances? Is that not correct? In other words, it is entirely discretionary, as I understand.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. NATO and the other international arrangements that we have made are in the main discretionary. We have given the President great leeway in saying whether he will do certain things. But, in effect, the adoption of the Senator's amendment would be an affirmative direction for the President to go ahead. Certainly the Atomic Energy Commission would make arrangements to comply with the law that is passed by Congress. As I say, the amendment is utterly offensive to me, because it provides for the giving of information and opportunity and training to foreign countries, while at the same time denying our own people an equal right and an equal opportunity to develop the program. The Senator's amendment unfortunately does just that.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. If the amendment is adopted and becomes a part of the law, our program at home with our contractors, and the construction and development, and everything else that is going on, will continue under the present law and will not be checked or hampered in any way. Is that not correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. There would be no private participation in this program at all, if the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. STENNIS. The present program in America will continue as it is now. It will not be hampered in any way.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. But the present programs are restricted programs. They are restricted to research and development by the Atomic Energy Commission in certain phases of this subject. It is a part of the President's program and recommendation that we lay the basis for the American economy to begin to experiment and develop in this field in a free-enterprise system, just as much as in connection with the international phase.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi realizes that the President made the recommendation.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. May I ask whether S. 3690, as reported by the committee, with reference to its various provisions that relate to the transfer of materials or information to other countries, passes authority equal to the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in carrying into effect such transfer.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The substitute offered by the Senator from Mississippi—and I say this with all due respect—is lifted bodily out of the bill. Therefore, the same provisions that are included in the Senator's substitute are already in the bill. However, what the Senator does is to strike from the bill everything except the provisions referring to the international exchange of information.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the Senator's amendment is a rearrangement of the various provisions of S. 3690, as reported by the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Pointing toward international arrangements only, and it precludes domestic participation in this program.

Mr. COOPER. Is there any substantive difference between the provisions of S. 3690, as reported, which relate to transfers to other countries, and the substitute which has been offered by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. They are substantially the same. The Senator from Mississippi has taken a part of the bill and offers it now as a substitute for the entire bill, but strikes all the rest of the provisions of the bill which let American business and American enterprise work on this program.

My contention is that if the adoption of the Senator's amendment will permit foreign countries with our advice and our assistance to go into this field, and preclude American citizens from going into it, it is an unconscionable thing from that standpoint.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] has the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will yield, provided I do not lose the floor.

Mr. COOPER. I believe the Senator from Mississippi knows the high regard in which I hold his views and judgment. The Senator from Iowa has stated—and it is agreed—that the provisions of the substitute which the Senator from Mississippi has offered represent an arrangement or collection of similar sections in S. 3690, as reported by the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Mississippi made that clear in the opening part of his statement, namely, he was taking them out of the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. COOPER. I do not agree with everything in the bill as reported by the committee which relates to domestic arrangements. However, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi—because I have great confidence in his judgment—what position he takes about carrying into effect at the same time the President's suggestions referred to in the argument of the distinguished Senator from Iowa, concerning the transfer of information and material to foreign countries before any arrangement would be made along that line on behalf of the people of this country.

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to have a chance to state my views on that subject. I think there is a clear distinction as to the general situation. These international programs with other nations are going to start off as a part of the military picture. There will be long negotiations with different countries when it comes to the civilian side of the ledger, so to speak. The Pastore amendment was not adopted. The President will have to take up the question with each nation individually before anything can be done on the civilian side with reference to their nationals, as I understand. So there is a great distinction between the two programs.

The first part of the foreign program will deal with nations. We will have to work out agreements with them. They will have to be submitted to the committee, and they will take quite a bit of time. The psychological impact of the passage of the foreign program will all be good. It is not expected that it will be put into immediate effect, whereas in the case of the domestic aspects, I anticipate legislation will be enacted early in the year 1955, and it will doubtless go into actual operation sometime before the so-called foreign program.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. With respect to the statement which the Senator from Mississippi has just made about enacting a bill next year, I again cannot overemphasize the fact that the pending legislation has had intensive study for approximately a year now. That study represents the accumulated knowledge and experience and information of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for 7 years. The subject has not been lightly approached. I do not know what the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy would do if this bill were sent back to it except to vote to report the very same bill, because after long months of study and very serious, meticulous consideration of all of its provisions, this is the result of its study. And to say we should study it some more and come forth with some other legislation is a suggestion I cannot adopt.

I am sure the joint committee could not report any better bill after Congress convenes next January. We have here a good bill. Certain small details have met with divergent views. But almost all the committee were in agreement on the entire bill. I do not know how the Senate can consider a proposition to place foreign nationals ahead of the citizens of this country in the atomic-energy field. It is really a shock to me that we would even consider giving information, techniques, and know-how to other countries to build reactors; to go forward, and preclude and deny American industry and American technology the right to at least an equal start in this race toward atomic-energy utilities. And that is what the amendment would do, even though it gave them only a year's head start.

We have been proud of the fact we have been ahead of the world in the atomic-energy field, and our superiority in that field has been one of our strengths. Our superiority in the field of atomic energy, I think, has been a great factor in keeping the peace up until now, and yet it is proposed by this

amendment to give away a substantial advantage which we have, and the advantage would be given to foreign countries and be withheld from our own people.

I am not going to talk any more about this matter except to answer a question or two, or perhaps speak to some point that is raised. I am going to let it rest at that. The amendment does a disservice to the citizens of the United States and gives an advantage in the atomic field to the people of other nations not only industrially, but it gives them more equality in the military field. Especially in the industrial field it would give an advantage over the American citizens.

I earnestly hope that this amendment in the nature of a substitute will be defeated. I could not possibly vote for the bill if this amendment were adopted, because I would not vote to give something to foreign countries that we deny to our own American citizens. The adoption of this amendment will indeed kill the bill so far as I am personally concerned.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I rise in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. I am very glad, indeed, to support it.

Objection has been made that this amendment would merely consummate or enact the provisions of the international field, and it would delete the balance of the bill. At present we have had much debate on the provisions of the pending bill, the committee bill, tending to indicate there is very grave doubt—and certainly many of us have those doubts—as to the wisdom of some of the complex and even obscure provisions of this bill dealing with the peacetime development of atomic energy in our own country. Many of these provisions have been described—and I have so described them—as among the most radical, the most dangerous, the most repugnant to the public interest of any provisions of any bill to come before us in this session. No; I will go further than that—to come before the Congress of the United States for a great many years.

In my judgment, Mr. President, the pending bill is a thinly disguised giveaway bill, which will have the effect of forfeiting and giving away the public rights in a priceless public resource—atomic energy. I said that it is a thinly disguised giveaway bill, but I am not sure that I am not overly conservative when I make that statement, because I was very much interested when I heard the distinguished Senator from Iowa a few minutes ago refer to this bill as a "colossal giveaway." In that description I am in full agreement. It is a colossal giveaway.

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

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Do I understand the Senator from New York to refer to this amendment or this bill as a giveaway?

Mr. LEHMAN. I refer to the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I refer to this amendment as a colossal giveaway. Is the Senator aware that it will actually give away the technique and know-how of the power developments to foreign countries but deny them to our own citizens?

Mr. LEHMAN. It is not giving them away. It is making it possible for the President to negotiate and deal with other nations, but under the safeguards clearly written into this amendment by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi.

The Government has, as I previously pointed out, spent $12 billion to unlock the innermost secrets of the atom; to harness a vast power that nature has placed in the atom. But we are dealing, in my opinion, with far greater values. The monetary value of these secrets cannot be estimated. They are worth billions and billions of dollars, in all probability far greater than the sum that I have mentioned, $12 billion, which represents only the investment. And I do want to point out that this investment of $12 billion was provided for the people of this country, the taxpayers of this country, all of the people of this country, not just a small and exclusive group, and these assets which have been paid for by the people belong to the whole American people.

I want to make it as clear as I possibly can that this effort that we are talking about, the further development of atomic energy, should be shared with private enterprise. It needs the great private industrial genius of America and that genius should be invited to participate in the development of the undreamed potentialities of atomic energy. I cannot possibly urge that too strongly. But, in my opinion, Mr. President, the Government of the United States has the unescapable obligation to safeguard the legitimate interests of the people in atomic energy in its peacetime use. The sharing of the atomic energy enterprise must be undertaken with every essential safeguard to the people's rights. We cannot be too cautious in this regard. The Government must retain full control and full sovereignty over the peacetime use of atomic energy, just as the Government must retain full control and sovereignty over our great system of navigable waters, over the ether, and over the airspace above us. Atomic energy belongs to all the people, and we must not ever fail to overlook that fact.

Mr. President, the debate in which we have been engaged has been carried on by my colleagues and me who are opposing the proposed legislation with the utmost sincerity, and in the conviction that we are serving the interests of all the people of the country. The debate has already shown that the subject is a highly complicated one, far too complicated for most of us fully to comprehend in the time that has thus far been available for the study of the proposed legislation. I believe it is far too complicated for any of us to study in the very short time that will be given to the consideration of the subject during the next few days, in order to meet an arbitrary deadline of adjournment by the Republican leadership. I am learning new things about this highly complicated subject every day and every hour. I want the advice and counsel of every expert I can get on this matter. I have every trust and confidence in the members of the joint committee and the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, but I cannot yield my responsibility, as the representative in the Senate of more than 15 million people of New York State to any committee of the Congress. The bill may effect a revolution in the economic life of my State, and of every other State of the Union. The bill may result in the development of a monopoly over the source of atomic power that will dwarf every other monopoly in the concept of the mind or in history.

I want to study the licensing provisions and the patent provisions, none of which have been adequately considered or debated. I will say that I do not, as of today, even begin to understand all of those provisions. I do not believe any of my colleagues do.

Mr. President, we have seen what has happened on the floor of the Senate when, on several occasions, provisions of a highly controversial nature were debated for hours and days. We saw what happened today when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] raised a highly important question, and obtained the admission of the majority leader and of the senior Senator from Minnesota that the question should be very carefully considered further, taken to conference, and fought for by our conferees in the conference. I am referring to a fundamental issue, the payment of Federal taxes and local taxes by a company with which a contract may be entered into by the Atomic Energy Commission, not for the production of atomic energy at all—not a kilowatt will go into the production of atomic energy—but to be used for other purposes.

Mr. President, I think it is high time we realized the economic and social implications of the domestic provisions of the bill, and how deeply they will affect the lives of every person in this country, and the fact that they may even destroy the economic life of this country. As I have said, this bill is, in my opinion, probably the most important and far-reaching piece of legislation that has been brought before the Senate of the United States in many years. It is certainly the most important one that has been brought before the Senate since I became a Member 6 years ago.

When it comes to the international provisions of the bill, I understand those at least in part. I do not claim to understand them in detail, certainly not as much as does the distinguished Senator from Iowa. But I do understand those that will permit the President of the United States to strengthen our relationships with our allies, and to proceed with the implementation of the objectives set forth in that dramatic speech which he made before the United Nations in December of last year. I hope it will permit us, at least in some slight part, to carry on our work of raising the standard of living of some of the underprivileged people of the world whose hearts and minds and confidence we must win if we are going to have lasting peace and security in the world. I understand those aspects, and I am perfectly willing to leave them to the

discretion of the President of the United States under the safeguards suggested by the Senator from Mississippi.

With respect to domestic matters, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], who favors the bill, stated on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that he did not believe, within any measurable time, or within any measurable number of years we could successfully hope to turn over any substantial part of this work of development to private enterprise. Then what is the hurry? Why rush into it? Why do we commit ourselves now to a course of action which we may find completely disastrous in the years to come?

Mr. President, we have reached the point now where, in order to meet an arbitrary deadline, in order to keep a promise made by the majority leadership in the Senate, we are seeking to pass a bill within the next day or 2 or 3 days, which may affect the entire future of this country.

I hope with all my heart, Mr. President, that the Senate will agree to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. I admit, of course, that what the amendment will do will be to delete from the bill the domestic features on which we are not prepared to vote, because they have not received sufficient study and survey by experts, and because they do not even meet many of the views of the President of the United States, and many of the views of the majority members of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Of course, in the case of the Dixon-Yates contract, the Commissioners have been ordered to enter into that contract, even though the majority had deep and sincere reservations.

I very much hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will agree to the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, which will permit international cooperation and an international pool, if the President deems that to be in the interest of the country, but always under the safeguards which have been written into the amendment.

I hope also that, as a result of the adoption of the amendment, there will be deleted from the bill other provisions which require far longer, deeper, and more comprehensive study than that which has been given to them.

Mr. ANDERSON. In view of the fact that the able majority leader has been hopeful that we would move forward rapidly with the bill, I shall not detain the Senate long at this time. I want to say this is purely a question of whether or not we want to make sure that the Senate passes legislation on this subject at this session. I am extremely doubtful, in view of all the questions that have been raised on the domestic front, that we will be able to get through a bill that quickly. There are many persons who did not believe that the atomic energy bill would take the form which it has now taken. There are many persons who thought we would act upon the President's suggestions and merely adopt something in the international field, and that then we would propose certain other matters relating to domestic questions, that we would study those questions for a period of 6 months, and pass that aspect of the measure early in the next session.

It was decided, and I was one who agreed to that decision, we would try to complete the bill and try to act on all sections of it. We have done that. Now I find there are many Senators who believe that the best thing to do is to pass the international section of the bill, giving the President the greatest possible opportunity to forward his program, and not enter into domestic questions on which we have been so severely divided.

As to the claim that this would give an opportunity to foreign people to profit that our businessmen would not have, it is not a correct assumption when one realizes that only recently a contract has been signed with Duquesne Power & Light involving millions of dollars, and when one realizes that the Monsanto contract is going ahead, in which the Government is pledging millions of dollars, and when one realizes that the North American Co. is going ahead with a sodium graphite reactor.

The program is not going ahead as rapidly as it would if the private parts of the bill were adopted, but that is a natural thing. It is true that if licensing were permitted for American firms without any restrictions whatever, we might move ahead more rapidly than we are doing. It is also true that we might face certain problems. That is why the Senator from Mississippi came to me and asked if there was a member of the staff who would help him draw up a provision which would sharply separate the international section of the bill from the domestic matters, so that we might pass the international provisions which the President has requested, and which the country so definitely requires, and leave the domestic provisions for later decision.

That is why, Mr. President, I am going to vote for the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi, because I believe the wisest thing now—the thing surest to obtain success—is to separate the international sections, enact them, and then give the country a chance to study this whole matter of the domestic development.

I think it may take a few months to get the domestic section adopted. I think that the country is, in the vernacular, going to "kick it around" a little bit.

Then the Senate can come back at a later date to make a decision, which may not be different from the decision now reached.

Members of the joint committee spent a tremendous amount of time on both the domestic and international sections. I certainly would be derelict in my duty if I did not say the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] spent a tremendous amount of time in studying those sections. There are other members of the committee whose duties called them away for a while. I am referring to the fact that the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] had his duties as majority leader; and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was required to spend a great deal of time in the discussion of the tax bill.

Much of the effort had to fall upon the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER]. Those two men have done a fine job.

I would not say that the committee had not made the best study it could on these domestic questions, but quite obviously, from the discussion which has been taking place on this floor, all these domestic questions have not been resolved. While it might be possible there would be some better solution than the one offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], it seems to me there is a sentiment on the Senate floor to this effect, "We had better take a good substitute which would involve all the international sections, exactly as the committee decided upon them, after long debate, and leave to a succeeding Congress the domestic issues presented by this bill."

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does not the Senator feel that if we are to take any section of the bill and discard the others we should take the domestic section before we take up everything for the foreign countries, excluding our own people from participation?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not think our own people would be excluded. I tried to show that the three contracts with the Duquesne Power & Light Co., the Monsanto Chemical Co., and North American Aviation represent three different types of reactors, and those three reactors would either prove to be something of value to us or not. We will decide that the type being used by Duquesne is good or that the type used by North American Aviation is better, or we will decide that neither is any good, and we will turn to a third type.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Does not the Senator think we had better postpone this whole bill, rather than to give it all to the foreign countries and exclude our own people from this field?

Mr. ANDERSON. As I tried to say, I do not believe our people are excluded. We want to take this action now while we develop these contracts with these companies. We have contracts with Goodyear. We have contracts with Du Pont. We have contracts with Monsanto. We have contracts with Procter & Gamble and Bell Telephone and Union Carbide. I could go down a long list.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Those are research and development contracts.

Mr. ANDERSON. I could name 100 of the great blue-chip corporations of this country with which the Atomic Energy Commission has contracts.

I would have to agree with the Senator from Iowa that under the most ideal circumstances it would be far better if we were able now to proceed completely with all these private contracts, but it is

a certainty that the main argument over the bill has been over the domestic provisions. The controversy has been over the fact that we have made a preliminary contract with Dixon-Yates, which has caused a great deal of discussion and I think some misunderstanding.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator from New Mexico spent as much time as anybody else in the deliberations of the committee; and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] was very attentive and spent as much time, I think, as anybody else on the Senate side. Does the Senator recall that there was any motion made for the committee to separate the provisions of this bill and only report the international phases of the bill to the Senate? Was the entire bill not voted out, with reservations on the part of several members that certain phrases they reserved a right to object to on the floor?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no question what the answer is. Of course, we voted to report out the entire bill. At the time I discussed whether or not I would file a minority report.

I do not like to file a minority report. I still believe in the right of the majority to rule in this country. If the majority of this Senate takes an action contrary to what I think is best, I am still going to say this is a fine democratic process.

The vote on one section of this bill was very close. The section was a controversial one. The vote on the Dixon-Yates section was 5 to 4 on the Senate side, and I believe 5 to 4 on the House side. That is as close as a vote can be and still have a majority decision. But I did not stand back and say, "Because the Senators did not accept my view I will not vote to report out this bill."

I voted to report it out because I believed the bill should come to the Senate floor. The bill did come to the Senate floor. The bill carries provisions in it which seem to be extremely controversial.

There are arguments here about the licensing provisions. There are arguments here about the patent provisions. There is a great possibility if a motion is made to recommit this bill the whole bill will be committed. Therefore, it seems to me far wiser, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] has suggested, to pass the international sections and pass them now, and take a chance that at a subsequent time the Senate may be able to do a better job on the domestic provisions. The Senate would have 6 months to discuss them, and 6 months in which to reach a more uniform conclusion.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate. As I said earlier, I have tried to bring this bill to a vote, regardless of what some people might think. I now desire to bring the motion of the able Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] to a vote; and, therefore, I shall not further detain the Senate of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, proposed by the Senator from Mississippi.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum has been suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Gore	Maybank
Anderson	Green	McCarthy
Barrett	Hayden	Millikin
Beall	Hendrickson	Monroney
Bennett	Hennings	Morse
Bowring	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bridges	Hill	Neely
Burke	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Humphrey	Payne
Butler	Ives	Potter
Byrd	Jackson	Purtell
Capehart	Jenner	Reynolds
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Cooper	Kennedy	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Crippa	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Daniel	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dirksen	Kuchel	Sparkman
Douglas	Langer	Stennis
Dworshak	Lehman	Symington
Eastland	Lennon	Thye
Ervin	Long	Upton
Ferguson	Magnuson	Watkins
Frear	Malone	Welker
Fulbright	Mansfield	Williams
Goldwater	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may now have a morning hour for the transaction of routine business. Parenthetically, I may say this morning hour comes in the evening. Nevertheless, I ask that Senators may introduce bills and submit resolutions, make insertions in the RECORD, and transact other routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, 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 passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3518) to amend the laws relating to fees charged for services rendered by the Office of the Recorder of Deeds for the District of Columbia and the laws relating to appointment of personnel in such office, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7128) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide an immediate revision and equalization of real-estate values in the District of Columbia; also to provide an assessment of real estate in said District in the year 1896 and every third year thereafter, and for other purposes" approved August 14, 1894, as amended.

BILL INTRODUCED

A bill was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 3815. A bill to provide for a specific contribution by State governments to the cost of feed or seed furnished to farmers, ranchers, or stockmen in disaster areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON TIN

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], I submit a concurrent resolution providing for the establishment of a Joint Congressional Committee on Tin. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be referred to the Committees on Banking and Currency and Armed Services, jointly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received, and, without objection, will be referred as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 100), submitted by Mr. CAPEHART (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was referred to the Committees on Banking and Currency and Armed Services, jointly, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Tin (hereinafter referred to as the committee), to be composed of 14 members as follows:

(1) Seven Members of the Senate, 4 from the majority and 3 from the minority party, to be appointed by the President of the Senate; and

(2) Seven Members of the House of Representatives, 4 from the majority and 3 from the minority party, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

A vacancy in the membership of the committee shall not affect the powers of the remaining members to execute the functions of the committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection. The committee shall elect a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members, one of whom shall be a Member of the Senate and the other a Member of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. It shall be the function of the committee to make the study and investigation determined necessary by section 1 (c) of Public Law 125, 80th Congress, which provides "It is necessary in the public interest and to promote the common defense that Congress make a thorough study and investigation regarding the advisability of the maintenance on a permanent basis of a domestic tin-smelting industry and to study the availability of supplies of tin adequate to meet the industrial, military, and naval requirements of the Nation in time of national emergency."

SEC. 3. The committee shall report to the Senate and House of Representatives not later than January 3, 1955, the results of its

study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation and such other recommendations as it may deem advisable.

SEC. 4. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to require by subpena (to be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee) or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable.

SEC. 5. The committee is authorized to appoint, without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and organizations thereof, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary and advisable.

The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Clerk of the House of Representatives out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the Senate in the amount of one-half of disbursements so made without regard to any other provision of law.

The committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of all agencies in the executive branch of the Government in connection with its study and investigation.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

NOTICE OF CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senate received today the following nominations:

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1954:

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts.
H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey.
J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas.
C. D. Jackson, of New York.
Charles H. Mahoney, of Michigan.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1954.

Wright F. Morrow, of Texas.
Roger W. Straus, of New York.
James J. Wadsworth, of New York.
Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York.
Ade M. Johnson, of Washington.

I give notice that these nominations will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

WATER USES—CONSUMPTIVE VERSUS NONCONSUMPTIVE

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, if the able majority leader will permit me to use 2 or 3 minutes, I should like to make a short statement that I was endeavoring to make tonight on an entirely different subject.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no objection to the Senator making his statement in the morning hour, so to speak.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Saturday agreed to report Senate bill 1555, introduced by the able junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] on behalf of himself and the other Senators of the upper Colorado River Basin States.

The favorable report on that bill represents the end of a long period of struggle on behalf of Senators from the upper Colorado River Basin States for legislation which will permit the utilization of the water of that river by the upper basin States.

The Senator from Colorado, as chairman of the subcommittee handling the proposed legislation, has done what I regard to be an extremely fine job, and I should like to pay tribute to him and to say that without his patience and his courtesy and his extremely fine spirit all along the way we would probably not have been able to report the bill.

I should also like to say that the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] has been a tremendous help to all of us who come from the area served by the bill.

I recall that the Senator from Utah invited me and other members of the committee, to come to his office, where he had special charts prepared and where he was able to demonstrate beyond any doubt the great value of this project.

I appreciate more than I can say the courtesy of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] for the work he has done on the matter. I should also like to say that there are other Senators, whose interests may be regarded as adverse to the upper Colorado River Basin States, who participated in the hearings but who did not try to destroy the hearings. I refer particularly to the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] whose interest was different from the interest of the upper Colorado River Basin States, who cross-examined the witnesses and who very vigorously offered testimony in behalf of his State, but who nevertheless did not prevent the bill from being reported to the Senate.

I refer also to the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] who, although he had a very peculiar problem on water below Elephant Butte Dam on the Rio Grande was nevertheless in favor of trying to do all he could in meeting the problem.

I desire also to say that the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], whose long acquaintance with irrigation matters was of great use to the committee, was steadily in attendance when the subcommittee was holding hearings. I desire to express my appreciation to him for the work he has done.

The State of New Mexico's project, unfortunately, had been left out of the House version of the bill, but I am happy to say that it was reinserted in the bill by the committee, and for that I thank the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and other Senators who participated.

I ask that a statement which I have prepared on water uses, consumptive versus nonconsumptive, be printed in the body of the RECORD, at this point.

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

WATER USES, CONSUMPTIVE VERSUS NONCONSUMPTIVE

The United States is truly a "land of plenty," but in at least one major resource the "plenty" is poorly distributed. Water is that resource. Water is the one substance, along with the air we breathe, without which life cannot exist. Although, in total there is sufficient water in the United States to meet all needs, it does not occur at the right time, in the right place and in the right amounts to satisfy the demands for water.

The United States is characterized by both humid areas and arid areas, with marginal areas in between. In the humid areas there is a surplus of water most of the time, but occasionally a short, disastrous drought occurs. In the arid area, water is limited in amount and poorly distributed. Artificial application of water to the land is required for the production of crops, and water sources, principally surface streams, have to be controlled and stored during periods of high surface runoff to supply the water needs during the periods of low runoff during summer and fall months. In the humid areas of the East, the major problem is to get rid of the surplus water safely but in spite of the large quantities of water usually available, short periods of drought become serious when they affect municipal, industrial, and hydropower water supplies. Not so long ago New York City itself suffered a severe water shortage. Recent studies by the United States Geological Survey indicate that with the rapidly growing municipal and industrial uses for water, no part of the country is safe from water shortages without holdover storage reservoirs.

Water may be used consumptively or nonconsumptively. The consumptive uses are: Domestic (serving culinary water needs of municipalities and industry), agricultural and industrial. The nonconsumptive uses are: For power generation, navigation, recreation, and fish and wildlife. Of these uses, domestic and agriculture have first priority because of these there is no substitute for water. Industrial uses follow agriculture and then comes the nonconsumptive uses. Although agriculture has a priority over industry for the use of water, there are many areas of short water supply where industry may some day compete with agriculture for the limited supply.

In the West, consumptive uses are paramount. This principle was accepted and written into the State constitutions of those States accepting the doctrine of appropriation as the basis of their water law. The other western States which recognize the doctrine of riparian rights have modified that doctrine by statute and court decisions to provide for consumptive uses. The Federal Government recognized the principle in the acts of 1866, 1872, and 1877 relating to water use and land reclamation. Still later, in the Reclamation Act of 1939, the prior rights for consumptive uses were reaffirmed for the area of the United States west of the 98th meridian.

The Colorado River compact provides in article IV (a): "The use of its waters for the

purposes of navigation shall be subservient to the uses of such waters for domestic, agricultural, and power purposes." Article IV (b) of the same compact provides: "Water of the Colorado River system may be impounded and used for the generation of electrical power, but such impounding and use shall be subservient to the use and consumption of such water for agricultural and domestic purposes." Specifically, therefore, the waters of the Colorado River allocated by the Colorado River compact are expected to be used consumptively; all other uses are secondary.

The consumptive uses in terms of priority are domestic, agricultural, and industrial. In terms of volume of use, agriculture consumes by far the most water, followed by domestic and industrial consumption.

Evaporation is a nonproductive consumptive use. It represents a loss but is an essential segment of the water production cycle.

The water allocated to the upper basin—7,500,000 acre feet annually—under the Colorado compact must cover all consumptive uses. This means that the evaporation losses from the storage reservoirs must be deducted from the allocated 7,500,000 acre feet in order to arrive at the quantity of water available for productive consumptive use. These evaporation losses are to be prorated among the upper basin States in proportion to their respective shares in the total allocation.

Present consumptive use in the upper basin is approximately 2,500,000 acre feet per year, or roughly one-third of the water to which the 4 States are entitled. Approximately 5 million acre-feet per year, therefore, is still flowing to the lower basin, where it is being used for power generation and subsequently will be used for agricultural, industrial, or domestic purposes if not put to use in the 4 upper basin States.

Consumptive use in the upper basin cannot be greatly increased in the absence of holdover storage without interfering with established rights in the lower basin during low water years which reoccur frequently and low flow seasons which occur every year. It is, therefore, quite evident that the full consumptive use of waters allocated to the upper basin cannot be made without holdover storage and that the reservoirs necessary for such storage must be provided and filled before the full upper basin consumptive use is established.

The total estimated consumptive use to result from the construction proposed in the pending legislation is about 2 million acre-feet. This means that when the current consumption is added, a total of 4.5 million acre-feet annually of Colorado River water will be used in the 4 upper basin States at the end of the construction period, some 25 years hence. Only under full development of the river—75 to 100 years from now—will all 7,500,000 acre-feet of water allocated to the upper basin States be consumptively used.

In the meantime then, water not consumptively used in the upper basin States will be available under control to flow through the wheels of the powerplants in the lower basin making firm power for lower basin uses at no cost to those power users for the falling water.

The development of the upper Colorado River basin through the authorization and construction of the Colorado River storage project and participating units will not only provide water for beneficial consumptive uses in agriculture and industry but also will provide water for municipal purposes. In addition, nonconsumptive uses for power generation, recreation, and fish and wildlife will result.

The development of the upper basin projects also will provide silt storage in the upper basin which will prolong the life of the lower basin reservoirs indefinitely. In addition, it will deliver upper basin water (3 to 4 million acre-feet per year) under a controlled supply for use in the lower basin powerplants for at least 50 years.

The Colorado River compact allocated to the upper basin States 7.5 million acre-feet annually for beneficial consumptive use. This water right, of vital importance to 4 semiarid States, cannot be exercised without the Colorado River storage project and its participating units. This project is self-liquidating. It also is a national investment in the future. Furthermore, in terms of dollars, after repayment of all costs including interest for all phases except irrigation, the annual net yield to the Government from the first 2 powerplants of the project will equal about $20 million.

RELIEF OF DROUGHT-STRICKEN AREAS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a very bad drought condition prevails not only in the Southwest but in the southern portion of the Middle West.

Temperatures in my State have run from 104° to 115° for a great many days, and the corn and soybean crops are largely destroyed. A great deal of damage has been done, also, to livestock, poultry, hogs, and so forth, and community water supplies are drying up.

Mr. President, I submit a concurrent resolution describing these facts, and asking that a joint congressional committee of 10 be appointed, to be comprised of Members of both Houses, to investigate the subject and to make recommendations in general for a long-range plan as well as to report short-range details for dealing with the serious drought of the Southwest and the Middle West.

I send the concurrent resolution to the desk, and ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred:

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 101), submitted by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Whereas serious conditions of drought exist in wide areas throughout the Southwest and the Middle West; and

Whereas Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives have been petitioned for relief and assistance by citizens, banks, farm organizations and other groups, representing great populations of Illinois, Iowa, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Texas, Oklahoma, and other States; and

Whereas many cities and towns in such States are suffering from acute water shortages, causing great hardship; and

Whereas drought conditions have been prevalent in this area for 2 or more years; and

Whereas telegraphic and press reports indicate high losses in grains, soybeans, egg production, livestock, poultry, and other farm products due to drought and excessively high temperatures; and

Whereas in some areas farm production has been estimated to have suffered a 75 percent loss; and

Whereas this situation presents a grave threat to the farm economy and represents extreme hardship to tens of thousands of farmers: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby requested to proceed immediately under such authority as he has to grant disaster relief loans in these areas in order to provide for the purchase and shipment of feeds and such other supplies as are needed on an emergency basis.

SEC. 2. a) There is hereby established a joint congressional committee to be composed of five Members of the Senate who are members of the Senate Committee on Agriculture, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives who are members of the House Committee on Agriculture, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. In each instance two of such Members appointed shall be members of the minority party. Vacancies in the membership of the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining Members to execute the functions of the joint committee and shall be filled in the same manner as in the case of the original selection. The joint committee shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among its members. A quorum of the joint committee shall consist of six members, except that the joint committee may fix a lesser number as a quorum for the purpose of taking sworn testimony.

(b) It shall be the duty of the joint committee to make a full and complete study and investigation of drought conditions in the United States for the purpose of preparing plans and programs for the alleviation of such conditions, including loan and feed programs, water storage, local lakes, construction of feasible reservoirs and irrigation and flood-control projects, and such other measures as are deemed practicable. In conducting such study and survey the joint committee shall take testimony with respect to such drought conditions and such plans and programs from representative farmers and other individuals residing in drought areas. The joint committee shall, not later than January 3, 1955, report to the Senate and the House of Representatives the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as to necessary legislation as it may deem desirable. Upon the submission of such report, the joint committee shall cease to exist and all authority conferred by this resolution shall terminate.

(c) The joint committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times during the session, recesses, and adjourned periods of the 83d Congress, to hold such hearings, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses, and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words.

(d) The joint committee shall have power to employ and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and other employees as it deems necessary in the performance of its duties.

(e) The expenses of the joint committee, which shall not exceed $———, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles published in Illinois newspapers. The first article, entitled "Drought and Heat Create Area's Worst Disaster," was published in the

Collinsville Herald of July 21, 1954, and the second article, entitled "Crop Devastation Is Almost Total Throughout Macoupin," was published in the Macoupin County Enquirer of July 22, 1954.

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

[From the Collinsville Herald of July 21, 1954]

DROUGHT AND HEAT CREATE AREA'S WORST DISASTER—100°–112° TEMPERATURES WREAK HAVOC—HOGS AND CHICKENS DON'T SWEAT, DIE; CORN SHRIVELS

The discomfort felt by the city residents during the record heat wave last week was nothing compared to the distress of the farmers who had to watch their crops wilt and "fire" under the blazing sun. Cornstalks, still a bleached green color, crumble like finely ground tobacco in the hand. Soybean plants, although still fairly green in appearance, are a delusion because the blossoms have fallen off. Horseradish, one of the big bottomland crops, is said to be almost a total loss.

Reports received here say that even the supermodern fields dampened by overhead irrigation are "cooked" with the plants wilted down to the ground.

Dairy farmers, too, took a double beating on the heat. They saw their feed crop burning up in the fields, and at the same time the heat was so severe that milk production fell off 20 percent.

Chickens, more sensitive to the temperature than cattle or hogs, died by the hundreds. The Herald heard of one nearby farmer who lost 100.

Madison and St. Clair Counties have been harder hit than the rest of the State by drought over a 3-year period, as showers have passed us by, except for the May–June sprinkles which saved the wheat crops this year. As a result, there was no deep moisture to protect the crops when the sun "poured it on" last week.

Truman May, county farm adviser, estimates the 3 days of intense heat last week cut the corn crop 20 percent. It had already taken severe damage from lack of moisture, and more is expected. There is much variation from field to field and even inside the same field, making it difficult to estimate the damage accurately, but May said it is safe to say that the corn crop will not be 50 percent of normal in this area.

Sweet corn is almost a total loss around here. May said the test plot west of Alton & Southern tracks about 5 miles west of Collinsville, containing about 80 different varieties, was given up a couple of weeks ago. Drought has been so extentive the test results would be meaningless.

Damage to crops is much worse in the Northeast quarter of the county, where soils are lighter than they are in this part of the county.

"It looks like more damage is yet to come," May said. The damage seems to show up more as the time goes on."

Highland, our neighboring city to the east, has been desperate for water for months, with car-washings, lawn sprinkling, etc., drastically limited. Arrangements have been made in advance with various cities nearby, including Collinsville, which can supply water in tank cars to Highland if the situation becomes that critical.

Last week, the Layne-Western Co. made test drills southeast of Highland in an effort to tap an underground water-bearing formation similar to the gravel which supplies Collinsville waterworks with ample supplies.

The tests failed to find water.

Madison County Farm Bureau Agent Truman May terms the past 10 days of terrific 110° to 112° heat following 3 years of subnormal rainfall the "worst disaster which ever hit Madison County farmers. We have had other disasters—floods, tornadoes, hail, and so forth—but they were all localized. This hit everybody." And there is no letup in sight.

The middle picture shows a horseradish patch photographed from Route 157 northwest of the city limits. The white leaves can't be picked off the plants—they crumble into dust. Horseradish growers of this area took a tremendous loss last year with their wet-weather crop and had to import root stock at great expense. This year's crop is said to be almost a total loss even on farms where overhead irrigation was tried this year.

Bottom view shows the only corn crop in the entire area which is in fine shape—and it flourishes in 10 acres which should be 6 feet under water at the bottom of McDonough Lake northwest of the city. Clarence Kosten put the lake bottom in cultivation this year. The photographer was standing at a point where normally the carp splash in a couple of feet of water. Other corn is "fired" very badly; many of the green-looking leaves crumble when touched.

[From the Macoupin County Enquirer of July 22, 1954]

CROP DEVASTATION IS ALMOST TOTAL THROUGHOUT MACOUPIN—ESTIMATED LOSS IS SET AT 2,000,000 BUSHELS OF CORN

Farmers throughout central Illinois are being exceedingly hardhit by the extreme heat and continued lack of moisture, with devastating effects showing greatly in the appearance of silver-topped corn, parched ground, wilted gardens and dead livestock and poultry. According to O. O. Mowery, farm adviser for Macoupin County, the heaviest damage is to the northern part of the county, but farmland in most parts of the county show ill effects of the record-breaking heat wave, which reached its climax Sunday.

Sunday was the beginning of another period of heat and drought with an official temperature reading of 113 degrees as recorded on the farm of Henry Hoelting, official weather observer, surpassing the intensity of the searing sun when the mercury jumped to 112 last Wednesday. Overshadowing storm clouds on Monday released a steady stream of rain for about 10 minutes leaving in its wake a few scattered puddles and a drop in temperature of about 4 degrees, from 100 to 96 degress, for a few hours.

SALVAGE FOR SILAGE

Mr. Mowery said: "Many farmers are anxious to salvage what forage they have. We have had very little experience with this type of drought damage before. The intense heat and low humidity has burned the stalks more than any previous droughts on record. What happens to some of these plants remains to be seen but if the heat continues like it was on Sunday it will take only a few days to complete the drying process."

Corn fields present a sight that has never before been seen by the greater part of the citizens of Macoupin and surrounding counties. The damage is spotted, some fields along the bottom lands have only occasional blasted spots, but most other fields are seas of white topped blades. A trip through county areas is proof enough of the powerful sun's rays when a large percentage of the tassels are seen dead. However, some of the late growing tassels show signs of recuperating enough to do the pollinating work.

Corn at this stage does have some food value and according to Jarry Cash, who has made some observations, the dry matter in this corn is practically equal to the dry matter in more mature corn. However, it will take a big acreage to make much volume as shown when Irvin Pocklington reported it took about 115 acres to fill his large silo in 1936.

The penetrating heat has been much more of a problem on fields which have had little or no rain since early in June. In the northern third of the country most of the corn has fired, leaving only dried up stalks which farmers are preparing to try to salvage by making into silage. In most cases, it is thought, farmers will let the crop stand either until it become a little drier or until rains revive the plants enough so that some grain can be produced.

CROPS ARE LOST

Mr. Mowery, who attended a meeting Saturday with a panel of experts from the college of agriculture in trying to determine losses in the severe cases in the county, said that it was generally agreed that many of the fields have already suffered as high as 80 percent loss, even if rain did come within the next few days. He said that without rain by the end of the present week, and continued high temperatures this will be the end of these fields.

Other crop losses are severe in many cases with soybeans suffering somewhat less than corn from the intense heat. Farmers throughout this and surrounding counties report the same story—crops are burned up. Mr. Mowery, who has been using cornfields almost as an office since the seriousness of the drouth became apparent, gave this warning:

"If I may stick my neck out to this extent I will venture to say that the corn crop has been reduced more than 2 million bushels at the present time, representing about a $3 million loss to Macoupin County farmers and the bean loss will not be much less in actual dollars. Add to this the loss from pastures and new seedings of hay and even some loss of livestock, the total loss to farmers in Macoupin County will represent several million dollars."

LIVESTOCK LOSSES

Destitute farmers who have almost given up hope in saving their crops, have turned to their one remaining concern—livestock and poultry. Many farmers in this and other areas are suffering staggering loss in hogs and chickens especially.

Near Staunton farmers said that so many head of stock had died that they had been notified to burn the carcasses as reduction plants were too busy to keep up with work of removal. Near Carlinville several farmers have reported loss of hogs—20 of which were lost on the Denby-Sanson farm.

Loss of livestock and poultry has reached the thousand mark on Central Illinois farms. In Illiopolis, 9,000 chickens were reported dead at the DeKalb Agricultural Association. Most of Sangamon County's farmers have reported animal losses. Livestock and crops have been lost in Menard, Calhoun, Montgomery, Christian, and Fayette Counties and possibly others.

WATER SITUATION HERE

The water-supply situation in Carlinville continues to meet all demands of residents and surrounding farmers. Jack Adams, waterworks superintendent, said that approximately 600,000 gallons of water are used each day meeting 2 peak periods during that time—1 between 6 a. m. and 10 a. m. and the other between 7 p. m. and 9 p. m.

In need of ironing out some of the more serious problems of water consumption, he said that something would have to be done in order to insure the farmer the supply which he needs. As in other communities, it was thought that limiting consumers to household needs and under no circumstances allowing sprinkling of lawns would abet the situation somewhat.

Robert Wiles' water station, which has been supplying from 35 to 40 farmers per day, began limiting farmers, who need from 2 to 3 tanks of water each day, to 1 tank a day.

THE BRIGHTER SIDE

"To every cloud there is a silver lining," and this is no exception. In Honey Point Township farmers have their "silver lining" due to the fact that late rains came just in time to save the corn crop from the blazing sun's rays.

It is said that in that township some of the farms have produced some of the best green crops in this county. However, if rain doesn't come soon, even the best of crops will go under.

OPERATION AMERICAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in a few months we Americans will again be going to the polls to exercise one of our most cherished democratic values—the right to vote. Universal suffrage did not come to us suddenly or easily but evolved through the years along with the growth of our country. Indeed, it has been said with much truth that in the history of suffrage we can trace the history of civilization.

When we cast our ballots in November we shall be expressing our faith in self-government, and we shall be in a distinguished company of men who have contributed so much to our Government. In the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt:

When you and I stand in line * * * for our turn at the polls, we shall stand in a line which reaches back across the entire history of our Nation.

Washington stood in that line and Jefferson and Jackson and Lincoln. And in later days Cleveland stood there and Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson. All these—in their day—waited their turn to vote. And rubbing elbows with them, their voting equals, is a long succession of American citizens whose names are not known to history but who, by their vote, helped to make history.

Yet, in every election, a discouragingly large number of Americans simply do not vote. We all hold dear the right to vote, but far too many people forget that the best way to retain this right is to use it. Democratic government means government by the people, and the most direct participation that many of us will ever have in government comes at the polls. If our Government is to remain strong and free, the people—all of the people—must participate in its affairs. Thomas Jefferson wisely stated, "That government is the strongest of which every man feels himself a part"; and in the words of Woodrow Wilson: "Freedom exists only where the people take care of the government."

It is my fervent plea that the American people this November will fully exercise their right to vote. Whether we be Democrats, Republicans, or Independents—we are all Americans first—to vote is our responsibility as Americans.

Grover Cleveland stated this responsibility well when he stated: "Your every voter, as surely as your chief magistrate, under the same high sanction, though in a different sphere, exercises a public trust."

Our aim as a people is a better America. May our votes, our lives, and our talents be directed toward this end.

Let us, therefore, join in this pledge in this great election year:

I am an American, proud of my country, grateful for the privileges and responsibilities that are found only where freedom lives. Neither by word nor deed shall I knowingly weaken the faith of the people in the institutions of representative government. I shall dedicate whatever talents God may have given me to the fulfillment of the promises of democracy.

THE MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, has the transaction of morning business been concluded?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. DIRKSEN. In the many hours that have been devoted to the discussion of the pending bill, it is only natural that some sparks should fly and that feelings should become aroused. However, some of the remarks that have been made about the majority leader seem to me to be quite unbecoming to this body.

I wish to say for the Senator from California that seldom have I seen such an exhibition of patience and forbearance as he has shown under very trying circumstances. It ought to be remembered he is responsible for the administration's program, and behind this prolonged deliberation many bills, many conference reports, and other matters are piling up and are giving some concern, not only to the administration, but to the Congress.

And so I want to say for him, notwithstanding some of the rather arbitrary and some of the vitriolic editorials, that he deserves the gratitude of the country, and the gratitude of the Senate, for the forbearance and patience he has manifested under the most trying circumstances.

His is a difficult job indeed. It was about 13 months ago that Bob Taft limped down the central aisle of this Chamber and asked BILL KNOWLAND to take over the responsibilities of floor leadership. He has discharged that responsibility with courage. He has done it with vigor. He has done it with great credit to himself, to his party, and to his country.

I think the time has come to say a kind word for the majority leader, because he is eminently deserving of it, and he is deserving of the plaudits of his fellow countrymen under these very difficult circumstances.

I salute his courage as the majority leader, and I want him to know that I am in his corner under any circumstance in carrying out a very difficult assignment.

COMMUNIST ATTACKS ON OUR AIRCRAFT

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, the disclosure that American fliers have shot down two Red jet planes which had attacked them without provocation should serve notice on the Communists that we will not be threatened or intimidated. Furthermore, the incident should make it emphatically obvious to the masters of the Kremlin that the far reaches of the Pacific are not the Communists' own private sea.

However, any action of this sort carries serious implications and serious responsibilities. While we must defend ourselves against unwarranted aggression, as was the case in the Hainan incident, we must be careful not to let the Communists draw us into another local war.

Mr. President, the situation is fraught with ominous potentialities and we must not be actuated by emotionalism. I know that President Eisenhower will appraise the situation calmly, deliberately, and in the background of his years of experience. However, in times like these it is well also to have the benefit of the thinking of others who have had to face similar problems in the past. For that reason, I would like to suggest to the White House that it call for consultation the country's outstanding authority on Asia—Gen. Douglas MacArthur. General MacArthur knows the Asiatic peoples and he knows how communism operates in Asia. His views could be of tremendous value to the administration in the crucial days ahead.

I sincerely hope that the administration will see fit to summon this great soldier and patriot for his advice.

REVISION OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1946

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 3690) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, is the morning hour completed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning hour is completed.

Mr. KNOWLAND. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, offered by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE]. Were he present, he would vote "yea." Were I permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE],

the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 51, as follows:

YEAS—31

Anderson	Humphrey	Maybank
Burke	Jackson	Monroney
Chavez	Johnson, Tex.	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Douglas	Kennedy	Neely
Eastland	Kerr	Smathers
Gore	Kilgore	Sparkman
Green	Langer	Stennis
Hayden	Lehman	Symington
Hennings	Magnuson	
Hill	Mansfield	

NAYS—51

Aiken	Ferguson	Millikin
Barrett	Frear	Pastore
Beall	Fulbright	Payne
Bennett	Goldwater	Potter
Bowring	Hendrickson	Purtell
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Reynolds
Bush	Holland	Robertson
Butler	Ives	Russell
Capehart	Jenner	Saltonstall
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Cordon	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Crippa	Lennon	Thye
Daniel	Long	Upton
Dirksen	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Martin	Welker
Ervin	McCarthy	Williams

NOT VOTING—14

Bricker	Flanders	McClellan
Byrd	George	Mundt
Case	Gillette	Wiley
Duff	Kefauver	Young
Ellender	McCarran	

So Mr. STENNIS' amendment was rejected.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUTLER in the chair). The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 67, line 6, it is proposed to strike out "1959" and insert in lieu thereof "1964."

On page 63, line 20, before the word "patent", insert "nonexclusive."

On page 66, line 11, before the period, insert the following: "on terms no less favorable than those granted by the patentee or by the Commission to similar licensees for comparable use."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send forward a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be read for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the request.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment to S. 3690 submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled respectively, by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided*, That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, if 1 hour is not sufficient, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma whether he would have any other suggestion.

Mr. KERR. An hour is entirely adequate. It is the desire of the Senator from Oklahoma to explain briefly the purpose of the amendment, and in his opinion it will not take to exceed 10 minutes to do so. Therefore I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that I do not believe this is the proper way to proceed, in view of the great record which has been made in the Senate today. There has been a discussion of a series of amendments; in fact, for the first time in days there have been presented both sides in the arguments on a number of amendments. There was the Gore amendment, which after debate was adopted. I think that was a clear demonstration of the soundness of the position of those of us who have said that the debate should run its regular course without any threat of coercion and duress, and the forcing of a unanimous-consent agreement upon us.

In my opinion there is a very important amendment before the Senate at this time, and I do not believe it will take long to debate it, if it is debated without any limitation being forced upon the Senate. I think we should wait for the developments and not vote on an amendment as important as the one before the Senate, the amendment now pending, if there is going to be necessary, in order to bring out all the facts, the statement of different points of view involved in the amendment. I think it would be a great mistake.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am informed by the distinguished Senator from Iowa that he believes that with the addition of certain language which has been worked out, he will be able to accept the amendment. Under those conditions, I withdraw the request for unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws his request.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the purpose of the amendment is to eliminate the harshness of what I have regarded as the features of the bill which would promote monopoly with reference to patents on the peacetime use of atomic energy.

We are all aware that at this time a very few industrial operators in our country, corporations and individuals, have most of the knowledge and most of the know-how with reference to the development of atomic energy and its uses for peacetime purposes.

It has been my thought that the pending bill, if it is to be written into law, should be written in such a way that those limited few with that know-how, and almost to an exclusive degree, should not become the primary or exclusive beneficiaries of that knowledge.

The Senator from Oklahoma offered an amendment a few days ago which would have continued the language of the McMahon law in that regard. That amendment was tabled. Then the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] offered an amendment which would have extended the period during which compulsory cross licensing of patents would have been available for a period of 15 years instead of a period of 5 years. That amendment likewise was tabled.

The pending amendment, first, would extend the period for compulsory cross licensing for a period of 10 years, instead of 5 years, as is provided in the bill. Furthermore, it would provide for the issuance of licenses under patents on a nonexclusive basis.

Next, with reference to the 10-year period in which compulsory licensing is provided, the amendment would make it so that such licensing would be on terms not less favorable than those granted by the Commission to similar licensees for comparable uses.

I have discussed this amendment with the distinguished vice chairman of the joint committee, the senior Senator from Iowa. I am glad to say to the Senate that the Senator has looked with favor upon the amendment as it is now written, and has indicated his willingness to accept the amendment insofar as he is concerned and let it become a part of the bill.

I believe, Mr. President, in view of the lengthy discussion which has been had heretofore on this amendment in other forms, and in view of the degree to which this amendment is similar to those which we have heretofore discussed, that is all I care to say at this time.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, during the day the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and I have been discussing certain beneficial changes which might be made in the patent provisions. We have arrived at an agreement on this proposal, as the Senator has just stated. I think it is a helpful proposal and I am quite willing to accept it. I believe it will add something of benefit to safeguarding the patent provisions. Therefore, so far as I am personally concerned, I favor the adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator from Iowa. Having worked with the Senator on this amendment and others today, I have found the Senator most able and cooperative, and I congratulate him and thank him.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I thank the Senator from Tennessee. I will say that others have been cooperative in desiring to work this amendment out.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a moment?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator's willingness to accept this amendment and accept the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] some time ago shows remarkable progress in the Senate this afternoon, in trying to iron out some differences and to improve this bill for

final passage. I expect that from the Senator from Iowa. It is the sort of relationship I have always enjoyed with him.

After a little further consideration of the bill, Mr. President, I think we may be able to get enough amendments adopted so that we can go to a vote on it.

I am delighted with the progress which has been made with respect to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] and the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. I regret that the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] did not prevail, because I think it is just as sound as the amendments we have adopted; but, after all, the majority did not share that point of view.

I think we are beginning to get a bill which is being put into pretty good form.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I want to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his patience and tolerance and spirit of cooperation as manifested in this matter, and I desire to express to the Senator my thanks for his willingness and devotion in helping to work out a provision which in his judgment and mine adds materially to the bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I merely want to say that the Senator from Oklahoma has been very generous in an attempt to arrive at a ground for mutual understanding. I appreciate the Senator's cooperation, too, in attempting to solve this problem, which is indeed of vital importance.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to call up my amendment, 7-22-54-K, and ask that the amendment, as modified, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, line 10, it is proposed to change the period to a colon and to add the following: "*Provided,* That notwithstanding any other provisions of law, such leases or permits may be issued for lands administered for national park, monument, and wildlife purposes only when the President by Executive order declares that the requirements of national defense make such action necessary."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to do so, I desire to clarify the situation. I desire to explain that I have discussed this amendment with the Senator from New Mexico. I personally feel that after the Senator has presented the reasons for his amendment it can be disposed of in a very few minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I wish to express my reasons also in a very few minutes.

In preparing this language we provided there might be leases by the Atomic Energy Commission to lands belonging to the United States. An item was apparently overlooked, and the wildlife foundation and various other people discovered that the language included the national parks and monuments, where there has always been a restriction against prospecting.

A few days ago in a bill before the Senate Commitee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] well knows, we added language which would have permitted licenses in these parks, but required some safeguards. This is merely language which says: "If you want to prospect for uranium in the national parks you cannot come in and demand the right to prospect; it has to be under Executive order of the President of the United States and be concurred in by the agency involved."

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CORDON. Does the language in the amendment the Senator offered follow substantially the language agreed upon in conference on the bill to amend the public-lands law with regard to minerals?

Mr. ANDERSON. It does.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I desire to say for the RECORD I have been in consultation with the Senator from New Mexico on this amendment. I think it is an amendment with merit. I am happy to accept it insofar as my acceptance is worth anything; and I recommend its adoption.

Mr. ANDERSON. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I call up my amendment 7-10-54-A, as modified. I have added a modification on the second page.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 102, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 271. Disposition of revenues:

a. All revenues of the Commission from licensing, the sale or leasing of material (including byproduct energy), or the furnishing of services, from and after the date of enactment of this act, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and held in a special account, and such moneys shall be appropriated exclusively for the purpose of promoting the national defense and national security through grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education.

b. An Advisory Council on Education for National Security is hereby created to be composed of 12 persons to be appointed by the President with regard to their experience in the relationship of education to national defense and national security, of whom 6 shall be from the fields of education and research in the natural and social sciences. It shall be the function of such Council to recommend to the President for submission to the Congress not later than 12 months from the date of the enactment of this act, a plan for the allocation of grants-in-aid of primary, secondary, and higher education provided in subsection a. of this section.

On page 102, line 15, strike out "SEC. 271" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 281."

On page 102, line 19, strike out "SEC. 281" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 291."

On page 102, line 24, strike out "SEC. 291" and insert in lieu thereof "SEC. 301."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, following out what the majority leader has done, I should like to offer a unanimous-consent agreement, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The proposed agreement was read, as follows:

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment to S. 3690 submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided,* That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to offer this in the same spirit the Senator from California has offered similar proposals from time to time; and I ask the Senator from Arkansas if the time allowed is agreeable, or whether the Senator would like to have more time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, for the same reason it was objected to the last time, I wish to object at this time. I do not expect to take very long, but I do not approve that particular procedure. So far as I am concerned, I shall not speak very long; but I will object.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Under the circumstances, I withdraw the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this amendment, which I offer on behalf of myself and the Senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], is very familiar to the Senate. The amendment provides for the use of whatever may be the income from this great new invention for the purpose of education. The Senate was thoroughly informed about the purposes of it and what would be done in the debate last year on the tidelands bill.

I have just a few words of explanation on this particular amendment, but I did desire to say that by way of a preliminary statement, so that everyone who heard the debate last year may be thoroughly familiar with the matter to begin with.

The amendment proposes that all revenues of the Commission from licensing, the sale or leasing of material—including byproduct energy—or the furnishing of services shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and held in a special account to be devoted exclusively for the purpose of promoting the national defense and national security through aid to education.

An Advisory Council on Education for National Security would be created. It

would be the function of the Council to recommend to the President for submission to the Congress not later than January 1, 1956, a plan for the allocation of funds to education.

Mr. President, the dilemma which confronts us today is illustrated in no better way than by the bill which is before us.

The forces of our industrial society have presented us with atomic energy. Atomic energy may prove to be the greatest boon in the history of all mankind, or it may prove to be the force which destroys us.

We have this great power for good or evil, but we know not what to do with it. It may save us or destroy us, and in my opinion this question will be resolved by education.

The word "education" means different things to different people. I use it to mean the process designed to create the capacity and the desire to think. Thinking is the process by which we learn and also the way we create new ideas. There is nothing more difficult or more painful for human beings to do than think and yet the capacity to think distinguishes man from the other inhabitants of the globe. The animals and birds and insects do many things better than man does; they can run faster, they can fly, they have better sight, and a keener sense of smell—but none of them have man's capacity for creative thinking.

If people are to enjoy self-government, if they are to manage their own affairs, if they are to control the forces which they have harnessed, such as atomic energy, they should have the knowledge and the capacity to think clearly, to discriminate between that which is false and that which is true.

In the early days of this Republic, Jefferson recognized the significance of this principle. As you all know, he was more proud of founding the University of Virginia than he was of being President of the United States.

In 1820, after having reached the full maturity of his great intellect, Jefferson had this to say:

> I know of no safe depository of the ultimate powers of society but the people themselves; and if we think them not enlightened enough to exercise their control with a wholesome direction, the remedy is not to take it from them, but to inform their discretion by education.

In a similar vein, Washington, in his Farewell Address, admonished his fellow countrymen:

> To promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.

In the days of Washington and Jefferson, the power to think and to understand was the mark of real distinction. Our Founding Fathers were men of learning, with strong and original powers of thought. Because they were educated men—men with great wisdom—they were able to create a superior system of government for the people of this Nation.

That system is now undergoing a severe test of its strength, the most severe test since the War Between the States. It is subjected to this test largely because we have failed to make education a primary objective of our society, because we have failed to follow Jefferson's and Washington's advice.

The neglect of education in this country can be shown in the dry terms of fact and figure. In a recent year we spent over eight and one-quarter billion on public education, out of a national income of two hundred and seventy-seven billion—or, approximately 3 percent. In the same year, we spent nearly sixteen billion, almost twice as much, on liquor, tobacco, race-horse betting and cosmetics. What we spend on education is obviously not a matter of capacity, but rather a matter of choice.

During World War II, more than 5 million men within the draft age were rejected because of physical, emotional, moral, or mental deficiencies. Eighteen million men were examined, so nearly 1 out of 3 was unfit to become a soldier. In the Korean war, the proportion of unfit young men was about the same—500,000 out of a million and a half.

Of the 5 million rejected in World War II, more than 700,000 were "mentally deficient." This is equivalent in manpower to more than 40 divisions, or nearly half as many divisions as we had in the Armed Forces at the peak of mobilization. The greater part of the 700,000 mentally deficient were "educationally deprived," or—in other words—had less than a fourth grade education, although they were capable of learning if given the opportunity.

This it not all. At the outbreak of World War II, more than 4 million men in the labor force had less than 5 years of schooling and about 1½ million were totally illiterate.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to read from an article which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on July 1, 1954. The headline of the article is "Eight Million Illiterates in United States Are Deplored." The article reads as follows:

> United States Commissioner of Education Samuel Brownell told American teachers today it was appalling that in a time of struggle for men's minds the Nation has 8 million functional illiterates.
>
> A functional illiterate he defined as a person with less than 5 years of schooling. In a speech before the 92d annual convention of the National Education Association he said nearly a fifth of the population of five States falls in this class and more than a tenth of the population of 11 other States.
>
> He urged that exchange-student programs with other countries be expanded. Until recently, he said, American interest in such education was only toward gaining knowledge as part of our scholarship, but today the struggle for men's minds has given education a new significance.
>
> Brownell said the most serious challenge to abolishing functional illiteracy is a shortage of qualified school and college teachers.

One of the measures of this neglect of education is the very low salary scales for teachers with the consequent failure to attract enough competent teachers especially at the elemenetary and secondary levels. In many States, it is not uncommon to find teachers receiving $1,200 to $1,500 per year. The national average for 1953 was only $3,400.

Another aspect of this problem is the comparative pay among the professions. In 1951 the estimated average annual salaries were as follows:

Dentists	$7,743
Lawyers	9,375
Doctors	13,432
Public-school teachers	3,095

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that our teachers are the lowest-paid group in America today?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no question about it. They are lower paid than even the average of the employed people in factories, that is, those in occupations which are not normally considered to be a profession—the lowest group of what we call skilled labor.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that teachers are paid lower than people who devote themselves almost entirely to manual labor, such as janitors and charwomen and people of that kind? Is not that true?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is quite correct and, as the figures show, less than half as much as, say, the members of the dental profession receive, which, I would say, does not require greater preparation to be proficient.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that not only is there a great shortage of teachers today, but that our teacher colleges simply do not have the students now to turn out the teachers because young men and young women are not entering the teaching profession?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is absolutely right. I saw figures recently, in which it was estimated that there were 70,000 below normal, we will say, below the number of qualified schoolteachers required for our school system.

I may say at this point that I would like to pay a tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alabama because he has done so much in this field, and if the Senate had followed his advice, long since I think we would be in a much better position than we are today. This amendment is only applying, or seeking to apply, a new source of income, and I think it will be a great source of income, to the solution of this particular problem.

As I said a moment ago, this is following in the footsteps of the oil-for-education amendment the Senate debated last year, so I want to pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Alabama for the work he has done.

Some day, I think, this country is going to follow that suggestion. It is a question of when, because we cannot continue to pile up illiterates, as indicated by the statement I just mentioned of the present and recently appointed Commissioner of Education. If this country is to survive, it has got to do something about this problem.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I certainly thank the Senator for his generous words, and I express to him my strong commendation for offering this amendment, and I congratulate him on the very fine case he has made in behalf of the amendment.

Permit me to ask the Senator this question: Is it not true that the Russians are making tremendous strides in the matter of education?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is entirely correct. Nearly every day I read an article based upon that very subject as to the great increase in the number of graduates from Russian schools into the professions, especially in engineering and the physical sciences.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator could not be more right. That is why I am really nervous about the long-term contest between the two systems of society, that is, the Russian system and our own, because they are showing great signs of appreciating the importance of education.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator recall the testimony of Dr. Waterman before the Appropriations Committee to the effect that next year, while the United States would be turning out 17,000 engineers, the Russians would turn out some 50,000 engineers?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I remember seeing that reported in the press. The Senator, being on that committee, probably knows much more about it than I do. I remember seeing a short article.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the Russians are making tremendous progress not only with reference to engineers, but also with reference to physicists, chemists, indeed, scientists of all kinds?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; and, of course, they are pursuing this approach in their international relations to a far greater extent than we are.

The evidence that was uncovered when we were studying our own information program, indicated that the Russians are spending 10 times as much in that field, which is allied to education, than we are; sending abroad their artists and their scholars, and bringing students and other people aside from students, such as professors, into Russia from many of the satellite countries and from other countries, wherever they were willing to come.

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

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

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator happened to see the recent article in the New York Times written by Dr. Eric Ashby, who was for several years the scientific attaché in the Australian Embassy in Moscow. In this article Dr. Ashby said, "The Russians are just as intelligent as we are, and soon they will be just as well educated," and then Dr. Ashby went further to add, "They have one quality that we in the West have lost, the deep inferiority complex which drives them to spectacular achievements."

Is that not the story as to the Russians? We sit here day after day, week after week, month after month, and year after year, and permit this terrible situation in our school systems, in our colleges, in our universities, as well as our elementary and secondary schools, and really do nothing about the situation, whereas on the other hand the Russians are driving forward, meeting their educational needs, educating more and more of their people, and are now in a position to challenge us in the field of science, in the field of technology, and in the other fields where education must be the basis.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is entirely correct. That is the real test, I think, of the right to survival. If this country does not do something about this particular subject, not only do I think it will not survive as a great society and as a great civilization, but it will not deserve to survive, if it is not willing to make a greater effort in the education of our young people. I ask the Senator if he thinks that today, relative to the demands of modern society—and I mean the complexity of modern society—and the number of children in our schools, we are doing as good a job as we did, say, 50 years ago.

Mr. HILL. Of course we are not. Surely we are not. We never have had the situation where our schools were so crowded as they are today and where we had so many inadequate school buildings and facilities, as we are using today. Surely our teachers have never been relatively as poorly paid as they are today, and never in the history of our country has the teaching profession had so little attraction for our splendid young men and women as today.

As the Senator knows, the teaching profession is not attracting young men and young women. The Senator recalls that at Princeton University a few months ago a poll was taken based on some examinations that were held in connection with the Selective Service Act. It was found that in the student bodies of the universities where the test was carried on the students who were preparing to become teachers failed the examination in much larger numbers than any other groups in the universities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a very short article entitled "Democracy's Secret Weapon: Education," written by James G. Deane and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

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

DEMOCRACY'S SECRET WEAPON: EDUCATION

(By James G. Deane)

In an international arena clouded by gloom one bright spot is the continuing role of American colleges and universities in spreading enlightenment beyond national frontiers.

In the school year just ended nearly 34,000 foreign students attended American institutions of higher education. Besides the fruits of specific learning, it can be assumed that these students are carrying back with them to their homelands increased appreciation of American democracy and culture. Behind them they undoubtedly are leaving a significant imprint on the educational communities where they have lived and studied. In this way American higher education is making a practical contribution to international good will and understanding.

Who are these foreign students, why do they come, and what do they study?

Some of the answers to these and other questions are given in a booklet published by the Institute of International Education—a nonprofit agency which sponsors an extensive program of international student exchange.

The institute surveyed 2,821 higher-education institutions in every State in the Nation. Almost 1,500 reported having foreign students enrolled this year.

The students came from 129 countries, dependent areas, trust territories, international administrations, and areas under military government. More interesting than this diversity of origin, however, is the fact that increasing numbers are coming from Asia. Four of the five largest nationality groups this past school year were Asian. These nationalities were Chinese, Indian, Filipino, and Japanese. They were exceeded only by Canadians. The institute labeled this Asian increase a significant trend.

The next five countries were Mexico, Colombia, Germany, Iran, and Greece. Government-sponsored educational exchanges are bringing fewer students from most European countries than formerly, but both Spain and Greece sent more this past year.

Thirty students were tallied from the Soviet Union, and a total of 252 from other Iron Curtain countries. But the institute reported doubt about the status of these students. Some said they planned not to return home, and others supplied no pertinent information.

It might be supposed that government aid was instrumental in inspiring or at least facilitating most study trips. This was not the case. About 14,000 students reported paying their entire expenses, and another 3,000 part of their expenses, with their own funds. Nearly 6,000 reported full financial support from private organizations, and another 3,000 similar partial support. Not quite 4,000 received governmental support, and in almost 1,000 of those cases it was only partial. (Not all students gave this information, however.) On the other hand, some of the biggest groups—the Asians—received the most government help.

Another popular supposition is that American technology is the primary attraction for students from abroad, whereas for culture one should go to Europe. This is only partly borne out by the figures. Twenty percent of this year's students were engineering majors. But an equal proportion listed the humanities—languages, art, literature or theology—and another 14 percent stressed the social sciences. The other fields of interest were physical and natural sciences, 12 percent; medicine, 9 percent; business administration, 9 percent; education, 5 percent, and agriculture, 4 percent.

As might be expected, the big universities attract the most foreign students. The biggest foreign enrollments last winter were at Columbia, the University of California and New York University, each with more than 1,000. The biggest ratios of foreigners were at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Harvard, and Cornell. Here in Washington there were 1,084 at 26 institutions, with the largest number, 226 at American University. There were 168 at the University of Maryland.

Not enough research has yet been done to gage the effects this foreign influx on international understanding, according to the institute. But "as long as education itself is considered to be a worthy goal of our interest and efforts, the existence of opportunities for study abroad will continue to be valued as an educational experience alone," its report points out. It adds significantly:

"Indorsed by congressional committees, by national leaders in the United States and abroad, the study-abroad movement will apparently continue to bring thousands of young foreign citizens into our colleges in the years to come:"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I close with this thought. I do not know whether the Senate will take the amendment any more seriously than the one on education. I offer it for consideration in the hope of adoption by the Senate.

We have here a product which is essentially the product of educated minds, namely, the discovery and development of the theory and process of atomic fission—or nuclear fission, if one cares to call it that. It is a product of the laboratory. Nothing could be more fitting than that some of the returns from the licensing of that product be put back for the purpose of recharging the battery, so to speak, so that there may be continued in the future that excellent progress.

If we continue to take out of the stream of production and out of the minds of our educated people this progress, and return nothing that will build for the future and prepare minds for the future, there is no question in my mind that our civilization not only will not prevail, but will not deserve to prevail. It will produce its own bankruptcy if it does not have enough intelligence to renew the source of the driving forces in its society.

I hope the Senate will give favorable consideration to the amendment. There are no vested interests in this particular program now, but in a short time private interests will acquire an interest, and then it will be impossible to devote these resources, so to speak, to the public domain. I do hope that before the acquisition of private rights in this field becomes a reality, it can be devoted to this public purpose.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. First, I wish to commend the Senator and my colleague for offering the amendment. I, too, would like to join in paying a tribute to my senior colleague for the long years of service he has devoted in behalf of this type of legislation.

I wish to ask just one question. There is, is there not, ample precedent for this type of earmarking, since it is essentially a national resource and in a sense a natural resource?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I like to think and I always do think that the greatest thing that any Republican ever did was the inauguration of the land-grant college program under the administration of President Lincoln, when there was devoted throughout the country in every State a certain amount of public land for the purpose of education.

Every State has a great institution today which resulted from that particular act. I think that act did more with less cost to the people than anything I can think of.

In a sense I think it is the same way today in connection with this amendment. Here is a great resource which has not been taken up by the homesteaders, so to speak. It is still in the public domain, which could be devoted to this purpose without any real injury to anyone and without calling on anyone to give up anything, because no one has it yet.

The Government has invested this money in developing an idea that came out of educated minds in laboratories. It seems to me to be a very good way in which to recharge our intellectual battery, so to speak, so that it will produce additional ideas for the betterment of mankind. Perhaps there may even be discovered some means of having people live in peace.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that beginning with the early Ordinances of 1787 and 1788, we set a precedent for making large grants of the public domain for purposes of education?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Oh, yes. Of course, in local ways that has been done right from the beginning. I was referring to the great national act which did it on a large scale. There is no question about the precedent. It is a question of choice. Do we think it is important to do it, or is it more important to spend our substance for building roads and ships and guns?

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that we might have all the fine roads that anyone could imagine and that we might have the oceans filled with ships, but that without education we could never have gotten atomic energy.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is exactly true. That was essentially the product of the education that I have in mind.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I just want again to say how delighted I am that the Senator has brought up this amendment. I wish to congratulate him on the amendment and on all that he has said in behalf of it, and to express my earnest hope that the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 102, between lines 14 and 15, it is proposed to insert the following new section:

SEC. 271. Disposition of revenues:

a. All revenues of the Commission from licensing, the sale or leasing of material (including byproduct energy), or the furnishing of services, from and after the date of enactment of that act, shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and held in a special account, and such moneys shall be applied exclusively to payment on the principal of the national debt.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, the question of Federal aid to education has been debated in both Houses of Congress over a long period of years. There are some of us who would favor any Federal aid that is necessary to certain schools, especially for the specific types of programs which have been mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Arkansas. I would favor Federal assistance in special scientific education and other fields and in spreading information to other countries of the world. I am certainly a strong believer in and supporter of the Fulbright program for exchange students. I would favor any appropriation by Congress that was necessary in these special fields.

But there are many of us in Congress, and there have been many in previous Congresses, who feel that a general program of Federal aid to education is not desirable. Such a program was defeated by the House of Representatives last year, when it was added to the Continental Shelf portion of the so-called submerged lands bill. Every time it has been up in Congress the program of general Federal aid to education has been defeated, because a majority of the Members of the Congress have felt that it would mean Federal control of education by the Federal Government.

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

Mr. DANIEL. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is it not true that such a general bill as the Senator mentions has twice passed the Senate?

Mr. DANIEL. I believe such an amendment to one bill passed the Senate last year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Prior to last year. I am sure because I was a cosponsor and the late Senator Taft was a cosponsor, and it did pass the Senate by a very large vote and was killed in the committee of the House. It was never submitted for a vote in the House and I, and many other people, believe it would have passed the House had it been submitted to such a vote.

Mr. DANIEL. I take the Senator's word for the previous action by the Senate. However, the bill was defeated in the House. It did not become law. There are some of us who sincerely believe it would be unwise to have a program of general Federal aid to education, because we believe there would be too many Federal controls on our local school systems under such a program.

Now, Mr. President, I have offered a substitute here which would apply these funds on the payment of the national debt. We now owe more money than all the other nations of the world combined. This atomic energy program has cost a lot of money, and it seems to me if we make any money out of it, one of the first things we ought to do is to pay for the cost of the program. The children of our country will be greatly benefited if we start paying something on the national debt that we now owe instead of leaving it to them and to their children to pay.

I am not sure it is a wise thing to earmark these funds at this time, but if they are going to be marked, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will mark the funds for payment on our national debt rather than putting them into a fund for Federal aid to education, when there is no such program now in existence. It has been rejected many times. None of the details for such a program have been worked out by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. President, I believe if we are going to earmark these funds, that it would be a wiser course of action for us to apply them on the national debt and thereby pay for some of the cost of this atomic-energy program. This is the second time that I have attempted to see funds earmarked for payment on our national debt, and I hope to see the day when the Congress will take action in this direction.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIEL. I will yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. May I ask when the vote on this matter be taken, it be taken by call of the "yeas" and "nays."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a sufficient number. The "yeas" and "nays" are ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator state the parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. KERR. Did the Senator from Massachusetts make his request with reference to the substitute, or with reference to the amendment, or both?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I made it with reference to the substitute offered by the Senator from Texas, which was the only one open to me at the time.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I think I feel as many people do. I am very sympathetic with the Senator from Arkansas in his desire to aid education. I think he is well aware of that. But I am definitely opposed to the earmarkings of uncertain and unknown funds to be potentially, or possibly in the future, dedicated to any particular line of public activity.

I opposed the allocation of potential and unknown and highly speculated revenues from the continental shelf oil deposits, if any, to education, or any other specific purpose of that kind. That does not mean that I am against education, but I am against the principle of this kind of earmarking, and I would say that a majority of the committee are against it, though we did not specifically pass on this proposition.

I feel we are on safe ground, however, in supporting the substitute of the Senator from Texas, which in effect provides that if, as and when there are any revenues, and I doubt if there will be for a long time any revenues of any substance, the Congress directs that they shall be applied to the national debt. I favor that if we are to earmark such revenues. I would prefer not to earmark the funds at all, but as a preference I intent to vote for the substitute of the Senator from Texas, but not with any great enthusiasm, because I generally do not support earmarking of funds, but as a substitute for an amendment which I feel is less desirable. I shall vote for the substitute of the Senator from Texas.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I trust that the Senate will repudiate both the substitute and the original amendment.

It must have been 17 or 18 years ago when I first encountered what was known as the Pitman-Robinson Act, to take a portion of the tax levied on ammunition and guns, and so forth, and to earmark it specifically for certain conservation purposes. I think that was my first experience, Mr. President, with a permanent and indefinite appropriation, and from that day on the woods have been full of them. It jeopardizes the flexibility of the financial operations of the Government; and if we carried out this scheme logically, there would be few dollars going into the general fund of the Public Treasury. We might just as well take the liquor tax and earmark it for the advancement of the cause of temperance. We might just as well take a portion of the gasoline tax and use it for the purpose of stopping the slaughter on the American highways. We now take 30 percent of all the customs on agricultural products and earmark them for agricultural benefits.

Where, Mr. President, is this silly scheme to stop? Are we going to earmark for some specific purpose every item of revenue that goes into the Federal Treasury? Maybe we ought to be earmarking a good portion of the individual income tax and a portion of the property income tax and let it filter back for some benefit in that particular field of activity.

It will not be very long, Mr. President, until nearly all the revenues that the Federal Government hopes to encompass will be earmarked for some purpose or the other. And it deprives the appropriating committees of the Congress of authority over those revenues for when you encounter a permanent and indefinite appropriation, neither the committee nor the Congress has anything to say about it. It is automatic, Mr. President, and that is precisely what will happen if you earmark the license fees and whatever revenues may be derived from atomic energy licenses, either for education or for the public debt. But the thing that I quarrel the most about is you completely destroy and vitiate the flexibility of the Federal financing operations. And if you carry it far enough you will completely embarrass the Treasury of the United States.

Both of these, the amendment and the substitute ought to be rejected and repudiated by a very substantial vote because it will be only another chain in a line of precedents now where first one type of revenue and then another is earmarked for a specific purpose at the expense of the Treasury and the common good. When we do, I think we depart from a very sound principle.

I said this morning, Mr. President, on a little radio cast to commemorate my affection for our former majority leader, Bob Taft, that one of the outstanding things in his credo was the common welfare of all as distinguished from any economic segment. That was primary in Bob Taft's political book. He knew that the whole was equal to all its parts, and it was greater than any part, and just as he condemned the excesses of industry and business long ago, so in his own generation he condemned the excesses of labor leaders because they sought to set over and above the common welfare the specific welfare of a single economic group.

Now, we are up against that same principle, taking revenue and earmarking it for a specific purpose. What happens finally to the well-being of the Government, and what happens to the well-being of not one group, or one segment, or one geographic facet of this country, but the welfare of the whole country? Now, there is at least this redeeming merit about the substitute offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas in that it does apply to the national debt, but even there you are earmarking the fund and you are delimiting the power of the Treasury and of the Bureau of the Budget to deal in an orderly fashion with the financing of this country.

There are billions in Government obligations coming due in the next year. I do not believe in tying the hands of George Humphrey as Secretary of the Treasury. He is doing a stalwart and courageous job under great difficulties and in the face of a very bitter inheritance that was placed upon his doorstep as a result of what happened in the years gone by.

Let us not make it more difficult. One of the jobs ahead is to get this Government out of the red. One of the jobs is to balance the budget.

But when we earmark this portion and that portion, we simply recede from a balanced budget, and for that reason I hold that both the substitute and the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. DANIEL. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois heard the Senator from Texas state that I was not sure these funds should be earmarked, but if they were I believe they should be earmarked for payment on the national debt rather than for Federal aid to education when we have no Federal-aid-to-education program set up and approved by the Congress?

Are we not now faced with the question on this substitute, and the original amendment, as to which of the two shall we earmark the money for if they are to be earmarked? Is that not to be determined first before we determine whether or not they shall be earmarked at all?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is quite correct, and I think that is a very reasonable statement on the part of the distinguished Senator from Texas, but I hope we will not follow either course because

it still goes to the flexibility of the financial operation of this Government at a time when we are still confronted with difficulties so far as the budget is concerned.

Mr. DANIEL. I hope the Senator from Illinois will vote for the substitute, and then, of course, he can vote against the amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. No, this Senator is going to vote both against the substitute and the amendment because I think either principle is wrong.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think the Senator from Illinois may have misunderstood the purpose of my amendment. It was not designed purely for the benefit of schoolteachers as such. He seems to make a difference between the public good and the general good that he mentioned in which the late Senator Taft was interested, and the interest of the schoolteachers. As I mentioned a moment ago, Senator Taft was a cosponsor of the last Federal aid bill that passed the Senate by a very substantial majority. It never occurred to me that the education of the citizens of this country was not for the general good of the people of the country and the future of it. I had not conceived all the funds as a largess just for the personal benefit of the schoolteachers.

It has always seemed to me that education as such was good for the country, if it was our intention to continue as a self-governing country. If we permit our governmental system to be reduced to one governed by small groups, such as in certain other countries, there would be no particular reason why the populace should be educated.

I can understand also why some people do not like to have the electorate well educated, so they would not understand what is going on in the country. It is much easier to deceive illiterate people and mislead them along false principles. So that I well understand why there has been a great and vigorous opposition to the improvement of education in this country, and I expect it to continue. But at some point, surely a country that intends to be self-governing should undertake to educate its young people so that they can understand the issues which are before them and upon which they must pass as adult members of a self-governing country.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOLLAND. Noting that the Senator from Arkansas has referred to Senator Taft as a sponsor of the last Federal aid for education measure which was before the Senate, I ask the distinguished Senator if he does not recall that the late Senator Taft opposed vigorously, both in the debate on the tidelands bill and the debate on the Continental Shelf bill, the amendments which were proposed to earmark for education revenues arising from the submerged lands?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That certainly does not prove the late Senator Taft was against the earmarking of funds for the use of education. He simply felt he was bound by a promise made in order to win an election in Texas. He lived up to his promises. One thing we can all say about the late Senator Taft is that he was a man of his word. Having made that promise, he thought it was the duty of his party to live up to it. The previous actions of the late Senator surely proved he was for aid to education. He was one of the strongest advocates in the Senate for aid to education.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Did not the late Senator of Ohio vigorously oppose the education amendments to the tidelands bill during the Truman administration, before the Eisenhower race was ever run?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not recall that. I do not remember any particular controversy before that time. The Senator does recall that the so-called Hill amendment came up for heavy debate in 1952, and that the Senator from Ohio, the late Mr. Taft, virogously opposed the Hill amendment. I do not remember on what basis that was made. The Senator could well be right. The only part I took in that question was last year, in which, of course, as the Senator well knows, I took opposite sides from him. We do not agree on it. I was for the Hill amendment as strongly as I knew how, and we failed. I do not recall the previous one. The Senator does know that the Senator from Ohio was a cosponsor of the Federal aid for education bill which passed the Senate, does he not?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HILL. The distinguished late Senator from Ohio——

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have nothing further to say. I yield to the Senator from Alabama for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that the distinguished late Senator from Ohio, Mr. Taft, was chairman of the committee which studied the question and was the author of the Federal aid bill, and as the author and chairman was the leader who led the fight and fought the battle in trying to have the bill passed by the Senate of the United States?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Alabama is quite correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the original amendment. I shall vote for the substitute, but if the substitute fails, I shall vote against the original amendment. I am one of those who believes that we cannot have free money when we have a debt of $275 billion. That is my first statement.

Whatever moneys are received as a result of the development of the atomic-energy program can be applied on the debt already created by that program for a number of years in the future. There are approximately ten or twelve billion dollars charged to that account now.

I am speaking now to the original amendment, and then I shall discuss the substitute, and I shall not take long on either one.

Mr. President, the amendment is the old "oil for education" amendment applied to atomic energy. As it is drawn, it is another adventure in futility. The amendment does not provide for the appropriation of a red cent for education. It provides for sequestration of funds, but not for their appropriation or use. It sets up an advisory committee to study and to report to the President who, in turn, will, at some time in the future, report to the Congress, and then the Congress will discuss the matter and determine what, if anything, it shall do.

Every step of that operation, Mr. President, can de done without the intervention of this amendment. We are not now dealing with any proposition that will provide money that could be available for a number of years in the future.

Further, and I now refer to the argument made by the distinguished Senator from Iowa, who is in charge of the bill, and who called attention to the fact that whatever funds are, some time in the indeterminate future, received on account of atomic energy's use, either through licensing or sale of byproducts, or what have you—whatever amount will be received is now unknown, and will be unknown until the actual receipt. If an appropriation is made, an indefinite appropriation would be made.

Mr. President, if there is one thing in the wide world to which the children of this country are entitled, it is to know that the overhead for their schooling is being met dollar for dollar. There is one way to aid education from the Federal Treasury and only one, and that is to appropriate the funds directly, and let the people who are charged with their expenditure know the amount of the funds, budget them, and have an orderly expenditure of them. When that kind of bill comes to the floor of the United State Senate, I shall support it.

The amendment would provide for a trickle of funds for a number of years into a special account and not until there had been an experience that I gravely doubt can come within the next decade, and perhaps not within the next 20 years, will there be that background of knowledge by which the people in charge of schooling in this country can know in advance what funds may be available for expenditure in any system of education.

Such an arrangement would go to the lack of order or method or certainty, and therefore to the lack of usefulness of any such fund.

Mr. President, let us take a look at another facet. Let us look at the equity of the proposal.

If there is one obligation that rests upon the people of the United States as a whole, and according to their ability to pay, it is the obligation of the education of their children.

I digress for a moment, Mr. President, to say that I regret that the distin-

guished Senator from Arkansas presented the argument he did when he inferred that there are people in this country in position to act, who were motivated by the most reprehensible reasoning that I could conceive of in the action that they take—that they are seeking to maintain ignorance among the children of the United States. Mr. President, that cannot be in this country.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought it was well known—certainly it has come to the attention of the Senator—that within the last year and a half there has been a very open and notorious attack upon oral education and educated people emanating from the Senator's side of the aisle. The Senator is not unaware of that, is he?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is wholly unaware of that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator unaware of the attacks made——

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Oregon undertakes to state that the situation does not exist on either side of the aisle, nor has it ever existed in the memory of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I shall not yield now. I shall complete my discussion.

I know of nobody worthy of the name of citizen of the United States who has ever acted in any respect to withhold knowledge from the children in the United States.

I am perhaps naive, but I doubt that there ever will be.

There have been critics of our educational system—honest critics; and in some respects I suspect—and I could even go to some of the records in the Federal institutions of detention for some exhibits if I desired to—in some instances some of our people have been overeducated. But that is not the fault of education; you simply cannot put a gallon of water in a pint cup.

Mr. President, I would like to call attention to this other fact: education, as I have said, in my judgment is an obligation which rests evenly on the citizenry of the United States. Were this amendment to prevail that would not be the case. Funds for division to all children in all parts of this Nation would accrue from the pockets of those who have a special use for some of the products of atomic energy. They would be called upon to pay a special amount of money above and beyond other citizens to be spread evenly over the United States for the maintenance of the educational system or in aid of that maintenance.

Again I say, Mr. President, the obligation of citizenship is general, and the obligation of education of our children is one of the highest of citizenship. We can let that burden rest where it should, evenly on the citizenship when we take the funds, if we are going to take them nationally, out of the Treasury.

Mr. President, let us take a look at this atomic energy matter for a moment. What revenues will accrue?

There can be revenues, Mr. President, from the use of byproducts of atomic energy in the treatment of the ill. It is so being used today.

There can be some revenue—and no doubt it will increase—from the use of byproducts of atomic energy in industry. It is being so used today.

But the greatest revenue, the only one which is worthy of even a moment's consideration in connection with this amendment, is the revenue which will come from use of atomic energy as a fuel, as a generator of electric power. That is where the real revenue must come from.

From what little I have learned in the short time I have been a member of the Joint Committee, I can say here today, Mr. President, in my opinion it will be but a very few years until atomic power can be harnessed for peaceful use transformed into electrical energy, and be a boon to mankind and particularly to the people of the United States.

But, Mr. President, there is no knowledge today which has come to my attention which indicates that the cost of such power will be less than the cost of electric power from some other sources, and particularly from the source of falling water.

Now, Mr. President, I might be charged here today or tomorrow, or some day, with speaking this evening against the interests of my own Pacific Northwest. We happen to have been favored by providence with steady flowing, rushing streams. We have in the Pacific Northwest the greatest source of hydroelectric energy on this continent. It can be harnessed and delivered more cheaply than any other electric energy on this continent.

Perhaps it might be better for me to join, not in supporting this amendment, but in perfecting this amendment so it would do what it is claimed sometime it may do, and saddle onto the users of electrical power created through the use of atomic energy the cost, or at least part of the cost, of educating the children in the Pacific Northwest. We would not have to pay a dime of it. We would get our power from the falling streams.

That is one way of looking at it. That is not the way the people of the Northwest would look at it. They are prepared to pay their way, dollar for dollar, with the rest of this country; and they should. I am happy to go back to my people with the argument I am making this evening.

I believe any funds for education that are to be contributed by the Federal Government should be an obligation of the taxpayers' dollars. That is not true here.

Considering that fact; and the fact that the amount which might sometime be available is an unknown quantity and, therefore, cannot be properly used in the budget for the educational process; plus the fact, Mr. President, that we are dealing in dreams when we think of revenues as being profits, when the total is insignificant in retirement of the debt resulting from the development of this new source of energy which would bring in the revenue; plus the fact that the bill does nothing, in my humble opinion; I have no other recourse but a negative vote.

I say to my friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and my friend from Alabama [Mr. HILL] that when they are ready to work out a bill which provides for the payment of funds for education and that bill carries every safeguard known to the human mind against any control, actual or potential, by the Federal Government over the public educational processes of this country they can add my name to the sponsors; but until then I must oppose both the original motion and its substitute, which at least has this virtue: The funds are used to retire the debt of the Nation. They are available prorata to the Nation. If they were ever of consequence they would be a godsend to those children who are school children today, who will be fathers and mothers tomorrow, and to the children of their children.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Fulbright	Malone
Anderson	Goldwater	Martin
Barrett	Gore	Maybank
Beall	Green	Millikin
Bennett	Hayden	Monroney
Bowring	Hendrickson	Morse
Bridges	Hennings	Murray
Burke	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bush	Hill	Payne
Butler	Holland	Potter
Byrd	Humphrey	Purtell
Capehart	Jackson	Reynolds
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Smathers
Cordon	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Crippa	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Kilgore	Sparkman
Dirksen	Knowland	Stennis
Douglas	Kuchel	Thye
Dworshak	Langer	Upton
Eastland	Lehman	Watkins
Ervin	Lennon	Welker
Ferguson	Long	Wiley
Frear	Magnuson	Williams

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if this amendment should prevail, would there be a second vote on the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There would be a vote on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, as amended.

The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted

to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

On this vote the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is paired with the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would vote "nay" and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] would vote "yea."

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] would vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 40, as follows:

YEAS—37

Aiken	Goldwater	Millikin
Anderson	Gore	Monroney
Barrett	Hendrickson	Reynolds
Byrd	Hickenlooper	Russell
Capehart	Holland	Schoeppel
Chavez	Jenner	Smathers
Cordon	Johnson, Colo.	Stennis
Crippa	Johnson, Tex.	Upton
Daniel	Kennedy	Watkins
Dworshak	Lennon	Welker
Eastland	Long	Williams
Ervin	Magnuson	
Frear	Malone	

NAYS—40

Beall	Green	Morse
Bennett	Hayden	Murray
Bowring	Hennings	Pastore
Bridges	Hill	Payne
Burke	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Jackson	Purtell
Butler	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Carlson	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Clements	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Cooper	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Thye
Douglas	Langer	Wiley
Ferguson	Lehman	
Fulbright	Martin	

NOT VOTING—19

Bricker	Ives	Mundt
Case	Kefauver	Neely
Duff	Mansfield	Robertson
Ellender	Maybank	Symington
Flanders	McCarran	Young
George	McCarthy	
Gillette	McClellan	

So Mr. DANIEL's amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was rejected.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. What is the pending question?

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

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], and the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

I announce further that if present and voting, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 55, as follows:

YEAS—25

Anderson	Humphrey	Monroney
Chavez	Jackson	Morse
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Murray
Douglas	Kennedy	Neely
Frear	Kerr	Pastore
Fulbright	Kilgore	Sparkman
Hayden	Langer	Stennis
Hennings	Lehman	
Hill	Magnuson	

NAYS—55

Aiken	Ervin	Payne
Barrett	Ferguson	Potter
Beall	Goldwater	Purtell
Bennett	Gore	Reynolds
Bowring	Green	Russell
Bridges	Hendrickson	Saltonstall
Burke	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bush	Holland	Smathers
Butler	Jenner	Smith, Maine
Byrd	Johnson, Colo.	Smith, N. J.
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Thye
Carlson	Knowland	Upton
Cooper	Kuchel	Watkins
Cordon	Lennon	Welker
Crippa	Long	Wiley
Daniel	Malone	Williams
Dirksen	Martin	Young
Dworshak	Maybank	
Eastland	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—16

Bricker	Gillette	McClellan
Case	Ives	Mundt
Duff	Kefauver	Robertson
Ellender	Mansfield	Symington
Flanders	McCarran	
George	McCarthy	

So Mr. FULBRIGHT's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have an amendment on the desk which I submitted last week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator identify it?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I shall take about 2 minutes of the Senate's time. The amendment was in the nature of an omnibus amendment, and it included the provisions of the amendments which have now been adopted. But inasmuch as no action was taken on the omnibus amendments, I want the RECORD to show that most of the amendments I had suggested in the overall omnibus amendments have been adopted, and I therefore wish to withdraw it. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point an explanation of the omnibus amendments and an interpretation of them.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be printed and lie on the table. This amendment, if adopted, will incorporate in the so-called Atomic Energy Act of 1946 the long-established and time-tested procedures that prevail in the Federal Power Act—with respect to the application for and issuance of licenses on water-power sites.

The amendment modifies at least four sections of the pending bill. Collectively these modifications provide an orderly procedure for handling the application of licenses for power-production facilities to be operated by nuclear reactors. Other Members of the Senate have introduced separate amendments covering some of the same problems.

My amendment, in effect, is an omnibus provision which will give Members of the Senate an opportunity to study in a single document all the provisions we are proposing to safeguard the licensing process.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to read the amendment:

"Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MAGNUSON to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, as amended, and for other purposes, viz:

"On page 44, before the period in line 3, add the following proviso: '*Provided*, That upon not less than 2 years' notice in writing from the Commission the United States shall have the right upon and after the expiration of any license to take over and thereafter to maintain and operate any facility or facilities for the utilization of special nuclear material for the generation of electric energy on payment of the net investment of the licensee in such facilities, with severance damages, if any, in general accordance with the terms of section 14 of the Federal Power Act: *Provided further*, That if the United States does not exercise its right to take over the facility or facilities on the expiration of any license, States, municipalities, and cooperatives shall have a prior right or acquisition on the same terms in connection with the issuance of a new license for such facility or facilities.'

"On page 86, line 18, after comma, insert the following: 'To municipalities, private utilities, public bodies, and cooperatives within transmission distance authorized to engage in the distribution of electric energy to the public.'

"On page 86, line 21, insert new sentences after the period, as follows: 'In case of protests or conflicting applications or requests for the establishment of special conditions in prospective licenses, the Commission shall prior to issuance of any license, hold public hearings on such application or

applications in general accordance with the procedures established in connection with consideration of applications for licenses under the Federal Power Act and interested parties shall have the same rights of intervention in such proceedings, application for rehearing, and appeal from decisions of the Commission as are provided in that act and in the Administrative Procedure Act. In any proceeding before it, the Commission, in accordance with such rules and regulations as it may prescribe, may admit as a party any interested State, State commission, municipality, public or cooperative electric system, or any competitor of a party to such proceeding, or any other person whose participation may be in the public interest.'

"On page 87, line 3, add the following: 'Where conflicting applications include those submitted by public or cooperative bodies such applications shall be given preference.'

"On page 87, after line 20, add new section as follows:

" '3. Every licensee under this act, holding a license from the Commission for a utilization or production facility for the generation of commercial power under section 103, shall be subject to the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act applicable to licensees under that act as established by sections 301, 303, 304, and 306 thereof and to such other provisions of the Federal Power Act as provide for the enforcement of the regulatory authority of the Federal Power Commission with respect to licensees for development of waterpower.'

"On page 89, line 9, change the period to a comma and add the following words: 'and no construction permit shall be issued by the Commission until after the completion of the procedures established by section 182 for the consideration of applications for licenses under this act.' "

The first part of this amendment provides for the recapture by the United States—the recapture by the people—of facilities licensed to non-Federal private or public corporations for the production of electric energy by utilizing special nuclear material. The provision is somewhat comparable to the recapture provisions of the Federal Power Act. In that act, Senators will recall, the Federal Government retains the right to recapture a waterpower site at the end of a 50-year license period by paying a just compensation to the owners.

The second part of the amendment prohibits the Commission from issuing a license for a facility—designed to produce commercial power—until it has given notice—not only to the State regulatory agency, but also to municipalities, private utilities, public bodies, and cooperatives—that the application is pending and a license is about to be issued.

This merely insures that the Commission cannot put over a "fast one." All parties having an interest in the distribution of electric energy within the service area covered by the application for license are put on notice.

The third part of the amendment provides that in the event there is competition between two or more licensees and that there have been protests by intervenors, the Commission shall hold public hearings before any license is issued. States, municipalities, or public or cooperative, or private utility systems are permitted to intervene.

This insures again that all parties at interest will have an opportunity to present their views in open public discussion before the Commission acts. A similar provision is contained in the Federal Power Commission Act.

It has been proved an indispensable weapon to protect the public interest. I need only to remind the Senate of the controversy going on now before the Federal Power Commission over Hells Canyon to prove the point. Had there been no such provision in the Federal Power Act as I am advocating, parties at interest in the Northwest would have had no standing before the Federal Power Commission.

The fourth provision in this amendment provides that where there is a conflict between applications for a commercial power facility, applications submitted by public or cooperative bodies shall be given preference.

The Federal Water Power Act contains a similar provision. It is based on the premise that priority and preference to the utilization of a public resource should be given to public, nonprofit agencies. This principle could be vitiated or circumvented unless there is a provision in this act requiring the Atomic Energy Commission to give first consideration to applications filed by public bodies.

The fifth provision of the amendment I am recommending stipulates that any licensee of a utilization or production facility for generation of commercial power shall be subject to the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act. It refers specifically to sections 301, 303, 304, 306 of the Federal Power Act.

These sections collectively set forth the criteria the licensee must follow in keeping accounts and records and stipulates that agencies of the United States, generating and distributing electric energy are subject to applicable rules and regulations of the Commission.

These sections provide for periodic reports and provide a method of filing and disposing of complaints alleging violations of the license or of the Power Act by the licensee.

Sixth and finally, the amendment prohibits the "quickie" issuance of a license by the Commission. It stipulates that no construction permit may be issued to anyone until such time as the license procedures and provisions I have already mentioned have been complied with.

This would prevent the Commission from circumventing the orderly licensing procedures which have been found so valuable in connection with the Federal Power Act.

Mr. MAGNUSON. There are also some quotes from debate on the 1919 and 1920 Water Power Act, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Senate proceedings of January 6, 1920, p. 1100]

Mr. LENROOT. But, Mr. President, to get back to the legal contention that is made that the Federal Government has no power or authority to exact a charge upon navigable streams over and beyond the reasonable cost of the administration of the law, the Senator from Minnesota yesterday very frankly admitted that wherever the United States itself erects the dam it may sell or utilize the surplus water, may itself create electric power, and may sell that power, and when the Senator admits that it necessarily follows it seems to me, that he must also admit that when we choose an agent to do that which the Government itself might do we may give to the agent to do that which the Government itself might take. That has been well established in numberless decisions. I have some of them upon my desk, but I am not going to take the time to read them. However, it is well settled that wherever the Government, State or Federal, either itself erects the dam or grants authority to some private individual to do so, it may reserve to itself the surplus water power created by that dam and may dispose of it.

What is the theory of granting these licenses? So far as navigable streams are concerned, it is based wholly upon the theory that the erection of these dams will aid navigation. Otherwise it is admitted that we have no jurisdiction to authorize the obstruction of a navigable stream. All will admit that the Congress of the United States has no authority to authorize the creation of a dam on a navigable stream for the production of waterpower alone.

Unless navigation is connected with it in the legislation and is the primary purpose of it we are wholly without power. So whenever we grant a license under this bill to an individual or a corporation for the erection of a dam across a navigable stream it is upon the theory that that obstruction of the navigable stream will be an aid to navigation, that we delegate to an agency of the Government which the licensee becomes, the right to do that which the Government itself might directly do if it saw fit. Conceded, as it is, that if the Government did it directly we could utilize all of the waterpower created and sell it on such terms as we saw fit, or refuse to sell it at all, it clearly follows that in selecting an agency to do that which the Government itself might do we may say to that agent, "As a reward for thus aiding in navigation by the creation of this dam you may retain for yourself 10 percent, 15 percent, or 75 percent of the surplus water or the power created by the use of the surplus water."

We may say to that agent, "In consideration of our delegating to you this authority instead of doing it ourselves, you shall pay to us 10 percent, or 15 percent, as the case may be, of either your revenues or a given sum, measured by the horsepower created." It seem clear to me, Mr. President, that as a legal proposition I do not believe there can be any possible question concerning the right of the Congress to enact this legislation.

But it is said that it would be most inequitable to take compensation for the privilege thus granted. Let us see. I do not contend for a moment that the waterpowers of this country should be utilized for the purpose of securing revenue for the Government. I fully agree with those who contend that the consumer should have the benefit of the low-priced waterpowers of this country, and just insofar as the consumer does or will get the benefit of a nominal charge, I am in full agreement with those who so contend.

But, Mr. President, there are many, many, cases where, under this amendment proposed by the Senate committee, the consumer will not get the benefit, but it is a clear gift to the water-power corporations who become licensees under this bill, enabling them to make vast profits and to cover up those profits so that under the terms of the bill relating to an investment and the right of the Government to take it over the Government itself at no time can secure any benefit from this great concession. The result would be, under the Senate committee amendment, that we would hand this great resource belonging to the people of this country over to these water power companies with the opportunity to make vast and exorbitant returns for themselves, with no power upon the part of either State or Federal Government to give to the consumer the benefit of this cheap utility, but merely make it possible for it to be used to enrich the licensees.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, House debate on Federal Power Act, June 27, 1919]

Mr. BEGG. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I rather hesitate even to express my opinions on this great question of water power and water transportation, particularly when these opinions that I may have do not harmonize entirely with those of the caliber of men that are sponsoring this proposition.

The gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Esch, the chairman of this committee, made the

statement that there was need for hurry, if I correctly understood him, in getting this bill through Congress, as it has been before the Congress for a period of years. I should like to call the attention of this Congress and particularly the attention of the new Members of this Congress, as I am one of those, to this fact, that it does not make any difference whether the Congress had consideration of this water-power bill for 5 years or 50 years. We, as the new Members of Congress, have had no opportunity to investigate it, and I, for one, would like to hear it, by its advocates and those opposed to it, thoroughly and clearly and unlimitedly discussed.

I do not mind saying to this House that I am not in favor of omnibus bills of any kind, and I cannot conceive of this being anything other than an omnibus bill. If I get the right interpretation of it, it turns over the control absolutely of all water power and every bit of navigable water there is in the United States under the direct and absolute control of three men with a few provisions and limitations added thereto.

I want to direct the attention of this Congress to this fact: If I have made a correct interpretation of the law as it is offered in this bill, the rights of the States to develop their waterpower are abrogated until after they get their permission from these three Commissioners, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of the Interior. And I should like to direct the attention of my new fellow colleagues to this fact, that this Commission is probably unique in this respect. Being made up as it is of three of the Cabinet members, it is of necessity a partisan Commission.

It does not have a tenure of office as long even as that of the President of the United States, as evidenced by our present Secretary of War. He has occupied that position only a short time, and so far as anyone knows, he may resign and relinquish duties, when in will come a new man to assume this responsibility.

I want to call attention to another feature of this bill to which I strenuously object. That is the time limit for which a license may be granted to an individual or corporation. It says "not to exceed 50 years." As I interpret that, 90 percent, if not all, the licenses will be granted for a period of 50 years. We have a number of great cities on the lakes. I want to present to you a problem that I see confronting those cities if this bill goes through. The chairman of the committee, Mr. Esch, said that power was one of the things that we needed in the war.

I grant all that, and I am in favor of developing the water power of this country so far as it is possible. But power was not the only thing of which the United States found herself short. Transportation was another line of endeavor that the Government was compelled to take hold of; and according to the figures that have been produced before this Congress since this session began, while some men differ as to the amount, all agree that the loss to this Government runs into the hundreds of millions of dollars because the transportation facilities of this country were not adequate to meet the emergency. If this bill goes through, with this power granted to this Commission to license a corporation for 50 years, a permit may be granted to the Niagara Power Co. at Niagara Falls to utilize all the water that may be diverted from the falls under our treaty rights with Canada, which, if I am not mistaken, is 20,000 cubic feet per second, or thereabouts. Let us see where we are putting the people of the West, who must seek an outlet for their products through that channel if they go by water.

If that privilege is granted to the Niagara Power Co. without any restrictions other than those that are carried in this bill, for a period of 50 years, suppose that the cities on Lake Michigan, Lake Erie, and Lake Ontario see that it is to their commercial advantage to get an outlet from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario by digging a wider and deeper canal—and may I say, in passing, that there is a movement on foot today on the part of a number of the lake cities to do that very thing, to make it possible to load boats at the inland ports and unload them in the ports of the world, a thing that has not been done up to date with any great success. If this grant is given to the Niagara Power Co., or any power company—I only use the Niagara Power Co. as an illustration because they are there, and in all probability will stay there—if we give them a grant to utilize the power of all the water that can be diverted for any purpose under our treaty rights, how could we get a canal big enough to take oceangoing vessels from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario without going first to Canada and getting a new treaty granting us permission to divert more water than we are privileged to divert under the present treaty?

If we go to Canada and ask for that treaty they may say, "You can use our canal"; and I have been informed that there is a movement on foot in the Canadian Government at the present time to deepen and widen the Welland Canal. That would furnish us access around the falls and from lake to lake if we wanted to subject ourselves to the control of a canal in another country. Now I believe that is bad policy. I believe it is bad business for this Congress to go on record as favoring the centralizing of the control of all the waterpower and all the navigation in this United States Government in any commission composed of any three men of any political party in this country. I believe it is wrong. I am averse and opposed to granting to any corporation a 50-year franchise for the use of a commodity with the privilege of a renewal which makes a thing almost a perpetuity.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Mr. Aandahl Was a Welcome Guest," published by the Wenatchee Daily World of Sunday, July 18, 1954.

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

MR. AANDAHL WAS A WELCOME GUEST

When an Assistant Secretary of the Interior visits us, it's news, and because Fred Aandahl, present assistant, is in charge of water and power development, his visit to this district where these are questions of vital interest to all of us, was especially welcome.

As was to be expected, we had some questions to ask the Secretary, and the Daily World reporter who interviewed him, Hu Blonk is an expert on reclamation matters, having been on the reclamation staff for a number of years, so the questions got down to the heart of the matter.

None of the questions were asked just to embarrass Mr. Aandahl, but because they were questions that people here have been asking for some time. It seemed a good idea to go to the top man in that line for the answers.

It was reassuring to us, who owe our economic growth and prosperity to a half century of irrigation to have the Secretary say that the so-called partnership program will not injure chances for expanding irrigation in the Northwest. Later Aandahl went on to add that there are already enough Federal power projects built, or under construction to support foreseeable future irrigation projects. Some of us wonder a little about this one.

One of these that this area is immediately interested in is the Chief Joseph Dam irrigation project, just approved by Congress. Here more than 5,000 acres are slated to be brought under water through the Chief Joseph Dam and Rufus Woods Lake above the dam.

Regarding rumors that the Interior Department is considering putting in effect a zone rate for power, which would mean cheaper power for the residents along the river than to coastal users. Aandahl gave little encouragement. Since such a course would benefit those of us living in north central Washington, we are interested.

Very little thought has been given to such a proposal, the secretary said.

To the much discussed, but little understood title "partnership plan," Mr. Aandahl helped a little in clearing up some of the fog of misunderstanding.

He said that when the Department refers to local agencies participating in the program, it includes public power groups as well as private power companies. Probably that is as much in the way of elucidation as we will get for awhile, and coupled with a statement reportedly made in Portland Thursday that the Government is still "feeling its way" in development of the partnership program, seems to mean that the Department hasn't got it figured out yet itself.

While we didn't get all the information we would probably have liked from our Assistant Secretary of the Interior, it was nice to have had him visit us.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial entitled "No One To Defend BPA," published in the East Oregonian of July 20, 1954.

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

NO ONE TO DEFEND BPA

The vacuum in which the Bonneville Power Administration has been placed through the past year was sharply pointed up last week in Washington when the Senate debated on passage of a bill authorizing local interests to construct Priest Rapids Dam.

Under the administration of Dr. Paul Raver, BPA was very effectively implemented by the Bonneville regional advisory council.

The council, composed of business, industrial, and professional leaders, representatives of public and private power agencies, farm and labor organizations, etc., met regularly to discuss with Dr. Raver and his aides all phases of the BPA program. And advisory council committees were assigned by Dr. Raver with the responsibility for investigating almost all the program and setting down the pros and cons on it.

The advisory council has not met in more than a year. As a member we last attended a meeting of the council's research committee in Portland more than a year ago. The committee at that time recommended that BPA be permitted to purchase and market excess power from any and all dams in the region that had such power available. It was the thinking of the committee that such an arrangement would enable those persons who sought financing for new dams to better get that financing. If they could go to the source of a loan with firm assurance that BPA would buy that output from their dam which was not contracted for by other purchasers the loan would look better to the bankers. The committee furthermore proposed that a revolving fund be set up to enable BPA to handle such business. Sale of power would constantly replenish the fund.

The proposal came to the Senate last week during debate on the Priest Rapids bill.

Oregon's Senator GUY CORDON blocked it immediately and effectively. We firmly believe that Senator CORDON would have hesitated had the full weight of the Bonneville advisory council been behind the proposal. But he or any other legislator from the Northwest need have no fear of kicking the shins of BPA. There is no one in the Northwest who now feels responsibility for protesting.

Washington's Gov. Arthur Langlie and his engineer, Holland Houston, have done more to muddy the waters of Northwest water-resources development than any pair in the region. Houston has made some fantastic statements on behalf of Idaho Power Co. in the Hells Canyon Dam dispute. You will remember, of course, the public indignation that swept this region after Houston had told the Federal Power Commission that the aluminum industry had harmed the economy of the Northwest.

Mr. Langlie and Mr. Houston are at it again. They are now protesting the proposed construction of two dams on the Clearwater River in Idaho. It becomes increasingly clear, as the Oregonian pointed out last week, that Langlie has joined the coalition of Idaho Power Co. and Idaho's Gov. Len Jordan to reserve all hydroelectric development in Idaho to Idaho Power Co. Surely the citizens of Idaho will be awakened soon to the truth of what is being done to them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I call up my amendment, "7-24-54—M."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 3, after the word "responsibilities", it is proposed to insert "including a division or divisions the primary responsibilities of which include the application of civilian power."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that the clerk read it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment to S. 3690 submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided*, That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Reserving the right to object, I again appeal to the majority leader to let us follow through on this amendment very much the same as we have done on the others. I have already discussed much of this amendment with the chairman of the committee. I believe it will take very little time for discussion. It is primarily an organizational amendment applying to the organization of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Under the conditions, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The purpose of this amendment is to establish in the Atomic Energy Commission a division or divisions, which will have as their primary responsibility the civilian application of atomic energy. It is a modified version of the amendment I offered several days ago. Since that time, I have had the opportunity to discuss this amendment with members of the staff of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, as well as with the chairman. I believe this amendment will be helpful in the structural organization of the Atomic Energy Commission in view of the licensing provisions that are embodied in the pending bill.

I have no more to say about it. I do not believe it is necessarily functional in nature. It is more or less organizational.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. We have been discussing this particular amendment yesterday and today. The staff was of the opinion that the amendment had been changed as submitted this evening, and that the word "power" had been eliminated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct; it has.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. May we have the amendment read again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will restate the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 13, line 3, after "responsibilities", it is proposed to insert the following: "including a division or divisions the primary responsibilities of which include the application of civilian power."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is the question I raised. I understood "power" was to be eliminated.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to the Senator what the modification was was not to hold this to the matter to just one division. It says "including a division or divisions the primary responsibilities of which include the application of civilian power."

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I will have to send for a copy of the amendment as we understood it to be before I could consent to accept this particular amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I modify the amendment to strike the word "power" and insert in lieu thereof the word "uses"?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. That is in accordance with my understanding with the staff.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. I modify the amendment by striking out the word "power" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "uses" and I think that will meet the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's amendment will be so modified.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Will the Senator explain to me what this amendment proposes to do?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will be happy to explain to my colleague. What it does is this: In that area of the bill, section 25, which relates to divisions of offices where a division of military application is established, it also establishes a division or divisions of civilian application for the sundry uses of atomic energy. It is a structural amendment, an organizational amendment, and it is necessary in this bill, because of the wide variety of uses of atomic energy which are contemplated under the terms of the bill for civilian uses.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield, and if so, to whom?

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it the intention of the amendment to do away with the probability of a great deal of duplication between the new duties of the Federal Power Commission and what may be the duties of the Atomic Energy Commission in the future under the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It would be helpful in that regard. It would provide appropriate provision in the Atomic Energy Commission to do the manifold duties proposed in the pending bill.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. In the setup of the Atomic Energy Commission, there are 11 divisions. One is specifically a military division, and the other 10 are divisions to be designated by the Commission to take care of various phases of atomic energy. I want to assure the Senator almost all of the other divisions or categories are civilian in character, but the amendment emphasizes, or is intended to emphasize, the application of civilian uses of atomic energy. I think it is a constructive amendment.

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

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. There must be information available to the local power bodies, the cooperatives, and other public bodies below the level of the Federal Government, so that utilization of the power can be made if, as, and when, it is available and usable, and a division of this character might well be the basis for studies and the promulgation of necessary rules and regulations, as well as the dissemination of the information necessary for that purpose.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is an error in the printing. It says page 13, line 3. It should be line 6, and I ask unanimous consent that it be so modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, as amended, will be further modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, designated 7-22-54-A, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 52, in line 12, it is proposed to strike out the word "approved", and insert in lieu thereof, "favorably recommended and submitted to the President."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the amendment applies to that section of the bill which is entitled "SEC. 123. Cooperation With Other Nations." It is in the international section. The purpose of my amendment frankly is to overcome what I think may be a constitutional limitation on the language of the bill. What it says, in fact, is in line 12, following the words "the Department of Defense has," instead of the word "approved," "favorably recommended and submitted to the President."

In other words, the purpose of the Senator from Minnesota is to see to it that any agreement which is cleared by the Department of Defense may not stand on its own right, but to provide that it has been submitted directly to the President and has been favorably recommended to him, so that there is no doubt whatsoever as to the legality or the constitutionality of whatever action may be taken. It is, in my opinion, a technical amendment, and one which I think clarifies the purpose of the section.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I do not see the necessity for a change in the wording. However, the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota does the same as what is intended by the committee. The committee considers that the word "approved" meant that the Commission had approved it. Later on in the section it is required that the President shall authorize it before it can be put into effect. However, I am perfectly willing to accept the language to the effect that the Department of Defense has favorably recommended it. My own personal view is that it does not change the paragraph one whit, but if it clarifies it in the mind of some of the Members of the Senate, we are perfectly willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. My only point is that I took this up with legal counsel. I was advised there might be some question about it. I have discussed the matter with the chairman, and he has no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, on page 52, line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, designated 7-22-54-D, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, in line 14, after the word "authorized", it is proposed to insert "and directed."

Mr. HUMPHREY. This, again, Mr. President, is merely a clarifying amendment. I think the language of the present act includes the words "authorized and directed." I believe that wording should be included in the bill. I wanted to make quite sure it is not exclusive.

Section 32 is the section which pertains to research by the Commission. The present language authorizes the Commission to conduct research. The Senator from Minnesota asks that it not only be authorized but directed.

The word "directed" is not to mean solely by the Commission, but that the Commission shall undertake research, but not necessarily to the exclusion of contract research or authorization of research by universities and other technical foundations or institutions.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, again I do not share the view of the Senator from Minnesota that the language is essential. The fact of the matter is the word "directed" which he would insert in the proposed bill is already a part of the existing law. We have lived with it for several years. The only reason the word was not included is that we wanted to make it doubly clear that the Commission was not required to build and operate all the facilities in which it conducts research and development; that it could use leased or contracted facilities. The Commission has been doing that for the last several years. It is perfectly legal. I see no reason, however, why, if it will bring aid and comfort to any Senator, that language cannot be put back in the bill. It will restore the law to what it has been for the past several years. Therefore, I am willing and happy to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] on page 19, line 14.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. The next amendment which I call up is designated 7-16-54-H. The purpose of the amendment is primarily to clear the legislative history in reference to the bill. I ask the clerk to state the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 89, in line 9, it is proposed to change the period to a comma and add the following: "and no construction permits shall be issued by the Commission until after the completion of the procedures established by section 182 for the consideration of applications for licenses under this act."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, at the time I drew up this amendment I was not aware of the modifications which had been made to section 182 and also to the judicial review section, which later I discussed with the chairman of the committee. The purpose of the amendment when it was prepared was to make sure that the construction of a facility was not permitted prior to the authorization of a license, because had that been done what it would have amounted to would be getting an investment of a substantial amount of capital, which surely would have been prejudicial in terms of the Commission issuing the license. In other words, if the Commission had granted the construction permit for some form of nuclear reactor, and then the question of a license was not fully resolved, surely there would have been considerable pressure, and justifiably so, for the Commission to have authorized the license once it had authorized the permit for construction.

The chairman of the committee tells me he has modified certain sections by the committee amendments to the bill, of which at that time I was not aware. The chairman indicates to me that under the terms of the bill, as amended, the construction permit is equivalent to a license. In other words, as I understand, under the bill a construction permit cannot be interpreted in any other way than being equal to or a part of the licensing procedure. Is that correct?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The Senator is correct. The staff has worked on this matter. An amendment was offered on, I believe, July 16, to section 189, having to do with hearings or judicial review, and that section was tied up with other sections of the bill. A license and a construction permit are equivalent. They are the same thing, and one cannot operate until the other is granted.

The same is true with reference to hearings. Therefore, we believe, and we assure the Senator, that the amendment is not essential to the problem which he is attempting to reach.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me ask the chairman of the committee if subsection b of section 182, which applies to license applications, also applies to construction permits? Subsection b reads:

> b. The Commission shall not issue any license for a utilization or production facility for the generation of commercial power under section 103, until it has given notice in writing to such regulatory agency as may have jurisdiction over the rates and services of the proposed activity, and until it has published notice of such application once each week for 4 consecutive weeks in the Federal Register, and until 4 weeks after the last notice.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. The section does. The answer to the Senator's question is "Yes."

Mr. HUMPHREY. In other words, the revised sections on judicial review and on hearings and the revised section 182 on license application all apply directly to construction permits?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. With that statement, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment. The only purpose of the amendment was to clarify that section. I am grateful to the chairman for having done it before the amendment was considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator withdraws his amendment. The bill is open for further amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I send one further amendment to the desk. I hope it will be received as generously. It is 7-16-54-G.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 87, after line 20, it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

e. Every licensee under this act, holding a license from the Commission for a utilization or production facility for the generation of commercial power under section 103, shall be subject to the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act applicable to licensees under that act as established by sections 301, 302, 304, and 306 thereof and to such other provisions of the Federal Power Act as provide for the enforcement of the regulatory authority of the Federal Power Commissoin with respect to licensees for development of waterpower.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment is, I think, rather succinctly and clearly stated in the language of the amendment. It simply says we have here in atomic energy a Federal resource just as much as we have in falling water or in what we call hydroelectric generation potentiality. We have in atomic-energy material the complete Federal monopoly, a Government monopoly completely owned by the people of the United States without question of doubt.

This is a matter of investment, since every dollar's worth and pound of material has been paid for by the people of the United States.

This amendment clearly says in view of the complete Federal ownership of atomic materials or fissionable materials or nuclear energy that when and if licenses are granted for the express purpose of generating power—in other words, licenses are granted for the use of a fuel which is federally owned to generate power—then the sections 301, 302, 304, and 306 of the Federal Power Act, which relate primarily to the accounting and reporting, apply to the atomically generated electricity.

My argument is this: If we can apply the Federal Power Act to hydroelectric generation both by the Government and by those who are licensed to use the rivers, the navigable streams and waterfalls, then indeed in this area, where there is not one shadow of doubt as to who owns the material, as to who in fact owns the licenses, as to the source which grants the licenses, surely the Federal Power Commission rules and regulations, insofar as reports and accounting, should apply.

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

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to yield to the chairman, if I may; and then I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I should like to say that we will have to resist this amendment as vigorously as we can, because this amendment says the Federal Power Commission shall move in and control the rates and utility of electricity, even intrastate, in spite of the State regulatory bodies or municipal regulatory bodies. It is the old fight as to how far the Federal Power Commission shall move into the sovereignty of the States and local regulatory bodies.

We take the position that electricity is electricity. Once it is produced it should be subject to the proper regulatory body, whether it be the Federal Power Commission in the case of interstate transmission, or State regulatory bodies if such exist, or municipal regulatory bodies. We feel that there is no difference and that it should be treated as all other electricity which is regulated by the public.

I call special attention to section 271 of the proposed act, which says:

SEC. 271. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the authority or regulations of any Federal, State, or local agency with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power.

That is designed to keep the regulatory authority exactly as it is now, traditionally and under the law. I merely call that to the attention of the Senator.

I earnestly hope the Senator will not press this amendment, because I feel it is an alteration of the present concept of regulation of electric power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I may say to my friend, the distinguished chairman: He has stated the case. What the Senator says is that there should not be any more regulation upon this kind of power than there is upon other forms. I agree.

What we are really talking about here are different kinds of fuels which produce the same kind of power. It makes no difference whether electricity is produced from thermal fuel or from hydro power. The fact is it becomes electricity.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HUMPHREY. In a moment I shall be happy to yield to my friend.

In this instance what we have is electricity which is produced from nuclear power. I see no reason why electricity should be treated any differently because of the parentage of the generation.

I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Is the Senator under the impression that hydroelectric power which is consumed entirely within the State in which it is generated is subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, nor am I under the impression that this kind of power which is generated entirely within the State in some small plants would be under any such control, either. The only control it is under is the same control we now have.

My argument is this: Why should the rules be changed in the middle of the game, so to speak, upon a form of energy known as electricity, despite its method of generation? The generation here under this bill is contemplated to be from a form of atomic matter or atomic energy. The generation under the Federal Power Act as we have it thus far is from hydroelectric sources and from thermal sources.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit an observation, any hydroelectric power which may be generated within a State and consumed within a State is not subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission.

What the Senator's amendment intends to do, if I understand it correctly, is to make this particular type of power generated within the States subject to the Federal Power Commission as to regulation; is that not so?

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Senator intends to do is to do exactly what is being done. What the Senator from Minnesota proposes by his amendment is very clear. It says:

The generation of commercial power under section 103, shall be subject to the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act applicable to licensees under that act as established by sections 301, 302, 304, and 306—

I have those sections in my hand.

In other words, if they are subject to regulation under existing law by the Federal Power Commission, they are subject to regulation under the terms of this act. No more, no less.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield for a question.

Mr. BUSH. Would the power generated from atomic energy not be automatically subject to the regulation of the Federal Power Commission if it came under the law? It seems to me the Senator's amendment is quite unnecessary.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. The Federal Power Act, part III, section 301, is involved. One section is "accounts, records and memoranda."

That relates, as it says here:

Every licensee and public utility shall make, keep, and preserve for such periods, such accounts, records of cost-accounting procedures, correspondence, memoranda, papers, books, and other records as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe as necessary—

That language may very well not be included under this bill.

Mr. BUSH. Why would it not apply to any source of new power?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because this bill does not refer by cross reference to the Federal Power Act.

Mr. BUSH. Why should it do so?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It should for the simple reason that this is a Government-held resource. This atomic matter is Government-owned more so than the rivers and the streams and waterfalls. At least God can claim those, and this we must take credit for. I say, on that basis, maybe we had better apply manmade law.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Could the situation not be cleared up by the following question? Under the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota, if energy were developed in the State of Tennessee, as it undoubtedly will be, and sold exclusively in the State of Tennessee, it would be under the regulation of the proper State authorities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But if it were generated in Tennessee and shipped across State lines and sold in other States, then it would be under the jurisdiction of the

Federal Power Commission, would it not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore, is not the proposal of the Senator from Minnesota simply to apply the same principles of Federal control over interstate shipments in the case of atomic-energy power and thermonuclear power as are now applied in the case of hydropower?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Just a moment and I will be happy to yield.

My position is also as described in section 304, where it states there shall be annual and other periodic or special reports as the Commission may prescribe with regard to this power development.

In other words, let us not forget here that the Federal Government issues a license. The position of the junior Senator from Minnesota is that a license is a privilege and not a right. It is a privilege. Because it is a privilege, it is entitled to be subject to regulation and to whatever regulations the appropriate agency of Government may deem necessary.

All I am trying to make sure is that in this bill—which I say is the heart of it—once the license has been granted, unless the same rules and regulations are applied to the generation, distribution and sale of electrical energy which is the product of atomic energy, as is done with hydropower, then there is set up a special category of power and a competing source of power, which is not regulated with the same rules and the same powers as the other.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. I now read section 271:

> Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the authority or regulations of any Federal, State, or local agency with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand that.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does that not apply?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. FERGUSON. Why not?

Mr. HUMPHREY. What that really means, I may say to my distinguished friend, is that there is nothing in this act that denies the Federal Power Commission the right to regulate. That is what it means, but it does not say how, and what the Senator from Minnesota wants to be sure is that the "how" on electrical energy created by atomic matter is the same "how" that is on hydrogenerated electricity; that is all.

Of course, the act says that there shall be nothing in the act to deny the Federal Government, the State, or the local government to regulate, but what kind of regulation concerning reports and accounting is the question.

What the Senator from Minnesota says is that he does not want one set of standards for electrical energy generated by the use of a fuel known as a fissionable material or atomic matter, and another set of rules under the Federal Power Commission that is for hydrogenerated power.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not true that if there is nothing in this act that can be construed to affect the authority of the Federal Power Commission, then everything can be done by the Federal Power Commission that the Senator would provide for?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No. May the Senator from Minnesota say that what he wants to do is to convey the authority specifically in the act. What the act provides now is a broad grant, saying that there is nothing in the act that will deny a Federal agency from regulating it. That is not good enough; that is what the Senator from Minnesota calls a negative authorization of potential authority.

What the Senator from Minnesota wants is to say specifically in this act that the authority is there, that there has been a conveyance of authority, and that the same authority and the same rules and regulations apply in this instance as apply under what is now known as conventional power.

Mr. LONG and Mr. PASTORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana and then to the Senator from Rhode Island, if he will just be patient.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator from Louisiana correctly understand the argument of the Senator from Minnesota, that he feels it is not adequate simply to say in the bill that "nothing herein affects the authority of the Federal Power Commission," but that he feels it is necessary to affirmatively convey the authority to the Federal Power Commission to regulate interstate transmission of electricity transmitted by atomic power?

Mr. HUMPHREY. May the Senator from Minnesota say to the Senator from Louisiana that what the amendment which the Senator from Minnesota has offered does, it applies to accounting procedure, rates of depreciation, reports and periodic memoranda. In other words, the Senator from Minnesota wants the same form of accounting procedures, the same depreciation schedule that applies to other units that create electrical energy to apply to the nuclear-created electrical energy.

The Senator from Minnesota now yields to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. FERGUSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator says he wants to compel the Federal Power Commission——

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota did not say "compel." The Senator said "convey the authority."

Mr. FERGUSON. That they must use the same method as they would use for other production of energy.

It may be entirely different.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Senator from Minnesota is saying to the Senator from Michigan, and saying to his colleagues, is that the Senator from Minnesota wants uniform standards applied, and the Senator from Minnesota says to his friend, the Senator from Michigan, that just as the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] said earlier this evening, that within a very short period of time, the energy that we are talking about here tonight, this atomic energy, will be available, and will be in a usable form for the purposes of electrical power. The Senator from Minnesota listened very carefully to his speech.

Mr. FERGUSON. The Senator from Michigan agrees to that.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota listened to the speech of the Senator from Oregon. Therefore, the Senator from Minnesota does not want to see a different kind of bookkeeping for electrical energy, produced by nuclear power, than he sees from electrical energy produced by a fuel that may be oil, gas, water power, or others that are prescribed to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. FERGUSON. Is it not possible that a different rule might apply because the depreciation will be entirely different? Upkeep, repairs, and amortization could be entirely different.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May the Senator from Minnesota say to his friend, the Senator from Michigan, that he would like to read the language of the act? I think it would be helpful.

Has the Senator read the sections of the Federal Power Act?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota will read them again:

> SEC. 301. Every licensee and public utility shall make, keep, and preserve for such periods, such accounts, records of cost-accounting procedures, correspondence, memoranda, papers, books, and other records as the Commission may by rules and regulations prescribe as necessary or appropriate for purposes of the administration of this act, including accounts, records, and memoranda of the generation, transmission, distribution, delivery, or sale of electric energy, the furnishing of services or facilities in connection therewith, and receipts and expenditures with respect to any of the foregoing: *Provided, however,* That nothing in this act shall relieve any public utility from keeping any accounts, memoranda, or records which such public utility would be required to keep by or under authority of the laws of any State."

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on that section?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; the Senator from Minnesota yields to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. Does that apply to all public utilities, whether they deal in interstate commerce or not, whether they cross State lines?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It applies to those public utilities that are regulated by the Federal Power Act.

Mr. BUSH. Exactly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That are engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. BUSH. Exactly.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Or those given a Federal license or those that are federally owned and generate power for Federal sale.

Mr. BUSH. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

The Johnson amendment which has been adopted provides that the Atomic Energy Commission can produce power for other than services for its own uses, and also to sell such surplus power as may be available.

Therefore, as the Senator from Minnesota says, if that power is put in this act, there should be, just as there is in the case of the Bureau of Reclamation, the accounting system, which the Federal Power Commission prescribes. All that the Senator from Minnesota proposes—this is not a complicated amendment at all—is that if those bookkeeping, those housekeeping methods and rules and regulations outlined in the Federal Power Act are applied to the business of generating electricity, then the same yardstick, the same rules, should be applied to atomically generated electricity as are applied to hydro electricity.

Mr. BUSH. Well, I ask the Senator, though, would not the Federal Power Commission automatically take jurisdiction?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I do not know.

May I say that the Senator from Minnesota——

Mr. BUSH. They would have to.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has been here just long enough to catch on that when there is doubt, it is best to write it in the law. The Senator from Minnesota has been here that long.

The Senator from Minnesota would say that once he did not know that, and how he paid for it.

Now, the Senator from Minnesota wants to be sure that when we get something here about which there is any doubt whatsoever, let us write it in the law.

The Senator from Minnesota sees the majority leader looking at him, and he wants him to know that he wishes to conclude this argument as soon as possible.

The Senator from Minnesota yields now to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from New Mexico wants to say to the Senator from Minnesota that he does not have the same interpretation of it the Senator has. The Senator from New Mexico thinks that the example that has been used is that where a utility that generates current that is used only in that State is concerned, it is not subject to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is what the Senator from Minnesota said.

Mr. ANDERSON. But this would make every licensee subject to the Federal Power Commission, and there might be licensees, as we pointed out, near Oak Ridge, generating current feeding into that establishment, that would be subject to the Federal Power Commission Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every Federal licensee, yes. Where there is a Federal license, that is so.

Mr. ANDERSON. But this is a matter of Federal licensees; not State licensees. This makes every utility, whether intrastate or interstate, subject to the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is not the case. The Federal Power Act relates only insofar as the Federal power is concerned, and relates only to those who are Federal licensees or those who are engaged in interstate commerce; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Senator from Minnesota is saying is that you apply the same yardstick as to atomic energy in those instances where you have Federal licensees and those engaged in interstate commerce.

Mr. BUSH. Will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator from Connecticut simply wants to ask a question.

Mr. ANDERSON. What does the Senator suppose the Senator from New Mexico wants to do?

Mr. BUSH. The Senator simply wants to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota yields to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from New Mexico was trying to say that there is a distinction; that where there is a utility that is not under Federal regulation because it does not cross the State line, it is now proposed to make it subject to Federal regulation under the amendment, and the Senator from New Mexico thinks it is quite a change in the usual system. He may be wrong.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. As the Senator from New Mexico remembers the discussion in the committee—it has been quite a while since we went over this ground, and he has forgotten a great deal of the points—just because one person used diesel fuel and the next one used coal and the next one used falling water, and the next one used nuclear energy, we did not seek to say that those who used uranium as a source of fuel are under the Federal Power Commission or a part of their operations are under the Federal Power Commission, but if they used coal or wood, they simply are not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota answers the Senator by saying that those persons who use coal or wood are not using a product that is exclusively owned by the Federal Government. The Senator from Minnesota wants his colleagues to remember one thing here.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from California would like to have the Senator yield long enough to see if we can get the yeas and nays ordered on this amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota wants his position perfectly clear. We are not talking about going out here in somebody's woodshed and getting enough wood to start up a steam plant. We are not talking about getting enough coal out of somebody's mine to start up a steam plant.

The Senator from Minnesota would have his colleagues remember that we are talking about licensees using something you do not own individually. We are talking about the licensing of the use of a $12-billion investment, or at least a portion thereof, for the purposes of the generation of electrical energy, and the Senator from Minnesota says that you have a public trust in this body to protect the use of that energy, and the Senator from Minnesota says that you are granting a Federal license, and he asks any man in this body to tell him of any Federal license that you grant that is not subject to Federal regulation.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Every license granted is subject to regulation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota yields to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BUSH. A licensee on a river who operates intrastate is not necessarily regulated by the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. If he has a Federal license, indeed he is.

Mr. BUSH. I differ with the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. He is subject to the regulations that I am talking about under sections 301, 302, and 304 of the Federal Power Act.

Mr. BUSH. With reference to impounding, and so forth?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; if he has a Federal license. We are not talking about rates. We are talking about bookkeeping and reporting—statistical reports.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I finish my question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. BUSH. Does the Senator not believe that the language in the bill completely covers what he is talking about? I refer the Senator to section 271, which consists of only four lines, and reads as follows:

> SEC. 271. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect the authority or regulations of any Federal, State, or local agency with respect to the generation, sale, or transmission of electric power.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What the Senator is saying refers to the subject in a negative way, that the Federal Government has the right to regulate that which it owns. What I am saying is that the Federal Government has a right to regulate what it owns, and must and shall regulate it. That is what I am saying.

Mr. BUSH. It seems to me that that section gives the Senator everything he is asking for.

Mr. HUMPHREY. It says that nothing in the act shall be construed to affect the authority. What I am saying is not only that nothing in the act shall be construed that way, but that the same authority that applies—I am not now talking about the rate structure—to accounts and records and rates of depreciation and reports and other requirements applicable to the agencies of the United States, and I say that that same authority not only should be included in the act in a negative way, but should be affirmatively stated.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is not what the Senator from Minnesota is trying to establish simply the fundamental principle in the common law that there can be no rights without duties, no privileges without responsibilities?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is exactly right.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Does the Senator intend by his amendment that a license under Senate bill 3690 becomes a license under section 301 of the Federal Power Act? If that is so, does it not necessarily mean that everyone who uses fissionable material, which is owned by the Federal Government, in the production of electric power, whether it is used within a State or used in interstate, will come under the Federal Power Act?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Insofar as these rules are concerned, such as reporting, statistical reports, and accounting.

Mr. PASTORE. In other words, the mere fact that they use fissionable material makes them subject to section 301 of the Federal Power Act.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say that the mere fact that——

Mr. PASTORE. I am trying to find out if that is the case.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is the case. I say to my good friend from Rhode Island that every person that uses hydroelectric power for generation of electricity comes under Federal regulation and is subject to the rules of the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. PASTORE. The use of this fissionable material is no different than the use of coal or oil——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Oh, yes; it is.

Mr. PASTORE. May I finish my question? It is no different in the generation of heat, and the only reason why the Government is retaining title in the fissionable material is because of the character of the material——

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed.

Mr. PASTORE. May I finish my question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am delighted to have the Senator ask his question on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If that is the case, if the Federal Government is retaining title only for the purpose of acquiring back the material in case of an emergency and only because of the character of material, are we not stretching the point by saying that it is analogous to hydroelectric power, when it is analogous only to coal and oil used for that purpose?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No; I do not think so at all. I may say to my friend from Rhode Island that the history of atomic energy is one of complete Federal development, and that the history of atomic energy is one of complete and total taxpayers' expense under the trusteeship and custodianship of the United States Government.

Because this is such important material and the Federal Government does maintain title to it, it is a privilege for a licensee to have the opportunity to use this material in the creation of electrical energy.

Furthermore, from all we know, this privilege will go to a rare few. At least it will be so in the beginning.

We know that sections 301, 302, and 304 of the Federal Power Act have a great deal to do with the gathering of information that can be of value in terms of documenting what is a fair rate structure. My amendment does not apply to the rate structure. It applies to getting information that is necessary. I will not be a party to permitting one kind of records to be kept on electrical energy created by atomic energy and other records on electrical energy created by conventional fuels.

Mr. PASTORE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. If that is so, and if we follow the Senator's argument to its logical conclusion, when we reach the point when fissionable material is used in place of coal and oil, because we have achieved our goal of making the fissionable material comparable and competitive with conventional fuels, then in fact we are saying that the Federal Government will supervise all public utilities in the country.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to my good friend from Rhode Island that if that point arrives it most likely will not be a Federal monopoly, and if that point arrives, it should not be a Federal monopoly.

Mr. PASTORE. The fact remains, whether that point arrives or not, that is what the Senator's amendment would do.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that what the Senator from Minnesota is proposing is a distinction between the procuring of information and the regulation of rates?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed, that is what I am doing.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not a fact that the Senator is proposing that all those holding Federal licenses to develop energy from fissionable material shall furnish information to the Federal Power Commission; but only in those cases where the energy is shipped across State lines will rates come under Federal regulation?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator is correnct. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. What we are trying to do by this amendment is to apply the same yardstick and the same rules of reporting and the same strict control and memoranda and records, and the same formula and the same regulation by the same agency as apply to other utilities.

Mr. President, mark my words that electrical energy created by nuclear energy or nuclear power will be competitive with other electric energy.

What we did here a moment ago by the Gore amendment, to deny a contract or to take out of any contract the Federal payment of Federal income taxes, was for a particular purpose, namely, that we will not get a false rate structure. If in the Dixon-Yates contract the Federal Government pays the Federal, State, and local taxes, that affects the rate structure, because in other contracts the Federal, State, and local taxes are included in the rate structure.

What I want to be sure of is that in connection with this energy we will have the same kind of reporting and the same regulations applied.

I can see in this bill, and I saw in the Dixon-Yates contract, an opportunity to upset these normal standards of Federal regulation. I say that the omission of the Federal Power Act rules, as laid down in the sections that I have mentioned, namely, sections 301, 302, 304, and 306, is related directly to what is intended by some of the original provisions in the bill, namely, to set up another standard for public power and private utilities in this country separate and distinct from that which we have had for 48 years.

I will not stand idly by and permit that to happen.

Section 306 provides:

> Any person, State, municipality, or State commission complaining of anything done or omitted to be done by any licensee or public utility in contravention of the provisions of this act may apply to the Commission by petition, which shall briefly state the facts, whereup on a statement of the complaint thus made shall be forwarded by the Commission to such licensee or public utility, who shall be called upon to satisfy the complant or to answer the same in writing within a reasonable time to be specified by the Commission.

That means the Federal Power Commission.

Now, if you make a grant of license to a utility, and if you do not have the right of review, not by the Atomic Energy Commission—that is not a grievance board—but the Federal Power Commission, if you do not have the same standards there of receiving complaints, adjudicating the complaint, the same standards of measurement of performance of responsibility under the license, you are going to set up two households in this Government that relate to elec-

trical power, and I say that is something that ought not be done.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I think that there is much weight to the argument provided the amendments were confined to interstate transactions, but when he tells me that the Federal Power Commission is better able to protect the consumers in a State where you have an intrastate operation, over and above the ability of the Government to do that, I disagree with the Senator.

Mr. HUMPHREY. May I say to my friend, who was once a governor—and I know former governors are jealous of their prerogatives.

Mr. PASTORE. They should be.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But, may I say to my friend that the Federal Power Commission Act specifically states that nothing shall be by rule or regulation which will in any way nullify the reports the State wants.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator has already said that by the mere fact that a licensee uses this fissionable material he becomes a licensee under 301 of the Federal Power Act; therefore, regardless of anything, the mere fact that a person uses this material subjects him to Federal control.

Mr. HUMPHREY. All right; will the Senator just hold for a minute and listen to this: This is from section 301 of the Federal Power Act:

> Nothing in this act shall relieve any public utility from keeping any accounts, memoranda, records which such public utility may be required to keep by or under authority of the laws of any State.

Now, the Senator should get it clear that we are not regulating rates. All we are doing is setting up a system of uniform reporting, so that on the basis of that uniform reporting there can be a uniform system of measuring the rate structure.

Mr. PASTORE. Why should the Federal Government have the jurisdiction and the authority even to control the keeping of books with regard to public utility that conducts business within the jurisdiction of the State exclusively?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Why?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Because they are using a commodity known as a fuel which is an atomic matter which the Government owns, which the utility does not own, which the State does not own, which the Federal Government owns and the Federal Government has a right to regulate. These reports are invaluable to State and local regulatory bodies and to consumer and competing utilities.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in my humble judgment the amendment that is before us will come as close to socializing the power industry of the United States as anything I have seen in all the days I have been here.

Let us take a look and see what the Senator from Minnesota proposes to do. He started out in the first paragraph by saying this was a very simple amendment. It is very simple, believe me, because it says that every licensee under this act holding a license from the Commission for two purposes: one, the utilization; or two, the production facility—for what? For the generation of commercial power. That is all he says. He does not say anything about transmission. He does not say anything about delivery. He does not say anything about the sale of power across the State line. There is a little power plant in the town where I live, a town with a population of 21,000. It makes power with coal. Neither the State commission nor the Federal Power Commission has an iota of authority over that plant. They could generate one million kilowatts in a day, but no commission would have any authority over them. It is when they start to sell and transmit the power that the authority of a Federal or State agency comes into being, and so long as that little facility does not go beyond the State lines the Federal Power Commission has nothing to say about it. It can burn coal that comes from the bowels of the earth in Illinois, and if it sells power, the Illinois Commerce Commission will say what the rates shall be. That is not what the Senator from Minnesota says. The Senator says that if they should use fissionable material instead of coal in my home town, it comes under the provisions of the Federal Power Act, and he went a little bit further than that when he said to the Senate——

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I have not had any time on this yet, so indulge me for a minute.

He points out sections 301, 302, 304, and 306 of the Federal Power Act, and then comes the residual clause. He says "and to such other provisions of the Federal Power Act that provides for the enforcement of the regulatory authority of the Federal Power Commission with respect to license fees for development of water power."

If that is not the whole story in a nutshell, I do not know what is. I will be the last to vote for an amendment that would apply to a little power plant in my home town and bring it under sundry regulations of a Federal agency, because instead of using Illinois coal it uses fissionable material.

If our hopes and our imaginings about the use of atomic energy are real, and if it reaches the dimensions we think it is going to reach, then very conceivably this can ultimately apply to every plant, large and small, local, State, and Federal, everywhere in the country because it deals with the stuff that generates the power. The Senator from Minnesota does not say anything about interstate transmission unless he wants to recur the language of section 103, and then it becomes very confusing indeed. But he says only for the utilization, or production facilities for the generation of commercial power.

If he would accept an amendment for the word "generation" and say "transportation and sale of commercial power," and then after the word "power", insert "in interstate commerce" that would make it a wholly different proposition.

But I shall be the last to vote for this amendment because it will be the beginning of socialization of the whole energy industry of the United States, and my friend from Minnesota knows it. He said that it was a simple amendment. It is indeed simple in its concept because it is going to take in the whole country and the whole energy fabric of this Nation, and I would be the last, Mr. President, to vote for it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I used to fade away under the sharp attack of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] but I now recognize it for what it is.

It really amounts to a lack of understanding of the purpose of the amendment, and I shall be happy to edify and to educate and do whatever I can for my distinguished colleague.

First of all, this brand-new charge—socialism—is just about as new as last year's calendar, and is just about as effective.

Let us see how much socialism is involved. First of all, let us read section 103 of this private enterprise bill. This is not what the junior Senator from Minnesota has written. Listen to what the committee has written. First of all:

> Such licenses shall be issued in accordance with the provisions of chapter 16, and subject to such conditions as the Commission may by rule or regulation establish to perpetuate the purposes and provisions of this act.

Even to get a license one has to go to that "socialistic agency" known as the Atomic Energy Commission. That is not owned by Sears and Roebuck; not yet. It belongs to the people of the United States.

Now, listen to subsection b:

> The Commission shall issue such licenses on a nonexclusive basis to applicants (1) whose proposed activities will serve a useful purpose proportionate to the quantities of special nuclear material or source material to be utilized.

Who decides that? The Atomic Energy Commission. Are the members of the Atomic Energy Commission apostles, disciples, or are they just ordinary people? With what kind of a special oil are they anointed to make them superior to those good souls on the Federal Power Commission?

Now, let us take No. 2:

> The Commission shall issue such licenses on a nonexclusive basis, to applicants—

And listen to this, my dear colleague—

> (2) who are equipped to observe and who agree to observe such safety standards to protect health and to minimize danger to life or property as the Commission may by rule establish.

In other words, the Commission can say that you have to have three light

bulbs in the rest room, and that is that, if it is for the health of the people.

Now, listen to this my dear colleagues:

The Commission shall issue such licenses on a nonexclusive basis to applicants (3) who agree to make available to the Commission such technical information and data concerning activities under such licenses as the Commission may determine necessary to promote the common defense and security and to protect the health and safety of the public. All such information may be used by the Commission only for the purposes of the common defense and security and to protect the health and safety of the public.

What else is there to do? Here you have an authority in a commission that is absolutely absolute. The Commission will determine who is going to get the licenses. The Commission will determine under what conditions you are to get a license. The Commission will determine what information you are going to give. The Commission will determine health rules and regulations. I am for that. Why? Because this material is owned by the people and the Congress has said that the Atomic Energy Commission is responsible for the custody and use of fissionable material.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does the Government own the coal under the public lands of the Nation to which the Government has title?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. When it gives someone a lease on the coal to be used to generate electric power, does that fix it so the Government can regulate that electric generating plant even though it is intrastate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. There is a difference. Coal is not all owned by the Federal Government; fissionable material is all owned.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for another question? Does he think the Government owns all the uranium in this country?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Federal Government buys all of it. Nobody else can buy any under criminal penalty.

Mr. KERR. Will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Could not the Federal Government pass a law and could not the Government purchase all the coal?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It could, but I hope it does not.

Mr. KERR. It has not.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope it will not. Let us see what the Senator from Minnesota was asking for in his amendment. My friend from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] knew what he wanted, and subtle man that he is, he says—socialism. What does the Senator from Minnesota want? He wants to be sure there is no socialism. He wants to be sure that every person who is in the electrical energy business has a right to compete on fair and equal standards. I want to be sure that the reporting is fair. I have an amendment which does not apply to rate structure, transmission, or sale of electricity. It applies to one thing, I say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. It applies to the gathering of information of statistical evidence, reports, and accounts. That is all.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator mean to tell this body he advocates a regulatory system that would have any effect at all and yet would not wind up by regulating the rate?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes; I do.

Mr. KERR. Then the Senator has a viewpoint which is entirely different from reality. [Laughter.]

Mr. HUMPHREY. No, I do not. There are many agencies of Government which gather statistical evidence that do not regulate the rate.

Mr. KERR. Does the amendment intend to compel the Federal Power Commission to gather statistics?

Mr. HUMPHREY. The amendment merely provides that if one is a licensee under the proposed act, he shall be under the terms or provisions of the sections that are mentioned in my amendment.

Mr. KERR. Under the regulatory provision?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Under the regulatory provision, insofar as records, memoranda, and accounts are concerned.

Mr. KERR. Is there any regulatory provision, function, or responsibility of the Federal Government that has any significance whatever that does not include regulation of rates?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course. There are a great deal. We have, for example——

Mr. KERR. The Senator had better be careful trying to give them because he would be here a year trying to name them.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Department of Commerce gathers all kinds of statistical information. The Health Department gathers all kinds of statistical information and requires uniform reporting. Wherever the Federal Government gives a grant, and the Senator from Oklahoma has insisted on it as a Member of the Senate, we require uniform records.

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

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Was not the same question developed in the East Ohio Gas Co. case? Is it not a fact that the then mayor of Cleveland, Mr. Harold H. Burton, later a Member of this body, and now a Justice of the Supreme Court, requested the Federal Power Commission to make appraisals of the costs of the East Ohio Gas Co., not in order that the Federal Government could regulate the rates, but so the city of Cleveland could have the information to go before the Ohio Public Utilities Commission and make a better case? If I am wrong, the person who later succeeded him as mayor of Cleveland, the present Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURKE], can correct me.

Mr. BURKE. That is precisely correct. The Congress, however, in the Hinshaw bill, took that power away from the Federal Power Commission.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think any person interested in rate structures and fair standards of depreciation and values of properties upon which rate structure is based would like some uniform accounting. My amendment, I repeat, can be of great service to State and local regulatory bodies, by assuring a uniform set of statistics on a basis of uniform standards. I want to clear the record and say I do not stand here easily and have my colleagues hurl charges of socialism at me in order to destroy an amendment which merely proposes to provide appropriate bookkeeping. I repeat that every Member who has ever voted 1 dollar to the Health Service has voted for uniform accounting and uniform standards of reporting. Every Member who has voted $1 for unemployment compensation, in the Eisenhower program costing $200 million, demanded uniform accounting. Every Member of this body who has ever voted $1 for any kind of grant-in-aid by the Federal Government, including the highway department, has demanded uniform accounting, because Federal money is being dealt with.

I submit to this body that they are dealing with Federal property. We are not dealing with a matter of private ownership. We are dealing with a Federal laboratory, fissionable material, Federal property, paid for by the taxpayers. Anybody who states we have the right to license use of that resource without fair and uniform accounting has some explaining to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PURTELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "Nay."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—23

Burke	Humphrey	Mansfield
Douglas	Jackson	Monroney
Fulbright	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Gore	Kennedy	Murray
Green	Kilgore	Neely
Hayden	Langer	Sparkman
Hennings	Lehman	Symington
Hill	Magnuson	

NAYS—54

Aiken	Ervin	Millikin
Anderson	Ferguson	Pastore
Barrett	Frear	Payne
Beall	Goldwater	Potter
Bennett	Hendrickson	Purtell
Bowring	Hickenlooper	Reynolds
Bridges	Holland	Saltonstall
Bush	Jenner	Schoeppel
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Smathers
Capehart	Johnson, Tex.	Smith, Maine
Carlson	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Clements	Knowland	Stennis
Cooper	Kuchel	Thye
Cordon	Lennon	Upton
Crippa	Long	Watkins
Daniel	Malone	Welker
Dirksen	Martin	Wiley
Dworshak	Maybank	Williams

NOT VOTING—19

Bricker	Flanders	McClellan
Byrd	George	Mundt
Case	Gillette	Robertson
Chavez	Ives	Russell
Duff	Kefauver	Young
Eastland	McCarran	
Ellender	McCarthy	

So Mr. HUMPHREY's amendment was rejected.

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

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I send to the desk a proposed amendment, and ask to have it read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, beginning on line 25, it is proposed to strike out section 56 and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 56. Fair price: In determining the fair price to be paid by the Commission pursuant to section 52 for the production of any special nuclear material, the prices paid by the Commission shall not exceed either (a) the estimated cost to the Government of producing similar material in facilities owned by the Commission, or (b) such amount as will, in the judgment of the Commission, provide reasonable compensation to the licensee, taking into account the estimated costs to be incurred and the estimated revenues to be derived by the licensee in the conduct of his licensed activities.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I send forward to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask that the clerk read it for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That any debate on the amendment to S. 3690, submitted by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], including any amendment or motion submitted thereto, shall be limited to not exceeding 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER]: *Provided*, That no amendment thereto that is not germane to the subject matter of the said bill shall be received.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I should like to say, because a number of inquiries have been made as to the contemplated program for this evening, that I have been very hopeful we could bring this bill up to the point of the third reading tonight, which would dispose of all the amendments. At that point I was hopeful that we might get a unanimous-consent agreement with a division of time which would be a liberal division of time on the motion to recommit, if there is to be one, and also on final passage.

If we could bring the proceedings up to that point with the 1 or 2 unanimous-consent agreements, as the case may be, on recommittal and on final passage; or the one, if there is to be no motion to recommit; then I would be prepared to suggest to the Senate that we stand in recess until tomorrow probably at 12 noon, because I imagine by the time we finish the amendments we might have to run until 12 or 1 o'clock.

If we are not able to do that, as the previous notice was given, we would expect to continue in session through the night in order to complete the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I say to my friend from California in all good nature and fun that his insistence on these unanimous consent agreements reminds me of the little boy at the county fair who was in the pie-eating contest. The boy had eaten so much pie that no one else was even close to him, because he was even covered with the pie down to his chest; but he still wanted that last pie, so he reached for another; and the poor fellow choked to death.

I am inclined to think, Mr. President, the majority leader, after a very remarkable day receiving splendid cooperation from both sides of the aisle—from those opposed to this bill—should not now insist at a quarter to 12 that we put this bill in shape for final passage. There are those of us who are still opposed to the bill, even in its present form, although it is greatly improved. I have cooperated all day long to help get the bill in that condition, because I felt that we probably could, if we kept at it, work out a composition which would be not satisfactory to us but one we could think at least ought to go to conference.

Some of the Senators would like to meet tomorrow morning at an early hour to discuss what further course of action we may want to take, if any, and discuss whether or not we think we ought to move to recommit this bill, and discuss whether or not two or three amendments still under discussion within our group should or should not be offered.

I think under those circumstances, in view of the progress we have made all day and the demonstration that when there is open debate on both sides of the issue with no parliamentary bludgeon being wielded over our heads, that at a quarter of 12 tonight, with the state of fatigue which exists within the professional staff of the Senate and to some extent among some of my colleagues, we should recess until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning. I respectfully suggest that to the Senator from California.

The majority leader on the other hand has a contrary opinion. The Senator from California is the majority leader. The Senator certainly is free to follow whatever course of action his best judgment dictates; but I will not agree, Mr. President, to this unanimous-consent request.

I will withhold my objection, if the majority leader desires, for any comment the majority leader may desire to make based upon anything I have said.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator, as I made the inquiry under similar circumstances in the past: Can the Senator give any estimate of the time which would be required for the discussion of this amendment on his part?

Mr. MORSE. I differ from some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, who in my judgment impliedly committed themselves to the Senator from California in respect to the length of their speeches. I have said in private conversations with some of my friends on this side of the aisle who have come to me and asked me whether or not I would make any such implied commitment to the majority leader that I would not. The answer is "No." I shall speak just as long as I think I have something to say on this amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. MORSE. I object, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay the amendment on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Aiken	Green	Maybank
Anderson	Hayden	Millikin
Barrett	Hendrickson	Monroney
Beall	Hennings	Morse
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Murray
Bowring	Hill	Neely
Bridges	Holland	Pastore
Burke	Humphrey	Payne
Bush	Jackson	Potter
Butler	Jenner	Purtell
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Johnston, S. C.	Schoeppel
Cooper	Kennedy	Smathers
Cordon	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Crippa	Kilgore	Smith, N. J.
Daniel	Knowland	Sparkman
Dirksen	Kuchel	Stennis
Douglas	Langer	Symington
Dworshak	Lehman	Thye
Ervin	Lennon	Upton
Ferguson	Long	Watkins
Frear	Magnuson	Welker
Fulbright	Malone	Wiley
Goldwater	Mansfield	Williams
Gore	Martin	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion to lay on the table. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. DOUGLAS. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the precise nature of the motion before this body?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from California to lay on the table the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is it that the Senator from California is moving to table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is moving to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MAYBANK. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MAYBANK. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If, without objection, the Senator insists——

Mr. MAYBANK. No; just give the Senator from South Carolina the nub of it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not printed as yet.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator from South Carolina thanks the Chair.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May the Senator from Illinois make a request? Will the clerk be permitted to read the amendment which it has been moved to lay on the table?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah asks for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] would each vote "yea."

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senators from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE and Mr. RUSSELL] the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—43

Aiken	Ervin	Purtell
Barrett	Ferguson	Reynolds
Beall	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hendrickson	Schoeppel
Bowring	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Bridges	Holland	Smith, Maine
Bush	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Thye
Capehart	Knowland	Upton
Carlson	Kuchel	Watkins
Cordon	Lennon	Welker
Crippa	Martin	Wiley
Daniel	Millikin	Williams
Dirksen	Payne	
Dworshak	Potter	

NAYS—34

Anderson	Humphrey	Mansfield
Burke	Jackson	Maybank
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Monroney
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	Morse
Douglas	Kennedy	Murray
Frear	Kerr	Neely
Fulbright	Kilgore	Pastore
Gore	Langer	Sparkman
Green	Lehman	Stennis
Hayden	Long	Symington
Hennings	Magnuson	
Hill	Malone	

NOT VOTING—19

Bricker	Flanders	McClellan
Byrd	George	Mundt
Case	Gillette	Robertson
Chavez	Ives	Russell
Duff	Kefauver	Young
Eastland	McCarran	
Ellender	McCarthy	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's motion to lay on the table Mr. MORSE's amendment was agreed to.

(At 12 o'clock midnight, July 26, the Senate was still in session. The proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate July 26 (legislative day of July 2), 1954:

UNITED NATIONS

The following-named persons to be representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1954:

Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts.
H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey.
J. W. Fulbright, of Arkansas.
C. D. Jackson, of New York.
Charles H. Mahoney, of Michigan.

The following-named persons to be alternate representatives of the United States of America to the ninth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to serve no longer than December 31, 1954:

Wright F. Morrow, of Texas.
Roger W. Straus, of New York.
James J. Wadsworth, of New York.
Mrs. Oswald B. Lord, of New York.
Ade M. Johnson, of Washington.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Paul Emmert Miller, of Minnesota, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the remainder of the term of 14 years from February 1, 1954, vice R. M. Evans, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JULY 26, 1954

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. Henry Grube, Mobile Gospel Tabernacle, Mobile, Ala., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we come today in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. We dare not come in any other name. We plead no merit of our own, but we do ask that Thou wilt bless this session. We pray for our country. We pray for the President. We pray for all those who are in authority. We pray especially for those who are here this day. We pray that everything that is said and done may be done for the honor and glory of Christ our Lord.

In Jesus name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, July 23, 1954, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 10, 1954:

H. J. Res. 256. Joint resolution to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the First International Instrument Congress and Exposition, Philadelphia, Pa., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes.

On July 12, 1954:

H. R. 8149. An act to amend the hospital survey and construction provisions of the Public Health Service Act to provide assistance to the States for surveying the need for diagnostic or treatment centers, for hospitals for the chronically ill and impaired, for rehabilitation facilities, and for nursing homes, and to provide assistance in the construction of such facilities through grants to public and nonprofit agencies, and for other purposes.

On July 14, 1954:

H. R. 1948. An act for the relief of Mrs. Fung Hwa Liu Lee;

H. R. 2404. An act for the relief of Tibor Horanyi;

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of Annie Litke;

H. R. 2875. An act for the relief of Dr. James K-Thong Yu;

H. R. 3191. An act conferring jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of the State of California;

H. R. 3903. An act for the relief of Sister Iolanda Sita, Sister Guerrina Brioli, Sister Pasqualina Coppari, Sister Anna Urbinati, Sister Ida Raschi, and Sister Elvira P. Mencarelli;

H. R. 4510. An act for the relief of Mrs. Helen Kon;

H. R. 4747. An act for the relief of Gio Batta Podesta;

H. R. 5265. An act for the relief of Margarete Hohmann Springer;

H. R. 5620. An act to remove clouds on the titles of certain lands in Colorado;

H. R. 5684. An act for the relief of Walter Kuznicki;

H. R. 5820. An act for the relief of Michael K. Kaprielyan;