Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 7, 1955

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 7, marks the anniversary of the birth of one of the great men of our times, Thomas G. Masaryk, founder and first President of Czechoslovakia. Much has happened since the establishment of that country, and much that has happened has been tragic. But history has a way of redeeming its tragedies and of restoring to its great and noble figures the status that is their due.

I was invited recently by the publishers of a Czechoslovakian newspaper in the United States to express my sentiments about Dr. Masaryk; and I was glad to do so in a message as follows:

Mr. ANDREW J. VALUCHEK,
New Yorksky Dennik-New Yorske Listy, C. S. Publishing Co., Inc., New York, N. Y.

MY DEAR SIR: I am deeply moved to be able to participate in the observance of the anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, one of the noble spirits of our times, a great leader of his country, and a distinguished citizen of the world family.

No matter how intensive the efforts of those, to whom his democratic ideals are repugnant, to besmirch his reputation and to seek to eradicate the memory of his great achievements, the name of Masaryk will survive. His enemies may demolish the stone memorials commemorating his name. They can never reach the shrine in which he is steadily revered, the hearts of his countrymen and indeed of the people of all the world.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1955

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

O Thou God over all, blessed for evermore: Amid the seething strife which mars the earth and still builds its walls of separation, when all mankind ought to be one, whate'er vexatious problems we face in this volcanic day, this white altar reared at the gates of the morning speaks to us ever of our final reliance on those supreme spiritual forces, faith and hope and love, which alone abide and on which our salvation in the end depends. Before the toil of a new day opens before us we lay before Thee the meditations of our hearts; may they be acceptable in Thy sight.

Prepare us for the role committed to our fallible hands in this appalling day. May our loins be girt and our lamps burning, and ourselves as men who watch for their Lord's coming. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 4, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Executive Nominations of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Reorganization of the Government Operations Committee was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

DEFINITION OF "SERVICE" OF MEMBER OF WOMEN'S AUXILIARY CORPS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to define service as a member of the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps as active military service under certain conditions (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CONTRACTS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Department of the Army on Research and Development contracts, for the period July 1, 1954 through December 31, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENTS OF ACT OF JUNE 3, 1916, RELATING TO FLIGHT INSTRUCTION

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the act of June 3, 1916, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF PROPERTY ACQUISITIONS, FEDERAL CIVIL DEFENSE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Washington, D. C., reporting, pursuant to law, on property acquisitions by that Administration, for the quarter ended December 31, 1954; to the Committee on Armed Services.

WAIVER OF COLLECTION OF CERTAIN FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE LOANS

A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate and to waive collection of certain financial assistance loans, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORT ENTITLED "BRAZILIAN TECHNICAL STUDIES"

A letter from the Acting Director, Foreign Operations Administration, Washington, D. C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of a report entitled "Brazilian Technical Studies" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUDIT REPORT AND SURVEY, NATIONAL SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the national school lunch program, and an investigative survey of the operations of the program, in the State of Indiana (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, TIMPANOGOS CAVE NATIONAL MONUMENT, UTAH

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit in the Timpanogos Cave National Monument, Utah (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

KAW TRIBE OF INDIANS *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Commissioner, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the findings of fact and opinion, and conclusions of law and final award, in the case of Felix McCauley, a member of the Kaw Tribe of Indians, on the relation of all members of the *Kaw Tribe of Indians, Plaintiff,* v. *The United States* (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

EXTENSION OF LAW RELATING TO PERJURY IN CERTAIN CASES

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, chapter 79, to add a new section, 1623, to extend the law relating to perjury to the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STANLEY RYDZON AND ALEXANDER F. ANDERSON

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF DIRECTORS OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Directors of that organization, for the fiscal year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution of the 31st Legislature of the State of Utah memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation recognizing that the sale of natural gas by producers or gatherers in interstate commerce for resale are an integral part of the production and gathering of that resource and exempting such sales from any and all regulation by the Federal Government

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (both houses concurring therein):

"Whereas the Congress of the United States in 1938 passed the Natural Gas Act which gave the Federal Power Commission regulatory authority over the transportation and sale of natural gas in interstate commerce and provided that the provisions of this act shall not apply to the production and gathering of natural gas; and

"Whereas the Federal Power Commission ruled on many occasions between 1938 and 1951 that it had no jurisdiction over sales of natural gas by producers and gatherers, and the United States Congress in 1950 again reiterated its intention that sales by producers or gatherers were exempt from Federal regulation under the Natural Gas Act; and

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in 1954 held that all sales of natural gas for resale in interstate commerce are subject to regulation by the Federal Power Commission under the Natural Gas Act whether made before, during, or after production and gathering, such decision reversing a precedent of long standing; and

"Whereas it is the consensus of opinion of the Legislature of the State of Utah that the resultant subjection of theretofore unregulated activities of producers and gatherers to Federal regulation is not in the best interests of the people of the United States in that it will have a very detrimental effect on the future development and ultimate beneficial utilization of this very valuable natural resource, and will also result in an inevitable clash between the Federal regulating authorities and State regulation with respect to utilization of this resource, and will have the further effect of encouraging extension of crippling Federal controls to many other commodities in the American economy: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That we do petition and memorialize the Congress of the United States to propose and enact an amendment to the Natural Gas Act of 1938 which will clearly and positively exempt from Federal regulation the activities of producers or gatherers of natural gas including sale by them of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted forthwith to the President of the United States, United States Senate, House of Representatives, and each congressional delegate from the State of Utah."

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

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 2

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the President and Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation curtailing and limiting the power and jurisdiction of inferior Federal courts to review criminal judgments of State courts

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring therein):

"Whereas the provisions of sections 2241 et seq. of the Revised Judicial Code, title 28, United States Code, purport to give to inferior Federal tribunals the right, by an application for habeas corpus, to review criminal judgments of State courts including jury verdicts, trial court rulings, and State supreme court decisions, and to issue orders staying the execution of such judgments by the duly constituted authorities of the States; and

"Whereas the exercise of such power serves to:

"(1) stultify prompt enforcement of capital sentences in the event of conviction;

"(2) produce disruption of State criminal proceedings;

"(3) disrupt the proper balance between the States and the Federal Government;

"(4) centralize and extend Federal power;

"(5) impair and debase the States' due powers and responsibilities in the detection and punishment of crime;

"(6) destroy the public faith in and respect for the judicial systems;

"(7) afford those guilty of heinous and reprehensible crimes the opportunity to delay, stultify, and avoid the enforcement of the sanctions imposed upon them by the legislatures of the various States; and

"Whereas the Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Senator from the State of Utah, has introduced in the 84th Congress, 1st session, S. 877, which will correct a duplicate jurisdiction given inferior Federal tribunals to review criminal judgments in the State courts including jury verdicts, trial-court rulings, and State supreme court decisions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah (the Governor concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby urged to pass S. 877 curtailing and limiting the power and jurisdiction of inferior Federal tribunals to review criminal judgments of the courts of this and the other United States; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Utah be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to send copies of this joint memorial to the President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Public Roads Administration; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable Orvin Fjare, Congressmen from Montana, requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway No. 2 to the national system of State highways

"Whereas the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, which amended the Federal-Aid Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that there shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico; and

"Whereas the act further provided that the routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of each State and the adjoining States, and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

"Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated the 2d day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways selected by the joint action of the State highway department of each State and adjoining States, as provided by the Federal Highway Act of November 9, 1921, for selection of the Federal-aid highway system, and which was reviewed by the Public Roads Administration to determine its compliance with the requirements and purposes of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944, and the system as revised and modified by the Public Roads Administration was approved by the said Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, or the aforesaid date, by virtue of the authority vested in him by the said highway act of November 9, 1921, the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1, effective July 1, 1939, in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944; and

"Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified, and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

"Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

"Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the shortest through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada and Alaska in the State of Montana and other boundary States; and

"Whereas said United States Highway No. 2 plays an ever-increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous growth of oil, nuclear, mineral, and timber industries, and in the development of power generated by the Hungry Horse Dam and other power sites in the Pacific Northwest, and in the expand-

ing industrial development in the Western States and in Canada, notably the Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

"Whereas the said United States Highway No. 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine and connected with Canada's highways, No. 9 from New York to Montreal, and No. 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air-defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, along the entire northern boundary of the United States; and

"Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length, and connects at points in 7 States from the city of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash.; and

"Whereas while this is a petition from the State of Montana, it contemplates the joining of similar petitions of the other six States involved; this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway No. 2, because such areas, at their present accelerated progress, resulting from a shift in population to the Western States and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

"Whereas this request that the designation of United States Highway No. 2 be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of Montana and in the other States served by United States Highway No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the 34th Legislative Assembly of Montana of 1955, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, do most earnestly and respectfully request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway No. 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway No. 2 designated as an integral part of the national system of defense highways and that it be placed on the national system of interstate highways; be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of Commerce; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Public Roads Administration; to the Honorable James E. Murray and the Honorable Mike Mansfield, United States Senators from Montana; to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and the Honorable Orvin Fjare, Congressmen from Montana.

"GEO. M. GOSMAN,
"*President of the Senate.*
"LEO C. GRAYBILL,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Approved February 27, 1955."

A resolution adopted by the Nashville (Tenn.) Industrial Union Council, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide a Federal minimum wage of $1.25 an hour; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Okonite Co., of Passaic, N. J., signed by A. F. Metz, chairman of the board and chief executive officer, enclosing a copy of the "Recommendations of Electrical Manufacturers on Foreign Trade Policy" (with an accompanying document); to the Committee on Finance.

Fifteen resolutions adopted by the Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., relating to proposed legislation for the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

A resolution adopted by the Retired Officers Association, Washington, D. C., relating to credit for $1,200 of retired income, for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

"House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial relating to timberland in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona

"*To the Congress of the United States:*

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"For many years a controversy existed between the United States and the Aztec Land & Cattle Co. as to the ownership of 98,600 acres of timberland in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona.

"A court decision in 1952 resulted in the transfer of 98,600 acres of land in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest in Arizona from Federal to private control and ownership.

"This acreage is a natural and integral part of the national forest in which it was formerly included and the best interests of the citizens of the State of Arizona and Nation require that it be returned to Federal ownership and control, as a part of the national forest in which it is located.

"At least 75 percent of this land is heavily forested and comprises probably the finest stand of virgin timber left on the Colorado plateau. Protection of this valuable timber and its proper sustained cutting can best be had by a return of ownership and management to the National Forest Service.

"This large acreage is valuable for timber, grazing and recreational purposes and is a natural resource that should not be jeopardized. It has immense value as a watershed.

"Without the protection and conservation practices of the Federal Forest Service this irreplaceable property will deteriorate to a point where the timber production and lumber business in Arizona will be extinct and the water cycle will be so affected as to drastically diminish the flow from the watershed.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, prays:

"That the Congress give its full support to the bill introduced by Senators CARL HAYDEN and BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, to provide for the purchase of the acreage described above so that it may again be a part of the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forest."

Mr. GOLDWATER presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL CEMETERY IN ARIZONA—JOINT RESOLUTION OF ARIZONA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona, praying for the establishment of a national cemetery in that State.

I ask unanimous consent that following the joint resolution there be printed in the RECORD Senate bill 1331, which I am introducing today, and which is designed to carry out the purpose of the joint resolution.

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

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as follows:

House Joint Memorial 5

Joint memorial requesting the establishment of a national cemetery in Arizona

To the Congress of the United States:

Your memorialist respectfully represents:

There is no national cemetery in the State of Arizona.

Proportionately, there are more veterans in Arizona than in most of the States of the Union. This is due partly to the fact that for several generations there have been numerous military installations in the State, and partly because thousands of veterans have moved to Arizona to have the advantage of the dry, healthful climate.

A veteran on passing, who has expressed a desire to be buried in a national cemetery, has to be transported to a distant point in another State for burial. If he dies without financial means, he will be buried in facilities furnished by the county for indigent persons.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Legislature of the State of Arizona, requests:

That the Congress provide for the establishment of a national cemetery in the State of Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The bill (S. 1331) to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona, introduced by Mr. HAYDEN, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Army is authorized and directed (1) to establish one national cemetery at a location selected by him in the State of Arizona and (2) to acquire, by donation, purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, such land as may be required for the estalishment of such national cemetery.

SEC. 2. When requested to do so by the Secretary of the Army, the Administrator of the General Services is authorized and directed to transfer to the Department of the Army, without reimbursement or transfer of funds, any Government-owned land in the State of Arizona, which the Secretary of the Army has determined to be suitable for the purposes of this statute and which is otherwise surplus to Government needs. In addition, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to utilize when practicable, for the establishment thereon of a national cemetery, such Government-owned lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army which are located within the State of Arizona and which are no longer needed for military purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon selection by the Secretary of the Army of such land, as provided in sections 1 and 2 hereof, he is authorized to establish such national cemetery and to provide for the care and maintenance thereof.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Army is authorized to prescribe such regulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the purposes of this act.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Be it resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled:

"Whereas His Excellency, Abba Eban, Ambassador of Israel to the United States, will be the honored guest of the State of Washington on his first visit to the Northwest; and

"Whereas the friendship and understanding between America and Israel are cherished by the citizens of the State of Washington and have inspired and strengthened our mutual love of freedom and the republic; and

"Whereas the Ambassador of Israel, who is also his country's chief delegate to the United Nations, has been given worldwide recognition as an outstanding spokesman for the young Republic of Israel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington in legislative session assembled, that they hereby extend their cordial greetings to the Ambassador of Israel, His Excellency, Abba Eban, and respectfully request that he address a joint session of the senate and the house of representatives on Thursday, February 24, 1955; and be it hereby further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Washington congressional delegation, to the Secretary of the United Nations, to the Secretary of the Israel delegation to the United Nations, to the President of Israel, and to His Excellency, Abba Eban, the Ambassador of Israel to the United States.

"Adopted by the house February 1, 1955.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Adopted by the senate February 2, 1955.

"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, and to the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, and to the Honorable Chan Gurney, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition, as follows:

"Whereas it has been reliably reported that the Civil Aeronautics Board has voted to issue a decision in the States-Alaska Case, Docket No. 5756, et al, which would reduce the number of air carriers now operating between the Pacific Northwest and the Territory of Alaska from 4 to 2 carriers; and

"Whereas the continuance of adequate air transportation services to Alaska is of vital importance to the further economic development of the Territory, the State of Washington, and to the national defense interests of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas the Board's decision would deprive every major city in Alaska of competitive air services, except the city of Anchorage; and would further deprive such important communities as Nome, Cordova, Kenai, Homer, Kodiak, and Bristol Bay of through services by any air carrier operating from the State of Washington and would thus require time-consuming and costly transshipment of all passenger, cargo, and mail traffic destined to these communities; and

"Whereas Alaska is almost wholly dependent upon air transportation facilities because of the recent discontinuance of passenger steamship services and because there is no railroad linking the Territory with the State of Washington, nor any satisfactory highway network; and

"Whereas Alaska is almost entirely dependent upon the State of Washington and other areas of the continental United States for its labor force and for virtually all of its foodstuffs, supplies, and materials, and is therefore peculiarly in need of adequate air transportation facilities especially tailored to its own needs; and

"Whereas the Territory is now on the threshold of significant business and industrial development which would be seriously impaired by any curtailment of air services as now contemplated by the Civil Aeronautics Board; and

"Whereas the Board's decision has resulted in an unprecedented storm of public protest throughout the entire Territory and the Pacific Northwest, resulting spontaneously in the sending of thousands of letters and telegrams to the Board and to the White House; and

"Whereas this public protest has been vigorously supported by the entire congressional delegation from the State of Washington, by virtually all of the other public and civic leaders in the Pacific Northwest, by newspapers, radio, and television commentators, and by most of the business concerns and labor unions in the State of Washington having trade interests with Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, That we respectfully memorialize and petition the President of the United States and the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board to reconsider the pending decision in the States-Alaska Case to insure that existing air transportation services to the Territory of Alaska are not curtailed, that competitive air services be maintained from the State of Washington to all of the principal gateway cities in Alaska, that through services by air from the State of Washington be preserved and expanded to as many Alaskan communities as possible, that the selection of the individual air carriers to perform such services be determined solely upon the basis of merit, and that paramount consideration be given to the vital need of Alaska for a system of air transportation services especially tailored to the peculiar requirements of the Territory and which will fully utilize the integrated operation of air carriers indigenous to Alaska, whose primary and exclusive interests are in serving the Pacific Northwest and the Territory; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be immediately transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States.

"Passed the house February 2, 1955.

"JOHN L. O'BRIEN,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate February 3, 1955.

"EMMETT T. ANDERSON,
"President of the Senate."

CONSTRUCTION OF LIBBY AND YELLOWTAIL DAMS, MONT.—JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF MONTANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate is interested in conservation of our Nation's natural resources. Without question, the most important of all our resources, next to our people, are our soil and water. Closely allied to these two fundamental natural resources are the use and the development of water power as a basis of industrial progress.

Therefore, I am certain every Member of this body will be interested in two joint resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Montana and approved February 26, 1955. One petitions for construction of Libby Dam, in northwestern Montana; and the other petitions for construction of Yellowtail Dam, in southeastern Montana. I ask unanimous consent that the text of these memorials appear in the body of the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolutions will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolutions were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Joint memorial of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; the Honorable James E. Murray and Mike Mansfield, United States Senators from Montana; and to the Honorable Lee Metcalf and Orvin B. Fjare, Representatives in Congress from Montana; the Appropriations Committee of the Uniter States Senate; the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives; and Joseph M. Dodge, Director of the Budget, requesting the introduction and early enactment into law the necessary and proper legislation authorizing sufficient appropriations be provided the Corps of Army Engineers for early construction of the Libby Dam located on the Kootenai River in Lincoln County in northwestern Montana

Whereas Libby Dam site is located in Lincoln County in northwestern Montana, and Lobby Dam will be constructed across the Kootenai River, at a point above and near to Libby, Mona.; and

Whereas preliminary geological investigation and work has been carefully completed and the findings compiled; and

Whereas the Libby Dam will be designed to provide power, flood control, and recreation benefits to Montana and the whole Pacific Northwest; and

Whereas existing industry and potential industrial development in timber, wood pulp and wood products, mining and its attendant products, will be greatly enhanced due to low-cost power at site of dam; and

Whereas the acre-feet of reservoir storage is estimated to be 6,483,000 acre-feet making a total accumulated acre-feet of 17,633,000 of regulated flow for the Columbia River for firm up-power for further industrial development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available for the early initiation of construction of Libby Dam on the Kootenai River in Lincoln County in northwestern Montana; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be also submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the natinal Congress, RICHARD M. NIXON and SAM E. RAYBURN; to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees; and

Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of the national Congress.

GEO. M. GOSMAN,
President of the Senate.
LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

"Approved February 26, 1955."

Joint memorial of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Montana to the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, Senator James E. Murray, of Montana; Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana; Senator Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming; Senator Frank Barrett, of Wyoming; Congressman Lee Metcalf, of Montana; Congressman Orvin Fjare, of Montana; the Appropriations Committee of the United States Senate; the Appropriations Committee of the United States House of Representatives; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate; the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States House of Representatives; Wilbur A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation; Rowland R. Hughes, Director of the Budget; Glenn L. Emmons, Commissioner of Indian Affairs; requesting the introduction and enactment into law of the necessary and proper legislation authorizing that sufficient appropriations be provided the Bureau of Reclamation for the immediate construction of Yellowtail Dam, located on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana

Whereas Yellowtail Dam site is located in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana, and Yellowtail Dam will be constructed across the Big Horn River, about three-fourths of a mile above the mouth of Big Horn Canyon, 35 miles southwest of Hardin, Mont.; and

Whereas Big Horn Canyon is the passageway of the Big Horn River between the northern end of the Big Horn Mountains and the Pryor Mountains. For more than 50 miles Yellowtail Dam Reservoir will lie within the rugged, inaccessible canyon, the steep walls of which tower hundreds of feet above the narrow and winding riverbed, forming a natural damsite of unique splendor that will in future years provide Montana, Wyoming, and the Nation with one of the greatest lake recreation areas in the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas the backed-up waters of Yellowtail Dam will flood no presently used or usable land, which alone makes it one of the most desirable and economical of damsites available; and

Whereas the United States Bureau of Reclamation was authorized by section 9 of the Flood-Control Act of 1944 as a part of the Missouri River Basin project to prepare preliminary surveys and construction of Yellowtail Dam; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation has long since completed preconstruction work at the site of Yellowtail Dam and only awaits a congressional appropriation to commence work. Design specifications for the dam and powerplant are available for immediate use. Surveys have been completed of the irrigable areas and transmission lines. Plans are ready for construction of access roads, construction camp, and other essential base work necessary for actual construction to now be undertaken; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam is designed to provide for irrigation, hydroelectric power production, flood control, silt retention, conservation of fish and wild life, recreational development and other related beneficial uses of value to Montana, Wyoming, and the Nation generally; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam will make possible the irrigation of some 45,000 acres of new land by gravity flow along the Big Horn River from the Big Horn Canyon to approximately 10 miles north of the city of Hardin, and supplemental irrigation water will be provided for large areas now inadequately served. Because irrigation of lands along the Big Horn, Powder, and Yellowstone Rivers is dependent upon pumping, a source of low-cost power is a prerequisite toward bringing many acres of now unproductive land under the ditch. Construction of Yellowtail powerplant will make possible the irrigation of many proposed and desirable projects along these three valuable, but in many instances, little utilized river areas; and

Whereas construction of Yellowtail Dam offers a priceless solution for equitable interstate use of the waters of the Big Horn by the creation of the Yellowtail Reservoir on the Montana-Wyoming State boundary line; and

Whereas power-generating facilities to be constructed at the damsite will have an installed capacity of at least 120,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical energy annually. This power produced at Yellowtail Dam will be available for irrigation pumping, and will serve as a part of the Bureau of Reclamation's power system, constructed to provide power for construction of other developments and to supply surplus power to principal load centers to permit its use of old and new industries as well as residence—rural and urban—of the area; and

Whereas fish and wild life resources will gain by the dam, fishing and hunting, as well as the many allied recreational opportunities that will most surely follow will be of immense value to Montana and Wyoming, as well as the Nation generally; and

Whereas Yellowtail Dam as planned will be a concrete archetype structure, towering some 499 feet above the riverbed, and will have a crest length of 1,480 feet and will have a storage capacity of 1,366,000 acre-feet; and

Whereas the construction of Yellowtail Dam will attract new industries into southern Montana and northern Wyoming and thereby be of great benefit to the entire States of Montana and Wyoming, as well as the entire Nation by firming up the economy and by supplying cheap power for industrial and home use, and this postwar period is the time to develop such industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives of the State of Montana, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged and requested to make sufficient funds available for the construction of Yellowtail Dam now on the Big Horn River in Big Horn County in southeastern Montana; Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be also submitted by the secretary of state of Montana to the presiding officers of both Houses of the National Congress, RICHARD NIXON and SAM RAYBURN, to the chairman of the Appropriations Committees and Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of both Houses of the National Congress, to the regional director of the Bureau of Reclamation and area director of the Indian Bureau, both located in Billings, Mont., and to the Governor of the State of Wyoming and the presiding officers of both houses of the Wyoming Legislature.

GEO. M. GOSMAN,
President of the Senate.
LEO C. GRAYBILL,
Speaker of the House.

Approved February 26, 1955.

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Montana, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. KERR:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 7

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to act promptly and favorably upon the Washita Basin (Okla.) project report

"Whereas the Washita River Basin in Oklahoma is one of the most fertile in our State and Nation; and

"Whereas the people of this great valley very frequently suffer heavy loss of life and property because of recurring disastrous floods; and

"Whereas following such disastrous floods there are long periods of protracted droughts, resulting in heavy loss of crops, excessive shortages of water for domestic, municipal, and industrial supplies, and greatly jeopardizing the health, welfare, and economy of the valley; and

"Whereas for many years the several agencies of the Federal Government have been making surveys and studies of the problems in the Washita Basin; and

"Whereas on July 25, 1953, the Secretary of the Interior did transmit the Washita River Subbasin, Red River Basin, Okla. and Tex., project report through the Bureau of the Budget to the Congress, identified as House Document 219, 83d Congress, 1st session, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and

"Whereas aforementioned project report and plans provide adequately for the protection from destructive floods, storage for domestic, municipal, industrial, and irrigation water supplies; and

"Whereas on March 22 and 27, 1952, the Governor of Oklahoma and the Oklahoma Planning and Resources Board did approve and urge the development of the Washita Basin as provided in aforementioned House Document 219: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we respectfully request the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Congress of the United States of America to consider at the earliest practical date and give their approval and to authorize for construction the Washita Basin (Okla.) projects.

"Adopted by the senate the 14th day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 22d day of February 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution relating to a permanent location for the Cowboy Hall of Fame; respectfully requesting the location committee, Cowboy Hall of Fame, to consider the many advantages of the Will Rogers Memorial site, Claremore, Okla., as a permanent location for said Cowboy Hall of Fame; extending an invitation for the establishment of the Cowboy Hall of Fame at said site; and directing that certified copies of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable C. A. Reynolds, chairman, Cowboy Hall of Fame; to each member of the location committee thereof; to the Honorable Will Rogers, Jr.; and to all other members of the Will Rogers Memorial Commission; and to the Honorable James Hammett, mayor of Claremore, Okla.

"Whereas a location committee of the Cowboy Hall of Fame is now giving consideration to a permanent site for the Cowboy Hall of Fame; and

"Whereas the Will Rogers Memorial, Claremore, Okla., was an inspiration for the establishment of a permanent Cowboy Hall of Fame; and

"Whereas the Will Rogers Memorial and the proposed Cowboy Hall of Fame are inextricably related in the folklore of the American cowboy; and

"Whereas the city of Claremore, Okla., a progressive city of native Americans and one of America's best known and most visited cities, is in the heart of "cowboy country" and is an ideal location for said Cowboy Hall of Fame, offering, among other advantages, the following:

"(1) Home of Will Rogers, native son, world citizen, and the greatest cowboy of all time;

"(2) Site of the Will Rogers Memorial, having an average of 1,200 visitors daily and ranking second only to visitation of Mount Vernon;

"(3) Municipally owned Will Rogers Library of approximately 11,500 volumes;

"(4) Oklahoma's largest roundup club, and ranking in size among the largest in the Southwest;

"(5) Location of the Davis gun collection; the largest individual collection of guns in the United States;

"(6) Home of the Oklahoma Military Academy;

"(7) Gilcrease Art Museum, in nearby Tulsa, which includes the world's finest collection of materials relating to the American Indian, as well as the finest collections of Frederic Remington and Charles Russell paintings and sculpture;

"(8) Excellent highway facilities directly serving the Will Rogers Memorial site include United States Highway No. 66, the Main Street of America, Oklahoma State Highway No. 20 connecting United States Highways Nos. 77, 169, and 69, and Oklahoma State Highway No. 33 connecting Claremore with United States Highway No. 169 and Oklahoma State Highway No. 33;

"(9) Nearby the city of Tulsa, Okla., has 5 airlines operating into and out of the municipal airport with 59 daily schedules; and

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma embraces a major portion of 'cowboy country, United States of America,' and has produced four world's champion all-around cowboys: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the 25th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the people of the State of Oklahoma through the 25th legislature do hereby respectfully request the location committee of the Cowboy Hall of Fame to give serious consideration to the many advantages of the Will Rogers site, Claremore, Okla., as a permanent location for the Cowboy Hall of Fame, and do hereby extend a cordial invitation for the establishment of said Cowboy Hall of Fame in the State of Oklahoma.

"SEC. 2. That a duly certified copy of this resolution be mailed to the Honorable C. A. Reynolds, chairman, Cowboy Hall of Fame, 804 West 67th Street Terrace, Kansas City, Mo.; to each member of the location committee; to the Honorable Will Rogers, Jr., Beverly Hills, Calif.; to all other members of the Will Rogers Commission; and to the Honorable James Hammett, mayor, Claremore, Okla.

"Adopted by the senate the 22d day of February 1955.

"PINK WILLIAMS,
"President of the Senate.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 24th day of February 1955.

"B. E. HARKEY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

IMPORTANCE OF UPHOLDING THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES—RESOLUTION

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last Tuesday was Town Meeting Day in Vermont. The people of my home town of Putney adopted a resolution in regard to standing by the Constitution of the United States. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Whereas there are several groups of people, both within and without the United States of America, which embrace various political ideologies, the effects of which are to enslave human beings; and

Whereas we, the people of Putney, being an informed, religious and patriotic people, do unequivocally reject all such political ideologies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That we, the people of Putney, go on record as firmly believing in, and as upholding the Constitution of the United States of America; be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as desiring to keep and retain, for ourselves and for our posterity, all of the liberties, freedoms, rights, and privileges now enjoyed by us, and guaranteed to us by the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That we go on record as favoring a standard of liberties, freedoms, rights, and privileges, comparable to our own present standard, for all peoples everywhere as soon as may be; and be it further

Resolved, That the town clerk of Putney be hereby authorized and instructed to forward, as soon as possible, a copy of the foregoing resolution in its entirety to each of the two United States Senators from Vermont, namely Senator AIKEN and Senator FLANDERS; and to forward a like copy to the congressional Representative from Vermont, namely, Representative PROUTY; and that the above resolution, so forwarded, shall have clearly indicated thereon that it has been approved by the people of Putney, in town meeting assembled.

IMPROVEMENT OF RURAL ROADS—RESOLUTION OF MINNESOTA STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a resolution adopted by the State Association of County Commissioners of Minnesota on February 3, 1955, relating to the improvement of rural highways. I believe this resolution is timely, and should be given attention by all Members of Congress.

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

RESOLUTION OF STATE ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, ST. CLOUD, MINN., FEBRUARY 3, 1955

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

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

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

Therefore we do hereby respectfully request the Commissioner of Highways, United States Senators and United States Congressmen to work together for effecting legislation changing the present Federal law for Minnesota to read 75 percent participation by the Federal Government and 25 percent participation by the county.

LEO B. GAMBRINO,
Secretary and Manager.

EXECUTION OF JEWISH CITIZENS BY EGYPTIAN GOVERNMENT—RESOLUTION

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District, on February 15, 1955, relating to the execution of Jewish citizens by the Egyptian Government.

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

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GREENFIELD-MONTAGUE ZIONIST DISTRICT FEBRUARY 15, 1955

Whereas the Egyptian Government in its attempt to strengthen its unsettled internal position as well as to gain stature abroad, has so recently resorted to the hasty execution of some of its Jewish citizens after a shockingly unfair trial by Egypt's supreme military court; and

Whereas the 11th-hour pleas for clemency by the American, French, and other Governments fell upon deaf Egyptian ears; and

Whereas by their haste in carrying out these inhuman executions in spite of the intervention of the American Government, the Government of Premier Nasser has again demonstrated its contempt for American public opinion; and

Whereas by the continuation of abuses, calculated to harm the State of Israel ever since its establishment, in spite of repeated gestures of conciliation and goodwill by the Israeli Government: Be it hereby

Resolved, That the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District in meeting assembled this day goes on record as condemning the Egyptian Government in this their latest shedding of innocent Jewish blood; and be it further

Resolved, That the Greenfield-Montague Zionist District commends the Government of the United States for its effort in attempting to save the lives of the two Jews in Egypt; efforts which were so unsuccessful as to highlight the contempt of Egypt for American public opinion and democratic concepts.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 3952. An act to amend the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; with an amendment (Report No. 47).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. CLEMENTS:

S. 1325. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended;

S. 1326. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and

S. 1327. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1328. A bill for the relief of Doreen Tsung-tao Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 1329. A bill to require certain specifications to be included in star route and screen vehicle service contracts and in advertisements for bids on such contracts; and

S. 1330. A bill relating to the renewal and adjustment of star route and screen vehicle service contracts; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1331. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 1332. A bill for the relief of Samuel Chalut; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 1333. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1334. A bill for the relief of Harry Hume Ainsworth; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1335. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Interior shall investigate and report to the Congress as to the advisability of establishing Huron Cemetery, Kansas City, Kans., as a national monument; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. THYE):

S. 1336. A bill to provide for a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas:

S. 1337. A bill for the relief of Joseph Vyskocil;

S. 1338. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Margarete Schober Frugia; and

S. 1339. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Betty M. Boyersmith; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 1340. A bill to authorize the conveyance by quitclaim deed of certain land to the Brownsville Navigation District of Cameron County, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

S. 1341. A bill to require that the budget shall include each year a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects; to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

S. 1342. A bill for the relief of Sayoko Fujimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1343. A bill to require bills and resolutions authorizing appropriations reported by committees of Congress to be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost of the legislation; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

S. 1344. A bill to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to dentists; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1345. A bill to readjust equitably the retirement benefits of certain individuals on the Emergency Officers' Retired List, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 1346. A bill for the relief of Col. Benjamin Axelroad; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEHMAN:

S. 1347. A bill for the relief of Jose Arriaga-Marin; and

S. 1348. A bill for the relief of Anna Jerman Bonito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1349. A bill to establish an internal revenue district consisting solely of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1350. A bill for the relief of Guiseppi Castrogiovanni, his wife and child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1351. A bill to provide a means whereby domestic producers who are injured by increased imports resulting from trade-agreements concessions may obtain preferences in bidding for Government contracts; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1352. A bill for the relief of A. J. Crozat, Jr.; and

S. 1353. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jeannette S. Hamilton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1354. A bill to provide that one floating ocean station shall be maintained at all times in the Gulf of Mexico to provide storm warnings for States bordering on the Gulf of Mexico; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PURTELL:

S. 1355. A bill for the relief of William Luke Phalen; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1356. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

S. 1357. A bill for the relief of Ingeburg Edith Stallings (nee Nitzki); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1358. A bill to authorize modification of the flood control project for Missouri River agricultural levee unit 513-512-R, Richardson County, Nebr.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

S. 1359. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to come into agreement with the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate, and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives with respect to any sale, exchange, grant, or transfer, in excess of 1,500 acres, of land acquired by the United States under title III of such act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1360. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to provide for refunds to farmers of the amounts of tax paid on gasoline used by them in farming operations; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1361. A bill for the relief of Margaretta Zwack; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

S. 1362. A bill for the relief of William Luke Phalen; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

S. 1363. A bill for the relief of George B. Cox; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1364. A bill for the relief of Elli Yorgiyadis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania:

S. 1365. A bill to amend section 4091 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to imposition of tax upon lubricating oils), and to amend section 6416 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to overpayments of tax); to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1366. A bill for the relief of the Ohio Casualty Insurance Co.;

S. 1367. A bill for the relief of Antonio Jacoe; and

S. 1368. A bill for the relief of Pedro P. Dagamac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1369. A bill to amend section 302 of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

S. 1370. A bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1371. A bill to promote an agricultural development program under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 1372. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. WELKER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NEUBERGER, and Mr. BARRETT):

S. 1373. A bill to promote the economic use of Indian lands, alleviate and adjust the heirship problem involved in Indian trust or restricted allotments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1374. A bill to provide for the termination of Government operations which are in competition with private enterprise; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

S. 1375. A bill for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung; and

S. 1376. A bill for the relief of Emil Arens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1377. A bill to further define the national transportation policy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1378. A bill to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States;

S. 1379. A bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; and

S. 1380. A bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. POTTER):

S. 1381. A bill to incorporate the Society of the 28th Division; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. STENNIS:

S. 1382. A bill for the relief of Homer E. Flynt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1383. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

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

S. 1384. A bill to provide that the Secretary of the Army shall return certain mineral interests, in land acquired by him for flood-control purposes, to the former owners of such land; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. J. Res. 54. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1955, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REFUND OR CREDIT FOR TAX ON GASOLINE USED FOR CERTAIN FARM EQUIPMENT

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide a refund or credit on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment.

The Congress originally enacted the Federal gasoline tax in 1932 for purposes of general revenue. Despite this fact the concept has gradually evolved that the purpose of the tax is to finance highway construction.

This concept was crystallized by the enactment of the 1954 Federal Aid to Highway Act. The message from the President, the hearings in the Public Works Committees of both Houses, and the debate on the floor of both Houses, include numerous references to the effect that the amount appropriated for highways by the Federal Government should be equal to the amount estimated to be available from the Federal gasoline tax. The amount that was authorized by the 1954 act was in fact equal to the estimate of the revenue from the Federal gasoline tax.

The Congress has, therefore, for all practical purposes, established the principle that the Federal gasoline tax is to provide revenue to build highways. Even though the money collected from the gasoline tax is not formally earmarked for this purpose, the net effect is the same.

Since the Federal gasoline tax is considered as a use tax, that is, a tax for using the highways, then it is clearly inconsistent to collect the tax on gasoline used for nonhighway purposes.

The major form of nonhighway use of gasoline is on farms. Gasoline used on a farm is one of a number of farm production supplies—gasoline, farm machinery, insecticides, feed, fertilizer, and so on. There is no relationship whatsoever between these production supplies and the use of highways. It would be just as illogical to tax fertilizer and to use the tax for building highways as it would be to tax gasoline used on the farm for this purpose. I do not know of any other industry in which a production supply is taxed to build highways.

Looked at in another way, gasoline used on a farm is a source of power. If power used on the farm is to be taxed to build highways, it would be just as equitable to tax power used in other industries to build highways. We might, for example, tax coal, or electricity, or oil, or natural gas, or diesel fuel, and use the money thus acquired to build highways. But it would not be logical to tax these sources of power for this purpose. Nor is it equitable or logical to tax gasoline used on the farm to build highways.

The taxation of non-highway-used gasoline to build highways is, in my opinion, inequitable, illogical, and discriminatory.

Many of us who have served in various capacities in State government will remember that the same issue has been fought over in the State legislatures. In most States non-highway-used gasoline is exempt from the State gasoline tax. The only States in which the State tax is not refunded for non-highway-used gasoline are Vermont, Utah, and Wyoming. I understand that in two of these States, Utah and Wyoming, there is a considerable likelihood that nonhighway use of gasoline may be exempted from the State gasoline tax in the near future.

The reasons which have impelled 45 State legislatures to exempt nonhighway use of gasoline from the State gasoline tax, are the same as the reasons which should cause the Congress to exempt nonhighway use of gasoline from the Federal gasoline tax, that is, that it is plainly discriminatory to place on one class of citizens a tax for building highways that is not placed on other classes of citizens.

Farmers should pay their fair share of the cost of building highways, as measured by their use of the highways. They should pay both the State and Federal gasoline tax on gasoline used on the highways. But merely because gasoline happens to be the major source of power for farm production is no reason why farmers should pay the gasoline tax on gasoline that is not used on the highways.

It does not seem to me that the administration of this exemption represents any particular problem. There is no reason why the farmer, in applying for his refund of the State gasoline tax used for nonhighway purposes, should not, at the same time and on the same form, apply for a refund of the Federal tax paid for non-highway-used gasoline. The State agencies administering this program could merely act as fiscal agents for the Federal Government in this connection. I see no particular difficulty in the State and Federal tax administrators entering into arrangements whereby this could be accomplished without particular difficulty. And even if some difficulties were involved, this is no reason why the Congress should continue this inequitable tax treatment.

I expect some of my colleagues will want to ask, What is to prevent the farmer from including in his application for a refund a portion of his gasoline purchases used for highway purposes? The State governments have, over the years, developed techniques for auditing applications for refunds to prevent such abuse. Even if a few farmers do apply for more refund than they should have on the basis of nonhighway use, this is far more than offset by the fact that during many months of the year farmers do not buy enough gasoline to go to the trouble of applying for a refund on that portion of such gasoline used for nonhighway purposes. Thus, farmers as a group will continue to pay their fair share of the cost of building highways.

I am surprised at the fact that farmers have been fairly quiet over this inequitable situation in years past. I expect that the reason this is so is that most farmers have considered the Federal gasoline tax to be a temporary tax, and, since it would be terminated eventually, there was no purpose in becoming too concerned about the situation. But now that the Congress has extended the Federal gasoline tax year after year, increasing interest in correcting the inequity is developing. In the past few months I have received many letters from farmers on this situation. It appears to me that their case is fully justified and that the Congress has a responsibility to take action to eliminate this discrimination at the earliest feasible date.

Some of my colleagues may agree that nonhighway use of gasoline should be exempted from the Federal gasoline tax, but argue that this is not the time to reduce taxes. I would say to them that this is not a tax reduction, but, rather is a correction of an obvious inequity that the Congress should have corrected many years ago.

For these reasons, I am introducing a bill to provide for the exemption of gasoline used for nonhighway purposes from the Federal gasoline tax. Similar bills have been introduced in the House. I hope that the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee will give such bills their early consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, and that, in addition, a letter from the American Farm Bureau Federation on this subject, and a letter from the Kansas Farm Bureau at Manhattan, Kans., be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1336) to provide for a refund or credit for tax on gasoline used or resold for certain farm equipment, introduced by Mr. CARLSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6416 (b) (2) (H) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to special uses in which taxpayments considered overpayments) is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (H) and inserting "; and"; and by adding after subparagraph (H) the following new subparagraph: "(I) In the case of gasoline taxable under section 4081, used or resold as fuel for the operation or propulsion of farm equipment."

SEC. 2. Effective date: The amendment made by section 1 of this act shall be effective with respect to gasoline used or resold on or after the first day of the first month beginning more than 10 days after the effective date of this act.

The letters, presented by Mr. CARLSON, are as follows:

AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION,
Washington, D. C., March 7, 1955.

Hon. FRANK CARLSON,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: The American Farm Bureau Federation has long favored termination of the Federal gasoline tax, thus leaving this source of revenue available to the States.

Until such time as the Federal gasoline tax is terminated, we recommend an exemption from taxation for gasoline used for nonhighway purposes.

Although the Federal gasoline tax was originally adopted to provide general revenues, the concept has been gradually adopted that the purpose of the tax is to finance highway construction. Current discussions of the Clay committee report and other proposals for an expanded highway construction program, all involve the idea that gasoline tax revenues are the source of highway financing.

We submit that to continue to tax gasoline used for nonhighway purposes to build highways is inequitable. Gasoline used for nonhighway purposes is no more related to the use of highways than fuel oil or coal used for heating buildings.

The American Farm Bureau Federation respectfully recommends that at an early date in the current Congress that hearings be held by the Senate Finance Committee on the proposal that nonhighway used gasoline be exempt from the Federal gasoline tax.

Very sincerely,

MATT TRIGGS,
Assistant Legislative Director.

KANSAS FARM BUREAU,
Manhattan, Kans., February 8, 1955.

Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CARLSON: Since the Federal gasoline tax at the 2-cent rate will expire April 1, 1955, legislation to provide for extension will undoubtedly be considered in the near future.

Kansas Farm Bureau was willing to go along with the Federal gasoline tax at the time it was originally adopted as a means of financing necessary war effort with the idea that it would be only a temporary measure used not only for road purposes but other activities as well. The thinking is that a gasoline tax should be left to the State legislatures as a method of financing road construction and maintenancee by the States and counties.

It now appears that Federal financing of roads with some of the funds raised by a gasoline tax is to be a permanent policy of our National Government. If this policy is to continue, and so long as it does continue, that part of our gasoline consumption which is used for nonhighway purposes should be exempt from a Federal tax.

To impose a special tax on nonhighway gasoline for building roads is as unrealistic as it would be to impose a special tax on any other material used in the production of any commodity including agriculture commodities. Some method of exempting nonhighway gasoline from this tax must be found. This might be done by exemption or by a refund system as now practiced by many States. Arrangements could be made with the States, whereby a refund of the Federal tax might be applied for and paid along with the State.

We know that none of our Kansas congressional delegation are on the House Ways and Means Committee where the extension of the gasoline tax will first be considered. But we also know that you may be in a position to exert some influence with the House committee. With your knowledge of the history of gasoline taxes in Kansas, you realize that Kansas farmers are very much opposed to taxing gasoline which is not used on roads, regardless of whether the tax is State or Federal. To do otherwise is to burden farmers with an added heavy production cost to further aggravate the cost-price squeeze. Kansas stands near the top in the use of gasoline for agriculture production.

Many Congressmen will not have the direct interest in this issue that you have. We must depend on our representation from agricultural areas to explain the discrimination effected through a special tax on nonhighway gasoline used for road purposes.

Sincerely yours,

W. I. BOONE,
President.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CARLSON. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the distinguished author of the bill to permit me to join with him as a cosponsor of the bill. I think the proposed legislation which the Senator has introduced is most appropriate, and I should like to be associated with the bill as cosponsor.

Mr. CARLSON. I would be most pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Minnesota be a cosponsor.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO BUDGETARY AND FISCAL MATTERS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to the budgetary and fiscal matters of the Federal Government.

I am privileged to introduce them in the Senate as companion bills to measures introduced in the House of Representatives by the distinguished Member from the 24th District of California, the Honorable GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB.

Briefly, one bill would require that each bill reported by a committee of the Congress which would authorize the appropriation of moneys from the Treasury must be accompanied by a printed report which shall include an estimate from the department, or other agency concerned, of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution.

The other bill would require the Bureau of the Budget to provide the Congress each year with a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects.

It is my opinion, Mr. President, that these two pieces of proposed legislation are vital to the proper function of the Congress. There has long been a critical need for the Congress to know to what extent the taxpayer has been committed to expenditures, annually, over long periods of time. This is particularly true in the case of great construction and development projects.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as follows:

To the Committee on Appropriations:

S. 1341. A bill to require that the budget shall include each year a special analysis of certain long-term construction and development projects.

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. 1343. A bill to require bills and resolutions authorizing appropriations reported by committees of Congress to be accompanied by an estimate of the probable cost of the legislation.

EXTENSION OF FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE SYSTEM TO DENTISTS

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Social Security Act so as to extend the benefits of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to our Nation's dentists.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, this proposal was voted favorably by the House of Representatives but failed to win approval from the Senate Finance Committee. Recently dental societies have conducted polls in many of the 48 States on this subject. Their members have favored the adoption of this retirement plan by ratios of up to 8 to 1.

The number of persons eligible for inclusion under social security has increased by more than 10 million during the past year. I am firmly of the opinion that our Nation's dentists are fully deserving of this opportunity.

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

The bill (S. 1344) to extend the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to dentists, introduced by Mr. BRIDGES, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED RECIPROCAL TRADE CASUALTIES ACT OF 1955

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to be known as the Reciprocal Trade Casualties Act of 1955, designed to cushion the impact of an expanded world-trade policy which may be felt by some segments of the American economy. The bill was originally introduced by the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, Member from Wisconsin. It is a pleasure for me

to associate myself with Mr. REUSS and to publicly pay tribute to him for his imagination.

The House of Representatives has already passed a bill to renew and expand our reciprocal-trade-agreements program. It is my hope that the Senate will soon follow suit. Our Nation requires an expanded world trade and we know that the peace of the world depends upon increased commerce and industrial exchange. An ever larger amount of American industry is export oriented. The prosperity of these export industries and our American economy depends in the long run on the ability of the other nations to earn the dollars to buy our exports. We also appreciate that lower tariffs help the American consumer.

These comments are accurate and pertinent in the general. In the specific, unfortunately, a number of individuals, companies, and occasional communities suffer if imports to the United States increase. The legislative process in a democracy concerns itself with the specific, Mr. President, as well as with the general. We, therefore, have the responsibility to do what we can to prevent the individual specific injury as much as possible.

Earlier in the session it was a privilege for me to join with the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] in introducing a bill to provide some assistance to individuals, communities and industries jeopardized by lowering of trade barriers. The bill I introduce today is presented in the same spirit and with the same objective. It is designed specifically to provide import-endangered companies with certain advantages on Government procurement, and is in my judgment a supplement to the original Humphrey-Kennedy-Williams bill, S. 51.

The bill, in brief, provides that any domestic producer found by the Tariff Commission to be in danger by foreign imports may receive a certificate entitling it to a percentage advantage—up to 25 percent—in its bids for Government contracts. The idea is to provide an oxygen tent so that a company may keep busy and solvent while it finds new products which can sustain it in the long pull. The certificate would be good only for a limited period, while the company energetically sought to develop new products which could withstand competition. With the Government purchasing many billion dollars a year worth of materials, a percentage advantage of this type could be of real significance in tiding a hard-pressed producer over a transition period.

We have a responsibility to concern ourselves with these specific problems raised by expanded world trade, because every company that goes out of business and every industry that is seriously impaired and every individual who loses his job thereby, to that extent diminishes the strength of our Nation. We thereby lose savings, management, skill, and many economic and spiritual values associated with jobs, families and community living.

The principle of sharing burdens is a well-established one in the American society. The bill now at the desk would take the costs of a liberalized trade policy off the shoulders of a few isolated industries and spread that cost over the entire Nation as it should be. If we can accomplish this objective, we can move closer to our goal, a goal so ably characterized by the distinguished Member from Wisconsin [Mr. REUSS], as "trade without tears."

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

The bill (S. 1351) to provide a means whereby domestic producers who are injured by increased imports resulting from trade agreement concessions may obtain preferences in bidding for Government contracts, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

OVERTIME COMPENSATION FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, legislation was approved by the Congress, at the request of ocean-shipping and other transportation interests, to adjust overtime pay rates for night, Sunday, and holiday inspections by employees of the Public Health Service at the various quarantine stations. The legislation did not receive Presidential approval and hence was not enacted into law.

In a statement explaining his refusal to approve the measure, President Eisenhower stated that "the claims of the shipowners for out-of-hours service have merit" and declared that "the problems which the bill seeks to solve are real and pressing." The Chief Executive further stated that he intended "to have these problems further explored," and promised a study of effective means to coordinate overtime pay for all inspectional services.

As the President so well made clear, the problems in the field of quarantine inspection are real and pressing, particularly with respect to ocean-cargo vessels and tankers. Because of weather and other conditions beyond their control, such vessels, and sometimes even the passenger liners, cannot reach port during the regularly prescribed daytime hours. Yet it may cost the owners as much as $5,000 if a vessel has to lay over until next day for quarantine inspections.

As is well known, operating costs for American vessels are extremely high in comparison to those of competing foreign ships. It is difficult enough to meet this low-cost foreign competition without running into additional quarantine-inspection costs every time a vessel fails to reach port before 6 p. m.

Inasmuch, also, as there has been no information forthcoming as to the results of the promised Presidential study, I consider the need so pressing that I have prepared a modified bill which merely seeks to place the Quarantine Inspection Service on an equality with similar inspection staffs of Customs and the Immigration Service with respect to overtime compensation.

All these employees are subject to 24-hour call and, as the President so justly stated, the Public Health group's claims for equal treatment with other inspectional groups have much merit.

Incidentally, the vessel owners for whom the overtime quarantine inspections will be made are quite willing to reimburse the Government for the full amount of overtime compensation paid, and this is provided for in the bill.

In view of the urgency of the matter, I sincerely hope that prompt consideration of the bill will be afforded in committee.

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

The bill (S. 1370) to amend Public Law 410, 78th Congress, with regard to compensation for overtime, Sunday, and holiday work of employees of the United States Public Health Service, Foreign Quarantine Division, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BUTLER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO FURTHER DEFINE THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION POLICY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to further define the national transportation policy. This is the so-called antiracketeering amendment to the Interstate Commerce Act. Its purpose is to establish as a matter of policy the intent of Congress that the transportation industry, insofar as it is subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, shall be kept free of terrorism, extortion, racketeering, or similar unlawful tactics.

This proposed legislation springs from recommendations contained in the third interim report of the Special Committee To Investigate Organized Crime in Interstate Commerce. Its principal sponsor was the late Senator Lester C. Hunt, of Wyoming, who was a member of the Special Crime Committee.

Bills similar to the one which I am introducing today were introduced in the 82d and 83d Congresses; they were promptly reported favorably by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and passed the Senate. For reasons unknown to me, however, the legislation on this subject never was reported from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce in either the 82d or 83d Congress.

As chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I intend to ask for speedy consideration of this antiracketeering legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1377) to further define the national transportation policy, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ESTABLISHMENT OF AIDS TO CERTAIN MARITIME NAVIGATION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of the Treasury, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury outlining the purpose and background of this proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1378) to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 10, 1955.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to clarify and consolidate the authority to require the establishment, maintenance, and operation of aids to maritime navigation on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States.

The proposed legislation would amend section 85 of title 14, United States Code, to place in the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating the duty to prescribe and enforce necessary and reasonable regulations, for the protection of maritime navigation, concerning lights and other signals required on fixed structures in or over navigable waters of the United States. The amended section would contain penalty provisions.

A description of present diversity in authority is contained in the enclosure. It is believed desirable to concentrate in one agency the responsibility for prescribing and enforcing the requirements as to the lights and signals of these structures. The Coast Guard, which now has primary responsibility with respect to aids to maritime navigation generally, would appear to be the logical agency. Since the amended section is limited in its effect to the protection of maritime navigation, it would not in any way interfere with the existing authority of the Secretary of the Army to prescribe operating lights and signals for bridges.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,
H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM ACCOMPANYING A DRAFT BILL TO AMEND 14 U. S. C. 85

As background information for the proposed amendment to section 85 of title 14, an explanation of the present diversity of authority in connection with the lights and signals on various types of fixed structures is contained herein.

The act of August 7, 1882 (22 Stat. 309) and the act of March 23, 1906, as amended (34 Stat. 85; 33 U. S. C. 494) required owners and operators of bridges approved for construction under those acts to maintain, at their own expense such lights and other signals as prescribed by the Coast Guard. The General Bridge Act of 1946, as amended (60 Stat. 847; 33 U. S. C. 525–533), does not contain such a provision. While the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of the Army may include compliance with Coast Guard requirements as a condition of maintenance and operation of a bridge under this later act, the Coast Guard does not now have specific statutory authority to control the navigational lights and signals on bridges approved for construction after August 2, 1946.

With respect to dams over navigable waters of the United States, the Federal Power Commission, under section 18 of the Federal Water Power Act, as amended (41 Stat. 1073; 16 U. S. C. 811), is authorized to require licensees to construct, maintain, and operate at their own expense such lights and signals as may be directed by the Secretary of the Army.

In connection with the lighting or marking of fixed structures other than bridges or dams, the authority for the Coast Guard to require certain lights and signals thereon is now derived from clauses in individual construction permits issued by the Department of the Army pursuant to authority contained in the act of August 18, 1894, as amended (28 Stat. 362; 33 U. S. C. 1).

Proposed legislation similar to the present bill was introduced in the 81st Congress and was passed by the House of Representatives, but action was not completed thereon by the Senate. At that time, the Corps of Engineers informally indicated that the Department of the Army would be in favor of such legislation.

AMENDMENT OF DEFINITION OF "AIRMAN" IN CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Secretary Weeks explaining the purpose of this proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1379) to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 9, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed proposed bill to amend the definition of "airman" in the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, be introduced in the Senate at your earliest convenience.

As presently defined in section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (49 U. S. C. 401 (6)), the term "airman" includes, among other aeronautical occupations, "any individual who is directly in charge of the inspection, maintenance, overhauling, or repair of aircraft" or their components. Section 610 (a) (2) of the act declares that it is illegal "for any person to serve * * * as an airman * * * without an airman certificate" issued by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics of this Department. Thus all mechanics in charge of inspection, maintenance, overhauling, or repair of aircraft or their components in the United States must hold a certificate of competency issued by the Administrator. In consequence of this rigid provision of the act, some mechanics and repairmen are required to hold certificates although no substantial public interest requires it.

Aircraft manufacturers must employ certificated mechanics to repair their own products, although there is no such requirement with respect to the original production of the same article. Obviously a manufacturer who has demonstrated his ability to maintain the quality of his product under a Civil Aeronautics Administration production certificate is qualified to repair, restore, or rebuild the same product at his own factory.

Repair stations performing a great variety of special services to aircraft are also certificated by the Administrator of Civil Aeronautics. The qualifications of the employees are checked upon the initial application for the certificate, and the maintenance of a qualified staff, and of high standards in work done, is requisite to its retention. Since employee qualifications are cumulatively passed upon in connection with this Government certification and inspection program, it is unnecessary duplication to require in addition a check upon, and a certification of, the qualifications of the individual supervisory employees.

It is our opinion, therefore, that aviation safety does not require the certification either of mechanics who work for a manufacturer on aircraft and aircraft components which he produces, or of employees of a certificated repair station. The enclosed proposed bill would amend section 1 (6) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 so as to authorize the Civil Aeronautics Board to except persons so employed from the definition of "airman." This change would permit the elimination of regulation and control of these occupations where Government supervision serves no useful purpose. The Department of Commerce, therefore, recommends early and favorable consideration of this proposed legislation by the Congress.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that it would interpose no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

CIVIL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATION OF SECURITY PROVISIONS OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT OF 1938

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request of the Secretary of Commerce, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from Secretary Weeks explaining the purpose of this proposed legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1380) to authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (by request), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, February 16, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is requested that the enclosed draft of a bill be introduced in the Senate at your convenience. The purpose of the proposal is: "To authorize the imposition of civil penalties for violation of the security provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, and for other purposes."

Following the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, legislation was enacted authorizing the Secretary of Commerce, upon the direction of the President, to exercise control of the flight of aircraft over certain areas for national security purposes. (64 Stat. 825; title XII, Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; 49 U. S. C. 701–705.) Thereafter, an Executive order was issued by the President (Executive Order No. 10197, December 21, 1950), directing the Secretary to put the program into effect. At present the only sanctions which may be applied for violations of the security regulations which have been issued by the Secretary under that authority are either (1) suspension or revocation of the offender's pilot certificate or operating authority, or (2) in the case of willful offenses, criminal penalties. In most cases, neither of these sanctions is appropriate.

To an airline or other commercial pilot, suspension or revocation means loss of earnings, and to the air transport industries, loss of essential man-hours of skilled services. Suspension of the operating certificate of a carrier, for example, means loss of essential transportation service to the Nation. These results are both inappropriate to the times and too severe for the usual offense.

Criminal penalties are even more drastic, and thus even less appropriate in most of the cases presented. In any event, criminal intent is usually lacking in these cases, which generally involve some unauthorized entry into an air defense identification zone through oversight or neglect.

The civil penalty which is the normal sanction applied for minor violations of other safety provisions of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 would provide a moderate and expeditious remedy more appropriate to these technical violations. An amendment to the law is necessary to authorize the imposition of that sanction in such cases. The attached bill would provide that authority; it would amend section 901 (a) of the act so as to include within those infractions for which a civil penalty may be imposed, any violation of a "rule, regulation, or order issued under title XII" of the act.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that it has no objection to the transmission of this letter and proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

SINCLAIR WEEKS,
Secretary of Commerce.

INCORPORATION OF SOCIETY OF THE 28TH DIVISION

Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to incorporate the Society of the 28th Division. All three of the sponsors of this bill are veterans of that organization, and every State in the Union is represented in the 28th Division. Fourteen States are represented as the incorporators.

Units of the 28th Division trace their history back to the Revolution. It first fought as a division in World War I, and was the fourth division in the whole United States Army in number of casualties. It also fought in World War II, in Germany, and during the Korean conflict, was a part of our occupational troops in Germany.

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

The bill (S. 1381) to incorporate the Society of the 28th Division, introduced by Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. KERR, and Mr. POTTER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

IMPROVEMENT OF TIMBER DEVELOPMENT IN NATIONAL FORESTS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill designed to improve timber development in national forests and to simplify the work of the Forest Service. This bill provides that 10 percent of all moneys received from the sale of timber and other forest products on the national forests during each fiscal year shall be available at the end thereof when appropriated by Congress. The bill further provides that these funds shall continue to be available until expended under such regulations as the Secretary of Agriculture may prescribe within the national forests in the States from which such receipts are derived for improvement. In other words, the funds made available by this proposed bill would facilitate needed improvement of timber stand through pruning, thinning, burning, poisoning, girdling, controlling rodents, and other improved cultural methods.

Membership on the National Forest Reservation Commission has given me an opportunity to observe the fine progress which the Forestry Service is making and also some of the problems facing reforestation.

I have been very much impressed with the work being accomplished under the Knutson-Vandenberg Act which, in my opinion, is extremely important and highly beneficial. However, some of the most urgent needs for reforestation and timber-stand improvement work on the national forest are on areas where timber sales are not yet possible. The present program is not adequate to provide needed improvement for these areas. There is a substantial area of timberlands which were cut over when in private ownership and now included in national forest regions. These areas are badly in need of stand improvement and reforestation measures. An example of such a situation is found in my State of Mississippi where 110,000 acres are in need of planting and another 100,000 acres which have been planted but in critical need of weeding and thinning. I also understand other desired work would include cutting and girdling low valued trees in 56,000 acres of natural stands of longleaf pine-scrub oak type in Mississippi. There are similar needs for the same type of work in Louisiana, Texas, Alabama, Florida, and South Carolina.

Officials of the Department of Agriculture estimate the cost of the high priority work for all national forests in the neighborhood of $115 million, which includes tree planting, timber-stand improvement, thinning, disease control—except white-pine blister rust—and rodent control work. This need when compared with present appropriations of less than $1 million—$810,000—for fiscal 1955 falls far short of meeting the critical need in developing reforestation and timber stand improvement work. The estimated $800,000 provided in the 1956 fiscal budget is not adequate to even restore the acreage of timber land annually destroyed nationwide by fire. Therefore, the backlog of work is increasing each year. The $115 million estimated for high priority work is far short of covering the cost of reforestation of the estimated 4 million acres within all national forests which need work so badly. Actually, these estimates would cover only the high priority work that should be accomplished on nonsale areas within a normal 10-year period.

Timber stand improvement measures and reforestation on several million acres where commercial cutting is not feasible cannot be accomplished under the provisions of the Knutson-Vandenberg Act. Neither can rodent control for the protection of established production and growing stock be protected under that act.

Mr. President, in my opinion the appropriation provided for in this bill amounting to about $7 million annually, based on the average of last 3-year sale of timber and other forest products on national forests, is not an expenditure, but can be considered a sound investment. I firmly believe that this is a pressing problem and I hope it will be given full consideration by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

The bill (S. 1383) to amend the act entitled "An act to facilitate and simplify the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes," approved April 24, 1950 (64 Stat. 82), introduced by Mr. STENNIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

TRUST ASSOCIATION OF H. KEMPNER — REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 542 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself and Mr. DANIEL) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 73), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 542) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Trust Association of H. Kempner" now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Court of Claims;

and the court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

COMMISSION TO STUDY COPYRIGHT LAWS—INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF BILL

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on March 2, 1955, I introduced the bill (S. 1254) creating a Federal commission to study the copyright laws and to make recommendations for their revision. I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of the bill be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from North Dakota? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 38, consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, and that the joint resolution be appropriately referred.

It is my understanding that in previous years proposed legislation relating to this subject has been referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I see on the floor of the Senate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe that is also his understanding, that compacts relating to oil and gas generally are referred to his committee.

Mr. MURRAY. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROTECTION OF VALUES OF CERTAIN LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, under date of January 24 last the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] introduced Senate bill 687, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to protect the timber and other surface values of lands within the national forests, and for other purposes, and it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. The bill really deals with mining, and should be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

SUPPLEMENTARY BENEFITS FOR RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE IN CERTAIN CASES—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] may appear as a joint cosponsor of Senate bill 627, to provide supplementary benefits for recipients of public assistance and benefits for others who are in need through the issuance of certificates to be used in the acquisition of surplus agricultural food products.

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

ANALYSIS AND REEVALUATION OF HUMAN AND ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF MENTAL ILLNESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, since the introduction of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 46) providing for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the human and economic problems of mental illness, and for other purposes, and pursuant to my previous request, the names of the following Senators have been added as additional cosponsors: Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. LANGER, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. IVES, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. SYMINGTON.

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES — REFERENCE OF RESOLUTION TO COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 45, the resolution (S. Res. 72) authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services, be taken from the calendar and referred to the Committee and Rules and Administration.

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

PROHIBITION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. LANGER submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 923) to prohibit the transportation in interstate commerce of advertisements of alcoholic beverages, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENTS

Mr. PAYNE submitted amendments, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED REVENUE ACT OF 1955—AMENDMENTS

Mr. NEUBERGER (for himself and Mr. MORSE) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 4259) to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal-tax rate and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a $20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

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

By Mr. KERR:

Transcript of discussion on the "Capitol Cloakroom" radio program between Senator LONG and newspaper correspondents on March 5, 1955.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Address delivered by Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at the Second Century Convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Recent correspondence between himself and Hon. Edmund G. Brown, attorney general of California, with reference to efforts to combat crime.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

Document prepared under his direction relating to the historical development of the conference committee.

PROTECTION OF CONSUMERS OF NATURAL GAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the consumers of our Nation are following most anxiously the opening stages of the battle in the current 84th Congress which will determine whether or not the consuming public will be protected from being gouged by skyrocketing natural-gas rates.

It is my earnest hope that the very unsound legislation which has been introduced for the purpose of depriving consumers of protection will be rejected by the Senate and House of Representatives. This has been my position ever since the inception of this battle many years ago, and it remains my position.

I have, moreover, communicated to the President, respectfully urging that he reject the recent gas-exemption recommendations which were unfortunately made by the Committee on National Fuel Policy.

I present a letter which I wrote to the President, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

Hon. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
The President of the United States,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing most respectfully to urge that you reject the recommendations of the Commission which had been appointed to study the Nation's fuel policies insofar as those recommendations relate to proposed exempting of natural gas from Federal control.

With all due respect to the distinguished members of that Commission, may I say frankly that in my judgment, were the recommendations of the Commission adopted, the net effects might be:

(a) To leave the consumers of the United States at the helpless mercy of a relatively small number of companies who have in the past shown themselves eager to skyrocket rates as high as the traffic would bear;

(b) somewhat to demoralize the people of the United States by weakening their respect of judicial process. Thus, decontrol would lead many people to feel that the judgment of the Supreme Court (which had fully confirmed the legality of such Federal control) has been arbitrarily tossed into the wastebasket because the majority decision did not please certain private interests and because those interests proceeded to raise a misleading hue and cry for decontrol.

May I say that I very definitely believe that in all fairness the investors in the vital natural-gas industry are entitled to a fair return on their investment and that they should be given sufficient incentive.

But unless they are subject to Federal control (which is, of course, always subject to court review), the respective consuming States like my own would be virtually helpless in trying to establish reasonable prices by the time the over-priced gas were to come into the respective State borders.

If we were to accept the absurd line of reasoning that the natural gas industry must be decontrolled in order for it to expand operations, then we would end up by scrapping Federal controls on railroads, on airplanes, on electric utilities, on the ground that Federal controls discourage those operations, too. I say that the public interest, through regulation, must remain superior to that of any purely private interest.

May I say, too, that the national defense with which you are naturally principally concerned, can best be served by reasonable Federal controls on natural gas.

Very shortly, Mr. President, I should like to submit to you the names of members of a highly qualified municipal delegation which would like to visit with you to explain the case for control of natural gas. I have been in close contact with Mr. Shanley toward such a meeting.

I know how heavy and time consuming are the countless burdens of your office and those of your staff, but I trust that you will find it possible to give this issue your considered personal judgment in consultation with staff experts.

With highest esteem of your great services, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

THE NARCOTICS PROBLEM IN THE FAR EAST

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over a period of many months, I have pointed out to the Nation the seriousness of the problem of narcotics addiction among United States servicemen in the Far East.

Fortunately, this problem does not affect more than a very small proportion of our servicemen in that theater.

Nevertheless, as was pointed out during Foreign Relations Committee hearings which I conducted on the International Opium Protocol, Communist China has been flooding free Asia and the rest of the world with opium. And one of her main targets consists of American servicemen. Fortunately, I am glad to note that yesterday, the Senate Rules Committee approved Senate Resolution 67 offered by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] for a review of this addiction problem by a Judiciary Subcommittee.

By way of depicting various phases of the problem in the Far East, I send to the desk now excerpts from a report as furnished by the headquarters of the United States Army Forces for the Far East, Office of the Provost Marshal General, to Dr. Frank B. Berry, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

I believe that this background information will be of interest to my colleagues. While it does not relate the overall grim statistics but confines itself to exploratory data, it will help flash a warning to our people. This narcotics problem is no accident, no mere coincidence. It is obvious that Red China is determined to continue her diabolic drive to subvert the world through dope.

The latest warning of that danger came from Narcotics Bureau Commissioner Harry Anslinger, at his recent testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee.

I believe that only the most vigorous and articulate reaction by the conscience of the free world can serve to deter Red China from her present infamous campaign.

In addition, the most effective detection and enforcement efforts will be necessary on the part of all the free nations.

Unfortunately, however, in the Far East, particularly, only the most insignificant fraction of what could be done and should be done against the dope problem is now being done. The evil of domestic corruption allies itself with the evil of international trafficking and the result is to further endanger the free nations of that area.

I ask unanimous consent that the background material from the Defense Department be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEMORANDUM ON FAR EAST NARCOTICS PROBLEM

HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES
ARMY FORCES, FAR EAST,
OFFICE OF THE PROVOST MARSHAL,
APO 343, September 29, 1954.

INTRODUCTION

This briefing will cover the law enforcement and confinement program pertinent to the narcotics situation in Far East Command. The scope of the briefing encompasses several phases of police activity; jurisdiction, liaison arrangements with other agencies, apprehension methods employed, types of persons and drugs involved in illegal narcotics traffic, and procedures for handling narcotics offenders in military confinement facilities.

THE APPREHENSION PROGRAM

1. Jurisdiction

A. Service personnel and civilians accompanying United States forces. The Manual for Courts-martial, which governs all three services, provides jurisdiction over civilian personnel, and by one service over personnel of another service in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. This is particularly applicable to service police personnel on duty. The post, base, or station commander is charged with discipline within the installation, and the operation of routine patrols in the vicinity of the installation. Most narcotics apprehensions, however, are made as the result of criminal investigation, or detective work. In Far East Command the Army is charged with "off-post" criminal investigation, except in specific areas where Air Force or Navy personnel predominate, such as at Tachikawa Air Base, or Yokosuka Naval Station. Under those situations agreements have been reached whereby the Air Force or Navy will conduct "off-post" investigations in those areas.

B. Japanese nationals. United States Armed Forces police do not have jurisdiction over Japanese nationals. The Japanese police are responsible for the police of Japanese citizens and foreigners living on the Japanese economy.

C. Korean nationals. United States Armed Forces police have limited jurisdiction over Korean nationals. Through agreements with the Korean Government, military police have authority to apprehend Korean nationals who commit offenses against United States property or persons. When apprehended the violators are delivered immediately to the Korean authorities for prosecution. The Korean national police have primary responsibility for apprehension of Korean law violators.

2. Liaison arrangements

A. Indigenous police. In consideration of the responsibilities of the Japanese and Korean Governments, the United States Armed Forces have not insisted upon authority to apprehend citizens of the two countries. Very satisfactory liaison arrangements have been effected that permit indigenous police to operate with United States Armed Forces police. In actuality the agreements have permitted a free exchange of police information on law violations, and if an apprehension is to be effected or a raid conducted, the police with unprejudiced jurisdiction are present to accomplish the task.

B. Narcotics Bureau of United States Treasury Department. The illegal narcotics traffic is such a problem in the United States that the Treasury Department maintains representatives in the Far East to help combat the traffic. Information on illegal narcotics or narcotics users is freely exchanged between United States Armed Forces police and the United States Treasury representative in Tokyo, Mr. Kent Lewis.

C. Indigenous governments. Continuous liaison with the Japanese Government is maintained for the Far East Command by Army forces, Far East Provost Marshal Liaison Division. The Chief of the Division acts as chairman of the Joint Committee for Suppression of Vice. The committee was organized in 1952 when the articles of agreement between the United States and Japan were signed. The commanding general of the Army forces was designated as responsible for police liaison with the Japanese Government for all three services. The committee provides for a mutual exchange of

information and coordination of effort, including legislation, toward suppression of illegal narcotics and other forms of vice in Japan.

The commanding general, Eighth United State Army, was delegated responsibility for liaison activities in Korea, and has effected a similar arrangement with the Republic of Korea Government aimed at the suppression of vice in Korea.

3. Apprehension methods employed

A. No unusual or sensational methods are employed in the apprehension program. Investigators are trained to observe, and to follow leads received from any source. Information on users or distributors and their source of supply is carefully investigated until the violators are apprehended or further investigation is useless.

B. Military investigators work very closely with the Korean and Japanese police. This is more important in the narcotics suppression program, perhaps than in any other phase of investigative activity because of the intermingling of civilian suppliers and servicemen users. In the metropolitan areas where the traffic is greater, special investigators are assigned exclusively to the narcotics program. Representatives of the Japanese police are assigned on a permanent basis to work with the United States investigators on the suppression of narcotics.

C. Army Forces, Far East, and Far East Air Forces each have an investigator group assigned to the headquarters which are available for immediate dispatch to assist local investigators in any part of the command. Special investigators are dispatched to a locality having an increase in narcotics incidents or suspected large-scale traffic in heoin or other drugs.

D. Science is also employed in the narcotics apprehension program. A lie detector is a standard piece of equipment in the larger criminal investigation detachments, and available to the smaller detachments. A complete criminal investigation laboratory is maintained in Tokyo for the benefit of any law enforcement agency that desires technical assistance in analysis of suspect articles or material. In addition to the Far East Criminal Investigation Laboratory, there is a medical laboratory in Tokyo, and another in Korea, which are available to investigators. All of the laboratories use the latest methods, such as paper chromotography, and are capable of detecting the most minute quantities of narcotics adhering to instruments, or present in specimens. The laboratories are invaluable in apprehending and convicting persons who use narcotics.

4. Statistical analysis of narcotics situation

A. The accumulation and analysis of statistical data is a vital part of police work. A successful narcotics suppression program must be based on knowledge of the type of person involved, the kind and source of the drugs used, and the attitude of the indigenous population in the locality.

B. The narcotics offender in the Far East.

(1) Usually he is a soldier. The Army has approximately 65 percent of the personnel in the command, but furnishes 80 percent of the convicted violators. The incidence of narcotics apprehensions among Army troops is twice as great as the incidence among Air Force and Navy personnel.

(2) Usually he is a Negro. Seventy-eight percent—3 out of every 4—are Negro. This is a very high proportion, and becomes even higher when command population ratios are compared. Only 13 percent of the command are Negroes, as against 78 percent of the offenders. The incidence among Negro troops is 20 times the incidence among white troops—14 per thousand compared to seven-tenths of 1 per thousand. This preponderance also exists among juvenile narcotics users in the United States. Negroes represent about 10 percent of the total juveniles but furnish 75 percent of the narcotics users.

(3) The violator is a reasonably well educated person. Seven percent have attended grade school, 87 percent have attended high school, and 6 percent have attended college.

(4) The majority are not new to the service, nor newly arrived in the Far East. In total service time, 29 percent have under 2 years, 34 percent have from 2 to 3 years, and 36 percent have over 3 years service. The amount of time in the Far East is very comparable to total service time. Thirty-five percent have been here less than 1 year, 42 percent have been here from 1 to 2 years, and 18 percent have been here more than 2 years.

(5) Many are chronic disciplinary problems. Twenty-one percent have been convicted by court-martial of other offenses once, 19 percent have been convicted twice, 20 percent have been convicted 3 or more times.

(6) The narotics problem is not confined to the Far East. There are an estimated[1] 50,000 adult, and 10,000 adolescent, addicts in the United States. It was reasonable to assume that some servicemen used narcotics before coming to the Far East. Research among convicted offenders revealed that many had. Nineteen percent used narcotics in civilian life before coming into the service, 5 percent first used narcotics after coming into the service, but while still stationed in the United States. Seventy-three percent first used narcotics after coming to the Far East; 40 percent in Japan, and 33 percent in Korea.

(7) Who induces the servicemen to use narcotics? Records show that 20 percent were introduced to drug use by prostitutes, 39 percent by service friends, 21 percent by civilian friends, and 20 percent by peddlers. Efforts directed against prostitution, and efforts to remove narcotics users from nonusers, reduces the possibility of others becoming users.

(8) It is a basic conclusion that among narcotics users there is a close affinity between the type of drug available and the user's choice of drug. Most of the world's supply of opium originates on the Asiatic mainland. The choice of drug in the Far East is an opium derivative. Heroin is the overwhelming choice—80 percent of the total. It is easy to conceal, the effect is quicker, and it can be taken in a number of ways. These factors are important to a person who uses or traffics in narcotics. Less than 1 percent of the illegal narcotics is raw opium. It is too difficult to conceal, and too difficult to use. Among narcotics users opium smoking is passé. Marihuana, synthetic opium derivatives, benzedrine, and other nervous system stimulants are used to some extent, but not to the same extent as heroin.

(9) The illegal narcotics traffic is not confined to service personnel. They do not smuggle or sell drugs. The smugglers and sellers are indigenous civilians, with whom the servicemen associate more or less freely and, over whom service police or courts have no jurisdiction. A soldier, sailor, or airman apprehended for a narcotics violation is almost certain to be tried by court martial, and if the evidence warrants, convicted. If convicted he will certainly be sentenced to confinement. The same attitude is taken by civil courts in the United States. Our national attitude toward illegal narcotics demands it. Such is not the case in Korea and Japan where the national attitude toward the traffic is more tolerant. Long association with the narcotics problem causes them to treat it more lightly than we do in the United States.

[1] Control of Narcotics Addiction, by George E. Connery, Washington, D. C.; published in J. A. M. A., vol. 147, No. 12, pp. 1162–1165, dated Nov. 17, 1951.

Japanese officials are becoming increasingly aware of the evils of narcotics and have passed many laws to control the traffic. Lesser officials, and the mass of the people, still regard the illegal traffic with no particular concern. Fifty percent of those apprehended are not brought to trial, 13 percent are given suspended sentences, 11 percent are given sentences of more than 1 year, 23 percent are given sentences of less than 1 year, 2 percent are fined more than 5,000 yen, and 1 percent are fined less than 5,000 yen. As a basis of comparison of the value of the fine, a housemaid will receive 6 to 10,000 yen monthly, and an average laborer will earn approximately 10,000 yen per month.

In Korea the situation is worse than it is in Japan. Of those narcotics cases referred to the prosecutor's office, 62 percent were dismissed without trial, 26 percent were tried by a summary court, and only 11 percent were tried by a court capable of sentencing to long prison terms. This chart does not show those cases summarily handled by the police and not referred to the prosecutor's office. There are only scattered statistics on police cases, but we know a very high percent of the cases are handled in the police station and never referred for trial. Narcotics offenders in Korea are never out of circulation for very long periods. There are many reasons for this. The government is bankrupt. Narcotics users are seldom productive workers and Korean prisons are expected to be self-supporting. Graft is commonplace. The general attitude of the Korean people toward narcotics is one of complete unconcern, despite laws forbidding the traffic.

CONFINEMENT PROCEDURES

1. A serviceman apprehended for a narcotics violation is tried by court-martial, and if found guilty, confined in a local stockade or guardhouse until the case is reviewed by the convening authority.

2. If in Japan, the prisoner is transferred directly to the United States Army Stockade in Tokyo when the sentence is approved. If in Korea, the prisoner is transferred immediately to the Pusan Military Post Stockade, and at the earliest opportunity transferred to the United States Army Stockade in Tokyo.

3. When the prisoner arrives at the United States Army Stockade in Tokyo he has actually entered the military penitentiary system. He is interviewed and completely classified as to background, type of offense, type of custody, and many other ways by the prison staff. The results of the interviews and classification determination will have a bearing on possible future rehabilitation and parole. The prisoner is held in Tokyo until shipped to the United States in a packet of other prisoners, either to serve his sentence, or earn parole.

4. The Narcotics Bureau of the United States Treasury Department is furnished the names of all prisoners convicted of narcotics offenses when they are shipped to the United States. This practice avoids the possibility of convicted narcotics offenders being released among the civilian population without the knowledge of the principal United States narcotics control agency.

5. At all stages of movement from local stockades to the United States, the prisoner is furnished necessary medical attention, carefully observed, and searched many times for narcotics or other contraband.

SUMMARY

We know we have a problem in the illegal use of narcotics by servicemen in the Far East. We do not think the problem is out of proportion, under the circumstances. The Orient is the traditional center of the illegal narcotics traffic. The attitude of the indigenous civilians is generally one of indifference and tolerance toward the use of drugs. It is not unusual for an otherwise honest worker to sell heroin in his spare

time to supplement his income. Opium and its derivatives are more available, and cheaper, here than in the United States. There is a wide variance in the price of narcotics. From day to day, and locality to locality, there are wide fluctuations. At the moment a 0.5-gram deck of heroin sells in southern Japan for 500 yen, $1.38. The same amount of heroin in New York City or Chicago would probably sell for more than $10, perhaps as much as $50.

Statistics on illegal users of narcotics in the United States show that 50 percent of the total are between 21 and 30 years old. Almost all service personnel in the Far East Command are in that age group.

Research among offending service personnel brought out the information that 24 percent were using narcotics in the United States. Many of those convicted of narcotics offenses in the Far East were previously convicted of other offenses, some of them 3 and 4 times. This group probably would have started to use narcotics had they never come to the Far East.

In view of these facts it is surprising that the ratio of users is as small as it is.

We are not attempting to pass over the problem. We are constantly working at it the same as we are at blackmarket, prostitution, pilferage, and other crimes. We maintain liaison with the Japanese and Korean officials, and keep pressure on them to work at the problem from the civilian angle. We spread the available men, money, and time as thick as we can on each of the problems. Unfortunately, it is never thick enough to eliminate any of the problems. We can devote enough effort to all of them to hold them in check.

We believe that the program of enforcement now in effect will keep the illegal use of narcotics by servicemen to a minimum.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS G. MASARYK

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, yesterday, March 7th, marked the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, following my remarks, a statement I have prepared in recognition of this noteworthy occasion.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR IVES

Today, on the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, his unwavering faith and devotion to freedom which brought to realization his dreams of a free Czechoslovakia, continue to sustain the gallant Czech people in their dark hour.

Thomas Masaryk was a man of far-reaching accomplishments. But above all was his compassionate dedication to democratic ideals, which embraced all peoples. In every sense this great patriot was a world leader and humanitarian.

The legacy of liberty which Masaryk left to his beloved land will never be obliterated by the Soviet despots. It is enshrined in the hearts of his people who bravely resist the ruthless Communist tyranny.

This anniversary of Masaryk's birth should provide renewed courage to the brave people of Czechoslovakia. Equally it should provide determination to free peoples everywhere that the march of Communist despotism must be stopped.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, yesterday, March 7, marked the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the late President of Czechoslovakia, who died some years ago.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement which I have prepared in commemoration of this anniversary be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR LEHMAN

March 7 marks the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, that great world statesman and fighter for democracy, the late President of Czechoslovakia.

Thomas G. Masaryk was one of the world's great scholars and writers. His contributions to the writings of our times on the subject of democracy are of lasting significance.

His death, in 1937, at the age of 87, brought to an end one of the most fruitful lives of our time.

Today, the people of his beloved Czechoslovakia are living under the yoke of Communist enslavement. The memory of Thomas G. Masaryk, and the democratic ideals which he nurtured throughout his life bring continual hope to the people of Czechoslovakia. We have a special obligation to these people, who have kept the torch of freedom burning through the many long nights of foreign oppression and occupation. We must continually show, by our actions, that we are working toward eventual liberation of the people of Czechoslovakia. Such action by Americans should include the liberalization of our immigration and refugee laws to provide a haven in the United States for some of the refugees and escapees from Czechoslovakia. We must strengthen the Voice of America, so that the voices of freedom will continue to penetrate the Iron Curtain. In the Senate of the United States, we should press for the ratification of the Genocide Convention as a demonstration to the world of our conviction that the destruction of national, racial, or religious groups will be punished before the bar of international justice. Through these, and many other acts of faith in freedom, we in these United States will be preserving the fundamental principles for which Thomas G. Masaryk devoted his life.

SUBMARGINAL LANDS IN ARID AND SEMIARID AREAS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, on February 9 last, I introduced S. 1023, which has been referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. This bill directs the Secretary of Agriculture to exercise his authority under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, to retire submarginal lands located in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States.

Two of the important problems which confront this country are drought and agricultural surpluses. My bill seeks to take some of the marginal agricultural lands out of cropland. This, in my opinion, would be a step in the right direction.

It would assure that there would be no tilling of land which, while it is not needed, may be seriously eroded during the first dry period and at the first windstorm.

If we have too much land under cultivation, which is a certainty because we are reducing both wheat and cotton total acreage planted, then the wisest course is to keep idle acres or diverted acres under the protection of grass or legume crops. There would then be created a reserve or a good earth deposit, just the same as a cash deposit would be created in the bank, awaiting some future need. This practice would definitely assist in bringing about an orderly reduction of crops which are now in surplus.

As will be recalled, title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, enacted in 1937, provided specific authority for a program of Federal purchase of submarginal lands which had been in operation under emergency relief legislation since 1934.

During the period 1934 to 1942, 10,086,000 acres were acquired under the program. The bulk of this acreage acquired, or 6,440,731 acres, was used for grazing in 1953.

No lands were acquired subsequent to 1942, in part because of changed conditions brought about by World War II, when increased production of food and fiber was essential.

I wish to call attention to a report by the Administrator of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture to the Governors' Conference, April 26, 1954, in which the Administrator stated:

Two principal areas—one in southeastern Colorado and southwestern Kansas and the other in western Texas and eastern New Mexico—are in the most critical condition. Within these areas more than half of the cropland has been damaged. And it is from these areas that our worst dust storms have been coming. The severe damage in the two critical areas is due, in part, to the large acreage of grassland that has been plowed up and planted to wheat or cotton during the last 12 years.

Best estimates indicate that about 2 million acres of grassland have been converted to wheatland in the northern part of this region since 1942. Soil surveys indicate that at least 75 percent of this new wheatland is unsuited for cultivation. Most of it is in the western drier part of the region and has shallow or sandy soils. Such land will produce profitable crops only during wet years and will blow readily during drought years.

More than 1½ million acres of sandy land in the southern part of the region have been converted from grassland to cottonfields in the last 12 years. Nearly all of it is now blowing severely, and some of it has been blowing ever since it was first plowed. Newly formed sand dunes from 20 to 30 feet high may be found in many of the cottonfields of this area.

Out of the lands presently in cultivation, about seven or eight million acres have thin or sandy soils or lie in such low rainfall areas that they are unsuited for cultivation. These lands should never have been plowed. They should be diverted as quickly as possible to a permanent grass cover.

Supporting such legislative authorization as is proposed in my bill are many qualified individuals who appreciate the seriousness of the problem sought to be solved, and who are greatly concerned over the possibility of serious duststorms this year. They have specifically pointed out certain critical areas, such as western Texas, eastern New Mexico, western Oklahoma, western Kansas, eastern Colorado, southwestern Nebraska, and southeastern Wyoming.

The Soil Conservation Service has reviewed a recent survey of all lands in the United States, and officials estimate that approximately 20 million acres of cropland in 17 Western States covered by my bill are unsuitable for cultivation under

present methods of farming. This is approximately half such classified land existing in the United States.

In addition, there are approximately 25 million acres in these Western States which are now being farmed, but which would be classified on the borderline of lands suitable for farming and those not suitable. In other words, 25 million acres would be suitable for farming under best known methods, but normal weather conditions would have to prevail throughout the growing period.

No authority exists, and none would exist under the provisions of my bill, for sale of title III lands to private ownership, and exchanges could be made only if the Secretary of Agriculture found that they would not conflict with the purposes of the act.

The lands retired, therefore, would not be returned to improper utilization, but would be restricted principally to grazing.

Government ownership and leasing of these lands would further provide an example of proper utilization for surrounding landowners, and make it feasible for them to convert from cropping to livestock production with the aid of summer range leased from the Federal Government.

As I have already stated, wheat and cotton production are now being controlled through marketing quotas.

Surpluses in other commodities necessitate reductions in their production either through quotas, economic forces, or by some other means.

The bill which I have introduced provides for reductions, to the extent feasible for retirement of lands primarily unsuitable for production, which constitute a hazard to the communities in which they are situated.

There appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Sunday, February 27, 1955, an article by Mr. Aubrey Graves, which deals with this important question. The article is most timely, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TWENTY MILLION ACRES ARE READY TO BLOW

(By Aubrey Graves)

The specter of continuing and worsening drought hovers over many areas of the country, particularly the Southern Great Plains. After 4 (and in some cases 5) dry years, some sections face conditions that can become more acute than those of 1954.

Compounding the accumulated effect of prolonged drought come depressing reports of greatly below normal winter precipitation. In 11 western States as of February 1, the mountain snowpack and reservoir storage, for instance, were reported to be low—in some areas, dangerously so.

More than 4 million acres of land have been damaged by wind erosion this winter, according to late Soil Conservation Service advices. Most of this soil blowing occurred in December. The high-velocity wind months (March and April) are yet to come.

"We are praying that in the period immediately ahead we get more moisture than we get wind," Harvey Dahl, Agriculture Department drought-program official, said last week.

MORE DISASTER AREAS

Last spring's soil blowing was the most widespread and severe since 1938. In some localities moisture and crop conditions have deteriorated still further since then. In the 1954 emergency, 945 of the Nation's 3,000 counties were given Federal drought relief. Today about 1,050 counties are officially designated disaster areas.

In Colorado the mountain snow cover in some regions is down to 50 percent of normal. The upland soils are dry. In 47 Colorado reservoirs storage is only about one-fifth of normal. In New Mexico flow of the three streams feeding into the San Luis Valley is expected to be three-fourths of normal. In this area the reservoir storage is 50 percent below the 10-year average.

In greatest jeopardy this spring are southeastern Wyoming, the extreme southwestern corner of Nebraska, eastern Colorado, western Kansas, the extreme northeastern part of New Mexico, and the Panhandles of Oklahoma and Texas. More than 20 million acres, according to statements by Agriculture Department spokesmen, are ready to blow.

Soil Conservation Service Administrator D. A. Williams blames present difficulties largely on 2 things: (1) The continued plowing up of range lands unsuitable for cultivation, and (2) improper farming and grazing methods. "There are now," he says, "about seven or eight million acres in cultivation in this region that should never have been cultivated."

There were few dust storms back in the early days when the hoofs of Indian ponies and buffaloes were about the only things that agitated the prairie sod. Until the coming of the white man (about 1870), wild grasses held the topsoil in place. But with the white man came the plow.

Moist seasons favored the first crops the settlers planted. They plowed up ever more land. But in 1890 came a dry growing season. The drought persisted for 4 years. Crop disasters were general in the Great Plains in 1894. Many farmers moved away.

In 1896 came the rains and shortly afterward the farmers returned. Fortune in the form of weather favored them for most of the next 14 years.

By 1912 the pendulum had swung back. In that year 65,000 acres of cropland in one Kansas county alone blew away. In the following spring, 38 dust storms lowered visibility to less than 1 mile on the southwestern plains.

In 1933, though the soil was extremely dry, only 22 hard blows occurred; the winds that spring were unusually mild. Forty storms plagued the area in 1935. In 1936 there were 68; in 1937, 72.

During these years, President Franklin D. Roosevelt proposed to plant belts of trees to serve as windbreaks at points throughout the Great Plains where cultivated fields were most unprotected. Farmers were educated to the advantages of contour plowing and strip cropping in combating erosion.

THE QUICK PROFIT

The great demands for wheat and cotton created by World Wars I and II are blamed for man's misuse of much western soil. It was not just the "suitcase farmers" of those eras who were responsible. These were the fly-by-nights who came in, leased lands and put in crops. In years of good crops, they took a quick profit and departed, leaving the fields devoid of protective winter cover.

The landowners themselves were guilty of the same offense, to a lesser degree. When they saw the possibility of making more money by plowing than by leaving their holdings in grass, they plowed.

Only one State—Colorado—has a law which really forces a man to protect his farmland in time of drought. Landowners there are required to "chisel" their fields when the soil starts blowing. A narrow plow point turns up moist soil in small ridges to arrest the destructive action of the wind. The State itself performs this service, and levies the cost of it against the treated land, just as it levies taxes. A few other States have wind erosion laws but with far less teeth in them.

SCS Administrator Williams believes that one of the big jobs of his agency is to induce farmers and ranchers of the arid and semi-arid areas to farm and ranch "according to the existing climate, not according to what they hope it will be."

Soil surveys of the region show a wide variety of land conditions, ranging from that suitable for permanent cultivation (if good soil and water conservation practices are used) to that suitable only for range. In between these extremes are areas of hazardous croplands.

A farmer may produce profitable crops on this land in wet years, but he usually has a crop failure in drought years. And when drought persists the soil starts to blow away.

"After the soil blowing starts it is too late to plant grass on the land," Williams points out. "Hence, it usually continues to blow until another wet spell comes. By that time much of it may have been so seriously damaged that it will no longer produce profitable crops even in the wet years."

Williams says that our present dilemma was caused in part by improper methods of cultivating and grazing.

"The improper farming or grazing," Williams adds, "is not always done by the man whose crops and land are damaged. Some fields with an excellent cover of productive stubble or straw are covered with drifting silt or sand from nearby unprotected fields. Some good grassland was smothered with dust from adjacent misused land.

"There were many conservation farmers who followed the best advice they could get, yet saw their crops ruined and their land damaged by their neighbors' careless practices."

The problem of wind erosion, he insists, must be attacked on a community basis.

Williams reports that farmers cooperating in soil conservation measures in the potential Dust Bowl areas are practicing stubble-mulch tillage (leaving winter crops or wheat stubble and high-cut cotton stalks) on about 5.5 million acres. They are plowing on the contour on another 6 million acres and have built about 150,000 miles of terraces. They have reseeded nearly 1 million acres to grass since 1938.

There are at least 7 million acres of land which should not be cultivated at all, Williams says, land with thin or sandy soil, or land in low-rainfall areas. "These should be diverted to grass as soon as possible," he says.

The persistent drought harassing the farmer makes the men in the city street wonder what has been happening to the weather in recent years. Has less rain and snow fallen on the country as a whole, and has the climate actually gotten hotter?

Dr. Harry Wexler, Chief of the Scientific Services Division of the United States Weather Bureau, has a quick answer to the latter question. The earth, he says, has become only 2.2 degrees hotter in the last 60 years. In Philadelphia the rise has been 4 degrees since 1870.

The weather scientists assure that, on the average, the 48 States as a whole receive just about as much precipitation one year as another. It is just that the pattern shifts.

In recent years the Pacific coast, the northern border of the country and New England have been getting more than their normal share of the precipitation. The Great Plains and the South—including Maryland and Virginia—have been short-changed. Some reason is given to hope that the pattern will change back again, sooner or later.

Virginia in particular hopes it will be sooner, Arlington and Alexandria found it necessary to ration water last summer. Some Fairfax County areas were left dry by the private utilities companies for days at a time. Wells went dry that had never gone dry before.

Prolonged dry weather decimated crops throughout the northern part of the State. And many a Virginia Guernsey got her drinking water courtesy of the volunteer fire department, which hauled it to her in fire engines.

Virginia uses about 1,300 gallons of water per capita per day. The average citizen, of course, does not use that much. The manufacture of 1 ton of steel, for instance, requires 65,000 gallons of water. It takes 300,000 gallons to make a ton of rayon.

More than 27,000 gallons of water is needed to irrigate an acre of land to the depth of 1 inch, and there were more than 700 irrigation systems taking water from Virginia streams during last summer's drought.

Virginia has an annual rainfall of about 42 inches. About one-third of it flows away unbeneficially to the sea.

With population increasing the way it is, there is a growing conviction that Virginia will have to adopt some sort of legislation regulating the use of water, perhaps as the Western States do. A State legislature commission on water resources opened public hearings at Staunton Friday. It hopes to make water-use recommendations to the next general assembly.

"The State needs a water code which recognizes the rights of everybody," said Dr. H. N. Young, director of the Agricultural Experiment Station at Blacksburg and a member of the commission.

By "everybody," he meant the farmer through whose fields a stream runs, the farmer who lives near a stream and feels he has a right to some of it, and the city fellow miles away who depends on the stream for his drinking and bath water.

Mr. THYE. I also ask that the bill, Senate bill 1023, to retire submarginal lands from the production of surplus agricultural commodities, be printed in the RECORD at this point in order that all may see just what the bill proposes.

There being no objection, the Senate bill, 1023, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to exercise the authority granted to him by title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to retire from the production of agricultural commodities in surplus supply lands in the arid and semiarid areas of the United States which are submarginal or not primarily suitable for cultivation.

RETURN TO THE FLOOR BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for 2 minutes, and perhaps an additional 2 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to take this opportunity to thank personally all my colleagues who were so thoughtful and generous to me while I was away from the Senate. No matter how skillful the doctors, and no matter how kindly the treatment, a hospital bed is a pretty fretful place.

I have a very warm spot in my heart for those who cared for me while I was in the hospital. I hope to see them many times again in the future. They were very able and very understanding. There is no State in the Union, unless it be Texas, where the people are more considerate of a person than are people of Minnesota. However, I hope my visits to that great State in the future will be purely social.

There were some bright spots incident to my visit to the hospital. The brightest was the solicitude displayed by my colleagues. All of them were generous. I, therefore, cannot single out any one as outstanding. However, I wish to express my deep gratitude to the able Vice President for his interest in my welfare.

I also express my appreciation to my beloved friend, the able minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I believe the thing which caused me to feel better, and which did me more good than Senators may realize, was the fact that my Republican colleagues in the Senate, under BILL KNOWLAND's leadership, sent me some beautiful flowers. The card which accompanied them read, "To a loyal Democrat, from his Republican colleagues in the Senate." I did not consider that a tribute to me, but I thought it was a tribute to the Republicans that they should feel and act in that way. I am very grateful for it.

I wish especially to thank the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] who took over my duties in my absence. I think he is one of the most outstanding men I have ever known. He is one of the great legislators of our time. I believe that every Member of the Senate counts EARLE CLEMENTS as a very close personal friend, and one who will always deal fairly and equitably with every man, regardless of party.

One of the most fortunate things that has happened since I came to the Senate was the selection of EARLE CLEMENTS by the Democratic conference as assistant Democratic leader. It brought to our leadership a mature mind and an able person. There have been few associations in my life that I have considered more rich and rewarding.

The State of Kentucky showed excellent judgment when it sent such a forceful and effective representative to the Senate as EARLE CLEMENTS. To me personally it has meant an enduring friendship.

Once more, I thank all my colleagues. I am glad to be back in the harness, even though my activity for the present must be on a somewhat reduced scale. [Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of all of us on this side of the aisle, I wish to say that we welcome back to his accustomed seat as majority leader of the Senate the distinguished Senator from Texas. We are delighted at his early recovery, even though it meant leaving such a delightful State as Minnesota, where he was temporarily incarcerated.

While the Senator from Texas was necessarily absent, he was ably represented by the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS]. We continued the usual friendly and cooperative relationships which the Senator from Texas and I had previously enjoyed while holding these two positions of responsibility. I know that those of us on this side of the aisle are just as happy as are the Senator's own colleagues on the other side because of his return to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I arrived in the Chamber in time to hear most of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Texas. I am one of those who missed him. I wish to express my very great pleasure at having him back, and I wish him a speedy and complete recovery.

I desire to say a special word with respect to the very fine manner in which the assistant majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], has carried on. He has been faithful to his trust. He has vindicated the judgment of those who thrust upon him these responsibilities. He has been faithful to the Senator from Texas. He has enjoyed the most implicit confidence of those on his side of the aisle, as well as Senators on the Republican side of the aisle. He has proved himself fully capable in every way, and has discharged his responsibilities in the finest traditions of the Senate. I commend him for his work.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I could not sit here without expressing to my friend from Texas my very deep appreciation for the warm sentiments expressed by him, even though his estimate of me may be somewhat exaggerated.

I wish to join with other Senators who have expressed their happiness over his early return to the Senate. I am happy to see him here, not only as evidence of his own improvement in health, but also for other reasons. For example, with him here I have just one-tenth of the responsibility as compared to that which devolves upon me when he is absent.

I should also like to say that I appreciate very much the expressions which have come from the lips of the Senator from California, the distinguished minority leader. Certainly there have existed kind and friendly relationships between the two sides of the aisle, and between the acting majority leader and the minority leader. However, all we did was to follow the pattern which had been established by the majority leader and the minority leader in the 83d Congress, and that pattern has been followed in the 84th Congress even though the positions of the two Senators were reversed.

As the assistant to the majority leader, I look forward to a continuation of that fine relationship.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I do not want the occasion to go by without expressing my enthusiastic approval of the generous comments which have been made in welcoming back our distinguished majority leader and in bestowing appropriate praise on and paying adequate tribute to the great senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] for the magnificent way in which he carried on in the absence of the majority leader.

In that regard I wish to say that I have also been inspired by what appears to be a resurgence of the spirit of good

will and the evidence of mutual confidence and respect which has reappeared on both sides of the aisle upon the return of our distinguished majority leader. I believe a distinct contribution has thus been made to the opportunity for progressive action by this body and that all of us will have a better chance to expedite the public business in the light of the good will which seems to be apparent on this occasion today.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should not like this opportunity to pass without thanking my good friend from Oklahoma for his very kind remarks.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to join in the joyous expressions made earlier today that the majority leader has returned to us, with every indication of a speedy recovery to robust health.

I wish to say to the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] that all of us are appreciative of the fine qualities of leadership he has exhibited in the absence of the majority leader. In fact, I shall speak this afternoon on a subject in connection with which I have received the wholehearted cooperation of the Senator from Kentucky; and I wish to have him know that I deeply appreciate his help, guidance, and leadership.

ANNOUNCEMENT AS TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, if the Senate will indulge me further, I should like to make an announcement. When the Senate concludes its business today, it is my purpose to have it recess or adjourn until Thursday. On that day I propose to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the tax bill.

I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader and with the chairman of the Committee on Finance. We have agreed, so far as the leadership and the chairman of the Committee on Finance are concerned, that no votes will be taken on that measure before Monday next. We wish to have prompt action on that bill and to have its consideration expedited as much as possible. At the same time, we realize that it is an important piece of legislation and that many Members of the Senate will wish to express themselves on it. Therefore, I should like every Member of the Senate to know that while we shall begin the consideration of the tax bill on Thursday, with the hope that every Member who cares to discuss the bill will be in a position to do so on Thursday and Friday, there will be no votes on the bill before Monday.

There will be no session of the Senate on Saturday of this week. When the Senate completes its business on Friday, I shall move that it go over until Monday. We hope that on Monday the Senate will be able to continue the debate on the tax bill and proceed to vote on it as soon as possible and in no event, I hope, later than Tuesday of next week.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to say that the program outlined by the majority leader is entirely acceptable to the minority. I join with him in the hope that the tax bill will be expedited as promptly as possible. In view of the fact that the Senate will not be in session tomorrow, but will go over until Thursday, I have already informed the majority leader that, so far as I am concerned, I would have no objection to having the unanimous-consent agreement extended so that the minority views of the committee may be filed by midnight tomorrow, with the understanding that the printing of the minority views will be expedited by the printer so that they will be available to Members of the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. With the indulgence of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may file their minority views on the tax bill by midnight tomorrow.

I have had a chance only this morning to review some of the preliminary expressions in the minority views. The staff of the committee informs me that it is still working on certain figures which will not be available until late this evening. In view of the fact that the Senate will not proceed to the consideration of the tax bill until Thursday, and in view of the further fact that printed copies of the minority views will be available to the Senate before it proceeds to the consideration of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the minority may have until midnight tomorrow night to file the minority views of the committee.

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

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HON. WISHART ROBERTSON, PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF CANADA

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, we are always delighted to have with us representatives of our wonderful, friendly, and progressive neighbor to the north. It is my high privilege and a great honor today to introduce to my colleagues in the Senate the President of the Canadian Senate, a distinguished statesman of Canada and of the world, the Honorable Wishart Robertson. [Applause, Senators rising.]

PARITY PRICES FOR FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter which I received dealing with parity price for farm products. The letter is from the Dickinson Farmers' Union, Local 781, Dickinson, N. Dak.

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

DICKINSON, N. DAK., *February 21, 1955.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We, the members of Dickinson Farmers Union, Local 781, favor price support of 90 percent of parity or better.

As for the wheat acreage allotment, we think the big farmers can more afford to be cut than the small farmers. How can a small farmer meet all his expenses and yet exist if he cannot seed anything? We believe the wheat acreage should be determined by the amount of land the farmer cultivates, the less he has the less he should be cut down. At the rate we are going the small farmer will have to sell out and move to the city, which itself and the schools also are fast overcrowding. What is to become of our rural schools, and all the money invested in their improvements.

On wheat selling program, why not set a certain amount per acre of what the farmer produces. This would enable the farmers to have a sale of produce even though he should have a failure the following year.

Yours truly,
DICKINSON FARMERS UNION, LOCAL 781, DICKINSON, N. DAK.
JOHN J. WOLFE, *President.*
ANDREW DOLUHEH, *Secretary.*

PURCHASE OF REMAINING ASSETS OF FEDERAL FARM MORTGAGE CORPORATION BY FEDERAL LAND BANKS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 40, Senate bill 941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 941) to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would authorize the Federal land banks to purchase the assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. The Corporation has not made any new loans since July 1, 1947, and is now in process of liquidation. Its loans are now serviced by the Federal land banks on a fee basis, and the servicing charges are approaching the point where they will exceed the interest received. It is therefore to the Government's advantage to dispose of the Corporation's assets, which consist primarily of these loans. Since the borrowers are generally land bank customers it is to the advantage of the land banks to purchase the loans. The land banks, however, do not now have authority to purchase these loans in all cases and this proposed legislation is consequently necessary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 941) was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"Twentieth. Without regard to any limitations or restrictions of this act, to purchase all assets, except cash, accounts receivable, and reserved mineral interests, held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation as a result of loans made on or before July 1, 1947, in the farm credit district in which said bank is situated and to assume the

liabilities of said Corporation for future payment funds of borrowers and trust accounts applicable to said assets. The purchase price of notes and mortgages, purchase money mortgages, and real estate sales contracts shall be equal to the total of the unpaid balances on such items and accrued interest thereon at the date as of which purchase is made, less the total of the liabilities of the Corporation being assumed by the bank as herein provided. The purchase price of real estate, sheriffs' certificates, loans called for foreclosure, loans in suspense, judgments, and any other assets eligible for purchase under this paragraph but not specifically identified herein shall be equal to the fair market value of the assets as determined by agreement. The total consideration for the purchase shall be payable over a period of not more than 10 years from the date as of which purchase is made, and upon such terms as shall be agreed upon through negotiation with the Board of Directors of the Corporation."

A PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DISARMAMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, last Wednesday I introduced Senate Resolution 71 and requested that it be retained in the Office of the Secretary of the Senate in order that Senators who might desire to do so might join as cosponsors of the resolution. The following Senators, 44 in number, have indicated a desire to join as cosponsors of the resolution:

Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEALL, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. CAPEHART, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. GORE, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POTTER, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. ROBERTSON, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. THYE, and Mr. YOUNG.

Mr. President, I should like to discuss an attack which was made on this resolution and me yesterday by the Moscow radio, in which the spokesman stated:

> I don't think there is any need to point out that not only the Soviet Union, but no Soviet country, big or little, would allow any country to dictate its home policy to it. The very thought is ridiculous, to say the least.

The Moscow statement asserts that the United States budget apportions 65 percent for military security, and then makes the extraordinary assertion that the Soviet apportions less than 20 percent for that purpose.

As I said in my statement a few days ago, in view of the fact that the Soviet Union is now producing around 40 million tons of steel, and but 45,000 automobiles, the industry which here consumes most of our steel, and America is now producing less than 100 million tons, but making some 5½ million automobiles, where is the Russian steel going?

In any case, could this question not be cleared up if the Communists allowed us the right of inspection and control, as we would be glad to allow them?

In the interest of world peace, this resolution only asks for that inspection and control which we would be entirely willing to accept ourselves.

Mr. President, in London the problems of disarmament are being discussed in secret session by representatives of the major nations.

Dispatches about the conference are not encouraging. So much is at stake, however, that hope must persist.

Low living standards are a primary cause of the unrest and tension that lead to war. Yet a tragically high proportion of the world's productive resources continues to be drawn into armaments.

Vast resources which could better the lot of every person are held back from that purpose because of the constant threat of further aggression.

Largely for these reasons I was impressed by the proposal for "butter over guns" disarmament put forward recently by Mr. Samuel Lubell, long-time associate of Mr. B. M. Baruch, with a broad knowledge in the field of economic mobilization. Mr. Baruch, probably our most experienced expert on economic mobilization, has long been for such a plan. Only today he reaffirmed his belief, stating, "While arming for defense we should also arm to defeat hunger."

Mr. President, I now reply in more detail to the attack from Moscow made yesterday against this resolution on this subject by a mouthpiece of the Soviet Government.

Moscow radio concedes that a government's peaceful or aggressive intentions can be determined by how it apportions its resources. "Naturally, there can be no argument on this point," the Soviet commentator said.

But then this spokesman failed to compare use of resources. Instead he took a comparison of military expenditures in the Government budget. To compare the United States and Soviet budgets is like equating pumpkins and apples, because under the Communist system the Russian Government budget is far over half their gross national product, whereas ours is less than a quarter of our gross national product.

Why did not the radio commentator take the axiom in this resolution—which he concedes is valid—and use it? Take, for example, such a key resource as steel. The Soviet produces about 40 million tons of steel a year. But every expert student of the Soviet economy agrees that if the Soviets fulfill their formerly promised meager goals for consumers' goods in 1955 by 100 percent, they could use no more than 2 to 2.5 million tons of steel for consumers' goods—or about 5 percent of their total production.

Where does the other 95 percent of Soviet steel go? The answer can only be into military-end items, war-essential transportation, and back into other heavy industries, and into the making of even more steel—the sinews of war.

One has only to look around the United States to see where the bulk of American steel production goes—into more than 5 million automobiles per year, into refrigerators and washing machines, and into school, hospital, and apartment buildings.

Let us start with the premise that the Soviets would like to deal in budget figures. Compare our military budget today, which is still steadily going down, with the wartime peak, and also compare similar figures for the Soviets.

To that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the insertion at this point in the RECORD of a table comparing, roughly, the military budgets of the Soviet Union with those of the United States from 1933 through 1956.

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

Military budgets

Year	U. S. S. R. (in billions of rubles)	United States (in millions of dollars)
1933	1.4	$784.0
1934	5.0	705.5
1935	8.2	924.3
1936	14.9	1,147.5
1937	17.5	1,184.8
1938	23.1	1,240.4
1939	39.2	1,368.0
1940	56.7	1,798.7
1941	80.0	6,252.0
1942	108.4	22,905.1
1943	125.0	63,413.9
1944	137.9	75,975.9
1945	128.2	80,537.3
1946	72.6	43,151.2
1947	67.0	14,769.3
1948	66.1	11,983.2
1949	79.1	13,987.6
1950	79.4	13,439.6
1951	96.4	20,857.0
1952	113.8	40,535.6
1953	110.2	47,455.5
1954	100.3	40,366.0
1955	[1] 112.1	[1] 34,375.0
1956	(2)	[1] 34,000.0

[1] Estimated.
[2] No information.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Russia's wartime peak appropriation in 1944 was 137.9 billion rubles, compared with 112.1 rubles for this year. Nineteen hundred and fifty-five, therefore, is 80 percent of the 1944 peak. These are face-value rubles. Their value does not take into account the much increased purchasing value of the ruble by virtue of seven official postwar price cuts in Russia. Actually 112.1 billion rubles in the Soviet today represent more than 137.9 billion of the 1944 rubles.

If that be true, and to the best of my knowledge it is true, consider the ominous fact that today, as of right now, the Soviet Union is spending more wealth on preparation for war than it did at the peak of World War II.

The wartime peak military expenditures of the United States were around $80.5 billion. Our present military budget is $34.3 billion, 45 percent of our wartime peak.

I now proceed to a discussion of Senate Resolution 71. The proposal is one of how to achieve security through high living standards for all peoples of the world, including the Russian and Chinese peoples.

It opens new possibilities to act against aggression while that aggression is still in the making.

Low living standards. High armaments. It is time the free nations launch an all-out moral offensive to break the chain linking these two.

That is the purpose of this resolution. It requests that the President of the United States present to the United Nations the need to explore the possibilities of limiting the proportion of certain key resources of any nation which can

be devoted to military purposes, in order to increase steadily the amount of every nation's resources which could be devoted to improving the living levels of its people.

As is the case with all disarmament plans, to accomplish this would require a foolproof system of inspection and controls.

But even if the Soviets do not agree, this plan would still provide a basis for action on behalf of peace.

Here is how the plan would operate:

Certain key resources would be selected.

A system of ceilings would then be imposed.

These ceilings would limit the proportion of each of those resources which could be devoted to military purposes.

As example, it could be stipulated that no less than X percent of the steel output of a particular country should be allocated to its civilian economy.

Clearly that action would limit the steel available for military purposes.

As everyone knows, steel is the base of any modern industrial economy. But few realize the extent to which that is true.

As example, in 1950, 1,260 pounds of steel were produced in the United States for every person.

Second to steel in use is copper. But during the same period only 23 pounds of copper per person were produced—23 pounds as against 1,260 pounds.

It is fortunate that characteristics of the steel industry make steel unusually adaptable to inspection and control.

We are in, or are rapidly coming to, a nuclear strategic standoff, with both the free world and the nations behind the Iron Curtain capable of destroying one another.

Therefore if any war does come, which God forbid, it will probably be a limited war, a "war of discrimination"—one fought with modernized conventional weapons.

To be ready to fight such a war, a nation or group of nations must rely primarily on the production and fabrication of steel.

Even if the world at some future date must suffer the catastrophe of an all-out hydrogen war, after each faction had delivered its nuclear blitz, the one which won the subsequent more conventional struggle would rule the earth.

The ceilings proposed under this plan would not curb any nation's economic expansion.

Because of different economic needs, all nations would not be allotted the same ceilings. The ratios would be subject to periodic revision by agreement.

This proposed method of disarmament is not intended to stand alone. Rather it is advanced as an integral part of any enforceable proposal to achieve a balanced reduction of all arms and armaments.

Nor is the resolution put forward with any thought that such a disarmament program could serve, in any way, as a substitute for our capacity to wage conventional war, or for our capability for instant retaliation with nuclear weapons in case of all-out attack.

The United States must retain that capacity. We should never lag, either in the development of nuclear weapons, or in the means of delivering them.

This is especially true with respect to the development and production of the so-called "ultimate" weapon, the intercontinental ballistic missile with hydrogen warhead.

This "nuclear strategic standoff" may encourage further aggression short of all-out war comparable to those which occurred in Indochina and Korea. But as mentioned, this disarmament proposal is designed to combat aggression of any type.

The plan embodied in the resolution would enable the free peoples to bring to bear the full pressure of world opinion upon the Communist leaders to improve the living standards of their people.

Since the same resources cannot be used simultaneously for both peaceful and warlike purposes, a rapid increase in the standard of living in Communist countries would tend to curb their potential aggressive power.

The desire for a better tomorrow is the strongest single yearning of all people. What we are asking through this resolution is, Can that yearning be utilized in the cause of peace?

Always in the past the Soviet rulers have justified the hardships they are imposing on the Russian people as being necessary for the country's defense. But this plan of disarmament would be applicable to all nations. Actually it would offer the Soviet leaders a means of preventing any effective invasion of Russia. At the same time the way would be opened for a swift increase in the Russian standard of living.

Rejection of the plan could only mean that sacrifices now being exacted from the Russian people are being exacted in order someday to be able to carry out the carefully planned long-term aggressive intentions and commitments of the rulers in the Kremlin.

When the United Nations was formed, the countries which signed its charter pledged themselves to "settle their international disputes by peaceful means" and "to refrain in their international relations from the threat of use of force."

That pledge is not compatible with an economy perpetually mobilized for war. It is not compatible with an economy where living standards are systematically depressed; where harsh sacrifices are imposed on the people so as to concentrate on military strength.

The free nations should call on the Soviet regime to honor these pledges, not only in words but in reorganization of their economy so as to give a decent priority to civilian needs in relation to military preparation.

When Stalin died, Malenkov declared publicly that Russia's basic industrial capacity was large enough to permit "a steep rise in the production of civilian goods."

Actually, the increases he proposed were shockingly small. But even these goals had not been reached when Malenkov was forced to resign.

In this country last year we produced 5,500,000 automobiles.

At the same time the Russians manufactured 45,000.

Steel is the basis for automobile production; and the Soviet capacity for steel production is large and growing rapidly.

Nevertheless the production of cars in Russia last year was less than 1 percent of the number produced in this country.

An important question to everybody in the free world is, Where did the rest of Russia's steel go?

Any hope for our two systems continuing to exist side by side may well lie in the establishment of some recognizable limits to the degree of war preparation these countries behind the Iron Curtain can have.

The disarmament plan proposed in this resolution is based on the following three principles:

First. The way a government divides the resources at its command is a revealing measure of its peaceful or aggressive intent.

Second. High living standards in effect constitute an automatic built-in deterrent against possible aggression.

Third. After a nation has committed its resources to peaceful uses, a significant length of time must elapse before they can be converted to war.

This lapse of time—conversion time—is of crucial importance, because, if aggression is to be prevented, the time to act is during the period when the manufacture of weapons first begins; that is, when resources are being shifted from peaceful to warlike uses.

The resolution being introduced stresses the importance of a full study of how this factor of conversion time can be utilized to prevent aggression.

In principle this conversion time can be transformed into a virtual "timelock," a lock which would have to be broken open before any nation's resources could be shifted to a program for war.

In the very process of being broken open, that timelock could serve automatically to warn the world of approaching aggression.

Based on my experience with the National Security Resources Board, I believe the timelock principle is applicable to certain hard-line industries.

If the Soviet leaders refuse to cooperate in the establishment of a foolproof system of international inspection and control, they can block this disarmament proposal, as they can block any other disarmament proposal. But they cannot prevent the free world from observing how the Kremlin allocates its resources between its civilian economy and its armament program.

Nor can they prevent the free world from interpreting that choice as a tangible yardstick of Soviet intentions.

Recently the new Soviet rulers, Khruschev, Bulganin, and Zhukoff, announced they would increase their arms expenditures at the expense of their already low level civilian production.

That action was a warning, and our diplomatic, military, and economic policies cannot but recognize that warning.

It will not be easy to develop the mechanisms needed to implement the three principles referred to previously.

Nevertheless, we seek, as we should seek, a method of preventing aggression; a method for drawing an economic dividing line between plans for war and plans for peace, throughout the world.

Much of the continuing search for peace and freedom lies in lifting the living standards of all peoples toward those which have been attained in America, instead of having them dragged down to the armed misery of a totalitarian fortress.

Poverty breeds communism. There is a definite connection between the hunger of many peoples and the security of the United States.

Last week Winston Churchill gave the world the fullest implication yet of the new weapons. He "took mankind solemnly by the hand and walked to the edge of the cliff," and then to me he just about summed up the greatest incentive for successful world disarmament when he said:

> It does not matter so much to old people. They are going soon anyway. But I find it poignant to look at youth in all its activities and ardor, and most of all to watch little children playing their merry games, and wonder what would lie before them if God wearied of mankind.

In effect, these words sum up the purpose of this resolution.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I notice that the distinguished Senator from Missouri, who is perhaps the best expert on this floor on the subject of airplanes, did not say how much steel is used in the manufacture of airplanes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is an interesting question. May I tell the able Senator from North Dakota that one of the great surprises I had was discovering that on a B-36 bomber there were more pounds of steel than there were pounds of aluminum.

Mr. LANGER. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield with pleasure to the able Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I have listened very attentively to the remarks of the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri in explaining the purpose of his resolution. If I may be permitted to do so, I should like to join as a cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, before I proceed with the statement I desire to make today, I wish to compliment the Senator from Missouri for the vision and the statesmanship represented by the resolution of which he is the primary author. I consider it an honor to join with him in that resolution, because I think he has presented once again to the Senate what is probably the most important issue of the century ahead, namely, whether or not the nations of the world will have the rationality to follow a course of action that will permit the preservation of mankind. If we pay any attention at all to the lessons of history, and if we contemplate what obviously is ahead of us, we cannot escape the conclusion that permanent peace on this earth never will be attained until men do two things: First, grasp the idea set forth by the Senator from Missouri this afternoon in connection with the need for true disarmament; and, second, recognize that we must settle international disputes by a system of international justice through law, which was so eloquently taught on the floor of the Senate for a long time by the great statesman from Michigan, Arthur Vandenberg.

I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri I think that by a constant teaching of the lesson he has taught on the floor of the Senate this afternoon, there is bound to be an awakening not only of our own people, because even in America the lesson must be better understood, but also among our friends and our allies, and a conviction on the part of the world that wants to be won over to the side of freedom that our motivation is a sincere and sound one. We recognize that disarmament would be foolhardy unless it were mutual, and unless the Communist segment of the world were willing to agree to international control, and to check the warlike tendencies which undoubtedly dictate the foreign policy of both Red China and Red Russia today.

I desired to make this comment because I think when one discusses a subject such as that discussed by the Senator from Missouri, his remarks are bound to be misunderstood in some quarters, and in other quarters they are bound to be distorted. The Senator deserves the commendation which I have given to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for his kind remarks, and assure him there is no Member of this body from whom I would rather receive such comments. The Senator mentioned possible misunderstanding of this matter. I am sure there will be much of that.

I also again call to the attention of the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon the fact that, based on the adjusted currency levels possible under a totalitarian system, as exists in the Soviet Union, the latter country is now spending more for defense than it did at the peak of World War II, whereas this country is spending a great deal less. I submit this as another excellent reason for continuing in our efforts to obtain international disarmament, under some foolproof inspection and control system, between the free world and its possible enemy.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the objective of the Senator from Missouri.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to proceed with the remarks I have prepared on the Hells Canyon Dam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

HIGH HELLS CANYON: THE INDISPENSABLE DAM

Mr. MORSE. The economic future of the 4 million people and the 392,451 square miles of the Pacific Northwest depends upon the building of Hells Canyon Dam. It is the indispensable multipurpose project for the comprehensive development of the great Columbia River Basin. Without it the United States will consign 13 percent of its land area and over 40 percent of its water resources to incomplete, haphazard underdevelopment.

It is a privilege to introduce this bill, S. 1333, to authorize the construction of Hells Canyon Dam, on behalf of myself and Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. CLEMENTS, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. GORE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HENNINGS, Mr. HILL, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. KERR, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LANGER, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. MCCLELLAN, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. NEELY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, and Mr. YOUNG.

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

The bill (S. 1333) to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is requested that the bill lie on the table until March 11, in order to permit other cosponsors of the bill to add their names to it. I make that request because several of my colleagues have told me they wish to study the bill further and to review the speeches which will be made this afternoon in support of the bill, before making their final decision in connection with it.

There are other Senators, Mr. President, who are not cosponsors of the bill, because of a policy on their part of not cosponsoring any bill, but who assure me they will join in the support of the bill. In fact, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, as a matter of policy, does not join in the cosponsoring of bills, has assured me that he will make a statement in support of the bill, and will make perfectly clear his intention to vote for it. There are other Members of the Senate who do not as a practice cosponsor bills, but who have assured me that they will support the sponsors of S. 1333 in our endeavor to have the bill passed during this Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and the bill will lie on the desk until March 11, 1955, for the purpose of adding additional cosponsors.

Mr. MORSE. The 30 Senators from 20 States join in support of this magnificent project not only because it is essential not only to the economic future of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, but they support it also because it is essential to the defense strength and economic expansion and stability of the Nation.

HELLS CANYON FOR A STRONGER AMERICA

The United States is today the mightiest nation in the world because of our magnificent natural resources and the genius of our free institutions combined.

We have built this great Nation with imagination and toil applied to the iron ranges fringing the Great Lakes, the coal deposits of Kentucky and Pennsylvania, the cotton-producing expanses of the South, the plains of grain of the Midwest, the oil of Texas, Oklahoma, and California; the timber of the Pacific Northwest; and the other natural wealth with which our country abounds. They are found in various parts of the Nation. They are regional resources, but national assets contribute to the strength and ease of all of our people.

The Pacific Northwest has a great resource which is as yet practically untapped—falling water. Aside from timber, which provides primarily seasonal employment, it has no other great natural resource. The Columbia River Basin, which makes our area a region, contains some 40 percent of the hydroelectric resources of the United States. Measured in terms of feasible projects, the Pacific Northwest holds some 60 percent of the hydroelectric potential of the country. Eighty-seven percent of the potential 30 million kilowatts of waterpower remain unharnessed. Their full development is the contribution which the Pacific Northwest can make to the Nation.

That contribution can be made in full measure if, and only if, the high Hells Canyon Dam is built by the Federal Government and is operated as an integral part of the Columbia River power system.

Nature and technology have so decreed it.

MULTIPURPOSE BENEFITS

The Hells Canyon Dam, which this bill would authorize, would rise 722 feet high from the floor of the deepest canyon in the United States. At this point on the Snake River, as it runs between Oregon and Idaho, nature has formed the greatest remaining damsite on the North American Continent. Through integrated operation with other power plants, the project would provide 1,124,000 kilowatts of firm power. As multipurpose benefits, it would provide badly needed flood control and improvement of navigation, and would create new recreational opportunities. And under a special and important provision in the bill, revenues from the sale of Hells Canyon power could be set aside to help farmers repay the cost of worthy irrigation projects in Oregon and Idaho, which they cannot finance unaided, and which are not now feasible under existing law. Except for a nonreimbursable allocation to flood control, navigation, and recreation, as authorized by Congress, the project is wholly self-sustaining.

FIFTY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE POINT THE WAY

The principles and conceptions embodied in this bill have been tested and proven again and again on river basin after river basin, in comprehensive plans for full development of our rivers. The foundation of these principles and conceptions was laid down in 1908 by President Theodore Roosevelt, when he transmitted to the Congress the first report of his Inland Waterways Commission, which read in part as follows:

> The report rests throughout on the fundamental conception that every waterway should be made to serve the people largely and in as many different ways as possible. * * * Every stream should be used to its utmost. * * * 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 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.

Mr. President, because of that signal report in the administration of Teddy Roosevelt and because of his dedication to it and his implementation of it, he is very often referred to as one of the great conservation leaders in our history, one of the great developers of our natural resources, along with another great Republican, Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania, followed, of course, by a whole series of bipartisan liberals in the Congress of the United States, such as the La Follettes; Hiram Johnson; Dill and Bone, of Washington; the great George Norris, of Nebraska; Charles McNary from my own State; and a host of others, all of whom recognized the importance of the basic premise for which I am arguing today, namely, that these rivers belong to all the people, and should be developed in their entirety and to the maximum economic potential of which they are capable.

Even as early as 1901, Roosevelt stated to the Congress that the major responsibility of moving forward with planning and programs to attain these objectives should be vested in the Federal Government.

> Great storage works are necessary to equalize the flow of streams and to save the floodwaters. Their construction has been conclusively shown to be an undertaking too vast for private effort.

And in its 1912 report, Theodore Roosevelt's Inland Waterways Commission was even more definite:

> 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.

These words have served as the foundation stones of specific programs of land and water development which through the years have broadened to encompass in some fashion nearly all of our major drainage basins. It has grown as engineering knowledge, management techniques, and integrated planning for multiple uses of our basic natural resources have deepened and expanded. Their accomplishments are written enduringly in the great dams, in the march of the transmission lines, in the fertile irrigated acres, and the communities which in a relatively few short years have emerged like magic from the arid desert.

Our nearly 50 years of progress in harnessing our rivers have given this country Boulder, Shasta, Fort Peck, and many other multiple-purpose installations. This program has given us the miracle of the Tennessee Valley Authority which lifted a blighted area and people into a new and more abundant life.

In the Pacific Northwest it has given us Grand Coulee, Hungry Horse, Bonneville, and McNary Dams, with the Dalles and Chief Joseph under construction. But these massive embodiments of engineering skill and planning would be meaningless as the Great Pyramid if they had not brought with them the magic gifts of great blocks of low-cost power, flood control, aid to navigation—all keys to release and stimulate the productive forces of free, competitive enterprise over the widest possible area and contribute significantly to the upbuilding of the Nation's industrial and agricultural economy.

HELLS CANYON INDISPENSABLE TO COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

The Hells Canyon project is the key to full future development of the basin. It is a key upstream project in the main control plan of the Corps of Army Engineers, which in turn was the initial development phase of its so-called 308 report — House Document 531, United States Army Corps of Engineers, 1948.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to join the Senator from Oregon in his exposition and declaration in behalf of Hells Canyon Dam, and the great project which is possible there under proper governmental authority. The Senator's fight in behalf of the development of natural resources is notable and most praiseworthy, and he will have my unqualified support in his endeavors.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota. I consider it a great honor to have him associated with me as one of the cosponsors of this bill.

I think I am at liberty to speak for the many thousands of people in the Pacific Northwest, both in my State and in the State of Washington, represented on the floor at the present moment by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], when I express for them our gratitude that so many Senators from the Middle West, the South, and the East see the importance of this project to the economy of the Nation as a whole, and realizing its importance, are willing to associate themselves with us in the Pacific Northwest in seeking the development of this indispensable dam, so essential, we think, both to defense and to the maximum development of our economic resources.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Both the Senator from Oregon and the distinguished senior Senator from Washington have rendered yeoman service, not only to the people of the Northwest, but to the Nation as a whole, in their proposals for the improvement and development of our great river, land, and water resources. This project is within the spirit of what

they have already done. We will work together to see that it is accomplished.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Minnesota very much for his kind words.

The Bureau of Reclamation, after exhaustive study, also considered Hells Canyon as vital to full use of the water resources of the Columbia Basin in its 1947 development plan—The Columbia, Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, 1947. The joint comprehensive plan of these two agencies was ratified in 1949, and approved by the Secretaries of the Interior and the Army, as well as by the President. Hells Canyon Dam was assigned to the Bureau of Reclamation for construction, because of the relationship of its power revenues to future reclamation projects proposed by the Bureau.

Upstream storage of water is a vital factor in river basin development. Water must be stored when it is in more than ample supply to be released later when it is needed downstream to keep power dams running at full efficiency. Such storage is needed to prevent and minimize floods. Such storage is needed to keep stream levels stable for navigation.

Hells Canyon Dam would provide 4,400,000 acre-feet of storage. The Snake River has an annual runoff of 12 million acre-feet of water. The Idaho Power Co.'s three small dam plan would provide for less than one-fourth that amount of effective storage, and without integrated release for proper use downstream.

That storage capacity cannot be duplicated elsewhere in the Columbia River Basin so efficiently or at comparable cost and without interference with fish migration.

Without Hells Canyon Dam the water storage which is indispensable to full development of the Snake River and Columbia Basin would be lost.

THE NEED FOR KILOWATTS

By 1960–61, the Pacific Northwest will be plunged into a power shortage which will increase to such proportions as to threaten its economy. According to the Bonneville Power Administration this deficit will amount to 807,000 kilowatts of prime, or year-round power, by 1963–64.

Moreover this deficit does not include an additional 400,000 kilowatts of interruptible power used by industry which needs firming up. It does not make any provision for expansion of energy loads for new electro-process industries, such as aluminum, ferro alloys, and phosphate fertilizer, which over the next 10 years could absorb between 1 million and 3 million new kilowatts.

Assuming the possible, there is needed 807,000 kilowatts for normal load growths, 400,000 kilowatts to firm up interruptible industrial loads and 1,500,000 kilowatts for necessary industrial expansion of electro-process industries to keep apace of the needs of the Nation for their vital products and provide jobs for a continuously growing labor force.

This in the aggregate calls for a Federal investment in major power dams to provide about 2,700,000 kilowatts to the Columbia Basin. We have the comprehensive plan, the main control plan which is the immediate target. We have the need. The purpose of the bill is to go about satisfying the need.

HELLS CANYON FOR YEAR AROUND POWER

Hells Canyon Dam will add a large block of firm power, 1,124,000 kilowatts, to the Pacific Northwest power supply—firm power, power available every hour of the day, every day of the year. The energy will come from three sources: one, power produced at the site of the dam; two, power produced at downstream plants through the release of Hells Canyon storage during periods of low flow of downstream rivers; and three, integration of the operation of Hells Canyon plant with other Federal power plants in the Columbia River Basin.

At the site Hells Canyon will produce 688,000 kilowatts of prime power. The remaining 436,000 kilowatts would be made available at downstream plants and other plants in the Columbia River power system by use of Hells Canyon storage and through transmission integration of the network. The project will add this output to the system if all projects which are now existing, under construction, or currently authorized were to be placed in operation before Hells Canyon.

The primary reason Hells Canyon can add a greater amount of prime power to the output of the region than dams without storage or with negligible storage in the same stretch of the river, such as the Idaho Power Co. proposes, is that the heavy runoff of the spring would be impounded in the reservoir for release during low periods of the river to produce power which otherwise would not be available. This is true in the same manner that storage dams increase the amount of land that can be irrigated from a river—by storing excess water and releasing it when it is needed.

Hells Canyon powerplant is not intended to operate as an isolated unit, and any reference to it as such is misleading.

FULL PROTECTION TO WATER RIGHTS

Section 2 of the bill provides specifically that the operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall be subordinate to all valid, existing rights to the use of water for beneficial consumptive purposes, and to future rights to the use of water for those purposes.

Section 2 of this bill is an improvement over section 2 of my 1952 bill, not because it offers greater protection or provides for greater irrigation development in the future, but because new language makes it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, for opponents of the project, already hard put to find fault, to declare that the irrigation structure of Idaho, present and future, is endangered.

Let us examine this important provision. The section states: "The operation of the Hells Canyon Dam shall be only such as does not conflict with present and future rights to the use of water for irrigation or other beneficial consumptive uses, whether now or hereafter existing, valid under State law, of the upstream waters of the Snake River and its tributaries."

The bill provides that Idaho—the State that appears to be concerned most with this aspect of the matter—shall have a right to irrigate every imaginable acre of land upstream from Hells Canyon before the new dam shall have a right to touch a drop of water.

POWER RESERVED FOR OREGON AND IDAHO

Section 3 seeks to answer another spurious objection that power company spokesmen made to the first bill. They sought to instill in Idaho people's minds a feeling that Hells Canyon Dam was to be constructed solely for the purpose of rescuing the coastal States of Oregon and Washington from a serious power shortage.

Section 3 (a) provides "500,000 kilowatts of power attributable to the Hells Canyon project, or such portion thereof as is required from time to time to meet loads under contracts made within this reservation, shall be made available for use in the Central and Upper Snake River Basin and to all other parts of Idaho lying outside the Central and Upper Snake River Basin."

This assures eastern Oregon and Idaho a major block of low-cost power.

ONE INTEGRATED PROJECT

Moving on now to section 4 of the bill it provides that the initial works of the Snake River project provided for in section 1 of the bill—the Hells Canyon Dam and the Scriver Creek plants in the Payette River Basin—plus any additional works that may be authorized and built later, including irrigation features of the Payette Unit of the Mountain Home Development, "shall be treated as one project." This is for the purpose, among others, of providing for the application of project revenues to the return of reimbursable costs in accordance with the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws. Section 4 also stipulates that additional reclamation developments may be authorized as part of the Snake River project only by a specific act of Congress.

To permit Congress in deciding on future authorizations to evaluate the worth of proposed additions to the Snake River project, the Secretary of the Interior must submit recommendations with respect to such authorizations in a report and findings under section 9 of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187), which report shall include findings as to the costs and benefits of the proposed developments and as to the effect of such authorization on the project's power-rate structure.

In the case of the irrigation features of the Payette Unit of the Mountain Home Development, such a report shall be made and transmitted to the Congress not later than during the term of the 85th Congress, which means 1957.

Aside from the tremendous business-stimulating effect that a new large block of power would have in Idaho and Oregon, the provision making available power revenues from this great dam and the smaller Scriver Creek plants to aid irrigation development is one of the most significant features of the bill. It would have an economic impact on the region that would be felt for decades, yes, for centuries to come.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say to the senior Senator from Oregon that I deeply appreciate his attitude with regard to legislation of this character, not only so far as Hells Canyon is concerned, but generally with respect to the development of the natural resources and rivers throughout the United States.

I had an opportunity to join in the introduction of the bill, but did not do so because I have consistently opposed and regretted the tendency toward multiplicity of authorship of bills. In the House of Representatives there is a rule which provides that only one Member may introduce a bill. Personally, I think such a rule ought to prevail in the Senate. I say quite frankly that I have deplored the tendency toward multiplicity of sponsorship of bills in the Senate, because I have always felt that it is a bad practice and ought not to be encouraged. Therefore, I have declined to join in the introduction of many bills which I favor and for which I shall vote on the floor of the Senate, merely because I think it is bad legislative practice.

Nevertheless, with regard to the bill dealing with Hells Canyon, which is a symbol, in a way, and typical of other situations, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that I am fully in sympathy with his attitude, with his bill, and with similar legislation that may come before the Senate. All my life I have felt that the great rivers of this country belong to the people and are the property of all the people. I have always opposed turning them over to any private group for exploitation or control. If we ever allow these great arteries of commerce to be controlled privately, it will be a long time before we ever recapture control of them on behalf of the people.

Because of that feeling, I have supported and urged the development of the Tennessee Valley Authority. I have supported the construction of dams and pools for irrigation, reclamation, power, and other uses, to which the great arteries of commerce, committed to Congress by the Constitution, should be put.

I desired to explain to the Senator from Oregon my reason for not joining him in the introduction of the bill. At the same time I wish to assure him that in my profound conception of the duty of Congress in dealing with our great natural resources, I am in sympathy with his proposal. While I have not read the details of the bill, and although I would not wish to commit myself to the details of it in advance, the Senator from Oregon can count on my support of the general idea he has in mind in introducing the bill.

I regret that because of my deep conviction about the procedure in the Senate I have not been able to join with him in the introduction of the bill.

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

Mr. MORSE. I should first like to respond to the Senator from Kentucky, by saying that there is no word which more appropriately describes my feelings, following the announced support of the bill by the Senator from Kentucky, than the word "thrilled."

I am greatly thrilled to know that the distinguished Senator from Kentucky stands behind us in the support of the bill. I wish to say to him that there will be great rejoicing in the Pacific Northwest over the announcement he has made on the floor of the Senate today. The people in my section of the country—and this is true likewise throughout the country—know the Senator from Kentucky to be one of the most beloved statesmen in our Nation today. I mean it most sincerely when I say that the history of the United States will record him as one of the great statesmen of our country. During his many years in the Congress of the United States he has made a record, he has fought to protect the people's heritage in their natural resources.

The announcement he has made comes as no surprise from the standpoint of the political philosophy he has expressed, but, I wish to assure him that it comes as a matter of great delight to those of us who intend to make the bill one of the major battles of our career in American public life. We recognize that only to the extent that we follow a course of action which retains to future generations of American boys and girls their rights to the Nation's natural resources will we be true to the future history of our country, as the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has been true to its history in his many long years of noble service to the people of this Nation.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator for that very generous compliment.

Mr. MORSE. It was more than deserved.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I was about to try to say the same thing, but probably not in such an eloquent way, to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. I have spoken to him concerning the bill, and I know his longstanding conviction about the technical procedure of cosponsorship. Like the Senator from Oregon, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, with whom I have served for many years in this body, that I have never found him wanting when it came to the question of whether the people's heritage was going to be protected or exploited. He has always been on the side of the people.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, I now yield to another great Senator who is also a cosponsor of this bill, the great liberal Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has just said regarding the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. The Senator from Kentucky helped me to fight for projects on the Great Plains of the Northwest, projects such as Fort Peck Dam, and, later, for the Garrison Dam, and for the development of the entire Missouri River Basin. He did a magnificent job for us. I know we can rely upon his experience not only upon the floor, in debate, but other ways to see to it, so far as he can, that ultimately the entire country which is so dear to the heart of the Senator from Kentucky, will be so developed as to equal what the distinguished Senator from Oregon has described as the miracle of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I shall be happy to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it will be a sad day for the American people if these great arteries of commerce, which, under the decisions of the Supreme Court, have repeatedly been declared subject to regulation by Congress, are taken away from the people and turned over to private control. I am in favor of private enterprise. I am interested in it, and I am for free enterprise. But when it comes to the great natural resources given to the people by God Almighty, it will be a sad day in the history of this country when they are turned over exclusively to the control of any private group. That is why I feel so profoundly upon the subject of retaining in the control of the people and the Government of the United States the development, improvement, and utilization of these great natural resources for the American people. That does not exclude their utilization for private industry.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Kentucky. With his great ability, and in his very concise way, he has summarized the whole political and economic philosophy of this bill and of similar bills which seek to develop through the Government the natural resources of the country for the people. I happen to believe it is one of the primary obligations of a representative government to do just that. Instead of its being in any way an impediment to free and private enterprise, it is one of the greatest stimulations of free and private enterprise. In my section of the country the great stimulation in private enterprise which has resulted from Grand Coulee and Bonneville never would have come about had not the Government of the United States built those great multiple-purpose dams, which are self-liquidating and are returning to the Treasury of the United States not only their original cost, but many times their cost, in the form of new tax dollars flowing into the Treasury of the United States from private enterprises, which never would have located in that area had it not been for the stimulation afforded by the cheap power obtainable from those dams.

The Senator from Kentucky has inspired me to digress long enough to make this observation in behalf of the farmers of the Pacific Northwest. When I think of the vast quantities of phosphate fertilizer which are in the ground and which have to be developed by cheap power, I must emphasize at this moment the importance of this dam to the development of commercial fertilizer for the farmers as far east, on the basis of present prices and cost of transportation, as Indiana. Even in Indiana

there will be great benefits accruing from the development of those commercial fertilizer beds by the cheap power which will result from the building of Hells Canyon Dam and other multiple-purpose dams, all of which are a part of the Army engineers' comprehensive 308 report. It never will be done by high-cost power developed by private utilities, if we permit them to scuttle the great dam sites still remaining, such as Hells Canyon Dam.

I shall join forces with private utilities any time at any point where there is a need for the building of a low-head dam by a private utility that is not aimed at scuttling a dam site that is part of the main control plan, but I shall continue to fight every attempt to scuttle the dam site at Hells Canyon. Roosevelt, Norris, LaFollette, McNary, and the Senator from Kentucky helped to stop the efforts of private utilities to exploit the great dam site which later became Grand Coulee. If those bipartisan liberals in the Congress, supported by the great liberal President in the White House, Franklin D. Roosevelt, had not fought against the attempt to build a low-head dam at Kettle Falls and stopped that private utility maneuver, there never would have been the great Coulee Dam. That fight is part and parcel of the major point which the Senator from Kentucky has so eloquently brought out in this debate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My attitude in regard to the development of our waterways indicates no opposition to private utilities. I am interested in their success. We all know that no private utility can develop a river valley. It cannot afford to undertake such a gigantic task. A private utility has stockholders who look to it for dividends. Therefore, a private utility will build a dam in order to create power for a local purpose, but in the very nature of things we cannot look to private utilities to develop a great system in any great river valley in the United States. It is, however, possible for the Government of the United States and for private utilities to work together in cooperation in developing these great valleys for the benefit of both the public and the utilities. That has happened in the Tennessee Valley in many instances.

My idea is that in the development of a river valley system, such as the Missouri Valley, the Columbia Valley, the Tennessee Valley, and many others, there can come about a general cooperation among private and public agencies which will inure to the benefit of all the people, including the stockholders of private utility companies and the citizens of the United States.

I express no opposition to private utilities. I am their friend. I think the development of our great natural resources, including the great rivers, will inure to the benefit of all the people. Such development may be worked out in such a way as to inure to the benefit of private utilities in a great cooperative scheme by which the entire resources of the United States may be utilized for the benefit of our economy.

Mr. MORSE. It is a matter of pride and is also a privilege for me to say that I share completely the views just expressed by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. There is always the attempt to distort and to represent falsely those of us who are fighting for public river basin development. There is a continuing attempt to place us in the light of being opposed to private utilities.

In the Pacific Northwest there is in effect the great principle of the pooling of power whereby private utilities and public dams pool their power in a great power reservoir. I am in favor of that.

I completely share the view expressed by the Senator from Kentucky. I favor helping private utilities. I will help them on low-head dams. But our point of view is different when they seek to prevent the building of a great multiple-purpose dam, which should belong to all the people, and attempt to take the site for the building of low-head dams, thereby preventing the maximum development of power and other resources of the river.

Mr. BARKLEY. The difficulty, as I have experienced it in conversation and in correspondence, is that many of our friends favor the development of the rivers for navigation and flood control; but when it comes to the development of the rivers for the production of power, the same people are willing to have the United States take charge of the flood control and navigation but desire to produce the power for themselves. I hope I have not overstated the situation.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator has used restraint and made a great understatement, but it is a very accurate one.

Mr. BARKLEY. When a great natural resource such as a river is developed for navigation, for flood control, for soil conservation, and the other purposes, I think the power developed by that enterprise conducted by the Government should still be the property of the people of the United States, and not of any private group.

Mr. MORSE. That is my thesis. There is no justification for asking the Government to give it away to a monopoly. The people are entitled to have the great project built and to have all the revenue derived from it go into the Treasury of the United States for the benefit of the people. Then, when the dam has been paid for, it is to be owned by the people, not by some private combine. That is a part of the great difference which has arisen over the development of Hells Canyon.

I shall not take the time to develop this point at length today, because I shall be discussing the subject from time to time for the remainder of the session. But the Senator from Kentucky has put his finger on the point when he speaks of the so-called partnership scheme, whereby the Government ends up with owning the fish ladders, the locks, and the other nonrevenue producing features of the project, while giving away great values to big business enterprises, so far as the power resources are concerned.

When a multiple purpose project is under consideration, it ought to be developed by the Government for all the people; and when the project is completely paid for, it should belong to all the people.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very much impressed with the remarks which have been made by one of the greatest experts in this body, certainly with respect to the question of public power versus private power, and more specifically with references to Hells Canyon Dam.

May I ask the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon if he is familiar with the report of the President's Materials Policy Commission in 1951 with respect to water conservation?

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I am familiar with it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am correct, am I not, in my understanding that that commission, after its efforts of a year and a half, stated that very possibly within the next 25 years our greatest shortage would be fresh water?

Mr. MORSE. Entirely correct. We had better begin quickly to use all our scientific knowledge in seeing to it that we preserve and reserve for future generations the maximum possible reservoirs of fresh water in this country.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Probably today the greatest remaining project for controlling water, which is important to cultivation of the soil, conservation of the soil, flood control, and for water storage, is the Hells Canyon Dam. Is that not correct?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. It is the greatest remaining multiple purpose dam site in the country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, as the distinguished Senator from Oregon and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] were saying, the Hells Canyon site should be developed as promptly as possible for all the people.

Mr. MORSE. The sooner the better. It should have been done yesterday.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As I understand, the nub of the proposition is that if all the people, through their taxes, develop this great additional unit in the Nation's entire hydroelectric water conservation and resource facilities, the Government would have no right to give it away to any group of private citizens.

Mr. MORSE. That is one of the underlying theories of the bill. The complete wealth of the project should be returned to the people of the United States in the form of revenues which should be deposited in the Treasury.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted to have the distinguished Senator from Oregon make it clear that in his mind this is not a fight between the private utilities, on the one hand, and the advocates of public power on the other; but that it is

a contest between the advocates of public power and the private-power monopoly.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is absolutely correct. It involves a very serious problem of monopoly.

The Senator from North Dakota having raised the point, let me make it very clear that the sponsors of the bill are not proposing any Federal monopoly of power. The spokesmen for this administration are constantly trying to put us in the bad light of advocating a Federal monopoly of power. The contrary is the fact. All that the spokesmen for the administration have to do is to visit the area and study the power system in the Northwest, where power is being produced for private as well as public interests. Eighty-five percent of the power in the United States is produced by private utilities, not by the Government. We have no intention of materially cutting down that ratio.

To some extent, when a great project such as Hells Canyon is built, there will be an addition to the total supply of public power. But I have already pointed out in my speech that the population increase in the Pacific Northwest in the past 10 years has required a great increase in the quantity of power produced, so no great damage will be done to the power production potential of private utilities.

We are saying to the private utilities that in areas where the sites are adapted to the construction of multiple-purpose dams, the Government will develop them. We are not going to give them away in the form of low-head dams built by private utility combines.

Mr. LANGER. I appreciate what the distinguished Senator has said about the partnership idea as expressed by the President in his Oregon speech some months ago, a speech with which I thoroughly disagree. I am very happy to note that the Senator from Oregon, likewise, did not agree with the proposed partnership idea. It always seemed to me to be something like a great big lion in partnership with a little lamb. The partnership would not last long before the lamb would be gobbled up.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator from North Dakota. In a series of speeches I intend to deliver in the next few months, I intend to discuss every phase of the partnership program which, in my judgment, needs to be discussed, and to correct some false conceptions about it which have been spread by propagandists of this administration.

While the Senator from North Dakota is on his feet, I may say to him that he was fighting in the Senate long before I came here for the principles on which we have joined forces today. I thank him sincerely for his cosponsorship of the bill.

Mr. LANGER. If funds had been allotted to the Judiciary Committee by the Republican administration during the last session, witnesses, whose appearance had been arranged, would have been called, and the committee would have been enabled to make a thorough investigation, at the request of the Senator from Oregon, of the entire Hells Canyon project. Unfortunately, we had no money for that purpose. We did the best we could in our investigation of the Dixon-Yates contract and some of the other monopolistic enterprises; but we could not consider the Hells Canyon project, and that has always been a source of keen regret to me.

Mr. MORSE. I think the Senator from North Dakota did a great job in the investigation which he undertook as chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary. I think the need for the continuation of that work still exists. It was the Senator's plan to conduct an investigation into the monopolistic tendencies and practices in the Pacific Northwest, including an investigation of the whole subject of what is happening to the Hells Canyon Dam program. I regret very much that there has been a lapse at least in the prosecution of that investigation, and I intend to urge on this side of the aisle that those in charge of the investigative authority of the Committee on the Judiciary continue to carry out the program so ably outlined by the Senator from North Dakota.

IRRIGATION DEVELOPMENT

As I was saying, Mr. President, aside from the tremendous business-stimulating effect that a new large block of power would have in Idaho and Oregon, the provision making available power revenues from this great dam and the smaller Scriver Creek plants to aid irrigation development is one of the most significant features of the bill. It would have on the region an economic impact that would be felt for decades—yes, for centuries to come.

There are some 44 projects in eastern Oregon and Idaho not yet authorized, but which, based on preliminary examinations made by the Bureau of Reclamation appear to be desirable of development at some time in the future, in view of the favorable benefit-cost ratios. However, with minor exceptions, they can only be undertaken if the water users have assistance in the repayment of irrigation capital cost.

POWER REVENUE NEEDED FOR IRRIGATION

A special provision covering this desirable aspect of resource development in the Snake River Basin is necessary because the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 limits the use of power revenues to assist in repayment of irrigation costs to features of the project of which the power development is a part. Thus, it is necessary to state by legislation that additional works may be treated for payout purposes as part of the Snake River project, of which the principal division is the Hells Canyon Division.

The State of Idaho could gain enormously from the financial aid provision of the new bill. It has lying at the doorstep of the city of Boise the Mountain Home project. It is desirable to transform this vast area of sagebrush, some 192,000 acres, into a community of fertile, irrigated farms—in favor of creating another Boise Valley, so to speak. The cost of bringing water to the land, which involves the diversion of water from one river basin to another, is high. The small powerplants associated with the project would not produce adequate power revenues to aid farmers in complete repayment of the project. Under this legislation, Mountain Home project, when authorized, would be made feasible through use of Hells Canyon power revenues.

FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION

Two outstanding engineering organizations have agreed, in writing, that there are tremendous benefits to be attained through the use of the storage space behind Hells Canyon Dam for impounding some of the flood waters that imperil downstream lives and property. My colleagues will remember 50 lives were lost and $100 million in property damage suffered in 1948, when the Columbia went on a rampage. If a flood similar to that which occurred in 1894—greatest on record—should occur now, with a much greater development along the river banks, the total loss would exceed $350 million. Engineers think that some day such a flood, or even a bigger one, will occur, for 60 years in the history of a river or a country is very short.

A flood-control system, known as the main control plan, which would cope with the worst recorded flood, has been worked out, and Hells Canyon Dam is a key unit in this system.

Hells Canyon Dam, if available in 1948, when the last major flood occurred, would have decreased flood damages between $10 million and $12 million, the Corps of Engineers advises me.

HELLS CANYON FOR NAVIGATION

Navigation on the Columbia and Snake from Lewiston to the sea has increased, and will continue to do so as pools afforded by the Dalles, John Day, McNary, and the four lower Snake dams stimulate river transportation of crops and manufactured goods as well. With their economic feasibility dependent upon Hells Canyon storage releases to enhance their power output, the four Snake dams, as is Hells Canyon, are closely knit one with another to provide for a total transportation system of some 500 miles from the mouth of the Columbia to a point upstream from Lewiston. Hells Canyon releases will likewise aid deep draft navigation by contributing to channel maintenance and reducing need for dredging.

The great lake behind Hells Canyon which extends to the railhead upstream will make slackwater barge transportation possible into and out of the rich copper and silver-lead deposits of the Seven Devils mining district and hasten their development, prevented up to now by the rough, inaccessible terrain. Navigation, too, is a leading objective in the comprehensive plan.

HELLS CANYON FOR NEW INDUSTRY IN IDAHO

The location of Hells Canyon is uniquely fortuitous to the development of the phosphate fertilizer industry in eastern Idaho and neighboring States, where 60 percent of the Nation's reserves of phosphatic rock are found.

Hells Canyon is the only great power producer within economic transmission distance of these deposits, which are primarily low grade and require large quantities of low-cost power to be adequately utilized in processing economical, high analysis phosphate fertilizer.

CHEAP PHOSPHATE FERTILIZERS FOR THE MIDWEST AND WEST

Farmers in a belt of States from Wisconsin to California are paying too high

prices for too low analysis phosphatic fertilizer. They will be able to buy fertilizer from this region at prices which will afford them savings of many millions of dollars annually, in the form of lower freight rates and handling charges. There will be consequently greater use of fertilizer to replenish land which has been depleted by the growing of crops and enhanced productivity. The attendant benefits to the entire agricultural economy will be reflected in greater volume, lower costs of production, and more nutritious food for consumers.

HELLS CANYON FOR RECREATION

Recreation is another important aspect of the multipurpose structure. Suffice it to say with one of the world's highest dams to be situated in North America's deepest gorge, a tourist attraction will be created that will lure from a third to a half-million visitors annually, probably more. Tourist dollars are an important phase of our northwest economy, and we should not overlook the added drawing power to be provided by the opening up of a spectacularly rugged canyon and primitive area.

Aside from its tourist-attraction lure, the dam will create a reservoir that will be ideal for fishing, hunting, boating, swimming, and camping. One nationally known writer, who travels the country over, predicts Hells Canyon reservoir will become one of the greatest bass fishing lakes in the Nation. He wrote, "I believe that the building of Hells Canyon Dam would be the greatest possible good fortune that conceivably could befall the sportsmen of this area."

HELLS CANYON—KEYSTONE OF THE SNAKE AND LOWER COLUMBIA SYSTEM

As Hells Canyon goes, so goes the Snake and lower Columbia. The Hells Canyon Dam is the keystone of the system.

Let us examine the projects which would be more efficient and whose power would be augmented by the release of Hells Canyon water during periods of low water downstream.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks the table showing integration benefits which appears at page 377 of the 1952 House hearings on H. R. 5743.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection?

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

Nominal prime capability—kilowatts

Plant	With Hells Canyon	Without Hells Canyon	Added by Hells Canyon
Hells Canyon	688,000		688,000
Lower Granite [1]	170,000	116,000	54,000
Little Goose [1]	209,000	141,000	68,000
Lower Monumental [1]	194,000	132,000	52,000
Ice Harbor [1]	204,000	139,000	65,000
McNary [2]	617,000	569,000	48,000
John Day [1]	715,000	659,000	56,000
The Dalles [3]	687,000	637,000	50,000
Bonneville [3]	476,000	452,000	24,000
Other plants	3,894,000	3,885,000	9,000
Total	7,854,000	6,730,000	1,124,000

[1] Authorized.
[2] In operation.
[3] Under construction.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the table shows the augmentation of power output at eight major downstream dams and a few other minor installations attributable to Hells Canyon. The eight are either in operation, under construction, or authorized.

Let us examine the authorized but unfinanced projects. As the table shows, Lower Granite (which is only authorized) has a potential of 170,000 kilowatts, 54,000 of which would result from integration with Hells Canyon—that is, approximately one-third of the total. We have the same situation in regard to Little Goose—68,000 kilowatts—again approximately one-third dependent upon Hells Canyon. Lower Monumental and Ice Harbor are in the same category. John Day is similar: of its full potential of 715,000 kilowatts, 56,000 would result from Hells Canyon.

The remaining dams, which are in place or under construction, would each have integration benefits smaller in kilowatts and percentage than any of the dams which are only authorized.

Last year a representative of the Army Corps of Engineers testified, for example, that Ice Harbor Dam would not be an economic project without storage of the amount and kind that would be provided by Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. President, I wish to digress long enough to issue a warning to the advocates of Ice Harbor Dam and the advocates of the other dams which have been authorized but have not yet been financed by way of appropriations made by the Congress. My warning to them is to "watch out." If they let the opponents of Hells Canyon Dam succeed in their attempts to scuttle it as a Federal project and prevent its construction, they will strike a devastating blow at the dams which have been authorized but have not yet been financed.

In connection with that warning, Mr. President, I wish to say that my fear is that so many of those dams, which, as I have just pointed out in my analysis, are dependent on Hells Canyon Dam, to the extent of one-third of their power capacity will be subject to the argument that they will no longer be economic without Hells Canyon Dam.

One of the reasons why the fight in favor of the construction of Hells Canyon Dam must be won now is in order to protect the future development of these authorized dams, for which Congress will sooner or later have to appropriate funds. We need to weigh that warning, Mr. President, in view of the testimony to which I have just referred; namely, that of the Army engineers, given last year, when they pointed out that without Hells Canyon Dam, Ice Harbor Dam would not be an economic project without storage of the amount and kind that would be provided by Hells Canyon Dam. Because of their similarity, the same would be true of Lower Monumental, Little Goose, and Lower Granite.

Without Hells Canyon, all of these projects may well be lost. With the loss of Hells Canyon's 688,000 kilowatts and storage, the probability is that the 1½ million kilowatts of the authorized but unfinanced dams will be gone. To that must be added the 131,000 kilowatts which Hells Canyon would add to Bonneville and the dams under construction. The results of not building Hells Canyon would come to a loss of 2,311,000 kilowatts a year.

NORTHWEST EXPANSION AND PUBLIC POWER

Is it mere coincidence that from 1939 to 1950 the kilowatt output in Oregon quadrupled and the total wages and salaries in manufacturing quintupled? The answer to that question, Mr. President, is that it was not a mere coincidence. Is it coincidence that the kilowatt output in the State of Washington increased 5 times over and that total wages in manufacturing went up to 4 times the 1939 figures? The answer to that question is that it was not a coincidence, Mr. President. Of course, in each case the tremendous increase in power was publicly generated power. During the period, public power in Oregon went from 216 million kilowatt-hours to about 4,000 million kilowatt-hours. Private output was increased all of 400 million kilowatt hours.

Is it mere coincidence that employees in manufacturing industries were 1½ times as numerous in 1950 as in 1939 in Washington and almost doubled in Oregon?

These are figures of growth which show that wages and employment are parallel to kilowatt output of inexpensive power—which has been public power. These are figures which tell in a very dynamic way, Mr. President, why the great labor organizations of the Pacific Northwest, most of the great farm organizations of the Pacific Northwest, and the leaders of small business in the Pacific Northwest see the importance of Hells Canyon Dam to the sale of farm products, the providing of jobs, the creation of new industry, and the great stimulation of the economic productivity of our section of the country.

HELLS CANYON—BUILDING FOR THE FUTURE

The Pacific Northwest and the Nation need the high Hells Canyon Dam as an integral part of the Columbia River Power System.

Hells Canyon power is indispensable.

Hells Canyon storage for downstream power increases is indispensable.

Hells Canyon's aid to navigation is indispensable.

Hells Canyon's contribution to flood control is indispensable.

Hells Canyon is needed to meet the low-cost power needs of industry, workers, and farmers.

Hells Canyon is needed to make new industry and new irrigation acres.

Hells Canyon is needed to provide employment and payrolls and taxes in the Pacific Northwest.

Let us move forward to build Hells Canyon Dam—the indispensable multipurpose project if we are to build for the future, not only in the Pacific Northwest, but throughout the Nation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the struggle over natural resources which has begun today with the introduction of the Hells Canyon bill will rank in history with the battle over the founding of the United States forest reserves

and the long fight by Senator George W. Norris for Muscle Shoals.

Hells Canyon is the greatest natural hydroelectric power site left on our continent, but even more than this is at stake.

Hells Canyon is the keystone in the arch of resources out in the great Pacific Northwest. If Hells Canyon is given to private monopoly for far less than full development, other resources will likewise pass from the hands of the people.

Five great principles are at issue in this bill:

First. Will the power resources of the Columbia River and its tributaries—the mightiest hydroelectric stream in North America—be tapped for the public or for a favored few?

Second. Will power sites in the Columbia Basin be used to full capacity or to merely a fragment of their possibilities?

Third. Will the 308 report of the Corps of Engineers, which is the master plan for Columbia Basin development, be followed, or will it be abandoned?

Fourth. Will Columbia Basin kilowatts be available to farmers, manufacturers, and homeowners at low cost or at high monopolistic rates?

Fifth. Will the generation of hydroelectric power be accompanied by such additional multipurpose benefits as flood control, irrigation, downstream power firming, and the protection of wildlife?

HELLS CANYON IS IN PUBLIC INTEREST

If the Hells Canyon bill which we have introduced today is passed by Congress and signed by the President these questions will be answered in the public interest.

If the bill fails of passage, Mr. President, these questions will be answered in sorrowful and adverse terms for the American people.

I should like to associate myself with my senior colleague from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] in what he has said about Hells Canyon and its impact on our State, region, and Nation. I also should like to thank from the bottom of my heart the other distinguished Senators who have joined with him and myself in sponsorship of this bill, which means much not only to our State of Oregon, but also to the United States of America.

Mr. President, I first visited Hells Canyon in 1939. I have been there many times since. I have ridden its rapids on the mailboat *Idaho*. I have trudged its narrow trails and ridden horseback over Freezeout Saddle, the great pass on the Oregon rim of the chasm where Capt. Benjamin L. E. Bonneville and his fellow explorers escaped from the gorge nearly a century and a quarter ago. My wife Maurine and I have camped alone in the Seven Devils Range of Idaho, along the eastern wall of Hells Canyon, and peered down upon the foaming mountain river, which has trenched more than a mile into the earth.

STRUGGLE IS HISTORIC

Never did I think on those memorable occasions, Mr. President, that I would have the privilege and the challenge of standing in this distant arena of government, alined with my illustrious colleague [Mr. MORSE], in an historic effort to retain Hells Canyon for all the American people.

Hells Canyon passed into protected public possession when Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot set aside the forest reserves in 1908. The vast chasm is divided between the Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forests of Idaho and the Wallowa National Forest of Oregon. The hydroelectric power resources of Hells Canyon need not be given to the absentee-dominated Idaho Power Co. if this Congress will only stand by the principles of those progressive Republicans, Theodore Roosevelt and his Chief Forester, Gifford Pinchot. Indeed, Roosevelt and Pinchot deliberately located forest ranger stations along swift rivers at power sites to keep these sites out of the clutches of what Pinchot called "the power octopus." We are again confronted by a challenge similar to that which sent Roosevelt and Pinchot into action.

An administrative arm of Congress—the Federal Power Commission—now has before it a proposal by which a private power company could preempt that section of the Snake River wherein the high multipurpose Hells Canyon Dam would be built. Through narrow interpretation of the Federal Power Act, legal counsel for that body has recommended that licenses be granted to permit building three small private dams in the Hells Canyon area. Through tortured logic, this position was taken despite findings that the alternative high Hells Canyon Dam would provide superior total multiple-purpose benefits.

The Federal Power Act, it seems to me, is fairly clear as to how the Congress intended the Federal Power Commission to function in cases such as the present controversy. The act specifically declares that the Commission shall license that project best adapted to comprehensive development of a river basin. How can less-than-full development be the best policy, when an alternative will produce maximum use? It sounds inconceivable, but that is the unbalanced interpretation of the law which has been given by initial recommendation within the present Commission.

INTENT OF CONGRESS DISTORTED BY FPC

This is not the first time that the intent of Congress—established in the Federal Power Act—has been circumvented or distorted by administrative fiat. When such occasions arise and the national interest is endangered, it becomes necessary for Congress to clarify and redefine the meaning of previous acts. It is a legislative responsibility; not one to be shifted to other branches of government.

Congress has delegated certain of its power-licensing authority on navigable streams to the Commission, but without periodic reaffirmation of policy, the administrative arm tends to become rudderless, and increasingly subject to having scientific and technical knowledge twisted by political whims.

By authorizing Federal construction of Hells Canyon Dam, the Congress will reestablish the guideposts for determining what constitutes full and comprehensive development of water resources. Then, there will be no question as to the primary test of comprehensiveness. It will be that project which contributes the most toward the economic and social development of an entire river basin. There will be no further reason for failure of the Commission to act in the best interests of resource conservation.

WATER POLICY IMPERATIVE

It is important that this national water policy be spelled out here and now. We live in an age when energy for industrial fuel is a dominant factor in social and economic growth. The Columbia River Basin contains about 42 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric energy. We have developed approximately one-sixth of the possible capacity. Here is a challenge to American ingenuity and farsightedness. Have we the wisdom to carry on the program which will realize the full possibilities of this resource? We must be equal to the challenge, because this Nation does not have a world monopoly on choice sites for development of low-cost energy.

If we fail to develop our waterpower to the fullest and at the lowest cost, industry will go where the cost of energy is cheaper and the supply more abundant. We have already seen this trend started in the Pacific Northwest, where aluminum companies have been forced to locate elsewhere because of the recent threat of power shortages. In our region—which has no other fuel for an energy base except falling water—the economic paralysis from piecemeal high-cost power would be roughly equivalent to a serious economic depression. We cannot allow the race for low-cost energy to be lost by default merely to satisfy the demands of special corporate interests.

The technique of multipurpose river development has been uniquely American. In recent years it has been one of our chief technological exports. The United States is spending millions of dollars to show governments in Europe, Asia, and elsewhere how to get the most out of river resources. Our funds and our know-how are being used for power development by governments around the globe. At home, however, such action is labeled by the present administration as "creeping socialism" and "subsidized power." Apparently the administration believes that what is good for our allies is not especially good for us.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S DOUBLE STANDARD

We in the Columbia Basin States saw the effects of this teeter-totter logic when the President's budget was presented a few weeks ago. Again the administration failed to allocate a single dollar for start of a new multipurpose project on the main stem of the Columbia or its tributaries. At the same time there were ample funds for faraway places.

I favor the use of our aid to help underdeveloped areas raise their standards of living by better use of resources. But it seems singularly inconsistent for the administration to give its blessing to multipurpose river projects in foreign lands and the back of its hand to similar objectives on the Columbia, the

Snake, and the Tennessee Rivers. Surely, Baker, Oreg., deserves as much consideration as Bombay, India.

Continuation of the administration's double standard for river projects will put the Nation further behind in meeting its prospective power requirements while power expansion goes on around the world. We must regain our position in the world as the recognized disciples of full river-basin development. Our leadership in this field of conservation has been an example for the entire world, but it is suffering under the administration's policy of do-nothingism and phony "partnership."

PARALLEL: HELLS CANYON AND GRAND COULEE

Grand Coulee is the greatest power project ever erected. Its vast supply of energy has helped make possible 50,000 planes a year to safeguard our country. This energy stokes the Hanford atomic works, where atomic energy undergoes its final processing. Grand Coulee turns out more kilowatts than any other powerplant, exceeding even vast Kitimat in British Columbia, Dnieperstroy in the Soviet Union or Hoover Dam in the canyon of the Colorado.

Yet Grand Coulee could not have been built if the McKay philosophy had prevailed during the 1920's. The parallel between Grand Coulee on the Columbia and Hells Canyon on the Snake River is a striking one, in its similarities.

When the crusade for Grand Coulee Dam reached the same proportions as the current agitation for Hells Canyon, the Washington Water Power Co. proposed a relatively small structure at Kettle Falls, 117 miles upstream from the Grand Coulee site. It is obvious that the Kettle Falls edifice would have effectively prevented a high dam at Grand Coulee, because the reservoir back of Grand Coulee was to extend for 151 miles—all the way to the Canadian frontier.

Listen to these words from the recent new book on the history of Grand Coulee by George Sundborg—a book entitled "Hail Columbia!"—Macmillan Co.:

> In March of 1921, just after the appropriation had been secured to core-drill the Grand Coulee site, the Washington Water Power Co. began to exhibit interest in Kettle Falls for power development. If a water right could be obtained at Kettle Falls, any dam at Grand Coulee would have to be held to a height of 202 feet in order not to flood out the upstream site. Thus, Grand Coulee would have more than 100 feet of head lopped off, with consequent enormous reductions in its power-production capabilities.

Far-sighted men refused to swap the Grand Coulee Percheron for the Kettle Falls rabbit. They fought the pygmy dam at Kettle Falls. These were men in and out of Government—Jim O'Sullivan, of Spokane; Rufus Woods, of the Wenatchee Daily World; Senators Dill and Bone and Norris and McNary; J. D. Ross, of Seattle.

As a result, the Kettle Falls dog-in-the-manger dam was blocked. Eventually, Grand Coulee rose to fortress height above the Columbia and began to develop an ultimate 2,650,000 horsepower of electricity.

But we can see the parallel. If the Columbia River had been surrendered to the Washington Water Power Co., as today it is proposed we surrender the Snake River to the Idaho Power Co., Grand Coulee as a high dam would have been impossible to construct.

Imagine the loss to America in terms of hydroelectric power if this had occurred.

What we pass on to the future by our action on the Hells Canyon bill is more than a single dam site. Our decision on this measure may well shape the destiny of national conservation policy—a policy tried and proven for 50 years, until thrust into limbo 2 years ago under the influence of self-seeking interests. The issue at Hells Canyon is the very synthesis of the meaning of resource conservation. The question is this: Given the opportunity to put to beneficial use the greatest natural water-storage site in the continent, will Congress decide to reserve for all time the full multipurpose utility of Hells Canyon? Or, will it surrender to shortsighted expediency, telling this generation and those to come that they must accept less than total productivity from their river resources?

NO TURNING BACK FROM DECISION

This is a decision from which there is no turning back. Once established at Hells Canyon, the policy circumscribes our national attitude toward every rivulet that runs to the sea. Shall we impose a doctrine of inadequacy or shall we look to the future, endorsing a physical structure which symbolizes the meaning of full and comprehensive conservation of natural resources?

Mr. President, a dam is different from almost any other resource. It is possible to take part of the coal out of a mine at one time, and then go back later to get the rest of it. On a farm it is possible to plow the north 40 and leave the south 40 fallow. However, once a pygmy dam is built, it is impossible to go back later and erect a high dam, to get the remainder of the power.

Mr. President, future generations of American boys and girls—interested in the rich natural resources of this country—will know from their history books what we do on this Hells Canyon bill, and they will judge us by it. I hope they, in turn, can tell their own children that we have not only handed on to them a great Federal multipurpose dam, but a sound conservation policy. In so doing, we will tap for the people the full energy potential of the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River, where it surges along the border between Oregon and Idaho.

I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks an article about the Hells Canyon bill written by the noted syndicated columnist, Doris Fleeson, and published in the Washington Evening Star of March 8, 1955.

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

SENATE FIGHT FOR HELLS CANYON—MORSE AND 28 OTHER SENATORS TO OFFER BILL AUTHORIZING UNITED STATES TO BUILD MULTIPURPOSE DAM ON SNAKE RIVER

(By Doris Fleeson)

The power issue will move up to the partisan battlefront this week when Senator MORSE introduces for himself and 28 colleagues a bill to authorize Federal construction of a multipurpose hydroelectric power project on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon.

This is the famous Hells Canyon, the last really choice power site in the Northwest. The Idaho Power Co. wants it and has the administration's blessing. Interior Secretary McKay withdrew the Government's claim to the site, announced his personal support of Idaho Power's plans and the Federal Power Commission is expected to announce a decision in the company's favor.

The Morse bill is an attempt to remove the power of decision from the administration and reserve the site for the Federal Government. Like the Dixon-Yates effort to carve out a slice of TVA territory, it furnishes one of the rather rare clean-cut differences between the Eisenhower philosophy and the New Deal.

Signing the bill with Senator MORSE are his colleague, Senator NEUBERGER, and 25 liberal Democrats from the Northwest, Northeast, and the Middle South. They are joined by what is facetiously called the liberal wing of the Republican Party, Senators LANGER and YOUNG, of North Dakota.

The Democratic leadership will do its best to pass the measure or at least to give it such support that Democrats can attribute its defeat to virtually solid Republican opposition. There are sound political reasons for this strategy as well as much real conviction that Hells Canyon ought to be a Federal project.

Three Senate seats will be at stake in the area next year. Democrats think that Hells Canyon will help them reelect Senators MORSE and MAGNUSON. They think it will help them defeat Senator WELKER, of Idaho, the intimate friend of Senator MCCARTHY.

There are wheels within wheels in the politics of the situation. Hells Canyon, for better or for worse, can be draped around the necks of the Republican Governors—Patterson, of Oregon and Langlie, of Washington—who are expected to be the opposition to MORSE and MAGNUSON, respectively. Governor Patterson is a protege of Secretary McKay, who is also a former Oregon governor. FPC Chairman Kuykendall, who has been going along with the administration, was recommended for the post by Governor Langlie.

No candidate has yet appeared to make the fight against Senator WELKER but the national committee here has solid assurances from Idaho that at least it won't be the former Progressive candidate for Vice President, Glen Taylor. Mr. Taylor won a primary fight last year but was defeated by Senator DWORSHAK for a seat Democrats think they could have had with a different candidate.

The hard core of Mr. Taylor's Idaho support has been the labor unions. They are said to have told him now that he has had it and gets not one dime more from them. This clears the way for Democrats to find a candidate their conservatives may be willing to accept.

In the fight for the bill, its supporters will make much of the fact that 65 percent of the common stock of Idaho Power, which has all the senior voting rights, is held by residents of the New England and Middle Atlantic States. Of that amount, 30 percent is held by 30 owners, largely eastern insurance companies, but including Harvard University.

Democrats will argue that the businessmen who so largely surround the President are advising him, not the residents of the Northwest, on this issue and that it is absentee owners who are against the further development of the low-cost power in the West.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Without taking too much of the Senator's time, I wish to compliment him on his exceedingly able

speech in support of the great Hells Canyon Dam, which is of such importance to the Pacific Northwest. It is so typical of the Senator's writing. He has put in succinct form the essentials of that great project. The people of the Pacific Northwest are greatly indebted to him for his fine speech.

I should like to ask 2 or 3 questions of the Senator. Is it not true that the junior Senator from Oregon made this project one of the prominent issues of his 1954 campaign when he asked the people of Oregon to elect him to the Senate?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The senior Senator from Oregon, as usual, has stated the facts correctly. Along the line of what the senior Senator from Oregon has stated, I believe it is additionally significant, although in modern times the State which we represent has been traditionally represented by a political party other than the one with which we are associated, that I carried nearly every county along the Columbia and Snake Rivers, from Hells Canyon to the sea. It was in those counties that the Hells Canyon issue was most predominant.

It was in those counties that the issue was most clearly enunciated to the people. Those people were most aware of the issue and most alarmed and most concerned by it. They have lived with it, too. In those counties I ran far ahead of any other Democratic senatorial candidate in the history of our State in modern times, I have been told by Dave O'Hara, Oregon's experienced and capable elections bureau head.

I believe the senior Senator from Oregon has correctly stated that the issue of this great power site certainly was an important contributing factor in that decision.

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

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not true that we may justifiably look upon the results of that election as a form of mandate on this particular issue so far as our State is concerned?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I agree completely with the senior Senator from Oregon. It is very significant that in the senior Senator's able presentation of the provisions of the bill, he emphasized the impact on our farm population, and discussed the question of cheap phosphate fertilizer as it is related to the development of electricity with low-cost power from Hells Canyon.

A short time after the election, there appeared in that outstanding national newspaper, the Christian Science Monitor, an article written by Mr. Malcolm Bauer, the correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor in Oregon. Mr. Bauer pointed to the very large rural vote which I had received, particularly in the areas contiguous to the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

From what Mr. Bauer has written and from the senior Senator's remarks on the floor of the Senate, we can draw no other conclusion except that the farmers in that important agricultural section of Oregon were influenced by the effect which the Hells Canyon Dam could have on our rural economy if it is constructed as a public, Federal project.

Mr. MORSE. Is it not correct to say that a few years ago, when the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, was a member of the Oregon Senate, the people of Oregon gave another clear mandate on this water development project at Hells Canyon when a referendum was held on a question that came before the Oregon Legislature involving an attempt on the part of the Idaho Power Co. to get peremptory rights over water in the Snake River?

Mr. NEUBERGER. The senior Senator from Oregon again recalls his facts correctly. I am very glad that he brought up this point. That occurred in the 1947 session of the Oregon Legislature. As I recall, it was the session before I became a member of the State senate.

It is significant that the late Gov. Earl Snell of Oregon vetoed a bill the Idaho Power Co. sought to have enacted, which would have facilitated the ability of that company to acquire the great Hells Canyon site for a piecemeal, pygmy development.

At that time the present Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, was a member of the State senate. As I remember, he was one of the very few State Senators who wisely voted to uphold Governor Snell's courageous veto.

It is significant that the people at the polls cast a margin of nearly 100,000 votes against that bill, despite the vast sums of money spent by the private-power companies to try to pass the bill.

I think it is also significant that the Secretary of the Interior, when he was a member of the State senate in our State, voted in that body to uphold Governor Snell's wise veto of the Hells Canyon giveaway; yet the same man, as Secretary of the Interior, is now out in front in favor of the giveaway parade—particularly as it applies to Hells Canyon.

Mr. MORSE. I think it is important to make this a matter of record, because I feel there have been two elections on the subject. There was one when the question was first before the people, and another one last fall when the Senator ran for his seat in this body.

I know my colleague's view on this issue and I completely agree with them, but while the Senator is on his feet I should like to have him spread on the RECORD a point which he did not cover in his speech today; namely, the argument of the opponents of Hells Canyon in reference to taxes; the argument that, of course, if the Government builds the dam, the taxes will not go into the Treasury, but if we permit the Idaho Power Co. to scuttle the dam by building three low-head dams, which will produce about 50 percent of the power potential, then more tax dollars will flow into the Treasury of the United States.

Will the Senator, for the sake of the RECORD, express his views on that highly fallacious argument?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in the first place, that is the oldest cliché in connection with the whole question of public power. If we should take property taxes, income taxes, corporation taxes, and payroll taxes, which are paid by industrial development made possible through low-cost public power, the amount would be many times more than the relative pittance of taxes paid by private utility companies. I remember looking into the situation in Spokane County, in the State of Washington, and noting that the aluminum plants alone in that one county paid substantially more in local property taxes than did the private utilities in that particular county.

I also looked into the situation in Chelan County, in Washington, and found that one new aluminum company in Wenatchee paid almost twice as much in local property taxes in its first year of operation as did the important Great Northern Railroad.

If we forget the millions and millions of dollars paid in taxes by the vast new industrial and manufacturing development which comes from low-cost public power, then, indeed, will we be throwing away the birthright of the people of the Northwest.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator. I think we shall have to repeat and repeat our answer to this phony tax argument, because, as the Senator well knows, persons who seem to think that private utilities should be allowed to scuttle these public projects are overlooking the fact that many times the amount of taxes which might otherwise accrue will be paid by industries that will locate in the area as a result of the high dam, whereas such industries would never locate there and undertake to operate if they had to pay the high rates of the private utility companies.

I wonder if the Senator will tell us his views from the standpoint of the national defense.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it seems to me we must learn from history. When the Senator from Oregon asks that question, let us look at the analogy with Grand Coulee and the people who preceded us, such as Senator Bone, Senator Norris, and also Senator McNary, in whose illustrious line serves my colleague from Oregon.

When President Roosevelt suggested the production of 50,000 planes a year, he was met with laughter. But, largely as a result of the construction of Grand Coulee Dam, we have produced 50,000 planes a year. Before the construction of Grand Coulee Dam not 1 ounce of aluminum was smeltered west of the Mississippi River, but when that dam was completed, approximately 45 to 50 percent of our whole national production was concentrated in that northwestern territory. That was largely made possible by the construction of the Grand Coulee Dam.

Low cost power provided by the TVA for Oak Ridge and low cost power at Grand Coulee in the Pacific Northwest made possible the production of the ultimate weapon which not only won World War II but which we know restrains the Soviet Union today from sending its divisions over the face of the world in aggressive warfare. If Grand Coulee had been bartered away, as Hells Canyon is proposed to be bartered away to private utilities, the result might have been very different.

In my State, Mr. President, Charles L. McNary was an esteemed figure. To

know where Charles L. McNary would stand on the question before us now, one has only to read his speeches. McNary was for low cost Federal power. The Senator recalls the President's speech in the 1954 political campaign at the dedication of the McNary Dam. That dam has a fine and honored name.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad the Senator has brought up that matter. The Senator has referred to the President's speech at the dedication of the McNary Dam. He will recall that the President sought to give the impression that those of us who are urging the construction of these projects are seeking a Federal monopoly of power, and in speeches evidently written for him by someone else he has referred to these projects as creeping socialism. What does my colleague have to say about whether we are advancing creeping socialism?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Of course, the senior Senator from Oregon, when he brings up that question, knows that they are talking about two kinds of monopoly, Federal monopoly and private monopoly. I recall reading figures published in the New York Times in 1953 which indicated that 6 percent of electricity is produced by municipal plants, 13 percent of the electricity generated in the United States is generated by Federal dams, and 81 percent by private utility companies. I am not very good at arithmetic. It was always my poorest subject in school. But even I know that if there is any danger of monopoly, 81 percent is a greater danger than is 13 percent. I wonder what kind of arithmetic they are using in this administration. They say nothing about the 81 percent monopoly. They are worried over 13 percent. I hope they are not figuring out the budget with that kind of a multiplication table.

Mr. President, we hear talk about Hells Canyon Dam being creeping socialism. The Secretary of the Interior recently appeared before committees and advocated the construction of Federal dams on the upper Colorado River. How a Federal dam in Hells Canyon can be creeping socialism and a dam on the Colorado can be just good Republican free-enterprise statesmanship, I cannot understand.

Mr. MORSE. That will be debated.

Mr. NEUBERGER. That will be debated. The question of how there is creeping socialism through the construction of a dam at one place and not at another place will certainly be debated.

I have been in Hells Canyon; I have walked almost all the way through that wonderful gorge, and I did not notice anything about the atmosphere there which would make that dam "creeping socialism" and a dam at some other place just good statesmanship.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator shares my suspicion that it makes some difference whether a proposed project is in an area where the administration wants to give something away to a private utility. When that is the case, then the building of a dam by the Federal Government is considered to be creeping socialism. But when the area is one where it would not be profitable for private utilities to be involved in a natural-resource development, then one is battling for the public interest, and it is not considered to be creeping socialism.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator has a very valid point. I am not an engineer, and neither is my distinguished colleague; but I have always thought that the way in which a power site can be determined to be valuable is if the administration wants to give it away. Then it is valuable. If the administration wants to keep it for Federal development, perhaps it is not quite so good a site.

Compare Hells Canyon with Libby. Libby is fraught with international complications. Libby is up near the Canadian border. The building of Libby Dam would create a vast lake backing water into Canada.

Our good neighbors in British Columbia, naturally and quite properly, if part of their land is to be flooded, believe they should ask for substantial reparation and get benefits in return for allowing Uncle Sam to construct such a dam.

This administration talks about fiscal solvency. If it is going to develop a site which will be of benefit to the people, let it develop one involving no international obligations, a site which the Army engineers recommend, and not give it away to the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. MORSE. The Truman administration was proceeding with negotiations for the construction of Libby Dam. When the Eisenhower administration came into office they discontinued the negotiations. But when they decided it was not very good politics, they reopened the negotiations and are now stressing Libby Dam very much, apparently in an effort to meet the charge that they are not favoring any new starts in the Northwest. But the only start they are proposing is one they know will take a lot of international negotiations to get under way.

It is my hope that those negotiations will be successful so that a start can be made on Libby Dam. It may take quite a while, but I want the Senators from Montana to know that they can count on my vigorous support for that great project.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator is correct. I think the site for Libby Dam is an excellent one and ought to be developed. I think that logically it should be developed. But I think also it is extremely significant that the one site which has need for international authority and treatymaking is one which has been recommended for Federal development, because the Government knows that negotiations will be required at Ottawa and Victoria.

But the Hells Canyon site, where the Government could be ready to go ahead, is a site which the administration wants to give away to the Idaho Power Co.

Mr. MORSE. One final question: What is my colleague's reaction to the very misleading argument of the spokesman for the Idaho Power Co., that there simply is not sufficient water in the Snake River to take care of the power, irrigation, and flood-control aspects of Hells Canyon Dam, and still leave enough water for the farmers and the other users of water in Idaho?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I should simply say, to begin with, that it is always strange that there is said to be enough water for private dams, but not for Federal dams.

Secondly, I should hate to think that the great United States Corps of Engineers, which we allow to decide where airbases and atomic-energy plants are to be located in the United States, where the Alaska highway is to be located, and where airbases throughout the world are to be constructed for the protection of the American people, cannot be entrusted with the decision as to whether there is sufficient water in the Snake River. The Army engineers in their great Report No. 308, which is the master plan for the development of the entire Columbia River and its tributaries, have said that there is sufficient water in the Snake River for the construction of a high-level Federal dam at Hells Canyon.

I should be very much amazed if the people of the United States thought that the Army engineers were not competent to measure the water in the Snake River, but still had charge of the engineering studies relating to our international defense program.

I am not an engineer, and my colleague is not an engineer; but if there is not sufficient water in the Snake River for the building of a multipurpose dam at Hells Canyon, then the country is in a sad plight indeed, because then we should have to admit that the Army engineers were not capable of constructing our defense establishments throughout the world.

Mr. MORSE. Not only do I agree with the observation of the Senator, but I think an inexcusable, misleading, false argument is being used in opposition to the construction of Hells Canyon Dam. Both the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation have set forth in detail the truth, if anyone will read it, that there is sufficient water in the Snake River to meet the purposes of the dam and also to supply water for the water users of Idaho.

I thank the Senator for participating in the discussion with me, and I congratulate him upon his very fine speech.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator. I wish to say in conclusion, especially for the benefit of the senior Senator from Montana, that my position regarding Libby Dam, so that he understands it unmistakably, is that Libby Dam should be constructed by the United States Government as a Federal dam, just as all the other multipurpose sites in the Report No. 308 of the Army engineers should be constructed—namely, Hells Canyon, Libby, John Day, Ice Harbor, and other sites in the Columbia River system, a system which contains 42 percent of the latent potential hydroelectricity of our country.

Hydroelectricity is a renewable resource. With it, great quantities of power can be developed without using up such limited fuel supplies as coal, oil, and natural gas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, today the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has introduced, on behalf of himself, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], the Senators from Montana, and numerous other Senators, a bill to authorize construction of a multiple-purpose dam in Hells Canyon, on the Snake River, in the Pacific Northwest. Because this matter is so close and so important to the people of that area, I—along with other Senators—feel compelled to take some of the time of the Senate to present the case for authorization of the Hells Canyon project.

Mr. President, I have supported Federal development of the Hells Canyon reach of the Snake River from the time it first was made an important element of the comprehensive plan for development of the Columbia Basin.

It is gratifying that so many of my colleagues from all sections of the Nation are joining those of us from the Northwest in sponsoring legislation to authorize this mighty and vitally needed project. I urge the Senate to act quickly and favorably on the bill we are introducing today.

The people of the Pacific Northwest—and, in particular, the people of the State of Washington—are keenly aware of the fundamental issue underlying the Hells Canyon case. They are aware that it involves a test between a long-established policy of maximum development of the rivers of the Nation and one which would provide, instead, for partial, wasteful, and restricted development.

This issue must be fought out again and again. The Columbia River spills itself like a prodigal giant from its headwaters to the Pacific. With its tributaries, it carries one of the richest prizes that can be sought—over 30 million kilowatts of electric energy.

To those of us who fight for the cause of full, comprehensive development, this is a challenge—a challenge to be met by putting this giant to work for the welfare of everyone.

To our adversaries, the falling waters of the Columbia River mean merely profits—even at the expense of wasting part of our resources. They see the river narrowly, and chiefly in terms of corporate self-interest.

To adopt the latter philosophy, as a policy to be underwritten by the Congress of the United States, would be to threaten both the present and the future economic growth of the Pacific Northwest—or of any other river basin where there is unharnessed power to be developed.

To the extent that the Nation fails to provide for energy in the highest volume and at the lowest cost and with the widest possible range of distribution—we fail to exercise the responsibilities which we owe to ourselves and to future generations. To the extent that we permit waste of a resource we undermine the very foundations of our society. This is true because every civilization in history has found that land and water—their use and conservation—determine its material welfare and even how long it will endure.

The greater part by far of activities in the development and use of energy resources is and must remain in the hands of private enterprise. But there are fields and situations that are far beyond the authority, the willingness, and the competence of private enterprise to assume alone. Fundamental conservation and development policies are impregnated with Federal responsibility. The Congress of the United States has recognized this fact and has established and carried forward fundamental policies and programs in this field since the beginning of the present century.

In the category of Federal responsibility is the planning, programming, construction, and operation of multiple purpose river development works designed and inaugurated to produce hydroelectric power and other benefits such as irrigation, flood control, and navigation. With such public projects has come the development of integrated operation of a series of dams by means of the regulation of stored water and a similarly integrated operation of power plants in order to provide the fullest use and greatest dissemination of energy over a backbone interconnecting transmission system.

Hells Canyon Dam is a proposal which fits in all respects into this conception of multiple-purpose development. It will be fully interconnected with the Federal Columbia River power system. Its 3,880,000 acre-feet of storage will be alternately held back and released. The 1,100,000 prime kilowatts of electric power it will produce, at site and downstream, will be fed into the backbone transmission system of the Bonneville Power Administration. Those kilowatts will become a part of the pool of energy available to meet the rapidly increasing load requirements of both the upstream and downstream areas of the Columbia drainage basin.

The proposal for private development at Hells Canyon violates these principles. The proposal, therefore, is contrary to the public interest.

Partial, uncoordinated and purely local development of a resource like that of Hells Canyon has no excuse for being, no matter by what agency it is proposed. For the Snake River pours its strength and promise through this massive, somber canyon for the use of the region and the Nation. To view the situation otherwise and to decide this question on the shifting sands of expediency and appeasement of powerful and vocal special interest groups is to betray the people whose resource this is and must always be.

Mr. President, a small, privately owned electric utility, the Idaho Power Co., incorporated in Maine, has fought bitterly to prevent maximum development at Hells Canyon. Its tactics have been those of delay and confusion during previous administrations. Since 1952 its tactics have included aggressive use of the present administration, all aimed at seizing the site for its own restricted use. To date it has not succeeded. It will not succeed.

I repeat, the issue is full and multipurpose development versus single-purpose underdevelopment.

Since 1916 this absentee-controlled corporation has held a small and unused powerplant at Oxbow, upstream from the Federal Hells Canyon site. From 1916 until 1947 it had its chance to do something about developing power there. It had 31 years to plan and perform, before the Federal Government completed its epochmaking river study of the Columbia and its tributaries. The company did nothing.

From 1947 to 1952, the Idaho Power Co. used this decayed plant at Oxbow as a lever to delay the Federal plans to harness Snake River at Hells Canyon. It was not until November 1950 that it applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to construct a small run-of-river dam at the site, of about one-tenth the power capacity of the Bureau of Reclamations proposed multiple-purpose storage project.

It was not until May 1953, after Secretary of the Interior McKay had withdrawn his Department's formal opposition to the construction of Oxbow Dam, that the Idaho Power Co. made application to the FPC for two additional installations. The three private plants collectively would produce less than two-thirds of high Hells Canyon output—and at a much higher cost—to be used primarily in the company's own service area.

Thus, we see a private company, controlled by eastern finance houses and insurance companies, which muffed its own opportunity of 31 long years to do something for the region when there was no competing plan at Hells Canyon. We see a private company which proposed a small dam to compete with the proposed Federal project to work a further delay of 5 years. It is 1955. Thirty-nine years of alternate inaction and obstruction are more than sufficient. The Idaho Power Co. has its own quota. Its time has run out—and the patience of the Northwest and the Nation with it.

The pattern of the fight for Hells Canyon is so similar to the great struggle for the Grand Coulee project that it bears out with startling truth what I stated earlier, namely, that comprehensive river development is an issue that must be fought over and over again.

At Grand Coulee too, a private power company proposed to build a low dam; a dam that would have obtained but a fraction of the benefits from the site. For years that company and its supporters delayed the project.

If these men of small vision—but of huge appetite for corporate profits—had had their way there would be no Grand Coulee, no Columbia Basin project. Had this private power company and its supporters had their way the kilowatts of Grand Coulee Dam could not have come to the aid of the Nation in World War II. Its kilowatts would not have been ready and waiting to produce 40 percent of our aluminum, and even the atom bomb itself.

The people won at Grand Coulee. No man in his right mind who lives in my State of Washington—be he Democrat or Republican—would now question the tremendous worth of this mighty project and what it has done for the economy of

the region and the Nation, in peace and in war.

The people are winning at Hells Canyon. This is my deep conviction. When the great dam stands astride the Snake River and the transmission lines are humming from McNary to eastern Idaho with the power created from its eight generators, the wisdom of the choice we shall have made will sink deep into the consciousness of everyone. But remember this—we can make this choice but once. There is no turning back once the die is cast.

Mr. President, the interest of the people of my State of Washington in Hells Canyon is based on two facts of life which hang over our heads like the sword of Damocles. They are most clearly illustrated by two major disasters which have struck us in the space of 7 short years, and can strike us again.

In 1943 the Columbia River produced a flood of proportions exceeded only once since river measurements have been taken. The swollen waters, almost without warning, burst through protecting embankments at the town of Vanport and inundated it in a wall of angry water. Fifty people were drowned. Damage to property exceeded $100 million.

Now let us turn to 1952. The spring runoff had gone down the river to the sea unchecked. During the fall and early winter of that year the lower Columbia experienced a tremendous drought. River flow dropped to a relative trickle. Power production fell. It was necessary to impose a power brownout over the entire area. The Bonneville Power Administration curtailed deliveries of interruptible power to the electroprocess industries and other customers. Firm power deliveries were cut 10 percent. Aluminum pot lines were shut down. Hundreds of workers were laid off. Privately owned electric utilities were forced to use old standby steam plants to provide high-cost energy to their customers. The loss to aluminum alone was over $5 million.

Here are two illustrations of economic damage to a region which comes from inadequate control of a river system. At one extreme—flood. At the other—drought. And as long as this situation exists, the Northwest must look nervously each spring to the melting snowpack in the headwaters—and hopefully each fall to the skies for rain.

Mr. President, there is not the slightest necessity for this shadow to hang ominously over my region. The Columbia carries to the Pacific Ocean a tremendous volume of water, exceeded in the United States only by the Mississippi River system.

The problem is to equalize the alternate cycles of high and low water—and, furthermore, to use every drop of that water, over and over, as it flows to the ocean. How can this be done?

It can be done by upstream storage reservoirs on the tributaries of the Columbia. These reservoirs will catch and hold the spring run-off and will release these impounded waters in the fall and early winter when precipitation is negligible. Thus the flow of the river system will be conserved, will be controlled, will be equalized through the year, and put to productive use.

That is why the upstream storage at Hells Canyon is so important. Its 3,880,000 acre-feet of impounding capacity will be a long step toward conservation and control. That storage will aid in reducing flood damage, by controlling Snake River from its source to the mouth of the Salmon. That same water will be released later in the year to turn the wheels of our run-of-river powerplants downstream, thereby firming up the power production. We must have that storage to aid in maintaining an equalized channel from the ocean to Lewiston, Idaho, and above. By so doing we will provide an added two-way avenue of transportation of goods and commodities of all descriptions through the inland empire.

Mr. President, Hells Canyon is one of the very important projects in the main control plan for the Columbia River system developed by the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in 1948. Years and years of study preceded the formulation of that plan. As a whole it is engineeringly and economically sound.

I have said before that this comprehensive plan calls for 27 million acre-feet of upstream storage. Hells Canyon will provide 3.8 million of that amount. In addition it will produce at site and downstream 1,100,000 kilowatts of electric energy.

We are not asking the taxpayers of the United States for a handout. Projects like Hells Canyon have added to the strength of the Nation by adding strength to the economic foundations of a region. Projects like Hells Canyon are investments which are entirely self-liquidating and which provide low-cost money for low-cost power. Even with annual interest charges, Hells Canyon will pay for itself twice over during the 50-year amortization period. In the years beyond it will continue paying for itself so long as the structure stands. I should like to add at this point that in the case of the Bonneville Power Administration and in the case of Grand Coulee itself, not only have we paid back to the Federal Government every cent with 5 percent interest, but we are years ahead on our repayment schedule, and have a very healthy backlog of almost $97 million in the Treasury.

Mr. President, I said that the Hells Canyon project will strengthen the Nation by strengthening the economic foundations of the Pacific Northwest region. It will do this because the kilowatts it generates will provide the energy to turn the wheels of new industries—the energy to expand the operation of present industry. Completion of this project will mean new investment in the region—new jobs, new retail outlets, new purchasing power, greater sales of consumer goods shipped into the area from all over the Nation.

Kilowatts are just a name unless translated into jobs and investments. Experts contend that 75,000 kilowatts will provide the base for $50 million in industrial expansion. That investment will create jobs for 7,500 industrial workers.

Now what do 7,500 new jobs mean to an area?

Recently the Washington, D. C., Board of Trade provided an answer.

Seven thousand five hundred new jobs—and this figure would be multiplied 15 times in the case of Hells Canyon—mean 15,750 more people employed, 75 more retail outlets, 10,000 more households, and $37,500,000 more in retail sales per year. In the case of Hells Canyon we are not talking about 75,000 kilowatts—we are talking about more than 1 million kilowatts—or 14 or 15 times the figures I have just cited.

We are talking about 110,000 new jobs, 1,100 new retail outlets, 140,000 new households, and 525 million additional dollars in retail sales.

We are talking about low-cost energy from Hells Canyon to support $700 million of new investment. We are talking about a great new tax base for local, State, and Federal Governments—supplied by private enterprise—but made possible by low-cost kilowatts.

If anyone wishes to question the validity of these figures—let me give him some cold, hard, indisputable facts—taken from the story of the aluminum industry.

The aluminum industry in the Northwest was born and nurtured by low-cost kilowatts. In 1953 the 3 major producers employed 9,000 men, with an annual payroll of $40 million,, with a capital investment of $200 million.

The Washington, D. C., Board of Trade would say that these 9,000 new jobs created 90 more retail outlets, created employment for 18,900 more people, and boosted retail sales by $45 million.

Hells Canyon kilowatts are not just a name. They mean jobs, they mean investment, they mean a better and richer life for thousands of people, they mean opportunity to establish new private enterprise. They mean additional tax income to Federal, local, and State governments. They mean a stronger America.

Mr. President, the basic issue in the Hells Canyon fight is whether a public resource will be fully developed or whether a part of it will be wasted. The fight over Hells Canyon is a fight between those of us who believe that a great resource owned by the people should be developed fully for the benefit of the people. I fervently hope that the Congress of the United States will settle the issue in favor of the people by enacting the legislation we introduce today.

Mr. President, I know the Members of the Senate are always interested in how the people of a State feel on a subject of this kind. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted on January 27 by the House of Representatives of the Washington State Legislature.

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

Whereas there is at the present time, before the Federal Power Commission, an application by the Idaho Power Co., a private utility, for permission to build three low-head dams on the Snake River; and

Whereas the Federal Government has heretofore proposed the building on the Snake

River at Hells Canyon of a multiple-purpose dam; and

Whereas the granting of the application of the Idaho Power Co. will kill off for the future the possibility of a multiple-purpose dam at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas the full potential of the Snake and Columbia River Basin for irrigation, reclamation, flood control and the production of electricity can be realized only by the building of a multiple-purpose dam at Hells Canyon; and

Whereas the economic conditions of the Pacific Northwest are dependent upon adequate power as well as adequate irrigation, reclamation and flood control; and

Whereas the proposed Hells Canyon Dam would provide for a better development of our natural resources and its construction would be in the best interests of the people of the State of Washington; and

Whereas with the exception of a few public officials, the majority of the people of the Northwest and this house of representatives are in favor of the building of Hells Canyon Dam: Now, therefore, it is hereby

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in regular session assembled, That we oppose the granting of permission to the Idaho Power Co. to build the proposed low-head dams; and be it further

Resolved, That we respectfully petition the Federal Power Commission to deny the application of the Idaho Power Co.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately forwarded to the Federal Power Commission to be filed in the present proceedings of the application of the Idaho Power Co., and that copies be sent to all the members of the congressional delegation and the Governor of the State of Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. In conclusion, I should like to say that I wholeheartedly concur in the comments made by both Senators from Oregon, as well as the other Northwest Senators, on this very vital Hells Canyon subject.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of attention to the debate which has occurred in observance of Hells Canyon Day. I do not rise at this time to engage in debate. That will be taken care of at some future time, I am sure, at a hearing to be conducted by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. On the question of resource development I shall not take issue with my colleagues from the Northwest States who have discussed the subject today. Insofar as natural resource development is concerned, my record of 8 years in the House of Representatives and almost 8 years in the Senate will demonstrate that I have consistently advocated maximum river development in the Columbia Basin. However, my colleagues, particularly those from the State of Oregon, and the senior Senator from Washington, have indicated that they are approaching this problem primarily because they are dedicated to constituents not only of their own States, but throughout the entire country, in the effort to provide this maximum development in the Columbia River Basin.

They have assailed a private power utility. I have no desire at this time to defend that private power utility, because it has an application for a license to construct three low-head dams in the Snake River Canyon, which application is pending before the Federal Power Commission. But, Mr. President, I must rise to point out that I also have constituents in the State of Idaho, and I am sincerely concerned in safeguarding their interests and the interests of those who use our water resources in my State.

Only yesterday at Idaho Falls, in the eastern section of my State, more than 1,000 representatives of water districts throughout the Snake River Valley from the Oregon line to the Wyoming border held their annual water meeting, endeavoring to solve many of the problems which confront them and to plan for future development. I am advised that unanimously this group of 1,000 water leaders in the State of Idaho adopted a resolution vigorously opposing the building of the high Hells Canyon Dam.

Oh, Mr. President, it is significant that the Senators who have preceded me this afternoon have pointed out that it is in the interest of national defense and resource development and in the interest of the people not only of the Columbia River Basin but of the entire United States, that the high Hells Canyon Dam be built. They overlook one very vital and important fact, namely, that the States of Wyoming and Idaho furnish practically all the water which would be impounded in the Hells Canyon Dam if it were constructed. It is easy for my colleagues from Washington to plead for the building of that great dam. But, Mr. President, not a drop of water from the State of Washington will be impounded in Hells Canyon Dam.

I also understand, Mr. President, that the State of Oregon will furnish only approximately 7 percent of the water which would be impounded in the high dam at Hells Canyon. The State of Wyoming sends down considerable water into the great Snake River Basin in southern Idaho, to flow down through the Snake River Canyon to joint with the magnificent Columbia River.

Let me point out, Mr. President, when we talk about flood control, which has been referred to frequently during the debate today—and the implication is plain—that in 1948 when there was a loss of 50 lives in the Portland area and a property loss involving many millions of dollars, it was contended that the Snake River and the failure to build the dam in Hells Canyon were largely responsible for that tragic flood. What does the record show? Mr. President, the record shows that most of the floodwaters which had such devastating effect in the lower Columbia River Basin did not originate in the Snake River. They originated in the Salmon River and in the Clearwater River. Yes, five-sixths of the floodwaters which course down the Snake River originate in the Salmon and the Clearwater Rivers. Yet we are told that a high dam must be built at Hells Canyon in order to avert in the future floods such as that which occurred in 1948.

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

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield for a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am very happy to hear the Senator from Idaho discuss some of the questions which have arisen in his mind with relation to Hells Canyon. I look forward to further debate on this subject, because the Senator from Idaho shares my great interest in the proper storage and development of the waters of the West.

I might say facetiously that he is beginning to feel the effects of the interests of other States in the water of Idaho. Without making any remark as to the State I am thinking of, I believe the Senator from Idaho might have a good idea.

I wish to ask the Senator from Idaho if private capital has ever offered to construct adequate dams on the Snake River for the purpose of water storage and the development of electricity?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I made reference previously to the fact that there is before the Federal Power Commission at present an application by the Idaho Power Co. for a license to build three low-head dams in the vicinity of Hells Canyon.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Is it true, as I have heard, that the three low-head dams could be constructed at a much less cost than a high dam?

Mr. DWORSHAK. According to newspaper accounts—and I must confess that I have not followed the hearing before the Federal Power Commission, because I consider it to involve a technical question by way of determining the adequacy of water with which to operate dams in the Hells Canyon area—I think it would cost only about one-third as much to build the low-head dams, which would depend largely upon the run of the river water, and would have less storage. I understand that 1 of the low-head dams would provide about 1 million acre-feet of storage, as contrasted with the much larger storage which would be provided by 1 high dam, such as that which is proposed in the bill introduced today.

Mr. GOLDWATER. If it be true that private funds can construct adequate dams in the Snake River, does the Senator from Idaho know of any reason why the United States should be deprived of the use of a half billion dollars, when private resources are ready to spend the money?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I answer the Senator from Arizona by saying that it would be the prerogative of Congress to determine whether such a gigantic investment of Federal funds as would be required for such a project would be justified at this time.

Mr. GOLDWATER. What I am getting at is that evidently another argument is shaping up between the private power and the public power interests. We all recognize the possible need for a dam project in the Snake River. My question is directed to the point: Would it not be more economical for private funds to develop the project than it would be for public money?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I presume that it would be, very definitely, from the standpoint of using tax dollars. I feel certain that if the private utilities could successfully build dams which would provide power to meet the anticipated shortage in the years ahead in the Columbia River Basin, and to take care of floodwaters, it probably would be advisable to let them do so. But again, I must emphasize that

that is more or less a technical engineering question, because actually there has been no adequate proof to show whether there is ample water available with which to operate a high-head dam.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator's last remark interests me. Has there been no proof that adequate water exists in the Snake River for this purpose?

Mr. DWORSHAK. The record will show that about 3 years ago the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, which was then under the control of the Democratic Party, conducted extensive hearings. Representatives of the water districts, the private utilities, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Army engineers testified for many weeks.

The proposal before the committee at that time to authorize a high Hells Canyon Dam was finally tabled unanimously, because all the members of the House committee concluded that there was not ample proof that water was available in the Snake River to justify the construction of such a huge project.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I have already referred to the meeting which was held in eastern Idaho yesterday, which was attended by about 1,000 leaders of water development in my State. But on February 15, 1955, it was my good fortune to attend another meeting at the same city, which was sponsored by the Corps of Army Engineers. On that occasion there were present about 1,200 representatives of water districts and flood-control districts from every section of the State, predominantly, of course, from the southern part of Idaho, where there is so much reclamation.

FAVOR UPPER WATERSHED USE

At that time emphasis was placed on the upper watershed development. At this late hour I do not intend to discuss what transpired at that meeting. I simply wish to state that in the upper reaches of the Snake River, near the Wyoming line, the Palisades Dam is now being completed. This is a multiple-purpose dam which will not only take care of flood control in that area, but likewise will provide water for reclamation development and will generate about 113,000 kilowatts of power, with which to pump water onto farms, and to provide some revenue with which to subsidize the reclamation development.

I was largely responsible for the holding of that hearing by the Corps of Army Engineers, because I was successful, in the second session of the 83d Congress, in having funds made available to the Army engineers with which to conduct a survey in that area.

Heretofore the Bureau of Reclamation has been extremely active in that field, but it was thought that so far as flood control was concerned, the Corps of Army Engineers likewise should make engineering studies of that area.

Emphasis has been placed upon the need of building not only the Palisades Dam, but also other multiple-purpose dams in the upper watershed.

When this development is completed—and it should be completed within the next decade—the engineers have testified that there will be very little water running below Milner Dam, which is one of the downstream points in the Snake River in Idaho, so far as reclamation is concerned.

As I have already pointed out, practically all our reclamation development, involving about 2 million acres in the Snake River Valley, is furnished by water from that stream; and during the past 5 years an additional 250,000 acres have been reclaimed and irrigated, largely with the use of underground water.

I stress this fact because when water is diverted for consumptive use in the upper reaches, it is very obvious that less and less water will flow down the Snake River to serve the proposed high dam in Hells Canyon.

I also wish to stress the fact that in Idaho we have not only the great Snake River, which runs throughout the southern part of the State and serves the reclamation interests of agriculture, but that through the middle section, from east to west, we have the great Salmon River watershed. Farther north, there is the Clearwater River watershed.

It is very significant that in the Salmon and Clearwater Rivers not a single acre of land is irrigated. This means that the water in those two rivers flows down to join the Snake River and the Columbia River without any of that water being diverted.

I ask, Mr. President, why the champions of resource development in the Columbia River Basin do not support some of the proposals to build high dams downstream on the Snake, such as at Pleasant Valley, Mountain Sheep, Nez Perce—and utilize Salmon River water—or on the Clearwater River, the North Fork, the Middle Fork, and the South Fork of the Clearwater.

In those instances they would be backing a program of flood control without in any way jeopardizing the water rights of more than 2¼ million acres of rich farmland in southern Idaho.

I point out that it is my firm conviction that we have seen the initiation of what I believe is destined to become a controversial issue in the campaign of 1956. There is plenty of evidence that is true, because we know that Hells Canyon is more or less of a "political" dam. It is merely a symbol in the controversy between public and private power. If we want to build dams, why do we not build them where they will be most effective, instead of creating turmoil and dissension among those who have as a common objective the maximum use of our water and power resources?

Mr. President, in order to show that there is plenty of evidence that this more or less is a political issue, I should like to call attention to an article in today's Washington Star, by Doris Fleeson, that stalwart champion of New Dealism. Her article is headed, "Senate Fight For Hells Canyon."

I read the first paragraph of her article:

> The power issue will move up to the partisan battlefront this week when Senator MORSE introduces for himself and 28 colleagues a bill to authorize Federal construction of a multipurpose hydroelectric power project on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon.
>
> This is the famous Hell's Canyon, the last really choice power site in the Northwest.

Another paragraph of Doris Fleeson's article reads as follows:

> The Democratic leadership will do its best to pass the measure or at least to give it such support that Democrats can attribute its defeat to virtually solid Republican opposition. There are sound political reasons for this strategy.

Again, Mr. President, I ask the pertinent question whether those who have inaugurated this observance of Hells Canyon Day are primarily interested in building multipurpose dams which will actually serve multiple purposes in the great Columbia River Basin and whether we are going to permit this maximum resource development to become stymied and bogged down in the political debates which we will face during the next 18 months.

Mr. President, on Saturday, February 26, 1955, a very well-known Democrat, Paul M. Butler, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, made a speech at Boise, Idaho. I have in my hand a clipping from the Idaho Sunday Statesman, and I wish to read one paragraph from that article, reporting on the speech delivered by Chairman Butler:

> He classed the current controversy over whether a Federal high dam should be constructed at Hells Canyon as "the best illustration of the difference in vision between Roosevelt-Truman statesmanship and the masquerade pose of leadership that now parades in Washington, D. C."

The Democratic national chairman also referred to the fact that the Hells Canyon bill would be introduced soon in the Senate.

Mr. President, I shall not question the sincerity of the Democratic national chairman, but I wonder if he does not know that his own party for 20 years controlled the executive and the legislative branches of the Government, with the single exception of the 80th Congress, which was controlled by the Republicans. So I ask the great national leader of the Democratic Party if Hells Canyon means so much to the resource development of the Columbia River Basin and the Northwest, and if the Democrats have been trying for years to build that project, then why did they not build it during the many years when there was no obstruction on the part of the Republican Party?

Mr. President, the fact that they did not do so should prove the contention that I made a few minutes ago, to the effect that efforts are being made now to promote in this country what can be designated as purely a political dam, namely, Hells Canyon high dam.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. DWORSHAK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I live about 2,000 miles from Hells Canyon, but I had the privilege of flying into the entrance of Hells Canyon, and I have a very real in-

terest in that dam. I should like to offer an explanation to my friend from Idaho as to the reason why the project at Hells Canyon was not included in previous budgets.

The fact is that under the leadership of the Democratic Party, we had been building dams on the lower river, which dams were constructed gradually upstream, and it is now time for Hells Canyon. Such projects are constructed first on the lower river, and are worked upward. If my colleague will consider the construction on the Columbia River before the Democratic Party came into power and then after the Democratic Party came into power, he will find the natural resource development of the Columbia River has been put through by the Democratic Party over the opposition of the Republican Party.

Mr. DWORSHAK. That is not entirely true. However, I thank my colleague from Illinois for his observation. I know a few years ago, when he was taken on an airplane trip from Lewiston, Idaho, a snowstorm was encountered and vision was obscured, but he came back and made a speech telling about the glowing potentialities of Hells Canyon. Is that not correct,

Mr. DOUGLAS. In answer, I should like to say there was a snowstorm in Idaho, but the nose of the plane did get into the mouth of the canyon, and I saw one of the great wonders of America.

Mr. DWORSHAK. With that statement I agree. We are all proud of that wonder of America. It should be utilized not only for the people of that area, but for the whole State of Idaho and for the whole State of Oregon. It may be timely to point out that the Senator from Illinois a few years ago opposed the reclamation features involving the Mountain Home project which is incorporated in the bill, of which he is a cosponsor. Would the Senator deny that?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly not. I think the Mountain Home part of the project is wasteful; that the cost of irrigation is excessive. If I had my way, I would have divorced the Mountain Home section from the Hells Canyon section.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Does the Senator from Illinois realize that in this bill which he cosponsors there is a provision for the diversion of surplus revenue from the generation and sale of power from the high Hells Canyon to build the Mountain Home project?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Illinois is aware of that circumstance, but the fact that he serves as one of the many sponsors of this bill does not mean that his hands will be tied when that section of the bill reaches the floor of the Senate.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure that is true, because I have seen the Senator from Illinois in action on past occasions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield to me?

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I should like to observe that there has been a sudden and very happy change in the philosophy of the Senator from Illinois regarding reclamation projects. I think it was a matter of 2 or 3 weeks ago that we discussed the matter in the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, and the Senator from Illinois was bemoaning the fact that people of his State had to pay for reclamation projects. I hope his generous attitude will apply when other western reclamation projects are suggested.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I should like to say I serve as one sponsor of the bill because of my interest in Hells Canyon, not because of my approval of the Mountain Home project, and I reserve the right to move the elimination of the Mountain Home portion of the project when the bill reaches the floor.

I may say, in connection with this discussion, that the good State of Arizona has been getting more money from the Federal Treasury for reclamation projects than the public interest of the Nation requires. I hope I may have the opportunity of enforcing the principles of economy for which the Senator from Arizona stands, when bills dealing with projects in Arizona, Colorado, Wyoming, and the $2 billion "boondoggle" for the upper Colorado are considered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know the Senator's penchant for correctness, and I should like to inform him that Arizona has paid back every cent of earlier project costs, and is now well ahead of its projected payments.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The great catch is that no interest is paid.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The interest will be applied as it is in irrigation features.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is done is that the power section of the project carries the irrigation section.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Does the Senator agree that is right?

Mr. DOUGLAS. No, I do not.

Mr. GOLDWATER. That is a point of difference. I suggest the Senator may not be a sponsor of this bill very long.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I wish to thank my colleagues from Illinois and Arizona. If my colleague from Illinois is consistent in cosponsoring the bill, which provides for subsidizing of reclamation developments, when he has indicated he is against such reclamation development, then certainly there must be some amendments offered in order to clarify the bill in accord with the Senator's own thinking in that regard.

I am going to conclude my remarks, Mr. President, by making a final observation: I think that those of us in the State of Idaho, particularly the water users of the State, who, under both Federal and State law, have a prior right to use—primarily for consumptive purposes—the waters of the Snake River, should have an opportunity for a hearing. For some years there has been what might be called a misunderstanding, as between the Bureau of Reclamation, the Army engineers, and the various States, as to which projects should be built. I have tried to point out that Hells Canyon is a political symbol, because there are many other dams which probably offer even greater possibilities for maximum resource development than does the Hells Canyon dam.

So, Mr. President, while I regret that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is not present at this time, I realize he is more or less of a political engineer, when it comes to the building of reclamation projects, and that probably we shall have an opportunity at the hearings—which will be held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—to determine just what the facts are.

Mr. President, if there is enough water remaining in the Snake River, after we utilize fully all the water resources in the upper watershed in Idaho and in western Wyoming, we shall be very happy to see the water used downstream, for the specific benefit of the people of Oregon and Washington. But, again, I wish to emphasize that this water belongs largely to Idaho. While my colleagues may be dedicated to the service of their constituents and their respective States, I, likewise, have a solemn duty to safeguard and preserve the water rights and insure the maximum use of the Snake River resources for the people of my own State.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, in joining with the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the other cosponsors of Senate bill 1333, authorizing the great multipurpose Hells Canyon project, I feel that we are simply keeping faith with the people of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation.

We in this favored section of our country are possessed of abundant natural resources which, wisely conserved and developed, will mean a constantly improving standard of living, not merely for the people of the West, but for the entire Nation. During the past 50 years, in region after region, we have seen what coordinated development of land and water resources can mean in economic growth and prosperity. This is not an ideological matter, but is an intensely practical matter which touches and advances the welfare of our people every hour of their lives. This program we are sponsoring will profoundly influence the economic future and welfare of the West in all the years to come.

In the Pacific Northwest we have seen with our own eyes the benefits that come from maximum use of the falling waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries, even though the program of comprehensive development is still in its infancy. True, in the past 2 years or more its progress has slowed up because the present administration has faltered in its pledges and promises to carry out its responsibilities.

Mr. President, in my own State of Montana we were compelled to enter into a long and bitter struggle to bring about the development of the Hungry Horse project. But no one today in Montana will question the wisdom of that development. It has stimulated population growth and industrial development on a wide scale through the low-cost power generated at the Hungry Horse Dam.

It has not only benefitted Montana, but it has had a pronounced effect upon the entire Columbia River System. The storage operation in Montana has provided a vast amount of additional output of electric power downstream, both

in Federal and private utility installations. Thus, in low-water periods on this river system, because of our storage facilities we have a constant supply of power.

Whereas Montana was regarded as a backward State 10 years ago, today it is recognized as one of the growing States of the Union. New industries have come into the State, and others will follow when the necessary low-cost power can be assured.

Furthermore, under this system the Hungry Horse project provides financial aid for future reclamation projects in Montana through its power revenues. We also see substantial benefits in flood control and conservation of natural resources.

A large phosphate fertilizer plant which located in the western part of Montana, and which processes the raw phosphate rock by means of electric furnace treatment, came into my State because of the cheap power available and because the legislation authorizing Hungry Horse also took cognizance of the needs of an underdeveloped area and allocated a substantial block of power to aid its economy. This is important. Projects of this type benefit the immediate region as well as the surrounding regions and the whole Nation.

And before Hungry Horse had begun to produce hydroelectric energy, contracts for nearly all its firm power had been let to public groups, new industries and privately owned electric utilities. This illustrates perfectly the wisdom of a resource development policy and program which conceives that creating large blocks of low-cost power ahead of demand creates a demand which quickly absorbs it. In the general interest, we must resume such a program, for if the economy of the Nation is not constantly sustained and stimulated to further growth by new energy it will not continue to expand.

The Employment Act of 1946 of which I had the honor to be the original sponsor, has written into our economic system a policy which calls upon the Federal Government to provide, through cooperation of all governmental units, a constantly expanding economy, thus to attain maximum employment and high purchasing power throughout our Nation. I have used the Hungry Horse example, close to home in Montana, to illustrate how this has been done and how necessary it is that the Federal Government resume a rapid and orderly creation of new economic strength in all other regions of our country by comprehensive development of certain key resources.

Here in the Northwest, between the States of Oregon and Idaho, the Snake River rushes with tremendous power through a massive canyon where walls of basalt rock have drawn together to provide a natural damsite which cries for development on a colossal scale. It is one of the last of the great natural damsites of this kind that is left in the land. If we in this body can see and understand what is required here to harness this great onrushing river and make it produce wealth on even a larger scale than Hungry Horse, we will exercise the wisdom and statesmanship our country demands and convert the wasted waters of Hells Canyon into one of the greatest economic assets of the Nation.

At Hells Canyon, just as at Hungry Horse, a huge storage reservoir will be created. It will be operated in coordination with other projects on the river to hold back water during flood stages to aid in protection against floods, and release it in dry months to firm-up the power production of the powerplants below and also contribute to maintenance of navigation.

Hells Canyon, just as at Hungry Horse, will pool its great contribution of low-cost power with the Federal Columbia River power system. Over the regional gridback transmission lines, this energy will surge forth to the load centers for the use of industry, municipalities, public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned electric utilities. The underdeveloped upstream areas of Idaho and eastern Oregon will be allocated a large amount of power attributable to Hells Canyon, which power will be available the year around. What happened in western Montana and the lower Columbia will be repeated in the Hells Canyon area, for low-cost power is a magnet constantly attracting new private enterprise; and this predominantly agricultural, lumbering, and mining community will be diversified by new year-around payrolls and employment which it so sorely needs.

In the West there are still untold opportunities for reclamation as population inexorably presses against available food supply. The power revenues from Hells Canyon project, aiding farmers in paying off costs of new projects beyond their ability to meet financially, will be a most important factor in this development.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the relationship between Hungry Horse and expansion of phosphatic fertilizer development. Hells Canyon is even more important in this regard because of its unique geographic location as the only large power producer within economic transmission distance of the phosphate rock reserves of eastern Idaho and contiguous States. From the Midwest to the Pacific coast, the effects of low-cost power upon full development of these reserves, the Nation's largest, will be felt by the agricultural economy. There will not only be greater use of phosphate fertilizers on the land to restore the needed ingredients taken from it by growing crops, but tremendous savings of millions of dollars every year to farmers in 17 States who will be able to purchase high-analysis fertilizer at lower freight and handling costs.

The issue at Hells Canyon is both simple and significant to the entire American people. I have shown how Hungry Horse, an accomplished fact, and Hells Canyon, which will be an accomplished fact, are basically identical in concept and planned use in controlling and using a river through upstream storage. The one difference is geographical location.

Hells Canyon will mean to the region and the Nation what Grand Coulee and Hungry Horse, the TVA, and other great public works, of the people for the people, have meant. Every drop of water in our rivers must be used over and over again until it reaches the sea. The planning of the extent and full range of uses must be comprehensive. Only in this way can we meet our grave responsibilities to the people of these regions and to the Nation, for these rivers belong to the people.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate of the United States, which controls the future welfare of our country, realize the significance of this important measure, both in its narrower and broader aspects, for indeed our action on this bill will involve important and far-reaching repercussions upon our future. For the general welfare of the region and for America, this bill should pass.

REPEAL OF PUBLIC LAW 820 REGARDING REVOLVING FUND FOR THE PURCHASE OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is prepared to speak at this time. However, if agreeable to him, I now wish to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of several bills which I believe will not involve debate.

Mr. CAPEHART. That will be satisfactory, if the bills will not involve debate.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Let me say that these bills, including Senate bill 941, which was passed earlier today, have been cleared with both the majority leader and the minority leader, and we know of no objection to the bills.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the bills have been reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in line with the explanation just given, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 942, Calendar 41.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 942) to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold."

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would repeal the act providing a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas. Japan was the only occupied area to make use of this provision; and no purchases have been made since January 1950. There is no likelihood of its use by any area remaining occupied, and the Department of the Army has consequently requested its repeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the

question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 942) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold," is hereby repealed.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on June 30, 1955.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 8A (4) OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT, AS AMENDED

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in connection with the explanation given in regard to the Senate bills 941 and 942, I now request unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 1051, Calendar No. 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1051) to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill would remove the limit of $10 on fees for registration of commission merchants and floor brokers under the Commodity Exchange Act. It was requested by the Department of Agriculture and is identical to S. 3207 which the Senate passed late last session but which was not passed by the House.

The $10 maximum registration fee was fixed in 1936 and is not now sufficient to cover the aggregate cost of registration activities under the act. In lieu of the $10 limit the bill would provide for reasonable fees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1051) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 12a (4)), is amended to read as follows:

"(4) to fix and establish from time to time reasonable fees and charges for registrations and renewals thereof and for copies of registration certificates; and."

AUTHORIZATION FOR PERSONNEL OF ARMED FORCES TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SECOND PAN-AMERICAN GAMES

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in line with the explanation given regarding the bills just acted upon, I now request unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 829, Calendar No. 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 829) to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments, on page 2, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary concerned is authorized to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, the games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and, if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein, any other international amateur sports competition.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary concerned is authorized (1) to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, the games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games, and Olympic games, and (2) subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) herein, to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in other international amateur sports competition not specified in (1) above, if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein.

(b) The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 30 days prior to the commitment of personnel pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (2) hereof, furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed participation by personnel of the Armed Forces in international amateur sports competition.

On page 3, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "(b) The", and insert, "(c) Subject to the limitations contained in section 3 of this act, the"; after line 12, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Appropriations available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Treasury, as the case may be, may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this act.

And in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in the activities covered by this act, not more than $800,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act, to be apportioned among the military departments as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

(b) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Coast Guard in the activities covered by this act, not more than $100,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act.

(c) Appropriations available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Treasury, as the case may be, may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this act.

On page 4, line 9, after the word "naval", to strike out "activities.", and insert "activities".; and after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (a) no member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to the travel or transportation allowances authorized by section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which his expenses for travel or transportation are being paid by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions authorized by this act, and (b) no member of the uniformed services without dependents shall be entitled to receive the basic allowances for subsistence and quarters authorized by sections 301 and 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which such member is subsisted and quartered by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions as authorized by this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 1, 1947 (Public Law 159, 80th Cong.; 61 Stat. 243), is hereby amended to read as follows: "That as used in this act, the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Defense, and, with respect to the Coast Guard when it is not operating as a part of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be.

"SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary concerned is authorized (1) to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the Second Pan-American Games, the Seventh Olympic Winter Games, the Games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American Games and Olympic Games, and (2) subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) herein, to permit personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in other international amateur sports competition not specified in (1) above, if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein.

"(b) The Secretary of Defense shall, not later than 30 days prior to the commitment of personnel pursuant to the authority contained in subsection (a) (2) hereof, furnish to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives a report setting forth the details of the proposed participation by personnel of the Armed Forces in international amateur sports competition.

"(c) Subject to the limitations contained in section 3 of this act, the Secretary concerned may spend such funds and acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide training of personnel of the Armed Forces for such games, to provide for their attendance at and participation in such games, and for training of animals of the Armed Forces for, and their attendance at and participation in, such games.

"SEC. 3. (a) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps in the activities covered by this act, not more than $800,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act, to be apportioned among the military departments as prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

"(b) There may be expended, for the participation of members of the Coast Guard in the activities covered by this act, not more than $100,000 during each 4-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this act.

"(c) Appropriations available to the Department of Defense and the Department of the Treasury, as the case may be, may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this act.

"SEC. 4. Nothing in this act shall authorize the payment of allowances at rates in excess of those fixed for participation in other military or naval activities.

"SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, (a) no member of the uniformed services shall be entitled to the travel or transportation allowances authorized by section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which his expenses for travel or transportation are being paid by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions authorized by this act, and (b) no member of the uniformed services without dependents shall be entitled to receive the basic allowances for subsistence and quarters authorized by sections 301 and 302 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, for any period during which such member is subsisted and quartered by the agency sponsoring his participation in the games and competitions as authorized by this act."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the bill was reported unanimously from the Committee on Armed Services. A report has been filed in writing. The bill represents a very slight extension of the program of the pan-American games, in which we now participate.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The bill is explained in full on pages 2 and 3 of the report under the title "Purpose of the Bill." I ask unanimous consent that the paragraphs on page 2 and the top of page 3, under the title "Purpose of the Bill" be printed in the RECORD.

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

This bill was introduced by the junior Senator from Ohio, Mr. BENDER, for the purpose of authorizing participation by personnel of the Armed Forces of the United States in international amateur sports competitions.

The act of July 1, 1947 (Public Law 159, 80th Cong.; 61 Stat. 243) authorizes participation in Olympic games by the Armed Forces but does not authorize any expenditures therefor. The instant bill, in addition to affording the necessary expenditure authorization for the Olympic games, broadens the authority for military personnel of the United States to train for and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games and Olympic games, and certain other international sports competitions if the Secretary of State determines that the interests of the United States will be served by participation therein.

Physical fitness activities are a regular and necessary part of the military training programs. The Department of Defense maintains that competitive athletic activities are conducive to, and are helpful in, keeping our military manpower mentally alert and physically strong. In view of our military interests in athletic activities and competitive sports, it appears that the Department of Defense should be authorized and encouraged to give active support to those international sports competitions in which the United States desires to be represented.

In the past the United States has achieved a position of prominence in international amateur sports competitions through the excellence and sportsmanship of its young men and women. Many of these young men and women are now performing service in the Armed Forces of this country. There is no sound reason why those persons who are now in military service and who are excellent athletes should be denied an opportunity to compete as representatives of this country in international sports competitions.

The committee is of the opinion that the authority granted in this bill would contribute to the demonstration of American standards of sportsmanship and fair play to the peoples of the world and that this action may enhance our efforts for world peace.

The expenditure of funds that would be authorized by this measure is for the purpose of preliminary training, equipping, and tryout costs that are generated within the Armed Forces. After a military athlete has been selected for a team representing the United States in international sports competitions he will be equipped, transported, and subsisted by the sponsoring agency (e. g., the United States Olympic Committee) in the same manner as are civilian members of the team.

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

The bill (S. 829) was passed.

THE FHA SCANDALS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, as every Member of the Senate knows, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is one of the most able, most highly respected, and most experienced Members of the Senate.

Throughout the Nation, Americans of both political parties have long admired and respected his devotion to his public responsibilities, his keen judgment, his sense of fairness, and his unquestioned integrity.

The senior Senator from Virginia is truly one of the great Members of the Senate. In matters of substantial public consequence, he is above partisan politics; acting always according to the public interest as he sees it.

The Senator from Virginia was one of the first to become aware of the mess that is now known as the FHA scandals.

As one who spent most of last year wading through that mess of the FHA scandals, I feel qualified to say that the Senator from Virginia has performed a great public service in helping to expose past practices of the Federal Housing Administration.

The Senator from Virginia certainly did not overstate the extent of these scandals when he described them as, "even greater than the Teapot Dome scandal." I am confident it is a billion dollar fraud.

Because of Senator BYRD's high standing, both in the Senate and with the American people, I was very pleased to read the United Press dispatch of February 15, 1955, that, "Senator HARRY F. BYRD called today for a continued investigation by Democrats into the Federal Housing scandals."

That press dispatch further quotes Senator BYRD as saying, "there are still a lot of irregularities that have never been discovered." I feel certain that the Senator is correct. The only thing we do not know is the extent of those irregularities.

The dispatch continues that Senator BYRD said, "the inquiry should be continued by Democrats on the Senate Banking Committee."

I completely support Senator BYRD's position and hope the Democrats will take his wise advice.

I pledge the present committee majority my full cooperation in a continued search for those irregularities.

I know that Albert M. Cole, Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency, is just as eager as Senator BYRD and I to uproot these scandals and will cooperate fully.

Senator BYRD has pointed out, according to that press dispatch, that FHA commitments are, "about $35 billion he estimated—and warned the Government will be 'left holding the bag' if the economy takes a downward turn." Of course, Senator BYRD is correct.

Yet, I should like to point out that while the statute of limitations has run against many of the criminal offenses committed by builders in the FHA program, I am counting on the Department of Justice to bring civil actions to recover any losses the Government may sustain.

There is no statute of limitations against a civil action by the Government for fraud.

The Senator from Virginia has had so much interest in these scandals that it is a source of deep personal regret to me that he was not a member of our Committee during the previous Congress. I know he could have been of great help to us.

In the previous Congress, the committee of which I was chairman heard 372 witnesses in public hearings and recorded 7,750 pages of testimony. We inquired into 543 projects and in 437 of those projects we found windfall profits exceeding $75 million.

Let me explain what we mean by "windfall profits." A windfall profit was the difference between the total cost—every conceivable cost—of a project and the amount of money received by the sponsor from his Government-guaranteed mortgage. In other words, if the Government agreed to guarantee a mortgage for $1 million, and the total of all conceivable costs was $800,000, there was a $200,000 windfall, because the sponsor received $200,000 more in cash from his Government-guaranteed mortgage than he actually spent in constructing the project. In those cases the Government-insured mortgages exceeded 100 percent of all costs of every kind by $75 million. In the great majority of those cases there were irregularities if not outright frauds.

Nevertheless I must completely agree with Senator BYRD when he says that our committee "barely scratched the surface" in our investigation. For example, we showed that Clyde L. Powell, for 20 years a top FHA official, received large sums of money which he did not report in his income-tax returns. In fact, he was the top official in connection with rental housing—what was known as section 608.

When we asked him what builders paid him how much money he took refuge behind the fifth amendment. But it is just as important to know who paid him money as it is to know how often he took money. Clyde Powell hid behind the fifth amendment on at least 3 or 4 occasions.

Our investigation has been criticized by a few as having been political and even as having been a witch hunt. Nothing could be further from the truth, as everyone who followed our inquiry knows.

I cannot understand anyone inferring that there was any politics involved in our FHA investigations.

It is now a matter of record in sworn testimony that it was common knowledge that approval of a big project required paying off Clyde L. Powell.

Let me give the Senate 1 or 2 examples of the almost unbelievable difficulty we have had in prying out the truth. It is a very difficult task to get at the truth and obtain the facts.

There is a lawyer in New York named Abraham Traub who represented builders in connection with FHA insured projects totaling very substantially more than $100 million. One of those projects was Farragut Gardens, in which the windfall profit was about $4 million. In other words, their total costs were $4 million less than the amount of actual cash which they received from the FHA Government-guaranteed mortgage.

We examined Traub's books with the help of accountants from the General Accounting Office and found a large number of checks drawn on his law firm's bank account to the order of cash.

The bank stamps showed that the checks had been cashed. But his records did not in any way disclose what happened to that cash. In the 5-year period when FHA was at its height checks drawn to cash on that Traub bank account, and for which currency was obtained at the bank, exceeded $1 million.

In other words, this attorney, who represented over $100 million in FHA mortgages in New York, had written checks to "Cash" for more than $1 million. The record showed that the checks had been cashed. Over a million dollars worth of checks had been written and cashed over a certain period of time.

We asked Traub repeatedly where that money went, to whom it was paid, and what it was paid for. The only answer he was ever able to give us was that it must "have gone to Schoenfeld."

Schoenfeld reads like a character out of a mystery novel. Traub claims that several years ago he borrowed a large sum of money from Schoenfeld in cash, and that these large sums of cash were payments to Schoenfeld in repayment of the loan.

When two such payments occurred in the same day, Traub said that Schoenfeld must have stopped in twice that day to ask for repayments.

Schoenfeld, as we might expect, is dead, and there is nothing in writing to show the existence of the loan or even to record payments on the loan.

At one point Traub said that the cash payments to Schoenfeld probably were not over $300,000. Yet that would still leave $700,000 not accounted for.

One interesting fact is a $125,000 payment to Traub from the owners of the Farragut Gardens project. It was not a lawyer's fee, and his books give no explanation of the payment.

Traub said it was a loan, but in 5 years he not only made no payments on the loan, but has not even paid interest on that alleged loan.

Could it be that that money was given to Traub for Traub to give to someone else, and that he did so?

The Traub story adds up to a million dollars in currency that cannot be accounted for.

There is no question about the fact that more than a million dollars cannot be accounted for by Traub. He had written more than $1 million worth of checks to "Cash." Those checks had actually been cashed. Yet, he could never tell us what he did with the cash, except to say that years ago he had borrowed in excess of a million dollars from a man named Schoenfeld, who is dead, and that Schoenfeld would come into his office from time to time and Traub would write a check for $10,000 or $15,000 and send one of his employees to the bank to cash the check. He said the employee would take the check to the bank and cash it and would bring the cash back to Traub, and Traub would give the money to Schoenfeld.

We pointed out to him that there were a number of occasions when 2 or 3 checks had been drawn to "Cash" on 1 day. Traub's answer was that he supposed Schoenfeld had come into the office in the morning to get $5,000 and then had come back in the afternoon to get $10,000. There is nothing on Traub's books to show such transactions. There is nothing on Traub's books to show that such a loan had ever been made to him by Schoenfeld. There is nothing on the books to show that he had paid out that money to Schoenfeld. There are no ledger sheets and no journal entries. Yet more than a million dollars' worth of canceled checks were before us, all of them made out to "Cash."

In the light of that background, let me say something about Traub's appearances before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Our staff interviewed him in New York on June 23, 1954. He was asked, "Have you ever had any business dealings with Powell?" Mr. Powell was the head of the rental division of FHA. Traub replied, "No."

When he was told that we had heard rumors that his group had had some dealings with Powell, Traub replied, "This rumor will turn out to be untrue."

On July 14, 1954, we heard Traub in executive session. He was sworn. I was present, and I swore him as a witness. He admitted frequent dealings with Powell; and then he was asked, "Have you, or has anyone else in your presence, ever paid or given anything of value, money, or otherwise, to Mr. Powell," He replied, "No."

He then testified that he had not, nor had anyone else in his presence, given anything of value to any FHA employee. Finally he was asked if his answer was unequivocal in both cases, and he replied, "Unequivocal, no, in both cases." That testimony appears at page 2807 of the executive session transcript.

I wish to review again the two occasions when this man Traub was asked if he had ever given anything of value to Mr. Powell, or whether he had ever seen anyone give anything of value to Mr. Powell. I do not mind telling the Senate that we were suspicious and we still are suspicious, and that we would like to know where the million dollars in checks made out to "cash" went. We always thought that a part of it went to Mr. Powell, and that perhaps a part of it went to other people as well.

We heard Traub at a public session for the first time on August 25, 1954. He testified then that he was certain that none of his cash payments went to Powell. Asked again if he was certain not only as to Farragut Gardens, but as to other projects, no cash went to Powell, he replied, "Positive."

When Traub testified that no money ever went to Powell, he was under oath. Mr. Traub then became indignant at the suggestion that he had paid Powell, and asked permission to make a statement.

I may say that we always found in these investigations that every guilty man was always indignant. We were always told by the guilty men that we were taking advantage of their personal liberty. In every instance the man who was guilty was the one who abused the chairman and abused the committee and yelled to high heaven that we were taking advantage of him and that we were taking advantage of his personal liberties. That is the kind of man who was always protesting that there ought to be some protection from these cruel Senators and these cruel chairmen who dared to question him. It was always that way. The innocent man was always very nice about it. However, the guilty fellow was always indignant. He always wanted to abuse the investigators.

As I said, Mr. Traub then became indignant at the suggestion he had paid Powell, and asked that he be permitted to make a statement. As chairman of the committee, I permitted him to make a statement.

He told the committee that he had been practicing law for 27 years and had represented some of the largest realtors in the country. He said he was considered one of the real-estate experts in the country.

Then he said, "I have never paid a bribe or conspired, not only FHA-wise, or in any other way with any official or anybody."

He took the position that we were abusing him. He said it was awful the way we were abusing him. He had been a lawyer for 27 years, he said, and he had never bribed anyone. He said he had never offered anyone any bribe. On several occasions, while under oath, he said he had never given any money or anything of value to anyone in FHA. That is the same man whose books showed that he had written checks for more than a million dollars, and he admitted the checks had been cashed, but could not remember to whom he had given the cash. I presume he still does not remember.

He was indignant, as I said. He said the "implications and insinuations" of the committee members and of the staff, to the effect that he had bribed someone, were "getting him down."

He added, "Now, I haven't, nor do I intend to, nor will I ever resort to bribery, collusion, or graft with anybody." That testimony appears at page 1253 of the printed hearings.

Throughout those hearings we showed him in his own books the hundreds of thousands of dollars in cash payments

charged under "expenses of clients"; but he would never tell us what client or what expenses those payments were for. He never did tell us, except to say that the money went to Schoenfeld, he supposed. We had a stack of checks before us which totaled over a million dollars, all of them made out to "Cash." He admitted they were cashed. The bank stated they had been cashed. We asked him to whom the money had been given. He could not remember anyone, except Schoenfeld. Schoenfeld is dead. Then we would pick out some checks at random and say to him, "To whom did you pay that $20,000?" He would answer, "I don't know, unless it was to Schoenfeld." Poor old Schoenfeld. He was dead. There is nothing on Traub's books to show that he had ever received a loan of money from Schoenfeld or had ever paid back so much as a dime to Schoenfeld.

Traub was examined again on August 26 and was asked to bring in some books. He objected, and finally Senator BUSH, who was then acting as chairman, said: "I shall have to rule that we will subpena those books, and we want them by 10 o'clock tomorrow morning." But the following morning Traub did not appear.

We then subpenaed Traub for an executive session in Washington on September 7, at which Senator BEALL presided. Traub's lawyer again raised technical objections to surrendering the books.

As a result we served a further subpena for those books returnable in New York on September 27, and I personally went to New York to preside at that hearing.

Most of the morning was spent by Traub's lawyer arguing against the production of the books. That is where we found a record of more than a million dollars in cash. I can well understand why they did not want to produce the books. But we ordered the production of the books.

That morning we also examined Traub's bookkeeper. She testified under oath that frequently Traub asked her to draw checks to cash in round sums like $5,000, $10,000, or $20,000; that sometimes he would tell her it was to pay an indebtedness without telling her to whom; and that sometimes he would not tell her what the payment was for.

In those cases where she was not told what the payment was for, she drew the check, delivered the cash to Traub, and charged the amount on the law firm books to "Office expense." That testimony appears at page 2935 of the printed hearings.

We examined Traub further at that New York hearing to inquire where the more than $1 million in cash that funneled through his hands went. But he would never identify any source to which any of that cash was paid, other than the dead man, Schoenfeld.

Finally, as we closed our hearings in Washington on October 8, 1954, we called Traub for the seventh time before our committee, and again we could not learn where so much as one penny of that $1 million in currency went.

The Department of Justice took over where we left off and subpenaed Traub before the grand jury. Being a lawyer, I assume he once took an oath to uphold the law. I think also as an officer of the court one could expect him to cooperate with the Government.

Yet after several appearances before the grand jury, he went to the United States district court in Washington last February 25 and asked for what amounted to an injunction against the Government taking him before the grand jury again.

I was amazed at a lawyer asking the court to prohibit the Department of Justice from taking him before the grand jury to answer the legitimate questions of the grand jury.

Of course Traub had, and still has, the constitutional right, which many of the witnesses before our committee, including Powell, took advantage of, to refuse to answer questions on the ground that the answers might incriminate them under the fifth amendment.

But without availing himself of the fifth amendment, Traub asked to be shielded from the grand jury because he said the special assistant to the Attorney General intended to seek an indictment against him.

The evidence brought out in open court was that Traub had told J. Bertram Wegman, one of his attorneys, that 99 percent of the builders in New York who had large FHA mortgages were forced to pay off to Powell.

The testimony was further that Traub had told Wegman he had been pressured by Powell into giving Powell a check for $11,684, which Powell turned over to Chicago gamblers in payment of a gambling debt.

Wegman's story was that Powell had in effect extorted this money from Traub. Traub did not want to be asked about that, or any other transaction, because he said the Department of Justice wanted to indict him.

The important fact to me is that Traub time and again told our committee under oath that he had never paid any money to Powell.

That is a matter of record, Mr. President. I do not know that it is necessary to place it in the RECORD, but I hold the testimony in my hand. I shall not place it in the RECORD, but it is available to anyone who wishes to see it.

Now Traub asks to be protected from appearing before the grand jury, on the ground that if he does so, the Department of Justice will seek an indictment against him in connection with the $11,684 that went from Traub to Powell, to the Chicago gamblers, in payment of a gambling debt. We tried to subpena one of the gamblers in Chicago to appear before the committee so that we might discuss the Powell matter with him, but we never succeeded in subpenaing him. I hope the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who will be chairman of what I hope will be a subcommittee which will continue this investigation, will bring the gentleman before the committee.

But here is a case in which Mr. Traub admits that he gave a check to Powell for $11,684.

Of course Traub does not want to be indicted. On no less than three occasions before the committee he stated that he had at no time given Powell any money or any checks. He now admits he gave him $11,684, and he does not want the Attorney General to question him about it. The $11,684 was a part of the $1 million. What we are trying to determine and what the Attorney General is trying to do is to find out to whom he gave the rest of the million dollars. Perhaps a large percentage of that amount went to Mr. Powell. We do not know, because he will not talk. Of course, Senators know that the first witness we called before our committee was Mr. Powell, because he was the head of the department at that time. We thought, when we called him, that he was going to give us some helpful information and would aid us. Instead, Mr. Powell, the very first minute he appeared, the very first minute the hearings opened, hid behind the fifth amendment. What did that mean? That was notice to everyone in the United States who had given Mr. Powell any money, including Mr. Traub, I presume, that he need not talk if he did not want to, because Powell was not going to talk. He was saying, in effect, "I am not going to tell the committee who it was that gave me the money"; and he did not tell. At no time did he tell the committee or admit that he had received any money from anyone. But, as Senators well know, the hearings show that we found any number of cases in which he did receive money.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the following:

An article entitled "Witness Says Powell Paid Off Bookie by Forced Levy of $11,600 on Traub," written by Morrie Dunie, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of Saturday, February 26, 1955;

An article entitled "Powell Forced Traub To Pay $11,864 Debt, Testimony Charges," published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, February 26, 1955; and

An article entitled "Jury Asks Traub Contempt Action," published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, March 8, 1955. In other words, the grand jury has asked that Traub be cited for contempt.

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

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1955]

FHA SCANDAL INCIDENT — WITNESS SAYS POWELL PAID OFF BOOKIE BY FORCED LEVY OF $11,600 ON TRAUB

(By Morrey Dunie)

A New York lawyer testified yesterday that former Assistant Federal Housing Commissioner Clyde A. Powell once forced Abraham Traub to pay an $11,600 bookie bill.

J. Bertram Wegman said Powell "stuck a gun in Traub's back" to get him to pay the debt. He said Powell actually did not use a gun, but that the action amounted to extortion. Wegman did not give any other details of the alleged incident.

The testimony came during a hearing by District Court Judge F. Dickinson Letts on a motion by Traub to enjoin a District grand

jury from questioning him in its probe of alleged misconduct in the Federal Housing Administration.

Traub, also a New York attorney, also asked that certain records he produced for the grand jury last fall be returned.

Traub was represented by Attorney Arthur Sheinberg.

During the bitter debate yesterday, Sheinberg declared that Max H. Goldschein was out to "get" Traub. Goldschein is the special Justice Department lawyer conducting the grand jury investigation.

Sheinberg called Wegman as a witness to prove this charge, and Wegman testified Goldschein told him that Traub might as well cooperate with the Government now "instead of after he has been indicted and convicted."

Goldschein took the witness stand and denied saying anything like this to Wegman. Robert Roschal, an assistant to Goldschein, then testified he was present at the conversations in New York and Washington between Wegman and Goldschein.

According to Roschal, Goldschein never said he was out to get Traub. He testified he heard Wegman tell Goldschein that all New York builders had to pay off Powell before they could get FHA insured mortgages.

Judge Letts said he would rule on Traub's motions Monday.

[From the Washington Star of February 26, 1955]

POWELL FORCED TRAUB TO PAY $11,864 DEBT, TESTIMONY CHARGES

Existence of an $11,864 check allegedly paid out by a New York attorney and businessman to cover a race bookie debt owed by Clyde Powell, was revealed yesterday in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

The check allegedly was made out by Abraham Traub of New York, a lawyer and head of a real estate firm, according to court testimony. Mr. Powell is former assistant commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration.

The financial transaction came to light during arguments on a motion by attorneys for Mr. Traub, who has been a witness before a Federal grand jury. The jury, since last October, has been investigating scandals in the FHA.

WANTS QUESTIONING CURBED

Counsel for Mr. Traub asked Judge F. Dickinson Letts to forbid further questioning of Mr. Traub by the grand jury. The request was based on the allegation that the jury is aiming to indict him and that the questioning infringed on his right against self-incrimination. Judge Letts said he would rule on the issue next Monday.

During the proceedings, an attorney for Mr. Traub, J. Bertram Wegman, testified that he was told of the check by Marx Goldschein, Justice Department attorney in charge of the FHA probe. Mr. Goldschein mentioned it in attempts to get Mr. Traub to cooperate with the grand jury and tell what he knows about Powell's dealings, Mr. Wegman declared.

During cross-examination by Mr. Goldschein, Mr. Wegman admitted saying that Powell "held a gun" at Mr. Traub's back in order to get the check. But the witness explained he did not mean "literally" that a gun was held.

SAYS PAYOFF NECESSARY

Earlier, Robert Roschal, special assistant to the Attorney General now assisting Mr. Goldschein, testified that Mr. Wegman had told him and Mr. Goldschein that all New York building projects had to pay off Powell before doing business with FHA.

The lawyers took turns on the witness stand and in cross-examining each other. At one point, Mr. Goldschein began to fire questions at himself. The function of questioner soon was taken over by Mr. Roschal.

At issue was a contention by Attorney Arthur Scheinberg, another of Mr. Traub's lawyers, that Mr. Goldschein had indicated he was out to indict and convict Mr. Traub.

This statement was corroborated by Mr. Wegman. But Mr. Goldschein vigorously denied the allegation and was supported in his denial by Mr. Roschal.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 8, 1955]

JURY ASKS TRAUB CONTEMPT ACTION

A district court grand jury yesterday asked that New York attorney Abraham Traub be found in contempt of court for contumaciously refusing to answer the jury's questions.

The gray-haired Traub, flanked by three lawyers, was in the courtroom when the jury asked Judge F. Dickinson Letts at 4:05 p. m. for the contempt action.

Judge Letts agreed to hear arguments in the matter at 10 a. m. Thursday.

For months, the grand jury has been digging into charges of misconduct in the Federal Housing Administration.

Last October, Judge Letts found Clyde L. Powell, ousted Assistant FHA Commissioner, in contempt for dodging the questions of the same grand jury. Powell got a year's jail sentence and currently is free awaiting appeal of the sentence.

In its presentment yesterday, the grand jury declared that Traub failed to produce all his records on fees he received from 1947 through 1953, and declined to say what he had done with records the jury claims still are missing.

Last November 5, Judge Letts first ordered Traub to produce the records.

On his last appearance, February 28, he was asked whether the sought-after records were in his office when the grand jury first subpenaed him. He replied: "They were in my office, yes," according to the grand jury.

The jury urged Judge Letts to use the court's punitive power against Traub "to preserve the authority and vindicate the dignity of the court."

Among other things, the jury wants to question Traub about allegations that he was high-pressured into writing an $11,864 check for a gambling debt owed by Powell.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I do not know, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] does not know, and the American people do not know, how much money Powell got and from whom he got it; nor do we know if any of the currency that flowed through Traub's hand went to FHA people and how much went to whom.

But I want to know. Many members of our committee want to know. The American people want to know. And I hope the grand jury will dig until they find out. If my desire to find out who paid whom, and how much, constitutes politics, then I can only say that I am certain the American people want that kind of politics.

Traub refused to tell us to whom he gave the money, but he personally handled the legal affairs of builders who had over a hundred million dollars. On 3 or 4 occasions, under oath, in direct answers to the question, "Did you give Mr. Powell any money or anything of value?" Traub said, "No," and then became very indignant because the committee had asked him such a question. He said he had been a lawyer for 27 years and that his record was unblemished.

Now he admits that he gave Mr. Powell at least one check for $11,684.

Another witness who gave us fantastic testimony was Arthur M. Chaite. Chaite formerly worked for FHA. He also is a lawyer. Telephone records which the committee had subpenaed showed many phone conversations between Chaite's home and Powell's home.

But under oath Chaite could not remember a single conversation he had ever had on the telephone with Clyde Powell.

Chaite worked for the Woodner interests, who received almost $50 million of FHA insured mortgages. Woodner paid him large fees for his work by checks made out to Chaite and deposited in his bank account.

In addition, however, we found among Woodner's records, checks payable to cash totaling about $50,000 which bore Chaite's endorsement.

The bank records showed the checks were cashed for currency. Chaite admitted his signature on the checks, but he testified that he could not remember whether he got the currency for any of those checks, and what, if anything, he did with the currency.

Fifty thousand dollars. Yet he could not remember what he did with it. He had to admit, of course, that his signature was on the back of the checks, because he could see it.

That is what we were confronted with from different witnesses throughout the hearings. They never seemed to be able to remember. They had cashed checks and obtained currency, but they had no record as to whom they paid the currency.

As I said a moment ago, the minute Mr. Powell appeared before our committee, he hid behind the fifth amendment, thereby signaling to everyone in the United States with whom he had had any dealings that they need not talk, if they did not wish to, because he was not going to talk.

Yet we found one bank account of Mr. Powell's, in the Riggs National Bank—and this information is contained in the record—in which he had deposited approximately $150,000 more than his salary during, I think, an 8-year period. But when we produced his income-tax returns, they showed only the exact amount of his salary; they did not show the additional $150,000. Yet he had deposited it. We do not know how many other bank accounts he had. At least, we were not able to find any others.

A former employee of Woodner's testified that on one occasion he identified Chaite at the bank to assist in cashing a check for thousands of dollars.

He testified that he saw the teller hand the currency to Chaite. Yet Chaite asked us to believe that he could not remember, not only what he did with all that currency, but whether he ever even received it.

The FHA must have been a very unusual place if one of its employees, upon leaving the Government's service, was so accustomed to dealing in large sums of currency that he could not even recall having received that amount of currency, much less what he did with it.

There are many other Traubs and Chaites, and I say that the American

people are entitled to know who received those large sums of currency that flowed through their hands.

As the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] said on the Senate floor on February 25:

A relatively limited examination of a small minority of accounts in only one of the many housing programs has developed scandals beyond compare in the history of our Government.

No truer words were over spoken, and I repeat, "scandals beyond compare in the history of our Government."

I ask the people of the United States whether they think it is politics for us to try to find out what happened to the currency that flowed through the hands of the Traubs and the Chaites?

We know that Clyde Powell in a few years deposited in his bank account about $150,000 in excess of his salary, and the $150,000 was not recorded on his income-tax returns. We also have reason to believe that he put large sums of cash in his safe-deposit box.

I ask if it is politics for us to try to find out who gave Powell that money, and why?

I have only one regret about my participation in the FHA investigation, and that is the pressures that were put upon me by so many persons.

In many cases we were vigorously urged that there were so many projects involving irregularities that we could readily skip this, that, or the other favorite builder.

I am proud to say on the floor of the Senate that we rejected all such pressures. We called them as we saw them; and we reported factually to the people and to the Senate what happened.

In St. Louis, Mo., the Department of Justice tried to proceed before the Grand Jury for an alleged crime involving the Warner-Kanter Co. A former official of FHA, since discharged, in effect pulled the rug out from under the Department of Justice by insisting that the Government was not defrauded.

I refer the Senate to the testimony of Assistant Attorney General Warren Olney, III, in charge of the Criminal Division, before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on April 23, 1954 as to this project. His memorandum on the Warner-Kanter project appears at page 1622 of those hearings. We found substantial additional irregularities in the projects of those companies.

Yet we were subjected to real pressure either to eliminate or to materially soften the comments and factual statements about these companies in our report.

Last fall I asked the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to try to find out who covered up for Clyde Powell during the many years he occupied that top spot at FHA. I wanted to learn why the two FBI reports on Clyde Powell's criminal record never came to the attention of the FHA officials and how they managed to disappear. The records showed that the FBI sent to the FHA reports on Mr. Powell and his arrest record prior to his employment by the FHA in 1934. Those reports disappeared. No one could find them.

I wrote to Mr. Cole, the head of the FHA, and asked him to ascertain what had happened. I wanted to know how it was possible that a man having Powell's arrest record prior to his employment with the Government could have remained on his job after the arrest record had been called to the Government's attention, because when Powell signed his application for employment in 1934, one of the questions was: "Have you ever been arrested?"

Powell's answer was: "No."

In big type at the bottom of the application there is a statement to the effect that if the questions were answered wrongly the applicant, if appointed, would be subject to discharge.

I have received a reply from the administrator, which I think should interest the Senate. I will ask my colleagues to pay close attention while I read the letter. This is Mr. Cole's answer to my letter as to how it was possible for Mr. Powell to remain on the payroll of the Federal Government for so many years, how it was possible for him to be promoted, how it was possible for him to become the head of this big organization, handling hundreds of millions of dollars, when he had the record that was his prior to his coming with the Government in 1934, and when, on at least two occasions, the FBI had called FHA officials' attention to his record, and yet he remained with the FHA. I now read the letter from Mr. Cole:

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: I regret the delay in replying to your letter of October 15, 1954. It was my desire, however, that the answers to the three inquiries propounded by you with regard to Clyde L. Powell be as complete as the files permitted. To that end I have caused an exhaustive review to be made of the many investigative reports and other material contained in the files of the Compliance Division of this Agency, as well as the records of the Federal Housing Administration. Certain additional inquiries have also been made by the Compliance Division to clarify the issues.

The facts disclosed are as follows:

1. Powell's original application was addressed to and processed by the headquarters office of the FHA in Washington, D. C., rather than by the field director, which was the normal procedure.

He was hired in St. Louis. Ordinarily the application would be processed there, but in this instance the application was sent to the Washington office, rather than being handled by the field director.

From correspondence between Powell and his St. Louis sponsors and FHA headquarters in Washington, it would appear that Powell may have been aided in obtaining his original appointment by Stewart McDonald, Special Assistant to the Administrator, who shared with Powell a number of mutual friends in St. Louis. Powell's arrests did not become known until he was fingerprinted by the FHA in 1941, since his appointment and employment were not within the civil-service system.

Powell went to work in 1934. According to this letter, his arrest record was not discovered until 1941, but that was before he was made the head of this big department.

2. Records of the Identification Division, Federal Bureau of Investigation, show that Powell was fingerprinted by the FHA on August 14, 1941; that the prints were received by the FBI from the Civil Service Commission on October 18, 1941, and that a copy of the ID arrest record was furnished to the Civil Service Commission.

The ID files also reflect that Powell was again fingerprinted on August 4, 1947, by FHA and that the prints were received in the ID on January 10, 1948. The arrest record was then forwarded by the FBI to the Civil Service Commission on March 31, 1948.

No person could be located who recalled taking the prints, and no record could be found of the receipt of the arrest records in the Civil Service Commission. Further, no record of the forwarding of the arrest records by the Civil Service Commission to FHA and no record of their receipt by the FHA could be found.

Research has disclosed that beginning in 1950, pursuant to a Civil Service Commission procedure, arrest records were received in the office of the FHA Administrator and then forwarded to the Personnel Division. The possibility exists that this procedure may have been in effect in preceding years and, if so, that Powell may have been able to intercept his arrest records through connections in the Administrator's office.

I am still reading from the letter of Mr. Cole:

3. Even though Powell was secretive by nature and a lone wolf so far as friendships were concerned, his gambling proclivities were common knowledge among his office associates. Moreover, as early as 1950, and continuing thereafter, his dereliction in duty, as evidenced by unexplained absences from the office as well as his gambling pursuits, were known to his superiors who, nevertheless, vacillated between indecision and decisive action. Powell was interrogated by his superiors on March 17, 1952, regarding the Dunes Club incident in August 1950—

The Dunes Club, by the way, was a gambling establishment at Norfolk—

and denied any gambling losses beyond his pocket money, which was contrary to the facts, but no action was taken against him. His retention in office, therefore, can be attributed in major part to the failure of responsible officials to concern themselves with his background, his dealings with the public, and his unorthodox behavior in both public and private life. There is no evidence of any protection through political influence. None of Powell's former superiors is now with the Federal Housing Administration.

If there is any additional manner in which we may be of service to you or the committee, the resources of this Agency are, of course, at your disposal.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT M. COLE,
Administrator.

That letter is not too helpful. It does show, of course, that somebody intercepted Powell's arrest record when it was delivered to the FHA by the Civil Service Commission and by the FBI. In other words, there is nothing in the FHA files to show the arrest record. Yet in the FBI's files and in the Civil Service Commission's files the records show the arrest record was forwarded to the FHA.

I realize that not all FHA projects were fraudulent. I want to say the great majority of them were not, but too many of them were. The large majority of the builders were honest, sincere, and conscientious, but I say to my colleagues too many of them were not. Too many of the FHA employees and officials and too many of the builders were not. I would be the last person ever to want to leave the inference that all projects were

fraudulent, but at the same time let us not leave the impression that there were only 2 or 3 fraudulent cases.

We now know of more than 400 cases in which the irregularities of FHA and builders resulted in mortgages in excess of 100 percent of all costs of every kind.

So far as the Senate is concerned, the important thing now, however, is not to discuss what has not been done by our committee, but to do promptly what needs to be done.

The present chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], submitted a resolution on February 11, 1955, asking for $100,000 to carry on this investigation. I congratulate him on doing that. The amount requested is certainly modest, and should promptly be granted.

If, however, an International News Service dispatch quoted him correctly, I must respectfully disagree with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. That dispatch says that the Senator from Alabama "pointed out that the probe handled by Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART last year actually covered only 'several hundred' projects and said a full report might provide a better picture of the situation."

There were 7,000 projects.

We exposed 437 with windfall profits of $75 million, or an average of $170,000 for each project.

Even if there is not a single irregularity in the remaining 6,500 projects—which I doubt is the case—the FHA scandals still smell to high heaven.

Is it not enough that there were $75 million of windfall profits in cases involving at least irregularities and frequently fraud?

On the other hand, I am confident that the Senator from Virginia is completely correct when he says we have only scratched the surface and that there are still many irregularities to be discovered.

I am confident that if the committee will continue a vigorous investigation of these scandals they will find everything the Senator from Virginia has indicated exists—and even more.

I urge the Democrat majority to proceed promptly with a resumption of the search for these frauds.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without the necessity of a report by the Rules Committee, the Senate proceed to consider the resolution of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], Senate Resolution 57, asking for $100,000 to carry on the FHA investigation.

It is my intention, if that unanimous consent is granted, to move the immediate adoption of the resolution so that the committee can promptly resume its investigation of the FHA scandals.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate Resolution 57.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is now in the Committee on Rules and Administration, so the Chair is informed.

Mr. CAPEHART. Then, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules and Administration be discharged from the further consideration of Senate Resolution 57, and that the resolution be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A motion to discharge the committee from the further consideration of the resolution must lie over for 1 day, under the rule. Therefore, unanimous consent would be required in connection with the request of the Senator from Indiana.

Is there objection?

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, before any such action is taken, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the chairman of the subcommittee which will conduct the hearing, has just informed me that the resolution will be reported from the committee tomorrow, and can be acted upon at that time. In view of the assurance from him, that the resolution will be acted upon and agreed to, and that the subcommittee will then immediately proceed with the hearing, I now ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I so understand, Mr. President; but, reserving the right to object——

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana that the order for the quorum call be rescinded?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Indiana that the order for the quorum call be rescinded? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to speak now in regard to the other request. I rise to speak because of the situation and because I would not want silence on my part to be regarded as acquiescence in all the statements which have been made by my friend and colleague, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. Let me say that I was absent from the Chamber, attending a meeting of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

I hope, Mr. President, the Committee on Rules and Administration will move very promptly in this matter. I understand it has already reported the resolution, so it will be on the calendar. But I would not want the conditions laid down by the Senator from Indiana, in the course of his remarks, to be considered as binding on either the majority leader or the minority leader, because whatever action the Senate is to take is of course a matter for the Senate itself to decide; and the order in which the Senate will take up various matters is—and I speak as a former majority leader of this body—a question which should be left to the discretion of the leadership.

I hope the resolution will be taken up promptly, but there are certain other legislative matters which lie ahead of us. If the resolution is not controversial—and I have been informed that it is not a highly controversial matter, and can be acted on promptly, I should think there would be no difficulty in getting it before the Senate.

Mr. CAPEHART. May we have assurance from the majority leader and the minority leader that the resolution will be taken up in a reasonably short period of time?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if I may be recognized for a moment, inasmuch as I simply happen to be sitting in the seat of the majority leader at the present time, let me say I have not consulted the majority leader regarding the position of the resolution on the calendar. I understand the resolution has been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration. I certainly share the feeling expressed by the able senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

I should like to say that our committee decided to request $100,000 for the purpose of carrying on the investigation, and to make a continuing study of the entire housing program. In my appearance before the Committee on Rules and Administration, I said we were requesting, as of that time, $100,000. I called attention to the fact that the committee, under the leadership of the able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], had, as I recall, $175,000, and that most likely the $100,000 we were requesting would not be sufficient to enable us to complete the job, but that we were requesting that much in order to get started, and that we would operate on as economical a budget as we could.

Mr. CAPEHART. Let me state that although we had $175,000, we spent only $125,000.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Very well. I said to the committee that most likely we would subsequently request additional funds.

It is my understanding that the committee voted, on yesterday, to report the resolution, along with several other measures, and that undoubtedly they will be reported to the Senate and be on the calendar as soon as reports on them can be prepared.

Beyond that, of course, the matter is one for the leadership to determine—in short, as to when the resolution will come up for consideration by the Senate.

We know that, as a practical matter, resolutions of such nature, once they have been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, are brought before the Senate at almost any opportune time, and are adopted very quickly.

So, speaking only for myself as an individual Senator, let me say that I feel confident the Senator from Indiana can rest assured that the resolution will get through. It was considered by both the Banking and Currency Committee and the Committee on Rules and Administration, and the committees voted to report it in exactly the form in which it

was submitted originally. So I feel confident that the Senate will give its approval.

I assure the Senator from Indiana and the other Members of the Senate that we are going to do a good job in making the investigation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that I shall certainly be glad to discuss with the majority leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] or, in his absence, with the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], if he is then serving in the capacity of acting majority leader, the request of the 2 Senators, and to urge that at as early a date as possible the resolution be given consideration.

But I would not want the RECORD to indicate that the resolution would have priority over all other measures, because the leadership must have some discretion in that connection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Of course.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to me?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of both the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], to the effect that the leadership will make every effort to bring up this resolution and the other resolutions, which also are important, and which came, on yesterday, from the Committee on Rules and Administration. Of course we shall be glad to do all we can to have them brought before the Senate for consideration at the earliest possible date.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], that if one of the resolutions appears to be noncontroversial, and if it also appears to be one as to which the membership on each side of the aisle can be reasonably spoken for by the leadership, and if there is an opportunity to break into the consideration of some other legislative matter which may be before the Senate, in order to have the resolution considered and adopted, I am sure such an effort will be made.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, it is very important to have the work continued. We now have a staff, but there are no funds with which to pay the members of it.

However, with the assurances of the majority leader, the minority leader, the chairman of the subcommittee, and the Senator who will be the chairman of the subcommittee which will make the investigation, I am satisfied to wait a few days.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield further, so that I may make another observation to my friend, the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It might be well for the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the subcommittee, who will be spending the money provided by the resolution, to place before the minority and majority leadership the views of other members of the committee, and expressions from Members on each side of the aisle, so as to see if the resolution cannot be disposed of in a very short time later this week.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say to the Senator from Kentucky that the Committee on Banking and Currency was unanimous in its support of the resolution. I appeared before the Committee on Rules and Administration, representing the Committee on Banking and Currency. The able Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] wrote a very strong letter urging quick action on the resolution and its approval. So I feel confident that it is a noncontroversial resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that this particular resolution has not yet been received from the Committee on Rules and Administration. It is not before the Senate.

THE PONTECORVO CASE

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, last week the press was full of stories about a statement by Dr. Bruno Pontecorvo, one of Britain's top atomic experts who had gone to Russia and was telling the folks back home how much better a place Russia is than our own United States.

I have observed in the press an open letter to Mr. Pontecorvo from Mr. A. N. Spanel, of New York. I happen to know that Mr. Spanel was born in poverty in Europe. He came to the United States and became one of our most successful businessmen. He is among those of our citizens who are most appreciative of the opportunities which the United States has to offer.

I believe he knows the difference between the happy land that Pontecorvo describes and the United States. I therefore ask unanimous consent to have the open letter of Mr. Spanel printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

TO DR. BRUNO PONTECORVO

England, a free man's democracy, gave you refuge from Mussolini's fascism; and you were treated as a free man. Canada and the United States trusted you with their priceless atomic secrets.

The Kremlin now says, in your name, that the British police embarrassed you with their questionings. Hence, so their story goes, you "chose" Russia. Perhaps so. But if you are now a free man, you can easily prove it to a world that questions the very authorship of the propaganda statement attributed to you. Ask your Red guards whose asylum you "enjoy," to give you the free man's right to travel outside the Iron Curtain even as the freedom-loving British gave it to you.

For the right of free movement is as intrinsic to scientists as is the right to exchange what is new in pure science.

Unfortunately, in the police state you find yourself, you probably will not be permitted to read these few words from an American business man, but since ideas may pierce even prison walls, I ask you to consider the following: The Kremlin, in your name, accuses the capitalistic world of preparing to wage atomic war on Russia. Ten days ago it forced General Zhukov into playing the identical role of a second-class Goebbels, peddling the identical propaganda line. How cheap do scientists and generals come in Russia that they are thus degraded?

It's a sad role to be forced into, Dr. Pontecorvo, and sadder still when you know, as you do, that since 1946 the United States has had it in its power to rain atom bombs on Russia, yet never entertained doing so in face of almost endless provocation. You were part of the free world in 1946 and knew that Russia could not have retaliated (for she had no atom bombs then) nor long survived militarily.

It is testimony to the restraint of the western democracies that even in the recent Korean incident, the United States, England, and their allies refused to use the atom bombs that promised such enormous advantage, strategically and politically.

The current Kremlin wolf cry, Dr. Pontecorvo, is the habitual Soviet attempt to mask the catastrophes of Communist failure from within—this time the agricultural failure and its resulting food crisis—by whipping up the fear of invasion when none is in sight. Your name has now been linked to General Zhukov's in a gramophonic duet of fear mongering that must sound as hollow and scratchy to you as it does to Zhukov and to the whole free world.

Brainwashed or prison tethered, you are still a scientist for whom demonstrable facts, even of history, are inescapable. The more the pity.

Sincerely,

A. N. SPANEL,
Chairman, International Latex Corp.
PLAYTEX PARK, DOVER, DEL., U. S. A.

THE MATUSOW CASE

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, on the morning of March 1, I received at my office an airmail, letter-size, registered envelope with a return receipt requested. The postmarks indicated that it was mailed in Cincinnati, Ohio, on February 28. In the upper left-hand corner of the addressed side of the envelop, there appears the following: "The Cincinnati Enquirer, one of the world's greatest newspapers, office of the secretary."

This envelope did not contain a letter. Its sole content was a tear sheet of the editorial page of the Sunday, February 27, 1955, issue of the Cincinnati Enquirer. An article on that editorial page under the byline of James Ratliff and entitled "The Matusow Case" was partially circled in red, indicating that it was the intention of the sender to call this particular article to my attention.

Mr. President, my colleagues and the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have already had that article made available to them, since on last Friday, March 4, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did me the unintentional kindness of having the article inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. However, for the sake of continuity and for the convenience of those who may read today's RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the extension of remarks of the Honorable EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, as they appear on page A1437, of the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1955, be again inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE MATUSOW CASE

(Extension of remarks of Hon. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, in the Senate of the United States, Friday March 4, 1955)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an analysis by Mr. James Ratliff with respect to the Matusow case.

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

"[From the Cincinnati Enquirer of February 27, 1955]

"THE MATUSOW CASE

"(By James Ratliff)

"One of the most remarkable exhibits of irresponsibility ever seen, even at Washington, D. C., was staged this week by Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas Democrat, as chairman of the Senate Investigating Subcommittee.

"Nothing ever charged to Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, his predecessor, came near the spectacle put on by Mr. MCCLELLAN with Harvey Matusow. Mr. MCCLELLAN took a man who already had publicly confessed that he was a perpetual liar, and gave him a nationwide, congressionally immune Senate forum to promote the book in which he psychopathically describes his own lies. As if this weren't enough, Mr. MCCLELLAN put the mess on television.

"Senator MCCLELLAN knew that the publisher of this book could answer under oath whether or not he was a Communist. He knew that Matusow's press conferences were staged by Carl Marzani, notorious jailed Communist, and Nathan Witt, who refused to reply when asked if he was in Alger Hiss' Soviet espionage cell. Yet despite all this, Mr. MCCLELLAN questioned Matusow in front of cameras and newsmen on the ground that he wanted the truth from Matusow 'if the truth was in him.'

"For 1 week Matusow had been babbling, 'Read the lies in my book.' This was a book by a Communist, openly parroting the Communist lies. But instead of questioning Matusow behind closed doors, Mr. MCCLELLAN chose to give the Communists of America their outstanding propaganda coup of years.

"I met Matusow in October 1951. He was brought here by Martha Edmiston, one of the Federal Bureau of Investigation undercover agents who had helped so much 16 months before with the Enquirer's Communist exposé before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

"Matusow was a swarthy but alert young man in a snappy Air Force sergeant's uniform. He kept twisting pipe cleaners into funny little animals while he talked. Maybe it was a warning. Martha, then a public relations official of Wright-Patterson Air Base, told us:

" 'This is the fellow who drove Wright Field brass into shudders when he listed the Communist Party and 46 Red fronts in his background. But he's a former Commie who wants to talk, Jim.'

"Matusow could type, so we put him at a typewriter to do his life story. It was an interesting tale of Red intrigue, 37 pages of it. But it still lies unused in Enquirer files, because only a little of it could be verified by us. One verification was a copy of the Daily Worker, the Commie paper, of January 29, 1951. In it Matusow was pictured as expelled from the Communist Party for misrepresentations. (How ironic can you get?)

"By coincidence, the Communists were helping to form the National Negro Labor Council, a Red front, over on Central Avenue. Matusow said he could identify some of the Communists, so he went over there with reporter Joseph Green, who had the news story.

"Matusow recognized some Communists all right. But they recognized him as a traitor to the party and threw him out. The Enquirer reported the incident, without using Matusow's name.

"In a few weeks Matusow was bounced out of the Air Force. He went to testify before the Ohio Un-American Activities Commission. I told Sid Isaacs, commission counsel, that he might be able to use Matusow for a while as Commie spotter and research man. This is a calculated risk, but the best way to investigate a secret conspiracy is a man who has been in or can get into it.

"Mr. Isaacs told Matusow he would give him about $300 a month, but Matusow didn't actually last a full month. He started working on January 21, 1952, identifying Red literature, but had to go off for 10 days in February to testify in Washington, Sid told me.

"When Matusow got back from Washington he had forgotten the repeated warnings that he was just a Communist trying to undo the harm he had caused. He became a big-time agent. Without a by-your-leave, he went off to Yellow Springs, Ohio, site of Antioch College, and suddenly, to the horror of Isaacs, issued a press statement.

" 'Antioch has at least 400 potential Communists on its campus,' Matusow blurted. Even if true, Matusow didn't know this and he had no authority to open his mouth anyway. Isaacs, who had given him endless warnings, blew up. Matusow was due to testify before the Senate, so Sid paid him off at the end of February.

"We never saw Matusow again, but heard of him. He made occasional headlines, romping from one trial and hearing to another as a witness. Many columnists, including ourselves once, mentioned him briefly. But when he began identifying Owen Lattimore and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam as Reds we became worried. We looked up his forgotten story in the files.

" 'He didn't tell us he had met Lattimore or Oxnam,' I told the city editor Jack Cronin. 'He may be lying.' But we were unable to prove his possible lies any more than his story, and we didn't print it.

"Now Matusow admits he lied about Lattimore and Oxnam. He says he doesn't know when he ever told any truth. This leads to speculation the Communists may have published his expulsion to set a decoy who would discredit all Communist investigations.

"Credence to this theory is lent by the fact that Matusow, again a Communist, is linking every Communist exposer he can think of with his lies.

"But his tissue of lies is mainly hackneyed Communist Party line stuff. For example, I am supposed to have told him (his book says) 'not to overshadow the Ohio Commission, as they need the headlines for votes.'

"The Commies aren't even clever. This has been the Communist Daily Worker line for years. Imagine me giving a hoot whether the 7 Republicans and 5 Democrats on that commission from all over Ohio got votes for the Ohio legislature.

"Matusow quoted Sid Isaacs as telling him to 'break up unions in Dayton, Ohio.' The old mouldy Red line. Not only is Sid so liberal that the Republicans wouldn't give him a job in the State Department which asked for him but whenever he goes after Communists like those leading the United Electrical Workers, a decent American union benefits.

"I don't think Matusow was planted from the start, however. Too much of his original tale was corroborated by Government committees. The Commies wouldn't dare let him expose so much just for the later harm he could do. They probably blackmailed him back into line when it became obvious to them, too, that he was lying for headlines.

"But the harm is done. All over the country people who never say an unkind word about communism are saying it's all a tissue of lies. The fact that endless FBI files send the Commies to jail—not just a Matusow—doesn't bother them. They keep croaking it's all a witch hunt.

"As for Senator MCCLELLAN's great book promotion that has aided the Communists? Well, it's your move now, Senator."

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, after reading the article by James Ratliff, whom I have never met, I must confess that I was surprised by its contents.

With reckless abandon of truth and facts, and in his unrestrained haste to criticize and condemn, the author of the article predicated his attack against me and the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on a wholly false premise. It is hardly conceivable that any columnist or newspaper man in America did not know that it was the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee that was then conducting the Matusow investigation, and that the distinguished and able senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] is the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. President, it will be noted that Mr. Ratliff concluded his article with this statement, "As for Senator MCCLELLAN's great book promotion that has aided the Communists? Well—it's your move now, Senator." I immediately searched for but did not find the name of either the publisher or the editor of the paper on the editorial page on which this article was published. I did find, however, printed in the upper lefthand corner of that page the following:

Declaration of faith by the Cincinnati Enquirer, April 10, 1841: If we fail, that failure shall not arise from a want of strict adherence to principle or attention and fidelity to the trust we assume.

Partially because of that profound declaration, I made the charitable error of assuming that Mr. Ratliff was possibly an irresponsible columnist who did not necessarily represent the policies or reflect the views of this—"One of the world's greatest newspapers." I did not know at that time that he is the vice president of the Cincinnati Enquirer. I believed that the responsible authorities of this paper would, when the full significance and import of this erroneous article was called to their attention, publicly acknowledge the falseness of it and the malicious and vicious implications it conveys against every member of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

I then learned that Mr. Roger Ferger is the publisher of the Cincinnati Enquirer. I reached him by telephone, and after a brief discussion of the article and its false premise and serious implications, he stated that the matter would have his prompt attention. Accordingly he directed his Washington representative, Mr. Glenn Thompson, to call on me. For that consideration and courtesy by Mr. Ferger, I wish to express my thanks.

Mr. President, I assume there is no way that this publication or Mr. Ratliff can completely undo all of the harm this article has done, but in all fairness I should like to relate for the record the

action they have taken in an attempt to at least partially right the wrong they have committed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of the letter which I received from Mr. Ratliff, dated March 3, 1955.

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

THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER,
March 3, 1955.

The Honorable JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: I owe you two apologies—one of which I shall give as much prominence and space as was given you in my column on February 27.

The mailing of the column without an enclosed letter was not intentionally discourteous but done in haste. I was trying to rush off copies in order to forestall more of Matusow's appearance, and with my secretary gone and a mail deadline to meet, rushed it off as received. I sent you the column because I would not dream of personally referring to you as I did without letting you know as soon as possible.

As to the confusion of your two committee assignments, I apologize for an inadvertent slip. Quite unfortunately it put upon you the entire onus when it was merely the committee of which you were one-ninth. This error will be corrected in my next column. You must admit that the subcommittees have complex ramifications, especially with the permanent investigating committee having so completely overlapped the Eastland Committee functions.

The best way to prove to you that personal malice does not enter into anything I write is the enclosed Times-Star clipping and its circumstance. I think I was the first person in the United States to whom Matusow told his original story. The story Matusow was telling then was, I believe, true. It was too detailed and incriminated too many names to be a Commie plant. Yet we here were dubious of Matusow's glib egotism and extreme forwardness. We never touched the story. Consequently, to be dragged into Matusow's lies is particularly galling.

You know of course what it means to expose communism. You have suffered the endless jibes and certainly the fevered tension of this uniquely uncomfortable crusade. Well, I have been at it 5 years, through congressional and State hearings, with more than my quota of insults. The Times-Star clipping shows graphically how disgruntled rivals seize on any opportunity to degrade anyone with a reputation as a Communist hunter.

I know from the celebrated TV hearings that you are a conscientious, loyal, and as disgusted with endless Red hippodroming and chicanery as I am. I believe it was your best judgment that Matusow be turned over simply to the Justice Department for quiet grand jury inquiry and prosecution. You say you urged that. I cannot understand what compelled you to change your mind and go along with this spectacle. As you went along, because the reason I inadvertently placed the action as your responsibility alone was that the Associated Press had constantly used you for a spokesman on the hearing. Senator EASTLAND is too new, I suppose.

There is no doubt that among many fair-minded persons Matusow's public appearance is discrediting him, but all too many Americans are attracted by sensation and headline. No matter how repugnant a thing is they flock around it in fascination simply because it wins attention. I therefore feel that this hearing has infinitely more possibility of spreading the confusion and distrust the Communists so dearly love to do than of discrediting its principal. Most Communists yearn to be martyrs. And a public forum enables them to perform beyond their wildest hopes. They should be restricted in Government hearings to only the most necessary questions when there is any chance of their putting on a show.

Matusow may be a psychopathic liar but he is no fool. And he is being advised by the same sinister anarchial minds which turned Judge Medina's courtroom into a travesty of decorum. The most successful public things the Communists have ever accomplished are their stunts in making one American mistrust another.

Had Matusow been nailed down for his openly admitted perjury before the publicity-barren facade of a grand jury his subsequent conviction would have amply labeled his book, without the sensation that inevitably will now attract the curious. He was no ordinary Red witness to be exploited. He already had admitted the crime of perjury.

You certainly know that the eastern press, along with thousands of amateur and professional civil-rights cliche howlers, look endlessly for material to discredit people like you and me, and important witnesses like Elizabeth Bentley. They care not how dubious the weapon. In my opinion, the Eastern press has been comparatively silent on this juicy morsel of what they normally label the travesty of Communist hearing procedure, simply because they are enjoying the trap into which the Red hunters have fallen.

I wish you had stuck to your initial resolve. But meanwhile I wish you the best possible luck in having this hearing turn out the way you hoped. I would rather be wrong on my whole thesis than give your enemies and mine the slightest crumb of satisfaction.

You have my sincere apology and best wishes.

Very truly yours,

JAMES RATLIFF.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I shall not take time to read the letter, but I shall refer to some paragraphs of it.

That letter, Mr. President, while expressing an apology, makes a feeble attempt to justify some of the contents of the article, since the author was at the time laboring under provocations caused by articles published by a rival newspaper, the Cincinnatti Times-Star, about him and his connection with Harvey Matusow. But that provocation did not warrant, nor does it excuse, this libelous attack upon the Internal Security Subcommittee and its members.

It is further noted that he says in his letter, "I wish you had stuck to your initial resolve"—referring, Mr. President, to the fact that I had declined to call Matusow before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. He is bound to know that I kept that resolve. Mr. Matusow has not yet been called before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations.

However, Mr. President, as a member of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I did acquiesce in the desire of its Chairman, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], and other members of the subcommittee to hold the public hearings of that committee at which Mr. Matusow has testified. As we all know, the jurisdiction of the Internal Security Subcommittee in that field is much broader than that of the Government Operations Committee and its Investigating Subcommittee, and I felt that if Mr. Matusow was to be called before any committee in connection with the book False Witness and his confession of repeated perjuries, the Internal Security Subcommittee was the proper and logical one before whom he should be required to appear.

Prior to the time this article was published, I had stated to the press, and in the presence of the Cincinnati Enquirer's Washington correspondent, that since this investigation had been undertaken it was my hope that the testimony of Matusow and other witnesses in the investigation would reveal that the book False Witness was inspired by a desire on the part of its author and its publishers to serve the Communist cause; that it would be shown that the publishers of the book are either members of the Communist Party or that they are strong Communist sympathizers; and that the evidence would further reveal that its publication is being sponsored and financed by individual Communists and Communist organizations. Those views I believe are shared by every member of the Internal Security Subcommittee.

That Matusow, the author of the book False Witness, and his publishers, Cameron and Kahn, are primarily motivated by a purpose to aid the Communists, in my opinion, is being established by the hearings now in progress before the Internal Security Subcommittee.

The book, its author, its publishers, and the advance purchasers of it are now, I believe, being exposed for what they really are. They now stand discredited before the bar of enlightened public judgment.

It is hardly conceivable to me that any loyal and thinking American who recognizes and abhors the evil of communism will now be interested in purchasing the book False Witness. I would not purchase a copy of it, for by so doing I would feel that I was contributing to the Communist conspiracy in this country.

I believe, Mr. President, the most effective way to fight and destroy communism is to expose the vicious evil of it and the traitors to this country who espoused it.

As has been noted, Mr. President, the first paragraph of Mr. Ratliff's letter to me of March 3 reads as follows:

> I owe you two apologies—one of which I shall give as much prominence and space as was given you in my column of February 27.

In some measure, he kept that promise in the Sunday, March 6, issue of his paper, under the title "A Correction."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the article to which I have just referred, entitled "A Correction," which was published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of March 6, 1955, be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

A CORRECTION

My column was in error last week in implying that Senator JOHN L. MCCLELLAN, Arkansas Democrat, was responsible for placing Harvey Matusow, turnabout Communist, on the stand at Washington. I apologize to Senator MCCLELLAN.

Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, Mississippi Democrat, is chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee hearing Matusow, and Senator MCCLELLAN is merely one of the subcommittee's nine members. Senator MCCLELLAN is chairman of the permanent Investigating Subcommittee (formerly headed by Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY) and he has informed the Enquirer that the committee he heads had declined to hear Matusow.

Answering our charge that the appearance of an admitted Communist liar on the stand only benefits the Communist Party, Senator MCCLELLAN disagreed. He said he went along with the other committee in hearing Matusow because he felt it was the best way to discredit Matusow and his book on false testimony.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. In conclusion, Mr. President, I wish to revert again to the profound declaration of faith of this newspaper to which I referred earlier in my remarks—"If we fail, that failure shall not arise from a want of strict adherence to the principle or attention and fidelity to the trust we assume."

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are indispensable essentials to human liberty. Those freedoms must be preserved. But freedom carries with it an obligation of honor, of reliability, and of responsibility. It does not license a newspaper or a columnist to bear false witness in what it publishes.

The article, The Matusow Case, by the strongest implications, falsely accused the members of the Internal Security Subcommittee of the United States Senate of a "great book promotion that has aided the Communists." I have recorded here today all that Mr. Ratliff and the Cincinnati Enquirer have done to repudiate their false witness against Members of the United States Senate. Those who read this record may now judge how well they have discharged the strict adherence to principle and attention and fidelity to the trust they have assumed.

Mr. President, I may say I appreciate the extent to which the newspaper and the author of the article, who is vice president of that publication, have gone in trying to rectify this wrong.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Arkansas for having indicated to me the general nature of the article. I may say I probably insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD fewer matters than does any other Member of the Senate.

How the article ever came to my desk, I am at a loss to understand. I am sure it was sent in the mail. As a result of the usual routine by which such matters are prepared, every once in a while I find myself submitting, for printing in the RECORD, a matter which is not too familiar to me.

I noticed that the article bore the general label of the Matusow case. If it had occurred to me for a moment that the article contained any reflection upon the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN] or upon any other Member of this body, I would have been the last person to have inserted it in the RECORD.

Mr. President, I began my service in the legislative branch with my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas, a long, long time ago. I have developed a deep and abiding affection for him. I know of no one who has brought to the public service greater fidelity to duty and greater patriotism than has he. So if there was any disparagement or any derogation by means of the article, I regert it exceedingly; and in so far as I am able to make amends, I shall certainly do so.

Mr. President, I have not the slightest hesitation whatever in apoligizing, both publicly and privately, if by any act of mine, either directly or indirectly, there has been any aspersion upon the reputation, integrity, or character of public service of any Member of this body.

I say to my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, that had I known about the article and had I examined it a little more carefully, it would not have been inserted by me in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I desire to thank my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois. I was surprised when I found the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But today, before I sought recognition by the Chair, I went to the Senator from Illinois, to tell him that I was compelled to refer to the article; and I showed him a copy of the remarks I would make, so that he might know of them.

I am glad to know that it was through inadvertence that the Senator from Illinois inserted the article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I could not conceive that he would do so otherwise, because I know it is not the general rule of conduct of the Members of this body to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD articles which are malicious and vicious regarding other Members of the Senate.

I am very grateful, Mr. President, for the very kind expression which has been made by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Illinois.

I may say that I regret to have taken this much of the time of the Senate in order to make the RECORD today or to correct the implications of the RECORD as it stood as of this morning. But I felt that the fight against communism is so serious and is so important a part of the duty, responsibility, and obligation of every good American citizen, that I should make these remarks. Sometimes we may use bad judgment in our efforts in the Congress and on congressional committees. We may disagree as to the means by which to approach our goal and to maintain our opposition to communism, and in our efforts to stem the tide of influence of communism. But I may say it does not serve that cause, in which all of us should be united, if, merely because a person happens not to agree with a committee's decision to call a particular witness and to have him testify under oath, such person indulges in criticism to such an extent as to challenge the patriotism, loyalty, and motives of Members of Congress who conscientiously are trying to render the proper service to their country.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield further to me?

Mr. MCCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, having served for 2 years on the same committee with the Senator from Arkansas, in our pursuit of the sinister forces which would destroy the free concept of this country, I can testify, out of long experience and almost daily association in that committee, to the unremitting zeal of the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas in his efforts to protect the institutions and the great concept of freedom, which is the wellspring of this country. I salute him now for the zeal and vigor he has brought to that task.

In that committee there have been differences of opinion and judgment, but, in the main, as between himself and me, they have always been considered, as they should be, objectively and in a spirit of almost complete amity.

So, out of that long experience, Mr. President, I can testify again to the great public service my friend, the senior Senator from Arkansas, has rendered in that field.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for the purpose of considering nominations on the executive calendar, with the exception of Calendar No. 68, the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iran. It is agreed that that nomination shall be passed over.

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

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Capt. Amos A. Jordan, for appointment as professor of social science, United States Military Academy, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

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

George W. Perkins, of New York, to be the United States permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, vice John C. Hughes, resigned.

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

John Von Neumann, of New Jersey, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the Secretary will proceed to state the nominations on the executive calendar, with

the exception of Calendar No. 68, the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to Iran, which, without objection, will be passed over.

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Charles Noah Shepardson, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Theophil Carl Kammholz to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, among the most serious obstacles to good government in our time is the difficulty in recruiting for the public service experienced and capable citizens of demonstrated integrity. I regard it as our great good fortune when such a citizen, at considerable personal sacrifice, accepts appointment to a public office, where rewards are few and brickbats many.

Theophil C. Kammholz, prominent Chicago attorney, was nominated by the President for the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. He was approved for the post by a majority of my fellow members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It is difficult to see, how on the basis of his character and career, the committee could have decided otherwise.

Mr. Kammholz, the son of a Lutheran minister, was born in Wisconsin and educated in the public schools of that State. In 1932 he was graduated from the law school at the University of Wisconsin, and engaged in the general practice of law until 1943. In that year he entered the public service as regional attorney for the Regional War Labor Board in Chicago, serving for a period of 8 months, whence he left to resume private practice. Since that date he has dealt primarily with the law of labor relations and is widely regarded as an expert in that field, an expertness particularly essential to the General Counsel of the NLRB. In 1954, Mr. Kammholz acted as an adviser to the United States Government delegation at the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva and filled that role with distinction.

Mr. Kammholz appeared before our committee and testified at length. The only witnesses who appeared against him were representatives of local printing trade unions in Chicago. They charged that some 12 years ago, Mr. Kammholz, while regional attorney for the War Labor Board, had been guilty of conduct which they alleged involved a conflict of interest. Mr. Kammholz entered a firm denial and our committee regarded the charge as not proved.

In his testimony, Mr. Kammholz enumerated 16 different labor unions with which he had dealt in the course of his career. Among these were such major organizations as the CIO Steelworkers, Auto Workers, and Electrical Workers, and the AFL Machinists and Building Service Employees Unions. None of these opposed Mr. Kammholz, nor did their parent federations, the AFL and the CIO. The only objection other than that of the local Chicago printing-trade unions was a written communication from the Union of Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, independent. The Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers is one of those unions expelled by the CIO as Communist-dominated, and I regard its objection as a tribute to Mr. Kammholz.

My distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] are the only members of our committee to sign the report recommending against the confirmation of Mr. Kammholz. As I have indicated, there is nothing either in his career, his character, or in the record to justify rejecting Mr. Kammholz. To the contrary, the Senators from Illinois and Michigan in their report specifically concede that he is a man of integrity, competence, and character—page 1. I quote further from their report:

> Theophil C. Kammholz has had an honorable record as a practicing attorney (p. 13).
>
> * * * * *
>
> With the exception of one incident in 1943 as to which there was contradictory testimony, there is no evidence that Mr. Kammholz acted other than as an honorable and able advocate for his clients' interests in all these years. Indeed, those who appeared before the committee to oppose his nomination freely conceded as much (p. 5).
>
> * * * * *
>
> The foregoing is a record of which any practicing attorney could well be proud (p. 5).

The sole basis for opposition to Mr. Kammholz is the assertion that one who, in the labor-relations field, has represented management exclusively, is incapable of attaining that objectivity and impartiality which the position of General counsel requires.

Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed by the increasing frequency with which nominees for public office are opposed solely by reason of their backgrounds. I fear this development. It contains the seeds from which might spread the view that American society is divided into classes whose interests are forever irreconcilable. This doctrine of class conflict is alien to our traditions and unjustified by the facts of our national life. I sincerely hope it never becomes a part of our existence. Mr. Kammholz has amply demonstrated his honesty, his integrity, his ability, and his unquestioned competence for the post of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. I move the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Theophil Carl Kammholz to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am reluctantly compelled to rise in opposition to confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Kammholz to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of views, signed by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] and myself, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

VIEWS OF SENATORS PAUL H. DOUGLAS AND PAT MCNAMARA IN OPPOSITION TO THE CONFIRMATION OF THE NOMINATION OF THEOPHIL C. KAMMHOLZ TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The undersigned, members of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without reflecting on the character, competence, or integrity of the nominee, are convinced from the evidence in the hearings that Theophil C. Kammholz does not possess certain qualities which are uniquely required in the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Accordingly we believe and recommend that his nomination to that post should not be confirmed.

NATURE OF THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The powers and duties given to the General Counsel by law are far reaching. They can affect the welfare and relations of business enterprises and their millions of employees across the country. Certain of these powers are not reviewable, by courts or by the National Labor Relations Board, and cannot ultimately be delegated under the law to any other person or tribunal.

The statutory provision is as follows:

"There shall be a General Counsel of the Board who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a term of 4 years. The General Counsel of the Board shall exercise general supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board (other than trial examiners and legal assistants to Board members) and over the officers and employees in the regional offices. He shall have final authority, on behalf of the Board, in respect of the investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect of the prosecution of such complaints before the Board, and shall have such other duties as the Board may prescribe or as may be provided by law" (sec. 3 (d), Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947).

It is thus clear that the General Counsel of the NLRB is not a "general counsel" in the usual meaning of that term in connection with other agencies and departments—a legal counsel advising the agency and acting under its control and direction.

The General Counsel of the NLRB is in fact administrator, housekeeper, prosecutor, and supreme judge of initial jurisdiction (or, one might say, Lord Chief Justice and Lord High Executioner), all wrapped up in one.

In the exercise of these functions, the law makes him independent of the Board. His supervisory and administrative powers over the Board's attorneys (with exceptions specified) and over the regional officers and employees are absolute. He has final authority over investigations, issuance of complaints and their prosecution.

It is in connection with the issuance of complaints, and most specifically in the refusal to issue them, that the extremity of the General Counsel's power is most clear. While the issuance of a complaint is ultimately reviewed by the NLRB itself and then possibly by the courts, the General Counsel's refusal to issue a complaint is not reviewable by anyone. This provision,

unique in administrative law, enables the General Counsel to close the door to the NLRB firmly and securely, and the parties thus shut out have no right of appeal. His decision is final.

That this power is not a mere theoretical one, but is one of great practical importance which goes to the heart of labor-management relations, is evident from the list of some recent decisions of the General Counsel refusing to issue complaints. As inserted in the hearings (pp. 10–11, hearings), they are as follows:

No. 1014. September 3, 1954. 34 LRRM 1601. Did employer violate act by hiring nonunion men ahead of pensioned union members? (No.)

No. 1013. September 3, 1954. 34 LRRM 1533. Did companies, members of trade associations, violate act by locking out employees of 3 companies because of strike against 1? (No.)

No. 1008. August 27, 1954. 34 LRRM 1512. Did unions violate the act by engaging in organizational picketing? (No.)

No. 977. July 16, 1954. 34 LRRM 1436. Did employer violate act by refusing to give union time study data? (No.)

No. 951. July 16, 1954. 34 LRRM 1208. Did employer violate act by refusing economic data to support its claim of inability to pay a wage increase? (No.)

No. 918. April 15, 1954. 33 LRRM 1527. Did a company violate the act by seeking a State court injunction? (No.)

No. 923. April 22, 1954. 33 LRRM 1527. Did a company violate the act by refusing to allow an employee to be represented by counsel in presenting a grievance to it? (No.)

No. 909. March 25, 1954. 33 LRRM 1461. Did a company violate the act by paying a Christmas bonus only to nonunion employees and refusing to bargain with the union about it? (No.)

No. 899A. March 10, 1954. 33 LRRM 1439. Did company violate the act by discharging a supervisor for union activities and then refusing to rehire him as a nonsupervisory employee for that reason? (No.)

No. 879. January 6, 1954. 33 LRRM 1218. Did company violate the act by discharging truckdrivers for failure to cross a fruit pickers' picket line? (No.)

No. 864. December 15, 1953. 33 LRRM 1137. Did employer violate the act by shutting down plant within 30 days after concluding a contract with a union? (No.)

No. 868. December 15, 1953. 33 LRRM 1137. Did union violate the act by securing discharge of union member who refused to pay increased union dues? (No.)

No. 851. November 30, 1953. 33 LRRM 1107. Did employer violate act by discharging two employees who attended an NLRB hearing without giving notice? (No.)

No. 856. November 30, 1953. 33 LRRM 1108. Did union violate the act by striking during the life of an agreement? (No.)

On basic matters of statutory interpretation, findings of fact and application of the law to the facts, therefore, the General Counsel of the NLRB has the power of life and death over charges by employers and unions. We do not think this provision of the law is wise or just. But it was enacted by the 80th Congress and is the law. We must deal with it as it is. And under it the General Counsel has sweeping and arbitrary powers.

NEED FOR IMPARTIALITY IN HIGHEST DEGREE

It is primarily because of this uniquely unreviewable, arbitrary power in the General Counsel, that impartiality, disinterestedness, objectivity, and lack of bias in the highest degree are required of any nominee to that post.

Customarily, great power in our Government is safeguarded by liberal checks and reviews. Here the only restraint possible on this independent NLRB General Counsel in his refusal to issue complaints is a self-restraint bred of his training and experience and the long-developed pattern of his conduct and thinking in a judicial capacity.

Indeed, in the case of judges, a higher court or associate justices on the same appeal level are always available to correct mistakes of judgment and to counterbalance the unfair effects of bias. Judges can likewise disqualify themselves when cases involving some past clients or adversaries come before them, and other judges are at hand to rule on them. With the General Counsel of the NLRB in his refusal to issue complaints, there are no such checks, no appeals, and no coordinate adjudicators. Consequently, impartiality and lack of bias to an even greater degree than that required of judges are obviously essential. Only then can the demands of justice be met. Only in such circumstances can the NLRB and its processes administered by the General Counsel merit the necessary public confidence.

A mere intention to be fair, honest as it may be, is not enough. The required impartiality and lack of bias are more than a conscious state of mind. They grow out of a background of balanced study and professional work, a general pattern of even-handed action and thought, a "bent" of a judicial and objective character—at least for this unique post they seem to us to rule out those who come directly with the deeply ingrained habits of advocacy over a long period of years for either employers or employees.

An especially heavy obligation is, therefore, imposed on the Executive of the Nation to present a nomination of one who clearly possesses these attributes. And a coordinate obligation rests upon us in the Senate to determine whether the nominee possesses the essential qualification for this powerful position. From a review of his background we are reluctantly compelled to conclude that he does not.

THE PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE NOMINEE

Theophil C. Kammholz has had an honorable record as a practicing attorney. The first 11 years were spent in general legal work in Wisconsin. This was interrupted by 8 months of service as regional counsel for the War Labor Board in Chicago in 1943.

The 11 years that followed were devoted to legal practice in Chicago with two different firms, both of excellent reputation. During all this period and with both firms, Mr. Kammholz spent most of his time in the labor-relations field. He represented management exclusively. He acted for employers in collective bargaining, in arbitrations, in grievances, in cases before the National Labor Relations Board, and in general consultations.

In the summer of 1954, Mr. Kammholz served as an adviser to the United States Government delegation to the International Labor Organization Conference in June, where he advocated that our United States delegation take a favorable position on a resolution for 2-week vacations with pay, despite employer opposition.

In his 11 years of employer representation, Mr. Kammholz acted in matters of public record for such large and well-known firms as:

Wieboldt Stores
R. R. Donnelley & Sons Co.
Cudahy Packing Co.
Fairbanks, Morse & Co.
Inland Steel Co.
Peoples' Gas, Light & Coke Co.
Spiegel, Inc.
Tucker Corp.

And also for the following companies and employer associations:

Chicago Foundrymen's Association.
Cinch Manufacturing Corp.
International Register Co.
Paragon Die Casting Co.
Frederick Post Co.
Muncie Malleable Foundry Co.
American Rubber Products Corp.
Bastian-Morley Co.
Benton Harbor Malleable Industries.
Edward H. Anderson & Co.
Chrome-Rite Co.
Coleman Co.
Ditto Press, Inc.
Electric Storage Battery Co.
Great Lakes Plating Co.
Indiana Steel & Wire Co.
Kaplan's Department Store.
Molded Products Corp.
Marengo Foundry Co.
Masonite Corp.
The Perfect Circle Co.
Reliable Paste & Chemical Co.
Simpson Optical Co.
Warner Machine Products Corp.

Mr. Kammholz further reported that in his professional work he has appeared against the following unions:

United Steelworkers—CIO.
United Auto Workers—CIO.
International Union of Electrical Workers—CIO.
A. F. of L. Molders and Foundry Workers.
Building Service Employees: General Service Employees Union—A. F. of L.
Teamsters Union—A. F. of L.
United Electrical Workers—independent.
Farm Equipment Workers—independent.
Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers—independent.
International Association of Machinists—A. F. of L.: Die and Tool Makers Lodge.
International Printing Pressmen—A. F. of L.
Amalgamated Lithographers—CIO.
Basic Processors Union—A. F. of L.
Gas Workers Union—A. F. of L.
International Woodworkers—CIO.
Retail Clerks International Association—A. F. of L.

With the exception of one incident in 1943 as to which there was contradictory testimony, there is no evidence that Mr. Kammholz acted other than as an honorable and able advocate for his clients' interests in all these years. Indeed, those who appeared before the committee to oppose his nomination freely conceded as much.

NOMINEE'S LONG ADVOCACY OF EMPLOYER INTERESTS MEANS LACK OF ESSENTIAL IMPARTIALITY

The foregoing is a record of which any practicing attorney could well be proud.

But we do not believe such long-confirmed advocacy, all on one side of the employer-employee relations and disputes, fits this nominee to serve in the sensitive and uniquely powerful post of General Counsel to the NLRB. We are convinced that with this constant and exclusive experience on the employer side, he cannot have the lack of bias and prejudice, the openmindedness, the impartiality and the balanced view of the equities that are required for this post.

This is nothing against Mr. Kammholz as a person or his competence or integrity. But it represents a clear conviction that he is not the person for this particular position. This unwise provision of the law requires in the General Counsel a degree of objectivity and judicial temperament which this nominee cannot rightly be said to possess.

The duties of an advocate are the very antithesis of the duties of a judge. In bargaining and in advising employers who are resisting efforts of union to bargain, the advocate is necessarily a partisan. He is employed to discover and present the strongest points in support of his client's position. In justifying and protecting and advancing his client's interests, he necessarily seeks out and assails the weak points of his adversary.

In Mr. Kammholz's case, the objectors to this nomination have conceded that he "displayed in behalf of his clients the firmness, aggressiveness, ability, and reliability expected of a very able employer's attorney" (hearings, p. 18).

But such constant and long-continued advocacy for 11 years is bound to condition any man's habits of thought and action, to give him a bias or bent, however unconsciously, that is not consistent with the highest impartiality required in the General Counsel of the NLRB.

While we were glad to note his services to the United States delegation to the ILO, his apparently disinterested advice to this advisory group can hardly counterbalance 11 years of able and aggressive advocacy.

We are convinced that a hue and cry would have been raised if a previous administration—or the present one—had nominated for this post a person who came fresh from the ranks of labor or labor's legal advocates. We would ourselves have opposed it as lacking the requisite impartiality for this sensitive job.

We cannot believe that from State labor relations agencies, other offices of the Federal Government, the academic world or arbitration groups, someone with more impartial experience and training than Mr. Kammholz has had could not have been found. The previous incumbent as General Counsel had established an honorable and enviable record for such impartiality.

Service to management or labor is not a disqualification for public office generally. But long-continued advocacy for one side, without an intervening period of public service, is a disqualification for General Counsel of the NLRB, whose arbitrary and well-nigh dictatorial powers we have summarized before.

As we have said, it is not primarily a matter of character or intention, though both are, of course, essential. It is also a matter of impartial experience, judicial habits, proven lack of bias, a deep-seated bent for balancing the equities of both sides. To the degree required in the General Counsel of the NLRB by the law, we believe Mr. Kammholz does not possess these qualifications.

PRACTICAL OBSTACLES TO NOMINEE SERVING AS REQUIRED BY LAW

Were Mr. Kammholz' nomination to be confirmed, an impossible situation would arise, for it is almost a certainty that both of his two law firms and various ones of his former clients and union adversaries (whose membership must aggregate over 5 million) will continue to appear in contested matters before the National Labor Relations Board.

As brought out in the hearings, a trial judge in such a situation would disqualify himself and pass the matter on to another judge for trial. An appeals judge would disqualify himself and allow the other appeals judges to decide the case.

But the General Counsel of the NLRB has an exclusive and final authority with no one in a coordinate position to whom he can transfer the responsibility which the statute gives to him. We grant that in many cases the field staff and regional attorneys would handle the initial decisions in routine manner. But all of them serve under the General Counsel's supervision, and the final responsibility is his. And hotly disputed matters and those involving any close questions of law or fact would necessarily come to him for final decision.

When asked what he would do in such cases involving his former law firms or former clients or adversaries, Mr. Kammholz replied that he would delegate these matters to members of his staff to decide.

But the statute does not authorize and surely Congress did not intend to permit these arbitrary and unreviewable powers and responsibilities of the General Counsel to be simply delegated to persons selected by him.

It is as if a judge should say, "In all cases of my former firm or clients, I propose to let my law clerk decide the issues. But I shall sign the order." No one would dream of suggesting that this device would conform to the basic principles of just procedure. But in such a case at least there could be an appeal to a higher court.

If the General Counsel of the NLRB refuses to issue a complaint against a recent employer client, however, the decision is final. And no one is going to be impressed with the fairness of the procedure if the General Counsel himself makes that decision. And many are going to doubt both its fairness and its legality if he seeks to delegate to some subordinate a final authority granted only to him by law, under a Presidential nomination confirmed by the Senate.

In matters affecting, as these do, the life and death of unions, the success and failure of business enterprises, and the peace and profitability of complex industrial relations, we believe the Senate cannot condone the possible exercise by some unknown person of these extreme and arbitrary powers—or confirm a nominee whose very success in the private practice should disqualify him to act in many cases that will come before him.

DANGERS TO PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

This is the fifth major appointment this administration has made to the National Labor Relations Board, 4 board members and 1 General Counsel. Two of the four board nominees came fresh from responsible experience as representatives of employer interests and the other two had rather clearly revealed before their appointment that their orientation was proemployer.

If now in the delicate and powerful post of General Counsel—the most important job in the NLRB—another long-time advocate of employer interests is placed, we fear that public confidence in the impartiality of the board will be even further weakened.

Now we do not, of course, take the position that a person with management experience is thereby automatically disqualified from employment as a member of the National Labor Relations Board. Just as we do not take the position that a person with labor experience is necessarily disqualified by reason of such experience.

But we do view with alarm, and we think many people of this country have a right to view with alarm, a policy which in effect says that only employer-minded people are going to be appointed to jobs which by their very nature require judgments as between the merits of union and employer positions. This sort of appointment policy is on the way toward undermining the confidence of millions of people who work for a living in the impartiality of the present Board.

Already long-established lines of decision are being reversed by the new majority on the NLRB. It begins to look as if amendment of the law is being accomplished by administrative decisions of the Board, without so much as a by-your-leave to the Congress of the United States.

We fear the present nomination may cap the climax of this unhealthy development. We most earnestly declare that a policy which results in appointments coming only from employer ranks, or from people who have employer oriented interests, is wrong. This is an appointment which should never have been made and of which we cannot approve.

THE 1943 INCIDENT

Representatives of printing trade unions in Chicago reported an incident which occurred in October 1943, just 2½ days before Mr. Kammholz resigned from the regional staff of the War Labor Board, which also raised a serious question in their judgment as to his fitness for this position.

They reported that, as a Government representative, late on Friday, October 29, 1943, he had met them and received from them inquiries, complaints, and information of a fairly candid and confidential character concerning their bitter dispute with the R. R. Donnelley & Sons printing company. The following Monday, November 1, 1943, they then met Mr. Kammholz as co-counsel for the same Donnelley company in hearings that then began before the National Labor Relations Board.

They were confident that he must have known of his forthcoming association with the firm representing the Donnelley company at the time of his earlier meeting and discussion with them, and that his failure to disclose this future connection with their adversary was a breach of accepted principles against conflicts of interest. This raised a serious further question in their judgment as to his impartiality.

Mr. Kammholz in reply stated that he could not recall the incident of October 29, 1943, and that his duties with the War Labor Board did not include any action on wage matters of the Donnelley Co.

The testimony on this incident is in conflict. We believe the opposing witnesses and Mr. Kammholz all gave an honest account of their recollection. But in view of the conflict on this event of some 12 years ago, we do not rely upon this incident as one of our grounds of opposition to his confirmation.

CONCLUSION

For all of the foregoing reasons, we believe the Senate should not consent to the nomination of Theophil C. Kammholz to the position of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.
PAT MCNAMARA.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I point out that my objection to this nomination was raised largely because of the unique and extraordinary powers which are given to the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board under the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947.

The General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board is not only made the legal officer of the Board, but he is also made the Administrator. He is in charge of the officers and employees in the regional offices. He has supervision over all attorneys employed by the Board, with certain exceptions. He is also the prosecutor.

Perhaps most important of all is the fact that this General Counsel has final authority, on behalf of the Board, with respect to investigation of charges and issuance of complaints under section 10, and in respect to the prosecution of such complaints before the Board. That means that if a union believes it has a grievance, requiring a hearing before the Board, the General Counsel may deny the union the right to prosecute its case, and the decision of the General Counsel is not reviewable by the Labor Relations Board or the courts. It is final, controlling, and complete.

These are extraordinary powers, which I think are unique in the whole history of American administrative law. In fact, they are a legal monstrosity and should never have been included in the act. Nevertheless, they are in the act; and the fact that such great powers are given to one official requires extra care in the nomination and confirmation of a suitable person for this post.

We do not attack the character of Mr. Kammholz. On the contrary we say that, so far as we can determine, he is an honorable man.

We do say, however, that this post calls for a man who has not been closely identified with one side or the other of labor controversies.

The record of the hearings, which is summarized in the report, shows that since Mr. Kammholz resigned from the War Labor Board in 1943, after a brief period of service as a regional officer of that Board, he has represented employers exclusively—some of the largest employers in the country—and they are listed. He has appeared against 16 or 18 of the largest unions in the country. His practice has not been of a general nature. It has been of a highly specialized nature. In that specialization he has represented exclusively one side of labor-management disputes.

In view of the fact that appointments of the present administration to the Board have been largely drawn from this same group of employer-oriented persons, I believe the administration should have shown more care in selecting a man for this sensitive and powerful office.

It would be almost inevitable that a man with the clients that Mr. Kammholz has had should carry with him some of that bias to his new post.

A judge can meet such a difficulty by dissociating himself from a case and disqualifying himself from a matter under consideration. He can do this because there are other judges who can fill his place, and the processes of law can go on.

Mr. Kammholz, however, cannot disqualify himself. The statute makes him the final authority. For him to say that he can get one of his subordinates to sit on cases on which he will not pass would be equivalent to having a judge say that if his former firm or clients should appear in court he will ask one of his legal clerks to decide the issues. That is not dissociating himself from a case or providing a satisfactory alternative.

I fear that if we confirm this nomination the Board, the parties before it, and the General Counsel himself are in for trouble. Therefore, without any criticism of Mr. Kammholz, himself, I say that in a matter of such importance as this the appointment should not have been made, and that the Senate should not confirm it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it occurs to me that character is, after all, the foundation of every good human attribute. Whether it be patience or restraint, or whether it be fairness or impartiality, all such questions rest upon the foundation of character. If we begin with character, I am confident that we can expect fair administration of an office by a man who possesses in high degress the quality we call character.

I have examined with a great deal of interest the minority views submitted by my colleague from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara]. The first part of those views deals with the wisdom or unwisdom of delegating such powers to the general counsel as he possesses under existing law. The second part of the minority views deals with the record. The third part deals, I would say, with a kind of psychological analysis of what Mr. Kammholz's mental processes, thoughts, habits, and potential actions might be under given circumstances. That is not meant invidiously, of course. However, as I examined the minority views I could almost contemplate Marc Antony standing at the bier of Julius Caesar. With great skill he constantly alluded to the fact that Brutus was an honorable man, while at the same time, speaking deftly and skilfully, he made it appear that Brutus was not the man he should be.

I have examined the minority views. Starting with character as the foundation for any public service, I read in the opening sentence that my colleague from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan state:

> Without reflecting on the character, competence, or integrity of the nominee—

At least it would appear that he is a competent man and that he is a man of character and a man of integrity—

> are convinced from the evidence in the hearings that Theophil C. Kammholz does not possess certain qualities which are uniquely required in the office of General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

I notice on page 3 of the minority views that the Senators agree the nominee "has had an honorable record as a practicing attorney."

If he is a man of honor, he must be a man of character, no matter whether he was a specialist on one side of the fence or the other in the whole field of labor relations.

The Senators state also that the nominee was associated in legal practice in Chicago. They say that the nominee devoted 11 years to "legal practice in Chicago with two different firms, both of excellent reputation."

However, say the signatories of the minority views, from a review of his background they are reluctantly compelled to conclude that he does not have the required qualities. He was associated with two law firms of outstanding competence and good reputation, but, they say, he does not have the required qualities.

I notice on page 5 of the minority views the signatories state:

> With the exception of one incident in 1943 as to which there was contradictory testimony, there is no evidence that Mr. Kammholz acted other than as an honorable and able advocate for his clients' interests in all these years. Indeed, those who appeared before the committee to oppose his nomination freely conceded as much.

They say further:

> We are convinced that with this constant and exclusive experience on the employer side, he cannot have the lack of bias and prejudice, the open-mindedness, the impartiality and the balanced view of the equities that are required for the post.

Mr. President, if character means anything, it means impartiality. If character means anything, it means a capacity for one to rid himself of bias and to condition his mind under any circumstance to be fair and judicial.

The minority views also state:

> This is nothing against Mr. Kammholz as a person or his competence or integrity.

Mr. President, in other words, he is a competent man, say the signatories. They say he is a man of integrity. However, they say:

> But such constant and long-continued advocacy for 11 years is bound to condition any man's habits of thought and action, to give him a bias or bent, however unconsciously, that is not consistent with the highest impartiality required.

Mr. President, I recall all that was uttered in a rather unkind spirit at one time, when I was a Member of the House of Representatives, about one from a Southern State who had been nominated for appointment to the Supreme Court. They expected him to be completely divested of an unbiased attribute of mind. They expected him to move in all directions at once. Yet he has turned out to be one of the most solid and substantial members of the Supreme Court in my long experience in Washington.

I think of a former Senator who came to this body from the great State of Michigan. He came here endowed with great wealth which he made for himself. Much of it, I understand, was invested in Government bonds which were then entirely tax free. There was a belief that he would be a reactionary conservative when he reached this body, but he turned out to be one of the great liberals of the United States Senate in his time.

I think, Mr. President, of a judge of a Federal circuit court in one of the Atlantic seaboard States, and I recall my own examination into his record when he was identified with certain "yellow-dog" contracts, as they were called. When he was appointed and the question of the confirmation of his nomination was before the Senate, the greatest of imprecations and maledictions were uttered against him. Yet, he has turned out to be an extremely liberal judge.

So, Mr. President, if Mr. Kammholz is an honorable man, if he is an able man, as my distinguished colleague, and as the Senator from Michigan say he is; if he is a man of character, if he is a reliable man, if he is an able man, as they say; if he is a competent man, as they say, what more is required in the public service to discharge his responsibility?

I note on page 5 of the minority views that our distinguished colleagues say:

> In Mr. Kammholz' case, the objectors to this nomination have conceded that he—"displayed in behalf of his clients the firmness, aggressiveness, ability, and reliability expected of a very able employer's attorney."

What finer qualities ought we to attract to the Federal service than firmness, aggressiveness, ability, and reliability?

But they say it is not a matter of character and intention, though both are, of course, essential. They say:

> It is also a matter of impartial experience, judicial habits, proven lack of bias, a deep-seated bent for balancing the equities of both sides.

That is interesting language, Mr. President. Let us give him a chance to see whether there is a deep-seated bent for balancing the equities. If he is a man of character, of competence, of ability, of aggressiveness, of reliability, of firmness, what further attributes are needed in order to make sure that he has that deep-seated bent if it is given a chance to manifest itself?

My esteemed colleagues also say in their views:

He served as an adviser to the United States Government delegation to the International Labor Organization Conference in June, where he advocated that our United States delegation take a favorable position on a resolution for 2-week vacations with pay, despite employer opposition.

What finer encomium could be given a man than that? He had one brief opportunity in public service, and there he acquitted himself with high credit to his country, to himself, and to his own sense of fairness. But, say those who signed the minority views:

His apparently disinterested advice to this advisory group can hardly counterbalance 11 years of able and aggressive advocacy.

The qualities are there and his character is there, and on the brief occasion when he could manifest them, he has done so. That brings to my mind, Mr. President, the quotation—

The noble Brutus has told you that Caesar was ambitious, and if so, it were a grievous fault.

But no fault has been pointed out. This has been a psychological analysis of what a man's mind might do. Let us give it a chance in the orbit of government, and see what it will do.

I notice that our esteemed colleagues say, also:

Service to management or labor is not a disqualification for public office generally.

Then they say:

Long continued advocacy for one side without an intervening period of public service is a disqualification for the General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Mr. President, there is pending in the Judiciary Committee of the United States Senate the nomination of a very distinguished lawyer from New York to be a justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. As I gather from the record—and I heard all the testimony as a member of the committee—he was one of the most skillful attorneys in the field of monopoly and antitrust actions. But he was on the other side from the Government. As a matter of fact, he came to Chicago and, with great brilliance as a lawyer and great competence as an advocate, argued the Du Pont case which was brought by the Government.

What other points are emphasized in behalf of this very brilliant lawyer from New York that would qualify him for a place on the highest judicial tribunal of the land? His competence is pointed out, Mr. President——

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not true that in the case of Judge Harlan, to which, I take it, my colleague refers, he had an interim period serving on the bench in New York, and although his service was not protracted, he had a period of decontamination from excessive advocacy?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it may be argued that 1 period on the bench can decontaminate a man who has been at the bar for 30 years.

Mr. Kammholz has been at the bar for 11 years. He was on the War Labor Board in its regional capacity in Chicago for 6 months, and he was an attorney for the representative to the International Labor Organization. Frankly, I do not know how long it requires for a man to decontaminate himself under those circumstances, but I am willing, Mr. President, to gamble upon his fairness when every element and every component of character are present. And that has been freely conceded.

We are not concerned here today, Mr. President, with the wisdom or unwisdom of the powers enjoyed by the general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board. That is a matter for the Congress to determine. We are passing only on the fitness and the capacity of a man to occupy a position in government quite aside from the powers which are involved.

So, as I appraise this record, Mr. President—and I sat with Mr. Kammholz throughout the entire hearing of the Committee on Education and Labor—even those who came to complain about some incident in Chicago were the first to concede his competence, his character, and his ability. I think, Mr. President, the Government of the United States and the public service will be enriched indeed with a clear-eyed, open-faced young man in a responsibility of this kind, and I earnestly hope that his nomination will be confirmed.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a memorandum which I have prepared in connection with this nomination.

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

OPPOSITION REPORT

First. On page 2 it is stated:

"His (the General Counsel's) supervisory and administrative powers over the Board's attorneys (with exceptions specified) and over the regional officers and employees are absolute."

Comment: As a matter of fact the power to hire, fire, promote, demote and discipline such employees rests not with the General Counsel but with the Board. Heretofore the Board has delegated this authority to the General Counsel, a delegation which it can withdraw at any time. Moreover, even under the delegation, final approval for the designation of regional directors rests with the Board.

Second. On pages 2–3 the report refers to the unreviewable power of the General Counsel to refuse to issue complaints and asserts that this "arbitrary" power is a grave defect in the Taft-Hartley Act.

Comment: Under the Wagner Act this power to refuse to issue complaints rested with the Board, but just as under the present law it was a final power not reviewable by any other agency or court. Hence, the only difference between the 2 statutes in this respect is that final unreviewable authority rested with 3 persons under the Wagner Act and with 1 person under Taft-Hartley. The disappointed complainant, in either case, could get no review from a higher tribunal.

On the other hand, the setup under the Wagner Act permitted the Board to act both as prosecutor and judge, a procedure repugnant to every American concept of due process of law. Taft-Hartley by separating these two functions restored due process in this field of the law.

Third. On page 5, it is stated that Mr. Kammholz' background is bound "to give him a bias or bent, however unconsciously, that is not consistent with the highest impartiality required in the General Counsel of the NLRB."

Comment: The report fails to adduce a single specific example of bias or prejudice in Mr. Kammholz's career to support this generalization. As a matter of fact, the report admits (p. 5) that in his service with the ILO in 1954 he took a position advocated by labor and opposed by employers. Thus the only concrete evidence dealing with Mr. Kammholz's attitude in the entire record, affirmatively indicates that this background does not determine his attitudes when acting as a public servant.

Moreover, the courts have uniformly held that a charge of bias against any person acting in a judicial or quasi-judicial capacity can be sustained only by specific evidence of bias in concrete instances and not by a marshalling of background material from which a generalized inference of bias may be drawn on exclusively psychological or literary grounds.

If the theory asserted by the report were to prevail, a judge could be disqualified for bias to sit in any case involving an issue which, in the past, he has decided in a particular way.

4. On page 6 it is stated:

"But the General Counsel of the NLRB has an exclusive and final authority with no one in a coordinate position to whom he can transfer the responsibility which the statute gives to him."

Comment: His authority is final but the statute does not declare it to be exclusive. Thus, from the enactment of the Taft-Hartley Act almost 8 years ago, only a tiny percentage of the complaints issued among the thousands of charges filed have been the result of the personal decision of the General Counsel. The overwhelming majority of charges have been disposed of by the regional directors, and in a small number of cases, by the General Counsel's top assistants in Washington. This was equally true under the Wagner Act, and neither statute provided for an administrative appeal to either the Board itself or the General Counsel, respectively. Where such appeals are granted, they are a matter of grace and not of right.

5. On pages 4–5 the report lists 16 unions with which Mr. Kammholz dealt at various times in his career. They include such major unions as the CIO Steel Workers, Auto Workers, Electrical Workers, The AFL Machinists, and Building Service Employees Union.

Comment: Among these 16 unions, the only protests to Mr. Kammholz's confirmation came from the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, independent, expelled from the CIO as Communist dominated, and local printing trade unions in Chicago. The latter, made the general charges of bias because of background on which the report itself is based and referred to an alleged conflict-of-interest incident in 1943 said to involve Mr. Kammholz. But the report itself, because of the conflicting testimony, does not rely on this incident in its opposition to confirmation. Thus, it is plain that the overwhelming majority of the unions with which Mr. Kammholz dealt, including the major unions, evinced no opposition to his appointment, and the objections of the Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers is to be regarded as an accolade rather than a condemnation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Theophil C. Kammholz to be General Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board? [Putting the question.]

The nomination was confirmed.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1957.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota, to be a member for the remainder of the term of 2 years from December 1, 1953.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the routine nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the routine nominations in the Diplomatic and Foreign Service are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Chester R. Davis, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE—NOMINATION PASSED OVER

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran, be not considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will be passed over.

Mr. STENNIS. I move that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next, at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, March 10, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate March 8, 1955:

UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Capt. Amos A. Jordan, Jr., O27895, for appointment as professor of social science, United States Military Academy, effective March 1, 1955, under provisions of Public Law 449, 79th Congress, and section 520 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1955:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Chester R. Davis, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Charles Noah Shepardson, of Texas, 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.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Theophil Carl Kammholz, of Illinois, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, for a term of 4 years.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

Laird Bell, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term expiring January 27, 1957, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Arthur Hollis Edens, of North Carolina, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years, expiring January 27, 1958, and until his successor has been appointed and qualified.

Anna L. Rose Hawkes, of Vermont, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years, expiring January 27, 1958, and until her successor has been appointed and qualified.

FEDERAL FARM CREDIT BOARD

Sam H. Bober, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board for the remainder of the term of 2 years from December 1, 1953.

ROUTINE APPOINTMENTS IN THE DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN 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:

Robert H. S. Eakens, of Texas.
Henry H. Ford, of Florida.
Merrill C. Gay, of Ohio.
Graham R. Hall, of Arkansas.
Mose L. Harvey, of Maryland.
Frank K. Hefner, of Virginia.
James R. Johnstone, of Virginia.
Clifford C. Matlock, of California.
Dwight J. Porter, of Nebraska.
Philip H. Trezise, of Maryland.
J. Raymond Ylitalo, of Minnesota.

Randall S. Williams, Jr., of New York, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 3 to class 2.

Henry C. Ramsey, of California, a consul general of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

John W. Auchincloss, of the District of Columbia.
John A. Chappelear, of the District of Columbia.
John F. Correll, of Ohio.
Joseph F. Donelan, Jr., of New York.
Donald B. Eddy, of Connecticut.
Robert Eisenberg, of Virginia.
John W. Ford, of Virginia.
Leo A. Gough, of Rhode Island.
Stanley I. Grand, of Missouri.
Herbert W. Griffin, of California.
Robert J. Halliday, of New Jersey.
Henry S. Hammond, of Pennsylvania.
William K. Hitchcock, of Virginia.
Russell B. Jordan, of Wyoming.
Abe Kramer, of California.
Stanley R. Lawson, of California.
Edgar L. McGinnis, Jr., of Virginia.
Louis C. Nolan, of Florida.
Richard C. O'Brien, of New Jersey.
Charles E. Rogers, of Connecticut.
Joseph M. Roland, of Pennsylvania.
John D. Tomlinson, of Illinois.

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:

Rodger C. Abraham, of Maryland.
Edwin M. Adams, of Illinois.
Hugh M. Adamson, of Virginia.
John L. Barrett, of Texas.
George A. Berkley, of Pennsylvania.
Keirn C. Brown, of New York.
Robert W. Caldwell, of North Carolina.
Miss Margaret A. Fagan, of Iowa.
George S. Freimarck, of Maryland.
Justie E. Gist, of Iowa.
Harold M. Granata, of New York.
Warren G. Hall, of Washington.
Dwight B. Horner, of Virginia.
Thomas D. Huff, of Indiana.
J. Alfred LaFrenière, of Massachusetts.
John S. Meadows, of Massachusetts.
John G. Oliver, of California.
Harold W. Pfau, of New Jersey.
Harry M. Phelan, Jr., of Tennessee.
Ferdinand F. Pirhalla, of Pennsylvania.
Normand W. Redden, of New York.
Reed P. Robinson, of Utah.
Kenneth J. Ruch, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Eleanor W. Sandford, of Massachusetts.
Schubert E. Smith, of New York.
Richard L. Sneider, of New York.
Mrs. Lucille M. Snyder, of Missouri.
William B. Sowash, of Ohio.
Bertus H. Wabeke, of Massachusetts.
William H. Wade, of California.
Frederick S. York, of New Jersey.

Scott George, of Kentucky, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4 and to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Charles C. Gidney, Jr., of Texas, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 5 to class 4.

Robert M. Beaudry, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of class 5 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

Chester G. Dunham, of Ohio, for promotion from Foreign Service officer of class 6 to class 5.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Karl D. Ackerman, of Oklahoma.
Joseph P. Bandoni, of California.
William P. Boswell, of New Jersey.
Hampton E. Brown, Jr., of Maryland.
Robert L. Burns, of the District of Columbia.
William J. Bushwaller, of Iowa.
Max R. Caldwell, of Texas.
Everett L. Damron, of Ohio.
John R. Diggins, Jr., of Maine.
George A. Ellsworth, of Georgia.
Miss Helen V. Garrett, of Oklahoma.
John W. Gordhamer, of California.
Miss Anna C. Gustavs, of California.
Arvid G. Holm, of Washington.
Thomas J. Hunt, of New York.
Anthony J. Jay, of Illinois.
John W. Jelich, of New York.
Edward P. Kardas, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Mary A. Kellogg, of Michigan.
Joseph A. Livornese, of Colorado.
Miss Charlotte M. McLaughlin, of Washington.
Jack C. Miklos, of Idaho.
William D. Morgan, of New York.
Robert L. Mott, of California.
Mathias J. Ortwein, of Pennsylvania.
James B. Parker, of Texas.
Richard W. Petree, of Virginia.
John M. Powell, of Illinois.
Ralph C. Rehberg, of South Carolina.
W. Courtlandt Rhodes, of California.
Charley L. Rice, of Texas.
Emery Peter Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Mrs. Virginia C. Stryker, of Washington.
Miss Margarite H. Tanck, of South Dakota.
Charles P. Torrey, of California.
Miss Irene Toth, of California.
Allen R. Turner, of Missouri.
James M. Turner, of Tennessee.
Miss Mary L. Walker, of Georgia.
Leland W. Warner, Jr., of Kansas.
Miss Alice D. Westbrook, of California.
Ralph H. Wheeler, Jr., of New York.

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:

John Daniel Barfield, of Tennessee.
Robert T. Burke, of New York.
Robert J. Carle, of California.
Charles M. Gage, of Illinois.
Harold E. Grover, Jr., of Florida.
Stanley P. Harris, of New York.
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Johnsen, of California.
Henry G. Krausse, Jr., of Texas.
Franklin O. McCord, of Iowa.
Donald W. Mulligan, of Kentucky.
John Patrick Owens, of the District of Columbia.
James A. Parker, of Maryland.
Arthur H. Woodruff, of the District of Columbia.
James G. Sampas, of Massachusetts.
William R. Smyser, of Pennsylvania.

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

Edward J. Conlon, of Tennessee.
Charles F. Edmundson, of Illinois.
Tom A. Noonan, of Kentucky.
Lawrence E. Norrie, of California.
John P. Rhodes, of Ohio.

Thomas J. Needham, Jr., of Florida, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul of the United States of America.

Jack Liebof, of New York, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a vice consul of career, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. (This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on November 8, 1954, and confirmed by the Senate on December 2, 1954.)

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Willis J. Marsh, Gordon.

ARIZONA

Henry L. Worischeck, Flagstaff.
Jerome B. Roberts, Parker.
Theodore Ralph Schmidt, Tolleson.

CALIFORNIA

Paul D. Hickcox, Agnew.
Vincent P. Murphy, Daly City.
Harry B. Woodbury, El Centro.
Mary J. Ramos, Farmington.
William E. Kester, Independence.
Harvey J. Kohler, Irvington.
Leland C. Barnard, Lynwood.
Norman Elwood Case, Orange.
Constance H. Post, Randsburg.
Phillip R. Freer, Rocklin.
Ralph A. McWaid, Twentynine Palms.

COLORADO

Richard D. Nelson, Lafayette.
Millard E. Ryan, Rocky Ford.

CONNECTICUT

Benjamin F. Wells, Shelton.

FLORIDA

James L. Ennis, Merritt Island.

GEORGIA

George W. Greene, Bluffton.
Marian L. DeLoach, Clyo.
Mathew H. Stevens, Jr., Danville.
Ora W. Adams, Dewey Rose.
Clara B. Kilpatrick, Midway.
Horace L. Fletcher, Mount Berry.
Shelby Deck, Rocky Face.
Paul P. Hunt, Silver Creek.
Leon C. Lewis, Twin City.

IDAHO

Richard P. Swanstrum, Ashton.
Taylor R. Bowlden, Cascade.

INDIANA

Gordon L. Schaefer, Andrews.
Maude Kendall, Cannelton.
Gilbert G. Gerster, Dillsboro.
Edmund G. Sollman, Haubstadt.

IOWA

Ray L. Haefner, Arthur.
Duane V. Clow, Gladbrook.
Evadne V. Fehrer, Lacona.
Alvin J. Goemaat, Leighton.
Mary E. Colwell, Livermore.
Thelma A. Godfredsen, Ringsted.
Louis F. Clay, Rudd.
William D. Parker, Stanhope.
Orlyn M. Enabnit, Swaledale.
Sigfred M. Johnson, Swea City.

KANSAS

John H. Leach, Arlington.
Melvin E. Decker, Bison.
Clarence W. Taylor, Chapman.
Melvin L. Butler, Fulton.
Irvin L. Magner, Galesburg.
Alfred H. Martens, Hepler.
Arthur H. Penner, Hillsboro.
Harry W. Arnold, La Roy.
Kenneth D. Bretz, Lucas.
Cleo L. Greenfield, Melvern.
Herman F. Kiesow, Osage City.

LOUISIANA

Carl D. Walker, Lena.
Milford L. Green, Natchitoches.
Malin A. Mary, Pleasant Hill.
Ione M. Estopinal, St. Bernard.

MARYLAND

Josephine P. Allison, Deale.
Ernest C. Zebuhr, Jr., Derwood.
Elizabeth H. Roberson, Dickerson.
Norman J. Schnepfe, Edgewood.
John Russell Carroll, Federalsburg.
Margaret R. Randall, Glen Echo.
Marion E. Slingluff, Mitchellville.
John D. Munnford, Vienna.

MASSACHUSETTS

Marshall E. Carroll, Chilmark.
Jerome A. Gallant, Jr., Green Harbor.
John S. Burnett, Housatonic.
William R. Richmond, Jr., North Wilbraham.
Donald M. Lincoln, Rutland.
Laurence J. Stange, South Deerfield.
Rosamond T. Marshall, Sterling.
Robert P. McMahon, Westfield.

MINNESOTA

George Ralph Laniel, Brooks.
Eugene C. Wensman, Chokio.
Donald J. Bode, Courtland.
Celia M. Mattinen, Esko.
Walfred R. Wicklund, Istanti.
Irven J. Kopischke, Janesville.
Edward C. Distel, Lakeland.
Melvin J. Moravec, Lonsdale.
Verlyn F. Cornelius, Medford.
Martha M. Freer, Oak Park.
Felix J. Eggen, Underwood.

MONTANA

Ruth Ish, Chester.
Olga Strand, Reserve.
Alma E. Fischer, Somers.

NEBRASKA

Harold D. Lessig, Gurley.
Edwin A. Misegadis, Lodgepole.
Eiet M. Wagner, Roseland.

NEVADA

Anna M. Houck, Weed Heights.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Thomas W. Golden, Hinsdale.

NEW MEXICO

Lucille G. Salazar, Dulce.
Charles Earnest Cooper, Melrose.

OKLAHOMA

Martha C. Roach, Chelsea.

OREGON

Flossie M. Coats, Boardman.
Thomas M. Biggar, Jr., Canyon City.
Leon M. Matheny, Jacksonville.
David I. Hoover, Mapleton.
E. Marjorie Ogan, Marcola.
Glen R. Sandford, North Plains.
Francis G. Petrie, Rogue River.
Nellie A. Bembry, Sisters.
Ray Kurz, Umatilla.
Doris H. Weaver, Valsetz.

PENNSYLVANIA

Edna M. Darragh, Amity.
Bertha E. Snyder, Dickerson Run.
Catharine B. Shultz, Dublin.
Kenneth H. Williamson, Edgemont.
Frank L. Bucko, Ford City.
William Jerome McMullin, Millheim.
Joshua J. Baker, Mineral Point.
Bian B. Walker, Jr., Mount Pocono.
Fred D. Starr, Muncy Valley.
Ralph H. Landes, Royersford.
Harold E. Walters, Sidman.
Demetrius Gula, Southwest.
David L. Dickson, West Monterey.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Elizabeth Y. Curran, Brunson.
William W. Cone, Saluda.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Clarence L. Shabino, Alexandria.
Eunice A. Sjerven, Bristol.
William L. Truex, Montrose.
Thomas V. Niederman, Morristown.
Matthew Voigt, Spencer.

UTAH

Donald F. Keele, Dugway.

VIRGINIA

Robert A. Wilkinson, Arrington.
Theodore Reese Hall, Callao.
Silverius C. Churn, Cape Charles.
Homer J. Amos, Chatham.

Walter R. Sealock, Falls Church.
Jerry W. Alford, Glasgow.

WEST VIRGINIA

Mary M. Leslie, Cowen.
Glen R. Dial, Harts.
Howard L. Carpenter, Hepzibah.
William D. Workman, Hillsboro.

WISCONSIN

Marvin W. Babbitt, Bloomer.
Raymond T. Huinker, Cato.
Lester V. Gilbertson, Coon Valley.
Arthur L. Ewen, Francis Creek.
DuWayne J. Bloch, Green Lake.
Robley H. Evans, Hawthorne.
Edward C. Hammer, Hillsboro.
Richard C. Cross, Larsen.
Dan H. Kimball, Marengo.
William A. Knoll, Mayville.
Arthur E. Bauer, Sussex.
Lloyd W. Bryant, Waterford.
Gordon A. Peterson, Waupaca.
Leo J. Verhasselt, Wrightstown.

WYOMING

Anthony M. Ries, Cheyenne.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Vernon F. Gallagher, president, Duquesne University, Pittsburgh, Pa., offered the following prayer:

Lord God of heaven and of earth, boundless in wisdom and infinite in power, give us who were molded in Thy image and likeness the vision and strength to look beyond personal advantage to the goal of common welfare; to see the shadow of tomorrow's evil in today's apparent good; to fear the lack of principle more than the results of following it; to recognize, even in the welter of material considerations, the oft-forgotten fact that man does not live by bread alone.

Grant that, while the government is upon their shoulders, these dedicated agents of a free people may feel the power of Thy special blessing and merit a full measure of that reward which is destined for all who undertake to be their brother's keeper. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

POTENTIAL RED AGENTS RELEASED IN FALSE COMMUNIST "LIBERATION" MOVE

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I strenuously object to the admission to the United States, or to any Territory or mandate either totally or partially administered by the United States, of Dr. Malcolm Bersohn and Mrs. Adele Austin Rickett.

These two American nationals, both graduate students, were released by the Chinese Reds on February 27, after having served approximately 3½ years in prison as self-confessed spies.

Accounts of what they had to say, together with their pictures, have been splashed across the front pages of our American press. Their comments have been carried on American TV and radio. In my opinion, altogether too much sympathy has already been wasted upon them.

The woman's husband, Walter A. Rickett, remains to this day a prisoner of the Chinese Reds. It has not been made public, perhaps it is not even known, who happens to be Dr. Bersohn's particular hostage. A tremendous proportion of the stories about them insist that they have been brainwashed.

I do not argue the truth or falsity of the hostage or brainwash situation. I do argue that their usefulness as American citizens has come to an end.

During the Korean conflict, a few—a very few—American prisoners of war succumbed to the insistence of Red propaganda. Those who elected to return to their native land were subjected to courts-martial and are now either before the proper courts or have already been sentenced. I believe that these men were no better, no worse, than Mrs. Rickett and Dr. Bersohn. Three-and-a-half years ago we were engaged in a struggle with Red China that was a war in everything except the name. The two people recently released gave aid and comfort to the enemy at that time.

Should they be allowed to return to the United States, or to our possessions, there is no assurance that they would continue to act in any capacity save that of agents of the Red Chinese. Enough Red agents are now currently operating here, without our going to great lengths to import two additional agents.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully suggest that, since Dr. Bersohn and Mrs. Rickett are acknowledged enemies of our way of life, they be returned to live out their lives in Communist China.

I know of no more just, no more stringent, sentence than the one I have just proposed should be meted out to these two people.

By their deeds, by their words, they have forfeited their God-given right to live in America and to call themselves Americans.

THE LATE MR. JOHN T. JONES, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in behalf of a man who wrote his name not in water but in indelible ink upon the humanitarian record books of this Nation in behalf of the working men and women of America, Mr. John T. Jones, of the United Mine Workers of America, who passed away last week.

There is an old saying that "Man proposes but God disposes." It would be well for Congressmen to realize the truth of that saying. John T. Jones lived by those principles, because evidently the good Lord was on his side in life, in his work in behalf of the working men and women of America.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 15 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE JOHN S. WOOD

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that Members of this body on both sides of the aisle are most happy and proud, as I am, that our good friend and former distinguished Member of the House, John S. Wood, was appointed by the President last Friday, March 4, for a 3-year term to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

John Wood served 12 years in the House and chairmanned the Un-American Activities Committee during the 81st and 82d Congresses. I learned to know John Wood quite intimately during our close association on the committee. His basic beliefs in freedom, the individual dignity of man, his sense of fair play, and his patriotism are, indeed, endearing traits.

John Wood is so ably fitted academically, too, to serve on the Subversive Activities Control Board. Before coming to Congress, he served the State of Georgia and her citizens as a superior court judge and as a prosecuting attorney. He has been practicing law for as long as I have lived and that dates back to 1910. No one will dispute that John Wood is known as one of the most formidable lawyers in the South, having handled better than 600 capital punishment cases without a defeat.

The American people will, I am sure, be grateful to the President for his choice of John Wood for this important appointment, and I do hope the Senate will be quick to give confirmation. There is no question in my mind that John Wood will do a splendid job for the American people as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

UNAUTHORIZED WIRETAPPING SHOULD BE A CRIMINAL OFFENSE

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the public must be protected from eavesdropping on telephone conversations. This is an invasion of a person's privacy, and frequently of his home, which cannot be tolerated.

Wiretapping is used for purposes of blackmail and other crimes. It may be used as a means of unfair business competition. In recent days it has become more prevalent, and further controls are needed.

Unauthorized wiretapping should be a criminal offense. Present laws do not adequately protect the public. The Federal communications law—title 47, United States Code, section 605—makes it illegal for a person improperly to divulge or publish a message, but a more direct prohibition of wiretapping is clearly needed.

I am today filing a bill to accomplish this purpose. It will add a new chapter to the Criminal Code providing that—

> Whoever willfully or maliciously and without legal authority taps a telephone wire or makes other provision for listening in on said wire with the purpose of intercepting or listening in on any communication line used or useful in interstate communication shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 3 years, or both.

I hope that this proposed legislation will receive nonpartisan approval from Members of Congress.

AMENDING THE LAW RELATING TO PERJURY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am asking Chairman CELLER, of the House Committee on the Judiciary, for an early hearing on H. R. 799, which extends the law of perjury to cover the willful giving of contradictory statements under oath. I introduced this bill on the opening day of this Congress and am pleased to note that Attorney General Brownell has renewed his support of such a measure.

The problem to which this bill is addressed has plagued us for a long time, but it has been dramatized recently by turnabout witnesses like Matusow and Mrs. Natvig. Under the present perjury statute and court cases, a person who makes contradictory statements under oath cannot be prosecuted unless the indictment charges and the prosecution proves which one of the two statements is false. Moreover, under the rules of proof imposed by the courts, the falsity of one of the statements must be established by the testimony of two independent witnesses or by the testimony of one witness and corroborating circumstances. This is ridiculous in the case of people like Matusow, who openly contradict themselves under oath.

My bill is based upon the New York penal law which has worked well in my own State. It has the full endorsement and support of the American Bar Association which has offered one suggestion of obvious merit—that the language ought to be broadened to make certain that perjury committed outside of courts of law in proceedings such as congressional hearings will also be covered. I shall urge that change. It also contains a safeguard by being limited to a 3-year period so that the offense could not be extended retroactively beyond the usual period of limitations for similar offenses.

I hope the Judiciary Committee will act without delay on this important proposal, and that the House will give it favorable consideration.

HON. JOHN WOOD

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the nomination of our former colleague here in the House, the Honorable John Wood, of Georgia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. In my opinion, this is one of the best appointments that could possibly have been made.

It was my great privilege on becoming a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to join that committee during the chairmanship of the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Wood. He is not only a distinguished jurist in his own right but he is a man who is fair and honest. I am sure that his appointment will be confirmed speedily by the other body and that he will contribute greatly in sound judgment and intelligent work as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board.

TELEVISION CRITICISM

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the American Building Association does not pay any more attention to the interests of the people they represent, and if the Ourisman Chevrolet Co. does not do a better job repairing Chevrolets, than does the TV fellow they hire to advertise their facilities, no one will get very good service out of either.

Last week I heard and saw their TV man Harkness on television and radio. Referring to the delay of the Committee on the Judiciary of the other body in confirming the nomination of Judge Harlan, in substance, he said that two-bit politicians doing a two-bit job had postponed the committee vote on that nomination.

I cannot make that statement here on the floor because it refers to Members of another body, but that man could, and he did, make that statement. Just who is he to characterize the members of a committee as two-bit politicians motivated by political expediency?

On that committee are 15 individuals, elected by more than 12,723,840 voters of 15 States. By just what authority does the gentleman who represents the American Building Association and the Ourisman Chevrolet Co. presume to characterize the members of that committee?

One of the questions which will come before the Supreme Court and which is of vital interest to all of our people, is whether, how far, or if at all, a portion of our sovereignty is to be surrendered to United Nations or some similar organization. Is there any sound reason why that committee should not take all time deemed necessary or advisable to consider the viewpoint of members who are to be appointed to the court of last resort?

Last night Mr. Harkness said another Member of the distinguished body at the north end of the Capitol should be appointed to the civil-defense organization because—as Mr. Harkness said, Members of that body left the floor when he rose to speak—he would be able to evacuate a hall quicker than anyone else.

Listen to him some night and see the smirk on his face when he finishes one of those nasty little jobs he is performing for those organizations every week.

If one desired to consult a building association or to have an automobile repair job done, would he not hesitate a little before patronizing an outfit which employed an advertising agent who assumed to speak so authoritatively, and with so little apparent knowledge of what he was talking about?

CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1949

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to which I would like to call the attention of the House. This bill is designed to clarify Public Law 763, chapter 1208, section 105, paragraph 7 of section 202 of the Classification Act of 1949 as amended.

The need for this remedial legislation was brought to my attention by the concerted protest of scores of my constituents employed at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, in Bremerton, Wash. It was pointed out by these employees that the interpretation placed on the present law would include certain trades, crafts, and positions of responsibility resulting thereto under the Classification Act. After a thorough investigation I arrived at the inescapable conclusion that these protests were well founded, and indeed the Navy Department itself was opposed to classifying these personnel into a so-

called white-collar category. The Navy Department takes the position, and I think rightly so, that this interpretation of the present law would inevitably result in a loss of efficiency and a lowering in morale with all the difficulties attendant thereto. As a result of the Navy's position in this matter the Civil Service Commission has held their decision in abeyance pending further investigation, and I am unofficially advised that the probable final decision will not adversely affect civilian naval employees at this time. However, in view of the fact that I am informed the Civil Service Commission has moved to implement this program with respect to these personnel several times in the past, it appears necessary that legislation be passed to settle for once and for all the status of these employees to the satisfaction of the Navy as well as the employees concerned.

In view of the fact that the results of my investigation disclosed an entirely different position on the part of the Army and the Air Force, this legislation is designed to exclude only Navy civilian personnel.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, may I again point out that the purpose of this amendment is to maintain the Navy's high level of morale and efficiency, nowhere more in evidence than at the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, where the important work of repairing and maintaining one of the most vital arms of our Nation's defense, the Navy flattop, is carried out more efficiently than any place else in the world.

It is my further hope that the illustrious Members of the House will approve and support this most necessary amendment.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Thursday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ARE CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS AND CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS PRESENTED IN READABLE FORM?—IMPROVING THE TYPOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, a committee report is usually very dull and uninteresting. The tables and charts are pictured up in black and white without the aid of color. They are not presented in the most readable fashion and are usually uninteresting unless a person has a particular interest in what they contain. On the other hand, when the Department of Commerce, the Hoover Commission, and hundreds of other organizations that are supported entirely by Government funds present similar documents, they are presented in colors and in very attractive, readable form, including large type.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 26 years ago, when I first came to Congress, was printed on fairly good paper and in type that could easily be read. Since that time, the RECORD has been changed several times and each time in the direction of making it harder and more difficult to read, both in the method of printing and in the size of type. The type is very small now. A suggestion that Congress should furnish every person receiving the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with a reader's magnifying glass in order to protect his eyes would not be unreasonable. On the other hand, publications that are gotten out by all other agencies of the Government with money provided by Congress present the readable material prepared by them in very interesting, readable form, both as to makeup and size of type, with the addition of color when needed.

It is heartening to me to know that the department of political science at Washington-Lee University, at Lexington, Va., is giving some attention to this matter. I am inserting herewith correspondence and statements that are self-explanatory. They are as follows:

LEXINGTON, VA.

Hon. W. PATMAN.

DEAR MR. PATMAN: I am interested in finding out your opinion concerning the format and type used in printing congressional reports. It would be very helpful to me if you could give me your answer to the following questions.

1. Do you think the format, type face, and size make congressional reports look hard to read?

2. Do you think the interest of the average person is discouraged by the format, type face, and size of congressional reports?

3. Do you think that improvements of the printing techniques of congressional reports would increase interest and understanding?

4. Do you think that congressional reports should be designed for the general public as well as congressional members?

5. Do you know of any movement to improve the printing techniques of congressional reports?

Sincerely yours,

E. BARCLAY SMITH,
Washington and Lee University.

FEBRUARY 24, 1955.

Mr. E. BARCLAY SMITH,
Washington and Lee University,
Care of Pi Kappa Alpha,
Lexington, Va.

DEAR MR. SMITH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter, with reference to the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

It is my belief that the format of the RECORD could be improved upon considerably, which would make easier reading and increase reader interest, as well as understanding of the contents. I believe, too, that it should be given wider distribution, particularly to schools and colleges in the United States.

Unfortunately, I do not know of any organized effort being made to improve the RECORD, although I have complained to the Joint Committee on Printing from time to time.

On page A1156 of the February 23 issue of the daily RECORD, there appears an article by Senator EARLE C. CLEMENTS, of Kentucky, setting out the value of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to schools and colleges. You will find it very interesting.

I want to thank you for your letter. I am glad that interest outside of the Congress is being shown in this matter.

With kindest regards and best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

WRIGHT PATMAN.

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY,
Lexington, Va., March 2, 1955.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
House Office Building.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATMAN: I think you will remember a recent letter from one of my students, Mr. Barclay Smith, asking your opinion of the typography of congressional reports. We are very appreciative for your interest.

We would like for you to have a copy of the enclosed petition. I am sure you will be attracted to it from an educational standpoint, for I know you are interested in seeing that young people are educated to take a greater interest in public affairs. I hope that on reading it over you will be able to support its specific aim of improving the typography of congressional reports.

I understand that as a result of our project a survey is being made by the Public Printer to determine what kind of changes might be made within a reasonable cost differential.

Aside from the intrinsic merits of this particular petition, I think you will appreciate the significance of this petition to all students of political science, and indeed to little people everywhere, as an example of democracy in action.

Very sincerely yours,

HARVEY WHEELER.

A PETITION FOR IMPROVING THE TYPOGRAPHY OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTS

BACKGROUND

1. The congressional committee has undergone an especially rapid development during the past 30 years. Committee hearings and reports are increasingly designed to provide broad background information. As a result committee reports have become increasingly significant publishing events, far transcending the earlier notion of the committee report as a working tool for legislators in their daily tasks.

2. Not only the more widely publicized reports such as the Watkins report, but also such documents as the reports of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report—especially the two recent ones entitled "United States Monetary Policy: Recent Thinking and Experience," and "Trends in Economic Growth"—are among the most important contributions to economics of the year. Should Senator DOUGLAS' projected background study of the stock market come to fruition, we may be sure that it will be one of the most significant documents of our day.

3. Such reports are major publishing events. They are directed to those outside the legislative branch as well as to working legislators. Documents of such importance should be designed to enlist interest rather than to repel interest.

4. The results of an inquiry directed to our Congressmen, a poll of the citizens of a small town, and the testimony of experts in the publishing field indicate that there

is a widespread feeling that the type size, face, and format of congressional reports repel interest rather than enlist interest. Given the importance of these documents, their significance outside Congress as well as inside, and the paramount need in a democracy to make every effort to provide for an informed citizenry, every effort should be made to determine whether improvements in readability may be made without significant increase in publishing costs.

5. The Public Printer has stated that "the general makeup and typography of congressional reports and hearings have been consistent since the First Congress. * * * Beginning in 1900, the present format was put into use, and is essentially the same today." During this time tremendous developments have been made in our knowledge of how to design a well printed page which is also economic. Each of the executive branches have redesigned their typographical practices with a view to informing the general reader as well as administrators who must use these documents in their daily work. It should be possible for congressional committees to designate certain of their reports as being likely to have widespread public appeal and therefore meriting better typographical treatment than the average report or printed hearing.

6. For all these reasons we are requesting your support of the following petition.

PETITION

1. It is our request that the Joint Committee on Printing conduct an investigation to determine (a) the potential demand for congressional reports from individuals outside Congress and (b) the opinion of experts outside the Government Printing Office on the possibilities of improving the type size, face, and format of congressional reports, with a view to establishing a more attractive and a more easily readable form for congressional reports deemed likely to appeal to a wide public audience.

The following documents are submitted in support of this petition:

1. Results of congressional questionnaire.
2. Poll of townspeople of Lexington, Va.
3. Statement by Mr. E. E. Morsberger.
4. Statement by Prof. C. Harold Lauck.
5. Excerpts from congressional replies.

Results of congressional questionnaire

[Total number: 501 [1]]

Questions asked	Yes	No	Indefinite
1. Do you think that the format, type size, and type face make congressional reports difficult to read?	21	16	13
2. Do you think that the interest of the average person is discouraged by the format and type?	22	20	10
3. Do you think that improvements in the printing and design would increase interest in congressional reports?	25	18	10
4. Do you think that congressional reports should be designed to be read by the citizen as well as the working Congressman?	31	11	11
5. Do you know of any attempts to improve congressional reports?	3	39	13

COMMENTS.—These answers show a remarkable proportion of the Congressmen who replied to our questionnaire think congressional reports hard to read and believe they should be redesigned to be made more readable.

[1] Due to the shift from fall to spring semesters it proved impossible to write all Representatives and Senators. Of the 100 Congressmen who responded to the questionnaire, 30 referred their questionnaires to Representative Burr P. Harrison, whose district includes Lexington, Va.

Poll of Lexington, Va., townspeople

[Total number in poll: 151; average age: 46; number of males: 76; number of females: 75; education: grade school, 10; high school, 54; college, 38; unreported, 49]

Questions asked	Yes	Percent	No	Percent	Undecided; no answer
1. Are you acquainted with congressional reports?	51	33	92	60	8
2. Have you ever read a congressional report?	46	30	101	70	4
3. Would you be interested in reading a report such as the Watkins report on Senator McCarthy? [1]	72	49	64	42	15
4. Do you know how to get a congressional report?	65	43	71	49	15
5. Do you think the appearance is appealing?	43	28	97	63	11
6. Would you use congressional reports if they were more attractive?	62	40	64	42	25
7. Do you think something should be done to make them more appealing?	48	31	51	33	52

[1] This was used as an example only because it was assumed to be the congressional report the largest number of people might have known about.

Comments: One of the most remarkable results of the poll is the indication from question No. 3 that something around 50 percent of our people might be interested in reading the most important or most publicized of the congressional reports; in this case the example used was the Watkins report. However, 63 percent thought them unattractive in appearance, and 40 percent believed they might be more interested in using them if they were more attractive.

Statement of E. E. Morsberger, assistant planning manager for Raymond Blattenberger, Public Printer, United States Government Printing Office:

"The general makeup and typography of congressional reports and hearings have been consistent since the First Congress. Until about 1848 reports were set in 10-point Scotch Roman, with page width of 4 inches. In addition, text was leaded: that is, with space of about one thirty-sixth of an inch between lines.

"From about 1848 to 1900, the page width was increased to 4⅜ inches, and the typeface was changed to text type of the period, but text was set solid. Beginning in 1900 the present format was put into use, and is essentially the same today. * * *

"Early printers designed the format for congressional printing, and it was accepted by the early Congresses. The typeface presently in use is regarded as most readable and practical."

Statement by Prof. C. Harold Lauck, director, journalism laboratory, Washington and Lee University: "The legibility of many congressional publications is notoriously bad. * * * I believe the Government Printing Office could help some if they give some study to the matter, and get away from some of the hide-bound traditions regulating the typefaces and sizes used. For the most part I would think it would be necessary to increase not only the type size but also to add extra space between lines. * * * I know Mr. Blattenberger, with his wide background as a printer, would be agreeable provided the economics could be worked out. Of course, the changes I have suggested would increase costs since they would involve an increased number of pages but these are necessary for better understanding by both people and Congressmen."

EXCERPTS FROM CONGRESSIONAL REPLIES

Senate

"I have often wondered when somebody else would recognize the deficiencies."

"My answer to your first four questions is in the affirmative. On calling the Joint Committee on Printing, I find that a number of the Members of the Senate and House have communicated with them as a result of your letter and they are preparing a reply in response to your fifth question."

"It is my opinion that the insert material * * * is difficult to read. * * * It is my further belief * * * that the average person would not be encouraged by the format and type used in the subject reports. * * * I think changes in design might increase interest. * * * I am happy to advise you that, as a result of several letters of an almost identical nature to your own, the Public Printer of the United States has been requested to have the Division of Typography and Design make a thorough study."

House of Representatives

"There is no doubt that the present makeup and type styles used in publication of congressional documents gives a forbidding appearance to them. Much could probably be done to improve them without resorting to the techniques of the huckster. * * * Anything which would make a document more useful to a Member would also make it more useful to the interested citizen."

"My reply is in the affirmative. * * * I have talked with the members of the official reporters staff to House committees, and while they, too, apparently agree that there is room for improvement, I understand that nothing definite has been done lately. * * * I shall do all I can to improve the congressional reports in connection with the suggestions outlined in your letter."

"I definitely feel that the format, type size, type face, printing design, and similar qualities of congressional hearings and reports should be improved to the end that they become much more widely read. To my way of thinking, there is no more interesting reading material, in general, than that developed by the various committee hearings. Were this material more attractively printed and indexed I think it would be much more readily read. I feel that a great part of the strength of a democracy is due to citizen interest and participation. Anything we can do to increase this interest and participation should be done. To me, it follows we could easily increase participation by making printed matter connected with the legislative process more readable."

"Your questions * * * suggest some dissatisfaction. * * * I agree with you that an improvement well might be made."

"I think that congressional reports should be designed to be read by citizens as well as working Congressmen."

"I am inclined to think that the average person is discouraged by the makeup of the congressional reports."

"May I say * * * that I do believe that the format, type size, and type face make congressional reports difficult to read, and it would obviously follow that I, too, think the interest of the average person would be discouraged by all this. * * * I believe that some improvement would certainly make them more readable. * * * I do think that the average citizen should be encouraged to read many congressional reports, especially those of investigating committees."

"I think that improvement of the printing techniques of congressional reports would increase interest. * * * I do think someone should give the matter thought. You will hear from me further on this."

Submitted by:

JOHN HARVEY WHEELER,
Associate Professor of Political Science, Washington and Lee University.

SAVE HELLS CANYON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, it is unbelievable that in this year of 1955 the monopolistic policies of this administration could turn the hands of the clock back 76 years and plunge the people all over again into a bitter struggle to preserve our natural resources. Yet that is exactly what the giveaway, do-nothing, scuttling policies of this administration, under the fancy titles of "partnership programs," "private enterprise," and "local initiative" really mean.

This administration has tried to sell their partnership program for the disposal of our few remaining, priceless, natural water resources as though it were an original proposal being offered to the American people for the first time. But if you will go back to the year 1879, and examine the Federal legislation that authorized the giveaway of our water power resources to private exploitation and monopoly, and then examine those giveaway policies during the next 30 years, you will find they almost exactly duplicate the so-called partnership policies of this administration 76 years later.

Such giveaway programs were denounced and repudiated—we had hoped for all time to come—in the stinging veto messages of President Theodore Roosevelt, a Republican, in the famous Rainey River and James River vetoes of 1908 and 1909. But now we find we are right back where we started from.

Mr. Speaker, we are witnessing the bizarre spectacle of the United States marching backward instead of forward.

ALL IN SAME BOAT

Those of us who believe in preserving our natural resources for the benefit of the people, whether you call them TVA, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, Boulder, or Hells Canyon, are in the same boat. We all sail along together, or we all sink together.

The private utility record is clear. They have already wrecked the Southwestern Power Administration. Through Dixon-Yates they are attempting to destroy TVA by driving a dagger into its heart. They are driving out of public office the finest servants in the Federal service. So what appears to be a local power problem in one part of the country is in reality a spoke in the common Federal power policy wheel.

Private utilities are solidly organized into a highly-financed, carefully-planned program which has for its objectives the destruction of any and all forms of public competition—local, State, Federal. To prove the truth of this statement we have only to examine the deceptive propaganda campaign against public power which the private utilities have so fully and completely financed out of the electric light bills that Mr. and Mrs. Average Citizen pay.

The technique is quite simple. It is a variation of the technique exposed by the Federal Trade Commission many years ago—only the names have changed.

In order to discredit the public power programs generally, private utilities engaged research groups to discover public opinion in the field of power. These groups conducted question and answer surveys. They angled their questions so they were sure they would get the answer they wanted. For example, they thought the answer to such a question as "Do you like the TVA?" would come back with a resounding "No." To their amazement and chagrin, these public opinion polls showed that a majority of people did like TVA.

PRIVATE POWER STRATEGY

So the private-utility lobby changed its strategy. They asked people instead, "Do you like socialism?" Of course, the answer was a resounding "No" this time. The private utilities then began to scheme to hook up public opinion on socialism, which the people did not like, and to hook it up with TVA, which a majority of the people did like.

As a result, the scream against public power changed from "bolshevism," which it was a few years ago, to "creeping socialism," which it is now. So you have the same deceptive propaganda—only the label has changed.

The private-utility lobby also has its own blacklist. To get on it a public servant has only to oppose any part of their program. The type of campaigns that have been waged against me indicate this to be true. I have been an outspoken advocate of the Hells Canyon Dam for some time.

Yet in this past campaign, I found that for every private-utility vote I may have lost, I gained votes from dozens of other fearless citizens. There is one real—one very reassuring fact in this power fight. Give the people the facts, and they carry the ball for you.

I should like to pause here to pay tribute to the many fearless public servants who have continued to stand up and fight for the people down through the years. They have written a challenging record in the forward march of democracy. Every decade has its own smear label to scare these courageous Americans into silence. These labels have had little connection with the plain historic facts. Nevertheless, in varying degrees, they have been partially successful in frightening some people into inaction.

PILGRIMS ORIGINATED PUBLIC POWER

As all of you recall, the Pilgrims landed in this country in 1620. How long do you think it was before those Colonial governments were owning and operating their own waterpower projects? Just 18 years, to be exact. In other words, 18 brief years after the first settlers landed in this country, government ownership and operation of its waterpower sites was a reality. There was no mention then of socialism or of creeping socialism because these were essential things that the government had to do in order to survive.

This early government ownership arose nearly 150 years before our present Federal Government was established. The same traditions were continued after the United States came into being. There is nothing un-American or socialistic in our Government performing these essential tasks for its people. The only thing that is un-American is distorting the plain facts of history, and the necessity and reality of the Federal Government doing for the people certain things they cannot do as well for themselves.

The high dam at Hells Canyon is a shining example of something the Government can do for the people better than they can do for themselves. I have today introduced a bill to authorize construction of that high dam.

Hells Canyon is the last large remaining undeveloped dam site in America, and is deeper even than the Boulder Dam site in Nevada. Because it is embedded in solid rock, it is a dam builder's dream.

HIGH DAM WOULD VITALIZE IDAHO

The high dam would create an empire of productivity and transform the whole Northwest into a resource of immense value to the entire Nation. It would vitalize my own State of Idaho, now seriously lagging behind other northwest States in economic development.

For the people of Idaho and the Northwest, the high dam would mean—

First. Vast quantities of low-cost power.

Second. New industries and new jobs.

Third. Immensely increased tax revenues.

Fourth. A mighty expansion of irrigation, with water for thousands of now arid acres.

Fifth. Flood control.

Sixth. Regulation of navigation.

Seventh. A wonderful new playground for hunters, fishermen and all outdoor lovers.

To irrigation farmers whose very life depends upon water on their land, I give this assurance. Section 2 of this Hells Canyon bill provides iron-clad protection not only of all present water rights, but of all future water rights that may become valid under State law on the Snake River watershed. I would not support a bill that did not absolutely guarantee the priority of the use of water for irrigation and domestic consumption over the use of water for power production.

PLENTY OF WATER

People, however, need have no fear that there will not be enough water for both irrigation and power needs. Every hydrologist with long experience in the study of the Snake River reports there is plenty of water even during the dryest recorded years to irrigate at least 1 million new acres and still fill the reservoir of the great high Hells Canyon Dam for the production of power.

Nor do people need to worry about the cost of the project to the taxpayer. The money to build the dam would be in the nature of a loan. Profit from power sales would repay to the Government approximately 90 percent of the cost of the dam, plus interest. These power revenues would also help pay for the mighty expansion of irrigation in the Snake River Basin. Until such financing is provided for, all discussion of further large-scale irrigation developments in this area is nonsense. Costs would be too great.

Federal plans for the multiple-purpose development of the great Hells Canyon site have been in preparation for many years. The dam itself would be one of the highest in the world, and the reservoir would back up more than 90 miles into the mountain fastnesses. With a maximum capacity of approximately 4

million acre-feet, it would be one of the largest projects of its kind.

At the dam site it would be possible to produce over 600,000 kilowatts of prime power, while its great storage capacity will make possible the production of more than 400,000 additional kilowatts of power at down-stream plants. Reservoir storage water would be caught only after every drop of its use had been squeezed out for irrigation. In other words, my bill provides that during the growing season, Hells Canyon power production would be completely subservient to irrigation needs above.

IDAHO POWER PLANS

For many years before this administration came into power in 1952, all Federal agencies concerned with resource planning were unanimous in their opinion that the high Federal dam was the best possible development of the Hells Canyon stretch of the river. In contrast, however, the Idaho Power Co. plans have changed many times. Its first proposal was for a single-purpose, low power dam; then it contemplated a series of five such low dams. The latest plan, for which it filed an amended application for a license with the Federal Power Commission in 1953, is a three-dam project. Brownlee, the storage dam of the trio, would be less than one-half as high and would have only about one-fourth of the storage capacity of the high Hells Canyon Dam. This would give little assurance of a continuing supply of firm power to the great cities of the Northwest now plagued with cutbacks and periodic brownouts.

Ten days before the Idaho Power Co. filed its amended application in 1953, Douglas McKay, the new Secretary of the Interior, turned his back on the people and withdrew the Department as intervenor in the Idaho Power Co. license request. This reversed the bold stand of previous Interior Secretaries, who had intervened to safeguard for the benefit of all of the American people the priceless natural resource that is the Hells Canyon site.

To fill the public void and to protect the people's interest—numerous cooperatives and farm and labor organizations, with underlying memberships of more than 2 million people, organized the Hells Canyon Association. Additional support came from the Northwest Public Utility Districts, which represented approximately 75,000 consumers of electricity.

The Hells Canyon Association and the Public Utility Districts obtained permission from the Federal Power Commission to intervene and oppose the applications of the Idaho Power Co. Likewise, the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association, speaking for a large majority of the members of the REA cooperatives, intervened, and filed a supporting brief.

Formal FPC hearings began on July 7, 1953, and with occasional recesses, continued for a little over a year. The first decision rendered—a staff counsel decision—favored the Idaho Power Co. The full Commission decision is expected sometime this year.

THE QUESTION AT ISSUE

The basic question at issue in the Hells Canyon controversy is, whether the long and carefully conceived Hells Canyon project is to come into being as an essential and integral part of a fully considered, comprehensive Federal plan to develop the entire Columbia River Basin, or whether three puny private dams in the Hells Canyon stretch of the Snake River are to make that impossible.

History provides a duplicate analogy to the Hells Canyon controversy. Back in 1921, while Grand Coulee was still a dream, the Washington Water Power Co. applied to the Federal Power Commission for a license to build a small power project at Kettle Falls on the Columbia River in Washington State. The site was in the same reservoir area of what was later to be Grand Coulee. The Federal Power Commission appointed a board of engineers to study the Kettle Falls project.

Then, in 1922, the comprehensive plan for the development of the Columbia River Basin was outlined. Upon recommendation of the board of engineers, the FPC suspended all license applications for permits on the Columbia.

In 1925, the Washington Water Power Co. filed a new application to build a low-head project at Kettle Falls. In 1933, after the matter was aired in hearings, the application was rejected by the Federal Power Commission. Thus the FPC twice furnished protection for a comprehensive development of our natural resources, even though in the first instance, the Columbia River Basin plan was still nebulous and Grand Coulee had not yet even been recommended.

HELLS CANYON IS KEY DAM

Today, we know for a fact that the high Hells Canyon Dam is a key storage dam in the whole comprehensive Federal plan to develop the Columbia River Basin. We have known this for many years. Shall we sit by and see the plan thwarted and stunted, and at the same time allow the last great natural dam site in America to be squandered for the benefit of a monopoly rather than developed magnificently for the benefit of all the people? No, we must not sit idly by, we must save Hells Canyon for the people.

The term "partnership" brought into use by this administration is a complete deception.

In the first place, most private electric utilities are monopolies. As monopolies, they are subject to so-called local regulation.

It would take too long to go into the whole question of State regulation, and how these regulations have been rendered innocuous in a maze of legal opinions and decisions so that it takes years of litigation to secure any effective action for the people.

THE PUBLIC POWER YARDSTICK

It is sufficient to state that public power was introduced to set up a yardstick which could be used to get around the interminable delays and the general ineffectiveness of State and local regulation. It demonstrates an unbelievable lack of knowledge for this administration to say that since utilities are subject to local regulation, nothing more is needed.

It also begs the question. Most big water and power projects deal with interstate streams and interstate matters which are beyond the scope or power of local regulation, even if present local regulation was effective.

This is not to say there cannot be, and are not, genuine local partnerships of our Federal Government and our people. The best illustrations are TVA, Bonneville, and the REA cooperatives. In these three examples, the Federal Government assumes its proper role and helps local people help themselves. This makes it possible to secure for themselves essential public service at a price they can afford to pay.

What, for example, do Idaho families now pay for their REA electricity? The average rate in 1952 was 2½ cents a kilowatt hour retail. Compare this with private power company rates of 20 cents, 17 cents and 15 cents per kilowatt hour which were quite common in the United States not too long ago. North Idaho has profited greatly by having a public power yardstick in the neighboring States of Washington and Oregon.

PUBLIC POWER ON RATES

A recent Federal Power Commission map demonstrates how strikingly public power competition has reduced residential rates charged by privately owned utilities in the States closest to the TVA and Bonneville areas. Rates become higher the more remote the State from the public power area.

Thus the average residential bill for 250 kilowatt hours a month goes up step by step from $4.92 in Tennessee as you move northeast or northwest from the TVA area until it reaches a peak of well over $8 in the Dakotas. Similarly, the average moves up from $4.63 in Washington and $5.36 in Oregon step by step through Idaho, Wyoming and Montana to reach a high of well over $8 again in the Dakotas.

WHICH WAY AMERICA?

Today, the United States stands tottering on the threshold of its destiny. The conservation and wise use of all our natural resources, including our few remaining priceless water power sites such as Hells Canyon, may mean the difference between continuing as the arsenal of democracy, or going the way of historically forgotten nations that having succumbed to private aggrandizement, are no more.

On the one side the road points backward. For those who know history, the sign reads: "Private utility monopoly exploitation."

The other highway sign points ahead. It says: "Natural resources conservation for all the people."

Hells Canyon is a symbol of that American promise—our greatness for which every American is justly proud. It urges America to expand to her fullest self.

The question presented is: "Which way America?"

Lest we go the route of oblivion, our answer is: The Federal high Hells Canyon Dam must be built for the benefit of all the people of Idaho, for all the people

of the Pacific Northwest, for all the people of the Nation. This is not only conserving for the living but conserving for future generations yet unborn.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. PFOST. I yield to my colleague the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentlewoman from Idaho for the splendid statement of the issues on this Hells Canyon controversy. I want to assure the gentlewoman from Idaho that as the Representative of an adjoining district—an area that does not drain into a tributary of the Snake but has important tributaries of the Columbia River—I, too, have today cosponsored a Hells Canyon bill that is identical to the one which the gentlewoman from Idaho is chiefly responsible for. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Idaho for the fight she has carried on during the past months and years to bring this Hells Canyon legislation up to the point that we have today.

I want to ask one question. The other day I read a news report that Secretary of the Interior, Mr. McKay, suggested that the order of the Federal Power Commission would be forthcoming around August of this year. Does that not mean that time is of the essence in the passage of this legislation; and if we are going to have any results from the bills introduced today, it must be accomplished during this session of the Congress?

Mrs. PFOST. Indeed it does. I, too, would say that time is of the essence and that we must consider this most important legislation as soon as possible.

I thank my colleague from Montana for his kind remarks, and I will say to the gentleman I well realize his State will not benefit from the Hells Canyon project to the extent that Idaho will. Nonetheless, he has again demonstrated today by introducing an identical bill to mine that he is a consistent and devoted fighter for the multipurpose development of our natural resources.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include a letter which today I addressed to the editor of the Lewiston Tribune, Lewiston, Idaho.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, since we are in special orders it would not be proper for me to raise some misgivings which I have concerning this legislation until the previously granted special orders have been concluded. So far as my congressional district is concerned, there is an extremely vital feature of this legislation which should be developed at length, and it is my intention to request time to do so at the conclusion of today's special orders.

The primary consideration—and I might say that it is or may well become a matter of primary consideration throughout the Western States—is the effect which the building of this project may have on the appropriation and use of water upstream under State law. I was not advised that these bills were to be introduced today, but fortunately I have this morning written a letter to the editor of the Lewiston Tribune, at Lewiston, Idaho, which deals briefly with the possibility of what may happen to those water rights, and which is being inserted in the RECORD at this point:

MARCH 7, 1955.

EDITOR, THE LEWISTON TRIBUNE,
Lewiston, Idaho.

DEAR SIR: On occasion in the past when you have editorially taken issue with statements made by me, you have courteously permitted me the opportunity of replying through your editorial column.

It seems to me that the occasion has again arisen in your issue of February 18 where you take issue with my recommendations for upstream storage, and state that if I would find an engineering engineer I would discover that for power, navigation, and flood control, downstream storage is preferable to upstream storage. In this connection I would like to quote from the report of B. E. Torpen, head engineer of the Corps of Army Engineers on the Columbia River Basin, written under date of August 1945 and supplementing the 308 Report of 1934. The title of the report is "Storage for Power, Columbia River Basin." Mr. Torpen is about as engineering an engineer as either of us is likely to discover. This is what he says at page 31 of his very comprehensive report on this very question, which comprises a total of 95 pages:

"When stored water is released at a powerplant, its direct effect is to increase the discharge at that site. If other power projects exist farther down the stream, they automatically receive the increased discharge induced by the released stored water from above them. In like manner, if several developed power projects exist downstream (as will be true when our rivers are fully developed) each in turn receives benefit from the released stored water above. Each time stored water is used through a downstream powerplant, it creates additional power, adds value. Obviously, then the farther upstream the stored water is situated, the greater is its potential value—directly in proportion to its elevation above sea level. Headwater storage sites at high elevations should, therefore, be investigated in great detail, even if more costly than larger valley sites farther down the stream because (a) they have greater potential value directly proportional to their elevation, and (b) because frequently headwater sites are in remote places where the damage created by flooding the reservoir areas will be a minimum.

"To locate storage on the headwaters of streams considered most likely to be fully developed along their courses—thereby making it possible to realize the potential value of storage at an early date—is desirable."

I am happy to note your statement, "And we have no objections whatever to any methods the folks in southern Idaho may find necessary and valuable for the fullest possible utilization in their area of the waters originating in their area." In southern Idaho, of course, the primary use of stored water has been for irrigation, and again, according to Mr. Torpen, each irrigation development helps the folks down the river. Mr. Torpen has this to say at page 10 of his report:

"Storage developed in the interest of power production will tend to provide benefits for other uses, such as flood control, recreation and health, navigation, and irrigation. Conversely, storage developed in the interest of any prime use, will, if properly coordinated, also tend to provide benefits to other uses, including power. When properly planned, conflict seldom arises between the use of storage for power and the use of storage for these various purposes; rather, they complement and benefit each other. This is true to the extent that the several purposes are almost invariably served more economically and effectively by joint, rather than separate, storage developments. Power storage, which with or without additional storage, skims off the peak floods and stores them for later release during periods of low flow, would obviously be beneficial to—

"(a) Flood control, because it removes the peak flood and joint storage brings economy.

"(b) Recreation and health, because it creates lakes in semiarid regions providing recreational facilities where most needed, and increases low water flow of streams. Power reservoirs are normally held near the full level during the summer recreation season.

"(c) Navigation, because it reduces flood peaks and increases low-water discharge.

"(d) Irrigation, because it conserves water otherwise wasted, raises the water level for irrigation diversion by gravity or pumping, and provides the power for such pumping. Irrigation and power further complement each other in that the irrigation power demand coincides with the period of surplus power capability of the Columbia River system, and the irrigation return flow reaches the river several months later, when most needed—during the winter when power demand is high and normal stream flow low."

So far as I know, no one in southern Idaho objects to the use by anyone for any purpose of the waters of the Snake River which cannot be used upstream. The objection is, rather, against any downstream commitment of any kind which may require the release of upstream waters to fulfill the commitment.

Much has been said about the fact that the authorizing legislation for the Federal Hells Canyon Dam adequately protects the water rights of the upstream users. It is my impression from your editorials on various occasions that you subscribe to this conclusion. It has been and still is my position, on the other hand, that there is no language which can be placed in a Hells Canyon bill or any other downstream commitment which will protect the water rights of the upstream users against the actions of a subsequent Congress. Present water rights have been obtained under the Idaho State constitution, its State statutes, and its State court decisions.

After the construction of Hells Canyon Dam or any other downstream commitment the Federal Congress could override the water rights obtained under State law and require the release of water from upstream to operate the Federal project. As authority for that statement I am attaching hereto a copy of a very exhaustive brief on this question prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. This brief resulted from my asking the Library of Congress the very question which we are here discussing, and I believe it contains every applicable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Brought down to its very essence, the answer appears on pages 7 and 10 of the attached brief.

Page 7: "'If the language in H. R. 5743 or H. R. 4648 does not protect both present and future upstream diversion and use when a conflict arises between such upstream diversion and use and the operation of the Federal dam, is there other language which could be placed in the authorizing legislation which would protect both present and future upstream diversion and use?'

"We are unable to state that the language of these bills would not protect both present and future diversions. It would protect such diversions to the extent that other areas are now similarly protected by similar provisions. Such protection, as we have heretofore indicated, is not absolute and cannot be absolute because of the constitutional powers of Congress that are involved. In

view of past decisions of the Supreme Court, a constitutional amendment would be required to divest Congress of its power and vest complete control of these water resources of navigable rivers in the States. Under the circumstances we see no alternative to existing arrangements or improved variations of those arrangements. Control, if there is to be further development and use of the water resources, must come in many instances through 1 of 3 methods: (1) Federal legislation, (2) compact, or (3) adjudication by the Supreme Court. Federal legislation recognizing State laws, to the extent practicable, and authorizing State laws, may be the better solution. Adjudication, by a series of Supreme Court decisions, would, in effect, ultimately place that Court in the undesirable position of administering the water rights of the area."

Page 10: "This bring us to the main question underlying this whole problem, which, as we see it, can be stated bluntly as follows: In the event, after the authorization and construction of the Hells Canyon division, there is insufficient downstream flow for its operation, could the Congress, in the exercise of constitutional powers, require release of waters from above and thus curtail beneficial use, under applicable State and other laws, in those upper areas? See Hearings * * * on H. R. 5743 (82d Cong.) page 782. Based on applicable court decisions, the answer is in the affirmative."

It is my position that the conclusion immediately above quoted would be true no matter what language might be contained in the authorizing legislation for Hells Canyon Dam, and, so far as I know, the conclusion has not been questioned by any attorney who has had occasion to go into the matter.

Indeed, the Bureau of Reclamation goes even further than this when in its Manual of the Reclamation Service it says that the United States Government need not follow State laws governing the appropriation and use of water because the Federal Government is the owner of all unappropriated waters in the nonnavigable streams of the arid West. And, of course, the Bureau of Reclamation is the agency of the Federal Government around which the Hells Canyon controversy arose when its Commissioner was Michael Straus, who, incidentally, could hardly be called an engineering engineer since he was by profession a newspaperman.

It seems admitted by all that from a physical standpoint the only logical place to store water for irrigation is upstream, above the area to be irrigated, since even Mr. Straus in his engineering studies failed to devise a system of making water run uphill.

I am sure that as has been evidenced by your courteous actions in the past, it is your desire that your readers may have both sides of controversial questions. It is, therefore, my hope that you will have an opportunity to again develop editorially the above propositions, (1) the advisability and value of upstream storage for all purposes, and (2) protection of upstream water rights obtained under the laws of the State of Idaho.

Sincerely yours,

HAMER H. BUDGE,
Member of Congress.

I hope that the membership of the House will not conclude from the remarks previously made that the people of Idaho overwhelmingly favor this Federal project because such is most certainly not the case. In fact, the Idaho State Reclamation Association, the Idaho Farm Bureau Federation, the Idaho State Grange, the Idaho State Chamber of Commerce, Idaho's Governor during the past 4 years, and practically all, if not all, of the irrigation districts and canal companies in the State of Idaho have formally and consistently opposed this project, as they did its predecessor, the Columbia Valley Authority. And, of course, it is patently apparent from the remarks preceding mine that the project does not fit in with the program of the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Although many, many reasons for such opposition in the area have been presented, I shall attempt to limit my remarks this afternoon to the one reason which I feel is uppermost in the minds of the people living on up the Snake River from the proposed location for this Federal dam. I am assuming that the various other reasons for opposition, as well as the opposition based on appropriation and use of water upstream, will all be fully developed at the time the appropriate committee holds hearings on the Hells Canyon bill.

SPECIAL ORDER

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I understand there will be no session of the House tomorrow. I had a special order reserved for tomorrow, and I ask unanimous consent that that reservation be put over until next Monday, March 14.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HELLS CANYON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order heretofore entered, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this is an occasion which I have long awaited. It is a privilege to introduce this bill to authorize the construction of Hells Canyon Dam. This bill is based on the fundamental concept that the power sites of the great Columbia and Snake Rivers are public resources—and it is dedicated to the principle that the water resources of the Northwest should be used for all the Northwest, and that, when full development of these resources can be obtained, anything less would be a crime against the public.

Many organizations in my State and other States of the Northwest are urging construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam because they have faith in their Government. The people of the Northwest are convinced that they and all Americans have an undeniable right to look to their Government for great multipurpose dams which will provide electric energy, flood control, and conservation.

In the Northwest there is 40 percent of the Nation's potential hydroelectric power.

I need not elaborate at this point on the importance of electric power. Certainly everyone here realizes how absolutely vital this source of energy is to our daily life—in our homes, our schools, our hospitals, our industries. Without an abundant, low-cost supply of electricity, our way of life would be incredibly impossible—for the people of the United States have a voracious appetite for electric power. Each year, consumption of electricity hits new peaks due to demands of our growing population and to the rapidly accelerating utilization of electric power in our homes, farms, and factories. The power demand curve soars upward year after year.

In recent years, and I stress the word recent, experts in Northwest power activities—Federal, private, and public—have been in reasonably close agreement concerning needs for additional power facilities required to meet power demands. It has been agreed by these experts that each year the Pacific Northwest must build new generating facilities having a capacity equal to a Bonneville Dam.

Even such a program, some have warned, would only provide sufficient power to satisfy the growing demands of domestic, rural, and commercial consumers. There is also the great need for power essential for the expanding industries of the Pacific Northwest. The tremendous and important task of constructing and operating a system of dams and power plants to meet such vast requirements is too big a job for non-Federal groups.

George Bernard Shaw once remarked: "The root of all evil is lack of money." His observation holds the key to the present power mess which has engulfed the Pacific Northwest and which threatent the stability of our regional and State economies. For the one question, "Where is the money coming from?" cuts across all the verbiage, the half-truths, the innuendoes, and places the Northwest power situation in realistic, factual perspective.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. As the gentlewoman is aware, the waters upstream on the Snake River are used for irrigation; can the gentlewoman advise us as to what happens to the water rights under State law in the event of the passage of the bill and the construction of the Hells Canyon Dam, as she advocates?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes; this bill guarantees the water rights to the State.

Mr. BUDGE. In what way?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I would refer the gentleman to the bill, and I would be very happy to see that the gentleman gets a copy of it this afternoon. Those rights are guaranteed; all the water rights upstream for irrigation benefits are guaranteed.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield further?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I should like to point out to the gentlewoman at this point that I have from the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service a very comprehensive brief upon that particular question. The brief concludes in so many words that if the project is constructed and a subsequent Congress decides that it wants to require the release of waters upstream even under decreed water rights, that the Federal Government could require the release of those waters which are presently being used on the lands of the State of Idaho and of eastern Oregon for the purpose of irrigation.

I simply call that to the gentlewoman's attention.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I believe the gentleman on reading the bill will find that those rights are taken care of.

To go back to the Northwest power problem.

Let us look at the record of the Federal Government's past responsibilities in this matter. The Pacific Northwest did not fare too badly—for a while at least. Grand Coulee, Bonneville, McNary, the Dalles, Chief Joseph—and other Federal dams now in successful operation or under construction—are massive evidence of this record. It took a lot of work on the part of Bonneville Power Administration and the Department of the Interior. It took a willingness to fight for appropriations in the face of the undercover sabotage by the private utilities.

However, the present administration quickly washed its hands of this entire effort. It disclaimed any responsibility toward providing power supplies for this region. And the strategy is most alarming. The groundwork was laid very subtly in a campaign—first of innuendoes, later of strong argument—that the Congress would no longer provide funds for the development of power supplies in our region. Spurious reference was—and is—made that the people of the rest of the United States do not wish to invest in the future of the region—and as a consequence, in the future of the Nation.

I ask, can this be true?

One may search the record carefully. But it is only with considerable difficulty that one finds a reference here and there of opposition. Strangely enough, the few—and, I repeat—few, Congressmen of other States who spoke and acted against Northwest power appropriations are those whose records have always been of continuous opposition to Federal Power investments and have shown them to be strong supporters of private utilities. I maintain that the proposition that Federal funds cannot be obtained for Northwest multiple-purpose projects whose power features are reimbursable is sheer fiction planted by the private utilities.

The Federal Government is now being repaid—with interest—all the costs allocated to power. The multipurpose dams will be useful far beyond the 50-year period and therefore will continue to provide revenue for the Government which will in time repay the full cost of flood control and other features considered to be nonreimbursable.

Up to the time the present administration took over the power policy, progress in obtaining funds for the new dams and transmission lines had been fairly steady—even though not completely satisfactory. The appropriations did come through, except in time of war, including the Korean emergency—and whatever failures took place were due to the skillful undercover work of the private utility lobby. Lest anyone think this statement is a figment of political imagination, let me point out that early last year, Mr. Purcell Smith, the $60,000-a-year lobbyist for the private power utilities, boasted openly of the success of his work in cutting back appropriations for all Federal power development projects in the United States. He went so far as to report precisely which items of appropriation he had been able to sabotage.

The fact is—and it is a monumental fact—that for 20 years, except in time of grave national emergency, the Nation has maintained a program of orderly regionwide development of the Columbia Basin. The planning was regionwide in concept. The benefits were nationwide in their effect.

Our farms, homes, and factories were electrified. Our cities flourished and attracted new people by the hundreds of thousands. And all this was made possible by a Congress—a Democratic Congress—which recognized that money spent here was not a current expense, but rather, a capital investment. Not only did Congress recognize it as a capital investment in America's future, but as a self-liquidating investment which is already years ahead of the payout schedule and is busily creating new taxable wealth to help pay the general costs of Government.

Who says, "Congress has changed its mind"? Who says, "Congress now looks on a dam as an item of current budgetary expense which we can no longer afford"?

I have seen no declaration by Congress to that effect. None is in existence. Did either political party make such a declaration in any recent platform? My party certainly did not.

But what has happened in this short period of 2 years since the present administration took over the power policy? The electric clock has been turned back 20 years. And what do we have now? This is the simple answer—we have nothing, nothing but disastrous confusion. As farm and labor organizations in my State have said—if the Government should scuttle Hells Canyon and allow Idaho Power to build three private profit dams on sites which rightfully belong to the people of the United States, it will be one of the most colossal blunders ever committed by any administration.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman yield to me now?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. Can the gentlewoman tell us what the cost per kilowatt would be to generate electricity at the Hells Canyon Dam, if it is constructed, and how many months during a calendar year the generating plant will operate during the low-water years upon which all these studies are based?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I think all the statistics show that there will be enough water so that the generators will be operating 12 months of the year. The water storage will be backed up for a distance of 93 miles. As far as the cost of it is concerned, our hope is to continue it on a postage-stamp rate. This means that we would continue to sell electricity at the wholesale rate of 2 mills per kilowatt. According to the experts in the Northwest, there is no indication that those rates will be raised in the immediate or the foreseeable future.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would permit me, I would like her to respond to the first part of my question as to what the cost per kilowatt would be to generate hydroelectric power at the Hells Canyon Dam; not what the rate would be throughout the system but what the cost to the Government would be to produce electricity at the Hells Canyon site.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sure the gentleman is well aware of the hearings held before the Federal Power Commission, and I would refer him to those reports.

Because of this nebulous "partnership" program, today, everyone is utterly confused—everyone except the private utilities. The industrialists, the farmers, the labor officials, the investors, the bankers, the insurance companies have not the remotest idea of where this situation will end. There is no prospect of stability in the administration's power policy. "Divide and conquer" is the unofficial word of the day. Pile confusion upon confusion—this makes the job of the private utilities much simpler. They can then continue in full control. The present situation is both tragic and ominous. The groundwork has been well planned. The real objective of the administration—paraphrasing that of the private utilities, is very simple. Notwithstanding pious protests to the contrary, it is the destruction of public power in the United States.

The administration program, in its simple private utility terms, is to destroy the yardstick principle so well-established by the Democratic administration and which resulted in power rates everywhere at the low cost levels. These low costs permitted wide and abundant use by everyone. The administration program is calculated to break down the principle of regional river and power development and to substitute piecemeal exploitation for the benefit of isolated private utility operations at a juicy, individual profit. The administration policy seems to be to abolish the idea of postage-stamp rates, which so far have made it impossible for individual utilities to charge locally all the traffic will bear. And the present administration seems intent on making impossible low cost power sales to industry and to permit the private utilities to skim the cream—as they did 20 years ago before Franklin Roosevelt put a stop to this practice.

A good start toward these objectives has been made—far better, I am sure than the most optimistic utility executive could have dreamed. Let us look at the record. Let us see the technique:

First, introduce rank confusion into the situation by throwing back power development to local enterprise, knowing full well its lack of financial capabilities. Second, destroy the one arm of government in the Pacific Northwest capable of appraising the situation and of planning for the future, by removing the Federal engineers who planned the system and could plan its orderly development for the widespread distribution of power to be generated from all portions of the Columbia River drainage system. Bonneville Power Administration has been

gutted of its most capable men. It is a hollow shell devoted now to unproductive accounting and bill collecting. Third, begin the fragmentation of the regional system by selling portions of the transmission system. Fourth, whittle away at the traditional preference and priority clause, long-accorded to publicly owned utilities, by means of weasel-worded contracts with private utilities. Fifth, make insecure the position of large power consumers such as the aluminum industry with the objective of curtailing their power demands. Sixth, start laying a foundation for increases in the power rates so as to make it profitable for the least efficient private utilities to operate.

I could continue the recitation of this factual record—a record which all of you have seen with your own eyes, but it would not provide the solution which must be obtained immediately.

The urgency of the overall situation is demonstrated by the agreed-upon fact that by 1960–61, the region's total power demands will be in excess of producing capacity, thus providing for black-outs and the most critical power shortage ever experienced by any region in the history of our Nation.

Inasmuch as "partnership," since it was first foisted upon us 2 years ago, has produced no tangible results except piously fraudulent talk, what are the alternatives? What do we do about this situation—this situation which threatens the immediate livelihood and welfare of so many?

First. We must return to the people the control and say-so on the development of our power resources. Let us make certain that the private utilities are placed where they belong—under effective control and regulation by means of the yardstick principle.

Second. Let us keep and use the assets of the Federal Government in the existing dams and transmission lines of the Pacific Northwest.

Third. Let us return to the tested and proved engineering programs providing for full river development on an orderly regionwide basis. The present dogfight over bits and pieces of our Northwest power resources is totally destructive and must be stopped.

Fourth. Let us see ahead, plan ahead, and be ahead of the needs of the coming generations—and that means, for one very important thing, the development of the Columbia and Snake Rivers.

A pattern for long-range development of the Columbia-Snake River system has been established. This pattern is a comprehensive pattern. It is based on years of study by engineers and cost nearly $5 million to prepare. It recognized the Pacific Northwest as one vast social, economic, and geographic unit and through the integration or tying together of river facilities it seeks to give maximum strength to the whole by the coordination of each part.

Each dam on the river system has been built with this pattern in mind. As a consequence, some are high storage dams with vast reservoirs behind them, while others are low, run-of-the-river structures, dependent for their performance on normal river flow plus the added feeding of storage waters from the high dams when normal flow is low. In this way a storage dam increases the capacity of several low dams and the power of each is fed back and forth over a vast network of transmission lines to increase the strength of the entire system. In this comprehensive plan no dam functions as an individual unit. Each is dependent on the others and each contributes far more because of this integration and interdependence than would be possible if it functioned as an isolated unit.

Every phase of the comprehensive river development program, through all the years of its projection, has emphasized the Hells Canyon site as the keystone to maximum development. The reason is obvious. Here, in this mighty chasm, exists a site for waterpower potential unrivaled throughout the Nation. In Hells Canyon the engineers visualized a dam 722 feet high, behind which the the Snake River waters will back up for 93 miles of the river basin. This huge reservoir of water offers a potential for the future which staggers the imagination. At the dam site Hells Canyon will produce 686,000 kilowatts of prime power—energy that can be delivered year after year, in wet or dry seasons—and the water it releases will again create kilowatts many times before it reaches the sea. It is a significant fact that downstream benefits from Hells Canyon are tremendous. On its way to the Pacific water from this mighty reservoir will make it possible for downstream plants to produce 436,000 kilowatts additional power.

The vast storage of water will help to minimize floods—in fact, even prevent them. You will remember there was $100 million in property damage when the Columbia River went on the rampage in 1948, and Hells Canyon will provide for irrigation development. Out of the arid desert it will provide fertile irrigated acres, and its cheap power will provide for the needed development of phosphate fertilizer, and not at all unimportant—Hells Canyon will provide a great recreation area.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Since the gentlewoman has referred to, what is I assume, my congressional district, and the irrigation of the arid lands therein, may I ask the gentlewoman to explain to the House just how the water will irrigate the desert upstream from the dam?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I said I would not yield at this point.

Again—to go back to the advantages to be derived from Hells Canyon Dam—except for a nonreimbursable allocation to flood control and navigation, the Hells Canyon project would be wholly self-sustaining. And this is extremely important to every taxpayer.

I maintain that Hells Canyon Dam can offer greater economic values than any alternate projects.

And I ask—where would our country be today, if we had not had the great public power developments at Grand Coulee and Bonneville—and in the Tennessee Valley, to provide the vast amounts of energy needed for aluminum production and for atomic development during the Second World War?

The President's own Materials Policy Commission had this to say:

> Shortage of electricity and rising costs could impede economic growth, they could throttle the Nation's effort in event of war.

Yet, there is no need to propose in fear alone construction for such productive capacity. Rather, it is well for us to look toward strengthening and stabilizing for peace.

The soundness of our regional economies is basic to the welfare of our great Nation. And as we build for our future welfare, the full and proper development of our natural resources is fundamental. Therefore, let us build energetically and with vision and enthusiasm.

In the construction of Hells Canyon Dam lies the key to development of the Great Northwest region—for power, for irrigation, for flood control, for improved navigation, for new industrial expansion, for employment of our people—and for a better, richer way of life for all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRD). The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes. I understand there is another special order to follow this, but I have conferred with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], whose special order it is, and he is agreeable to this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I desire to take this moment to congratulate the gentlewoman upon the high quality of her presentation. She certainly shows tremendous knowledge of a project that is important to her section and to the country.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. MULTER. I am happy to be present at this time to hear what the gentlewoman has said. Coming from a consumer district, I am very much interested in the subject. What she has said comes very close to our interests. We commend her for her very fine statement and agree with all that she has said.

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mrs. PFOST. I, too, would like to join with my colleagues in saying that you have made an excellent presentation. I appreciate very much the fine support of my colleagues, the gentleman from Washington, Mr. DON MAGNUSON, yourself, Mrs. GREEN, and the gentleman from Montana, Mr. LEE METCALF. It is a privilege to join with you in sponsoring legislation so vital to the section of the country we represent.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. I wish to join with my colleagues in commending the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] on the very fine presentation she has made.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentlewoman from Missouri.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. As a cosponsor of this Hells Canyon legislation, I assure the gentlewoman from Oregon I am very greatly concerned about any legislation which will impair the water rights of the farmers and the water-right holders of any State in the Northwest. I have examined this legislation, and I want to assure you that if such legislation were passed for the State of Montana I would be satisfied that the interests of the individual appropriators of water for irrigation purposes will be amply and adequately protected. I have not examined the brief which was referred to by the gentleman from Idaho. I am not as familiar with the laws regarding water rights in Idaho as I am with the water laws of the State of Montana. But I would like to call your attention to the fact that the question here is not whether or not the Federal Government is going to build the high dam at Hells Canyon, but the question is whether we are going to build one kind of dam or another, and whether we are going to build the three low-level dams or whether we are going to build a high dam. There is going to be a project. We are going to have electricity generated, and we are going to have some storage, and we are going to have a dam of one kind or another. To my mind, the question then comes up whether or not by such legislation as we have introduced today we are better protecting the water rights of the farmers who have appropriated it for agricultural purposes than their water rights would be protected in the proposal advanced by the Idaho Power Co. If the laws of Idaho are anything like the laws of Montana, this bill would take better care of farmers' upstream water rights than the protection afforded them by State laws if there were an appropriation by a power company or public utility such as the Idaho Power Co. The gentleman from Idaho has described a danger which is much more apt to arise under State laws and a private dam than under this bill.

The gentlewoman from Oregon has made a wonderful argument today for the kind of a program that we ought to have, not only in the Clearwater and on the Snake River, but in the State of Montana and on other tributaries of the Columbia. She has demonstrated here today that the appropriator's rights will be better protected. Not only will we have cheaper power, but we will get more benefits. We will get flood control and recreational benefits, and all these other things that come from a multiple-purpose dam which we will not get if we are going to build the other dams proposed by the Idaho Power Co. I call your attention to the fact that the Idaho Power Co. has already ordered generators for the Ox Bow Dam. They must be fairly optimistic of the decision of the Federal Power Commission. So the question that this Congress is going to decide between now and adjournment of the 1st session of the 84th Congress is whether or not we are going to build a dam under legislation that we have introduced today under rules and regulations that will protect the rights of the farmers and the prior appropriators, and whether we will build up recreational facilities, reclamation and flood control, or whether we are going to let a private power company build dams that will not protect those rights and give those benefits. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

HELLS CANYON—LAST CLEAR CHANCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of history that I am introducing today, together with the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST], the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], a bill authorizing Federal construction, operation and maintenance of a high dam at Hells Canyon on the Snake River.

Construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon long has been recommended by Government engineers as an integral part of a comprehensive plan for the full development of the water resources of the mighty Columbia River and its tributaries. The high dam at Hells Canyon is a vital link in the chain of dams, high and low, which already have begun to harness the vast waterpower potential of the Columbia Basin and add so abundantly to the agricultural and economic good of the West and the entire United States.

Already, in the relatively few years since the completion of other dams called for in the comprehensive plan, tremendous changes have taken place in the Northwest. Aluminum, chemical, and atomic energy plants have been built, and whole new cities created, using the power provided by these dams. Great, barren areas have been planted with crops irrigated by the water which formerly was lost to the Pacific Ocean.

The comprehensive plan seeks to utilize and control all aspects of the endless flow of water from the mountains to the sea—low-cost power, navigation, irrigation, recreation, resource development and flood control. It is a multipurpose—not a single-purpose—plan. And Hells Canyon is the greatest remaining multipurpose dam site, not only on the Columbia River system, but within the whole of continental United States.

Today there is pending before the Federal Power Commission the application of the Idaho Power Co. for authority to construct a small dam—or possibly three—on this stretch of the Snake River. The application has the official blessing of the administration. If the application is approved and construction of a small dam started we shall have given away forever the multipurpose promise of a high Hells Canyon Dam.

A high dam at Hells Canyon will help provide control of the not infrequent and often disastrous floods on the lower Columbia; one or more small dams will not. A high dam will increase substantially the power produced at downstream dams through regulation of annual flow; one or more small dams will not. A high dam will make possible large irrigation projects; one or more small dams will not. A high dam will permit development of the vast deposits of low-grade phosphate ore in nearby areas; one or more small dams will not.

This is the last clear chance to save this great site for a multipurpose dam. There is every indication that by next year—unless Congress acts now—the picture will be clouded by a Federal Power Commission decision to give the site to the Idaho Power Co., which undoubtedly would throw the issue into the courts.

We in this country often enjoy the comforting belief that the resources which God has bestowed upon us are limitless. Under the pressures of the moment we often feel we can afford to waste much of our abundance. But if our population and our standard of living continue to increase at the present rate, the day is not far off when we shall need every bit of productive resources which we have.

The great issue at stake—the issue which will be decided by our action or inaction on this proposal—is conservation of our water resources. Acting wisely, we shall earn the praise—as failing to act we shall deserve the blame—of future generations.

We must not sacrifice the resource potential of a high Hells Canyon Dam.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I know the House is interested in hearing both sides of this question, so I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentlewoman from Oregon be extended an additional 5 minutes, and then I will ask her to yield.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentlewoman wish additional time as requested by the gentleman from Idaho?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order and I have not been consulted. I am objecting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair wishes to state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is entitled to recognition at this time.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, may I address an inquiry?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order, and I make a point of order against any further inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] has been recognized under a special order for 15 minutes.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes immediately following the conclusion of any other special orders today.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order, and I object. The gentleman can make his request later.

NEW HOUSING AUTHORITY BONDS AND PUBLIC HOUSING FOR THE AGED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA] is recognized.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in addressing the House at this time is to comment on an article by John S. Linen, vice president of the Chase National Bank of the city of New York, which originally appeared in the American Banker of December 16, 1954, and which now is being distributed in pamphlet form by the Chase National Bank to investors and financial institutions throughout the Nation.

As reflecting the new outlook on public housing in circles of conservative thought and in the sources of the wealth of the country, the article written by the vice president of one of the largest banks in the United States and widely circulated by that bank should prove of great interest to the Members of this body. It is possible that some Members have not seen this article by Mr. Linen. If so, I am confident they will appreciate my bringing it to their attention.

But first, Mr. Speaker, I feel moved to compliment the distinguished gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST] and the distinguished gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] on the addresses they made immediately preceding my remarks. They were outstanding in convincing content and eloquently forceful delivery. The gentlewoman from Oregon, whose reputation had preceded her arrival in the Halls of Congress, I understand was making her maiden speech in the well of the House. She understood so thoroughly her subject, and handled herself so masterfully in debate, more than justifying the reputation that had preceded her, that I would have wished to agree to a further extension of her time that the colloquy with the distinguished gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] might have been continued. My reason for objecting was solely that the Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am a member, has scheduled a public hearing on a most important measure and which I feel it my duty to attend. It was a matter of not having time available. I trust the gentleman from Idaho will understand my situation and that the time which by unanimous consent now has been granted him, following my remarks, will afford him ample opportunity to present his views in opposition to those so ably presented by Mrs. PFOST and Mrs. GREEN.

HOUSING FOR THE AGED

Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago in addressing the House I stressed the demand for housing for our senior citizens, men and women of 65 and past who are living on limited means supplied by small retirement payments. In this connection I urged the prompt enactment of a measure I had introduced with 12 cosponsors, 11 of them members of the Banking and Currency Committee, to provide public housing especially constructed for these elder citizens and within their financial means. I am glad to know from Mr. Linen's scholarly article that such proposal impliedly would have the endorsement of the great bank of which he is vice president. Mr. Linen says:

If slums of objectionable character are to be cleared, and in the public interest as well as for humane reasons they should be, other homes must be found. In most cases the new public housing projects under the low-rent program have provided the only answer. A greatly improved environment for low-income families from the standpoint of health, public morals, and self-respect has been provided by this program. It should result in a more healthy, self-reliant, and responsible citizenry.

Changes in the structure of our population have occurred which present problems, particularly in our larger population centers. With many individuals being retired at the age of 65 and therefore having to exist on a substantially reduced income, it is interesting to note that the proportion of persons over 65 years of age comprised under 3 percent of the population in 1850, but was 8 percent of the population in 1950.

Thus, the purpose served by the low-rent housing program meets a variety of needs and deals with different segments of our population groups in constructive and useful ways.

Mr. Linen's article, in full, follows:

NEW HOUSING AUTHORITY BONDS

(By John S. Linen, vice president, the Chase National Bank, of the city of New York)

Unrealistic indeed would be the man, who, after examining with any understanding, the living conditions in the slum or poorer districts in most of our larger cities, would contend that housing facilities do not need substantial improvement.

There is involved far more than a desirable betterment for general social and welfare purposes. Public health which quite directly concerns our body politic, is clearly threatened by the absence of sanitary precautions; contagious diseases and avoidable illnesses are fostered by conditions prevailing in some of these areas.

Public safety is also endangered by the old and diplapidated buildings creating serious fire hazards as well as being a menace to proper moral and social standards and concepts.

To attempt to deal with these conditions, the original United States Housing Act was passed by Congress in 1937. It established a national policy of promoting the general welfare of the Nation by employing Federal funds and credit to assist the States and their political subdivisions in the elimination of unsafe and insanitary living conditions and to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for families of low income. The Housing Act of 1949 authorized a large expansion of the foregoing program. To carry out the provisions of the act, the Congress created the United States Housing Authority as a permanent corporate instrumentality of the Federal Government, the powers, functions, and duties of which are now administered by the Public Housing Administration, an agency of the Federal Government. This agency performs many important services in assisting local housing agencies in their project planning, financing, construction, ad operation.

Local housing agencies are public bodies organized by cities and other appropriate subdivisions under authority granted by the legislatures of 43 of our States and also by Congress for the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Such authorities or agencies are empowered and required to meet the many statutory provisions of the act in order to obtain from the Public Housing Administration the annual contributions and financial assistance provided for in the Housing Act, as amended.

FEDERAL OBLIGATION

Bonds issued by local agencies constitute obligations of such agencies. Most significant, perhaps, in considering the investment merits of new Housing Authority bonds is the obligation of the Federal Government to provide annually moneys sufficient in amount, together with funds of the local agencies available for such purpose, to pay principal and interest on all bonds issued by local housing authorities or agencies. This is in spite of the success or lack of success in the operation of the project against which new Housing Authority bonds are oustanding.

The amended legislation now completely eliminates the conditions to which payment of Federal contributions were subject under the provisions of the original Housing Act of 1937, which conditions applied on previously issued series A and B housing bonds. The commitment of the United States through its agency, the Public Housing Administration, is now unconditional.

The Federal Government's obligation to make the required funds available was confirmed in an opinion rendered by the Attorney General of the United States to the President dated May 15, 1953, which stated in part: "In summary, I am of the view that: * * * A contract to pay annual contributions entered into by the PHA (Public Housing Administration) in conformance with the provisions of the act (United States Housing Act of 1937, as amended) is valid and binding upon the United States, and that the faith of the United States has been solemnly pledged to the payment of such contributions in the same terms its faith has been pledged to the payment of its interest-bearing obligations.

New Housing Authority bonds made their initial appearance in the investment market in July of 1951. Since that time, or in a period of a little over 3 years, approximately $1½ billion of new Housing Authority bonds have found their way into investment channels.

LACK OF UNDERSTANDING

The introduction of new Housing Authority bonds to investors has not been without disappointments and difficulties. Despite the fact that these bonds are in effect obligations of the United States, they have been plagued by a lack of public understanding and a broad investor prejudice. It would have been much simpler in the public mind if it could have been said that the obligations of the local Housing Authorities were "guaranteed" by the United States Government. This, however, would not have been an accurate statement, even though the effect were the same.

Because the Federal Government's commitment was through a Federal agency, (the PHA) even though direct, it required a sufficiently involved explanatory statement which discouraged ready acceptance by the public.

Investor prejudice if widely held can be a real market factor, whether or not such prejudice is well founded. Institutional and the larger individual investors who are interested in tax-exempt issues rather generally are strong advocates of the private-enterprise system. In the initial stages, before the need to remove and improve slum conditions was as well understood and accepted as it is today, many public-housing projects were considered unnecessary and in conflict with this concept.

PRICING

While all of the bonds issued by the various local housing agencies are identically secured, it has been found necessary by underwriting groups, in pricing the bonds for sale, to place selected issues in different price groups. Because bonds issued in some States and local housing agencies of the Territories and possessions above mentioned are exempt from State and local taxes as well as Federal in-

come taxes, where this local exemption is of special value, the bonds are priced to reflect this. Such advantage applies principally in the States where a high millage tax is levied on personal property or where a State income tax is present. A notable instance is the State of Pennsylvania. The status of bonds as a legal investment for trust accounts and savings banks in certain States is another factor which is given consideration.

In theory all of the remaining issues of new Housing Authority bonds should be offered at a price scale which shows no variance between issues. There are two factors which interfere with this procedure. One is investor prejudice which shows a preference for well known names, and issues offering sizable or round blocks in each maturity. The other is the fact that the bonds are purchased at public competitive sale. Because of competition all factors that affect the price at which the bonds can be reoffered must be carefully weighed by the bidders. This includes investor preferences and prejudices. If the investor will pay more, the bidder can bid more, and the result of these considerations is shown in the different offering scales applying to the respective issues. The placing of specific issues in various groups reflects the judgment of the underwriter regarding the preferences the ultimate investor will show in considering the purchase of such bonds. Time proves the underwriter right or wrong in such judgment.

For those understanding the pricing of these bonds the above discussion will appear to be unnecessarily elementary.

The comment is made because there are still many investors who believe that the price differences shown in the various price groups are due to some basic factors, not fully understood by them, which make such bonds in the higher priced groups better secured obligations and therefore a safer investment.

FINANCING PROCEDURE

There are three steps in financing the capital costs of low-rent housing projects. First, the Public Housing Administration makes direct loans in the preliminary stages to the local authorities. Second, the local authorities sell temporary notes at public sale when the amount required warrants going to the public market and the PHA is reimbursed accordingly. These temporary notes may be refunded with similar notes several times in certain instances before the third step occurs. Third, when the project is approaching completion long-term bonds are sold and the proceeds are applied to the payment of the notes and construction costs.

During the past fiscal year temporary notes in the hands of the public showed a net increase of $374 million and long-term bonds a net increase of $336 million or a total increase of $710 million. The total amounts outstanding as of June 30, 1954, were:

Temporary notes	$1,093,202,971
New Housing Authority bonds	1,335,750,613
Total	2,428,953,584

The placing of additional obligations in the amount of $710 million in the hands of private investors during the past year, resulted in paying off advances and loans made by the PHA to local authorities of approximately $410 million. This in turn reduced the advance by the United States Treasury to the PHA, thus making funds available for curtailment in the national debt.

The cost of temporary note financing is, of course, related to the money situation. Beyond this, however, there has been an improved and broader demand for such notes during the past year as evidenced by a decline in the interest rate from 1.965 percent on July 7, 1953, to 0.669 percent on June 15, 1954. The most recent sale on December 7, 1954, produced an overall average rate of 0.693 percent.

INTEREST TREND

This favorable rate on the notes makes it clearly advantageous to sell notes to the public rather than borrow from the PHA which must pay interest to the Treasury at the Federal going rate which averaged about 2¾ percent last year.

The sale of local Housing Authority bonds has also shown a favorable downward trend in interest cost during the past year. It should be noted that in the schedule below the issues sold in 1953 had the last maturities averaging 30 years as compared with 38.5 years or slightly longer, for the issues sold in 1954. Therefore, the reduction in the average interest rate is even greater than is shown when adjustment is made for the longer maturities.

Recent sales of new Housing Authority bonds

Sale date	Average longest maturity	Total sold	Average interest rate
	Years		*Percent*
Sept. 22, 1953	30.0	$125,210,000	2.833
Dec. 15, 1953	30.0	121,225,000	2.471
Mar. 2, 1954	38.5	119,000,000	2.338
June 22, 1954	38.9	119,210,000	2.273
Sept. 14, 1954	38.5	135,935,000	2.333

ANNUAL CONTRIBUTIONS

The commitment of the PHA under the annual contributions contract, under which payments started in 1941, has been showing substantial increase during the past 3 years in view of the stepped-up construction program. Actual contributions over the past 14 years have totaled $160,716,647 which, however, was slightly less than half the maximum contributions for which the PHA was liable. The difference represents project earnings (rents less current operating expense).

The result of expenditures for public housing purposes was reported at Senator BYRD's request last summer. A total of 372,005 housing units under the low-rent housing program were constructed or are under construction. On July 1, 1954 there were 35,329 additional units authorized for completion on which construction has not yet started.

The maturity arrangement on the new Housing Authority bonds has from the beginning provided for level debt service. Thus, the total required for interest payments and principal retirement remains approximately the same each year. The annual cumulative total for debt service at the end of the 1953–54 fiscal year was something over $60 million for all of the 443 different issues of bonds sold to the public by the various local housing authorities up to that time. While this represents a substantial charge the actual amount of annual contributions paid was slightly under $45 million, the balance being provided from the net earnings of the projects. There were various other costs, such as interest on temporary notes and operating charges of the PHA agency and other miscellaneous expenditures.

INVESTOR INTEREST

It is, I believe, appropriate to observe that a consistent effort on the part of underwriters to better educate the public generally regarding these new Housing Authority bonds has brought about a much broader investment interest in those obligations. Because this broader demand for housing bonds has developed a far more active and dependable secondary market for the bonds, commercial banks, which require as a matter of policy a high degree of marketability in the major portion of their purchases for portfolio account, have been more disposed to acquire these bonds for their investment accounts.

Equally important in creating this broader interest and more active secondary market, has been the participation by some of the larger commercial banks as underwriters and dealers in these bonds. They have aided greatly in the educational program and their sponsorship of these bonds has carried much weight with a multitude of other banking institutions and with many other investors. In addition their own investment interest, increased substantially by their ability to underwrite and deal in such bonds, has contributed most helpfully in establishing a better market reception for new issues and a broader market generally.

The effect of the broader market has been of value not only in the sale of new Housing Authority bonds, but in the sale of temporary notes as well. As the notes are an integral part of the financing program of the housing projects, at least brief attention to them seems in order as we examine the overall program.

NEW YORK CITY NEEDS

In addition to the efforts of the Public Housing Administration, there are other public agencies that have also contributed to giving relief in this field. In New York City, for instance, the New York City Housing Authority has charge of constructing and managing projects financed through the local housing authority with Federal assistance (PHA) of which there are 19,682 apartments or units completed, New York State financed projects of which there are 23,297 completed, and New York City Housing Authority financed projects (guaranteed by New York City), with 22,644 apartments completed.

The need in New York City has been and still is serious for better housing conditions. A visit to some of these projects competently handled by the New York City Housing Authority is convincing evidence indeed of not only the better living conditions, but of the foresight in planning which is a part of such program. There are included in this plan modern sanitary conditions, outdoor recreation areas in many cases, child care and play facilities with the cooperation of the Hudson Guild, room for leisure-time activities with work benches, etc., in the basement for adults, cooperative laundry facilities, and in some cases medical care and examination centers.

SERVING VITAL NEED

The suspicion unquestionably still lingers in regard to some projects as to whether political considerations may not have been given as much weight as other factors when approval was given. Whether or not this suspicion is warranted, experience has demonstrated that the large majority of such projects are serving a vital need. Slum conditions in certain areas have been deplorable and disgraceful; they promote evil ways and delinquency. The effect of substantially improving the character of living and sanitary conditions will almost certainly reduce welfare, hospital, health, and fire departments and police costs. If slums of objectionable character are to be cleared, and in the public interest as well as for humane reasons they should be, other homes must be found. In most cases the new public housing projects under the low-rent program have provided the only answer. A greatly improved environment for low-income families from the standpoint of health, public morals, and self respect has been provided by this program. It should result in a more healthy, self reliant, and responsible citizenry.

GROUPS SERVED

Changes in the structure of our population have occurred which present problems, particularly in our larger population centers. With many individuals being retired at the age of 65 and therefore having to

exist on a substantially reduced income, it is interesting to note that the proportion of persons over 65 years of age comprised under 3 percent of the population in 1850, but was 8 percent of the population in 1950.

Thus, the purpose served by the low-rent housing program meets a variety of needs and deals with different segments of our population groups in constructive and useful ways. Veterans returned from service duty and beginning their civilian lives or returning to it with family responsibilities, are given preferential consideration. That they avail themselves of this privilege is illustrated by the fact that in many cases they represent over 75 percent of the occupants in these housing projects. A study has shown that approximately 16 percent of the projects under the management of the New York City Housing Authority, represents the very low-income group including families receiving welfare assistance. About 5 percent of the occupants are made up of the older residents including the pension and retirement group.

BENEFITS IMPRESSIVE

In the development of these housing projects not only has progress been made in the replacement and improvement of home facilities, but the results provide far more healthy environments which combine both sanitary and safety factors.

In addition to the physical advantages there is a corresponding benefit from the improved surroundings which should be favorably reflected in the character and lives of the children as well as the self-respect and, in some cases, rehabilitation of adults as well. We may all be happy and take satisfaction in these accomplishments.

HELLS CANYON DAM

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, the presentation of the Hells Canyon bills catches me somewhat unprepared. I had understood for some weeks that the bills were to be introduced, but of course I did not know the exact date.

For the further information of the House, I believe that we should know a little bit about just what the Hells Canyon project entails, particularly insofar as it affects the irrigated acreages upstream; that is, the irrigated acreages of Idaho and of eastern Oregon.

The Federal Government, and of course all private individuals who depend upon water that is stored in the irrigation dams, depend upon that water to irrigate their crops to grow the agricultural products which have made southern Idaho and eastern Oregon great agricultural producers. All of those people, including the Federal Government, due to its investment through the Bureau of Reclamation, are seriously concerned about what happens to the water rights in those areas.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] stated that perhaps the water laws in Idaho are different from those in Montana. I doubt that there is much difference, but even though there were, once this project is constructed and the Federal Government decides it needs water from upstream to operate this project, any subsequent Congress can require the release of those waters from these great irrigated acreages upstream in order to run this powerplant, and the laws of the State of Montana, or Idaho, or any other State of the Union would not be called into being at all.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is the gentleman familiar with the Reclamation Act passed by the Congress which provides that the Secretary of the Interior or anyone constructing dams pursuant to the Reclamation Act is required to comply with State law?

Mr. BUDGE. I am very familiar with section 8 of the Reclamation Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does not that apply in the State of Idaho as well as the rest of the Nation?

Mr. BUDGE. It most certainly does.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I should like to ask the gentleman another question.

Mr. BUDGE. I wish to answer the gentleman's first question. This or the next or any other Congress can change section 8 of the Reclamation Act or any other Federal law.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUDGE. Not at this point; I want to answer the gentleman's inquiry.

This whole controversy arose during the regime of that great engineer, newspaperman by profession, Mr. Michael Straus, then Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. Mr. Straus put out a manual in the name of the Reclamation Bureau and in that manual this is what the Bureau of Reclamation said about section 8 of the Reclamation Act:

> The section is purely directory; it is not mandatory, and the Federal Government owns all of the unappropriated waters in the West.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. BUDGE. I decline to yield, Mr. Speaker, and I would very much prefer if the gentleman would permit me to follow along on my brief statement. After all, the gentleman's side has had about an hour. I should be permitted 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BUDGE. I want to complete what Mr. Straus and the Bureau of Reclamation printed in their manual: That in spite of section 8 of the Reclamation Act the Federal Government is the owner of all unappropriated waters in the streams of the West, and that the Federal Government need not comply with the water laws of Colorado, Montana, Idaho, or any other Western State.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Is the gentleman familiar with the Supreme Court decision in the case of Nebraska against Wyoming and Colorado under section 8 of the Reclamation Act and the contentions set forth in the pamphlet to which the gentleman referred were called to the attention of the Supreme Court and they very definitely and with certainty held that the Secretary of the Interior and any agency of the Federal Government operating under the Reclamation Act were bound by section 8 of the act. Is the gentleman familiar with that decision?

Mr. BUDGE. Let me answer the gentleman's questions one at a time. I have previously referred to an opinion prepared for me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. The opinion in my belief contains every applicable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States on this question including the case to which the gentleman has just referred. In their opinion which, I believe, comprises some 32 pages and which should contain every applicable decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, this is what they say.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Quoting from what opinion?

Mr. BUDGE. This is an opinion addressed to me by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, written by Mr. Frank B. Horne. I should be happy to furnish the gentleman with a copy. This is what is said on page 10:

> This brings us to the main question underlying this whole problem which, as we see it, can be stated bluntly as follows: In the event after the authorization and construction of the Hell's Canyon Division there is insufficient downstream flow for its operation could the Congress in the exercise of its constitutional powers require release of the waters from above and thus curtail beneficial use under applicable State and other laws in this upper area? Based on applicable court decisions the answer is in the affirmative.

I submit to the gentlemen, that coming from the arid Western States, as they do, they should pay a great deal of attention to the problem which we are discussing here this afternoon. Any time a commitment is made downstream from your irrigated acreage, you are placing your State in jeopardy of having the Federal Government through a succeeding Congress come in and say: We are going to override your water rights; we are going to require the delivery of water downstream in order to operate our powerplant.

I am not going to permit my congressional district to be placed in that position, if I can help it.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The matter the gentleman quotes from came, as he says, from an opinion of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress?

Mr. BUDGE. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Did they include in that the Supreme Court decision in the case of the State of Nebraska against the State of Wyoming in which the State of Colorado was interpleaded?

Mr. BUDGE. It is my impression that that decision is discussed in the opinion.

I do not want to guarantee that but the Library of Congress said it had included all applicable court decisions.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. For the benefit of the gentleman, I may state that as Attorney General of the State of Colorado I was involved in that lawsuit, representing the great State of Colorado. When the Department of the Interior through the Department of Justice made such a claim, it was filed as a part of the pleadings in that case. When it finally reached the Supreme Court of the United States they spelled out in no uncertain terms that the Reclamation Act, under section 8 that the gentleman refers to, requires the Secretary of the Interior or any other Government agency that files an appropriation to comply with the State law. They spelled that out in no uncertain terms and I would suggest to the gentleman, if there is any doubt in his mind that he read that decision.

I also would direct his attention to the fact that probably the State of Idaho like all the Western States has in its constitution that the first use of water shall be for domestic purposes, second irrigation, and third manufacturing, which is that of power. Under the interpretation as given throughout the entire West and substantiated by the Supreme Court decision in the Nebraska against Wyoming case, there is no question in my mind but what the building of this dam or any other dam does not deprive the State or the water users of their water rights contrary to their own State constitution and their own State laws.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, in order that I may answer the gentlemen fully, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. Regardless of the legalistic arguments and the decisions of the Supreme Court would it not result, as a matter of fact, in about the following situation, if the Federal Government actually did deprive the downstream people of their rights: By the time they got through enforcing their rights in the courts, their farms would not only be dried up but they themselves would be bankrupt?

Mr. BUDGE. I thank the gentleman from California for that observation. I recall that his State just recently went through that experience exactly.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to proceed further in answer to the statements of the gentleman from Colorado. The Bureau of Reclamation in following section 8 of the Reclamation Act has, so far as I know, in the past in every instance complied with the State laws relative to the appropriation and use of water; but we should bear in mind that the Bureau of Reclamation also, to the best of my knowledge, in times past has never built an irrigation project below the area to be irrigated.

Just who dreamed up the idea that you could run the water uphill in this instance I do not know. The Bureau of Reclamation has always built its dams upstream where it impounds the water, changes the normal gravitating flow of the water, and diverts it to the areas to be irrigated. In this instance, the dam is being built some 200 miles below any potential irrigated areas. Now, that, of course, presents a different problem than any with which we have ever been confronted in the operation of the Reclamation Act.

As the gentleman from Colorado well knows, this Congress or any subsequent Congress can entirely delete section 8, should they so desire.

Now, I wish to quote again from this opinion from the Library of Congress, and I shall be happy to make a copy available to any Member of the Congress who is interested. This is what the opinion says on page 4 in the discussion on water rights. Incidentally, I am putting this section that I am reading from in the RECORD, and it will appear tomorrow.

> Such protection, as we have heretofore indicated, is not absolute and cannot be absolute because of the constitutional powers of Congress that are involved. In view of past decisions of the Supreme Court, a constitutional amendment would be required to divest the Congress of its power and vest complete control of these water resources of navigable rivers in the States.

In other words, until the people of the United States amend the Constitution of the United States there is absolutly no safeguard that you can put in these Hells Canyon bills which will protect the upstream users.

Now, that is the objection of the people of southern Idaho.

Now, let us follow the thinking of the gentleman from Colorado to a further conclusion. If it were true that the Federal Government could not build this project until it secured a permit from the State of Idaho, then would it not be logical to defer consideration of the project until such time as the State of Idaho has given the Federal Government that water right? Thus far, the State of Idaho certainly has not done so, and, so far as I know, is not about to do so. Why, then, should we be discussing this project when none of us know the answers to two very important questions. First: Is the water legally there, under the theory advanced by the gentleman from Colorado? Then, of course, the second question: Will it be there physically after the complete upstream development will have occurred, and which development the proponents of this bill maintain they are protecting?

I have heard the thought expressed around the country about this being solely a public versus private power fight. That is far from the whole story. We might all have our opinions on that, but the crux is whether you are going to place in jeopardy the present and the future water rights of a great agricultural area of this Nation, the major portion of which lies in my congressional district.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. There are going to be some dams built either by the Idaho Power Co. or by the Federal Government; is that not right?

Mr. BUDGE. I certainly assume that that is correct.

Mr. METCALF. If the private power companies build the dams, where is the protection for those people that you say are jeopardized by this legislation?

Mr. BUDGE. Well, now, I would take exception to the gentleman's statement that I am an apostle of the private power companies. I have no financial or any other interest in any power company.

Mr. METCALF. I will change that to "proponent."

Mr. BUDGE. I would not even agree to become a proponent. But now, this is the difference, if the gentleman will let me explain to him.

Mr. METCALF. I have been waiting patiently for this explanation.

Mr. BUDGE. The gentleman is going to get it. The water right which is given by the State of Idaho to the Idaho Power Co. to construct these dams has in it, as do all recent water rights obtained by the Idaho Power Co., the direct statement that any right therein granted shall forever be subservient to upstream appropriation and use under the laws of the State of Idaho.

Now, you cannot do that same thing with the Federal Government, because the Federal Government under the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States will have a paramount right. Once this Congress says that this project is for navigation, flood control, or probably for the generation of hydroelectric power, which is its chief purpose—once you have done that in this Congress, you have conferred upon the Federal Government a paramount right to all the waters on that drainage.

Mr. METCALF. Unappropriated waters.

Mr. BUDGE. No, I do not agree that it is limited to the water which is unappropriated. That, however, is the difference so far as the upstream users are concerned between the private development and development by the Federal Government. We can protect ourselves in Idaho against the Idaho Power Co. We can protect ourselves against the citizens of our State or of any other State. But once you bring in the Federal Government, with its paramount rights, then the future development of my State and very possibly such present development as it has achieved is in serious jeopardy. I submit that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROGERS] had best be careful that the same thing does not happen in their States when the Federal Government comes along and wants to build a project far below your irrigated acreages.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Does the gentleman know how long the reclamation law has been on the statute books?

Mr. BUDGE. The Reclamation Act was passed in 1902.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. More than 50 years?

Mr. BUDGE. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. During that period of time, Congress has not seen fit to change the laws of the States of Idaho, Colorado, Montana, or Wyoming, has it?

Mr. BUDGE. I also know that during the last 52 years the Bureau of Reclamation has never attempted to build nor has it built a dam below the areas to be irrigated. That presents an entirely different situation.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BUDGE. I want to answer the gentleman's question before he asks me another. As I say, this is the first instance in the 52-year history of the Bureau of Reclamation where they have drawn up plans to build a gigantic structure with a gigantic lake away down the river from the areas to be irrigated. That of itself poses a new question. I also know that if this project is built, that then at any time the Congress of the United States decides that it does not want to comply with State law as to the appropriation and use of water, it does not have to do so.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Can the gentleman point to any time when the Federal Government has, by court decision, been granted the right to invade State laws as applied to water rights?

Mr. BUDGE. I recall that in two successive sessions of the Congress we were forced to put a rider on an appropriation bill, and the House passed it overwhelmingly, to protect some irrigators down in California. I think perhaps some of the California Members might be able to answer the gentleman a little better on that; but I recall that happening in two successive Congresses.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. What I was asking was whether there were any Supreme Court decisions which have said that the Federal Government has the right to override the State laws.

Mr. BUDGE. I will say to the gentleman that I shall deliver personally to him a copy of the Library of Congress brief. I have stated the conclusions which have been reached therein. I know that both of us have the fullest confidence in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and I shall state unqualifiedly to the gentleman that that was the conclusion reached in that opinion to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE] has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. On the point of interference of the Congress of the United States with the rights of States with respect to water, this Congress in passing the Boulder Canyon Project Act forced the State of California to limit its rightful use of waters in the Colorado River to 4.4 million acre-feet a year. At the present time, with respect to the situation as to the law and the courts, the Bureau of Reclamation is holding two interpretations of the Colorado compact with respect to the allocation of water rights among the seven Western States which is before the court itself for decision at the present moment. So naturally there can be no assurance that the Bureau of Reclamation might do anything but make its own interpretations of the law and persist therein to the very great detriment of those people who are standing behind and guarding the waters in their own ditch, as the gentleman from Idaho is so ably doing today.

Mr. BUDGE. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. Of course, the manual published by the Bureau of Reclamation under the dictatorship of Michael W. Straus specifically stated that the Federal Government was the owner of all unappropriated waters in the nonnavigable streams of the arid West, and note that that is "nonnavigable." They assumed that they were the owners of all the navigable streams. The Supreme Court of the United States has specifically held that the Snake River, on which this project is to be built, is a navigable stream, and that every drop of water that flows into it becomes a part of that same navigable stream. So the Bureau of Reclamation by its own publication says that the State water laws do not mean anything, that if the Federal Government wants to move in they can move in. That was the philosophy of Michael W. Straus during his administration of the Bureau of Reclamation and may be a recurring philosophy.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUDGE. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am sorry that the gentleman from California saw fit to bring this California self-limitation act into this discussion, but since he did I think it might be well to point out to the House that while California limited itself to the use of 4,400,000 acre-feet of water from the main stream of the Colorado River, they are now by their own admission using 5,316,000 acre-feet from the Colorado River, and we do not know where it is going to go from there. We are in the Supreme Court trying to keep them from taking the last drop of water from that stream.

Mr. BUDGE. I very much appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Arizona because they point up to me another very significant problem which will arise if this dam is ever constructed, and that is that from a practical standpoint if the Government ever builds that gigantic dam and has this investment down there totaling nearly half a billion dollars, with the transmission lines necessary to get the power away from it, if the Federal Government ever puts that kind of an investment in that canyon I am satisfied that the two Members of this House allotted to the State of Idaho would have a very difficult time attempting to secure diversion of any additional water upstream. When that Federal investment to produce those kilowatts becomes a reality, I can well imagine that same Federal Government taking, to put it mildly, a dim view of further appropriation of water upstream.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUDGE. I want to make one further observation.

During the hearings on the Hells Canyon bill some 4 years ago, which were held before the House Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, my recollection is there were some 21 members on that committee. Twelve members were of the present majority party and nine members of the present minority party, and after extensive hearings the committee unanimously refused to vote out the Hells Canyon project.

One strange thing happened in those hearings. The Bureau of Reclamation insisted that provisions had been made for all possible upstream development, but in their power studies down at the site of this dam, the Bonneville Power Administration in computing the amount of water which would be there to turn the turbines to generate the kilowatts to sell to pay for the project allowed for the diversion of only enough water to irrigate 192,000 acres upstream. That, strangely enough, is the exact acreage of the Mountain Home project which the Bureau of Reclamation wants to irrigate, and which I would like to see irrigated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have been trying to inject myself into this—I hope the gentleman will assure me that he will yield to me for a couple of questions before he has completed his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUDGE. In making that computation of the amount of new acreage, the Bonneville Power Administration did not even take into consideration the Bureau of Reclamation projects which they presently have under construction on that river, nor did they anywhere near sufficiently provide for the private development which has occurred. Since the studies upon which this bill is based were completed, not 192,000 acres over a 50-year period as was set forth in the Bureau plan, but approximately 225,000 acres of new land have already been put in—not in 50 years but in the period between 1948 and 1954, and not a drop of

water has yet gone on the Mountain Home project.

I know that this water-rights question is a serious one to every Member of the Congress from the West. It has not in the past been sufficiently pointed up, and it is my sincere hope that the colloquy and the frank discussion which we have had here this afternoon will point up the issues which are involved and indicate to us the proper course which we should pursue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of congratulating the gentleman from Idaho on the very fine presentation that he has made of this problem. It shows that he has studied it and knows whereof he speaks. He has asked for aid from the Legislative Reference Service which is certainly commendable, and he has pointed up the real issues involved in this problem.

Some of the remarks made about this administration with regard to its policy on public and private power are very wide of the mark. Repeatedly the President and this administration have made it abundantly clear that they will do nothing to interfere with either private or public power. They have said that on the one hand they are not going to drive private-power companies out of business, and on the other hand that they are going to foster all proper public power developments. They have made it clear that they are not going to turn over the power development of this great country entirely to private interests nor are they going to say that it shall always be done with Federal funds. There is a proper sphere for each. The position of this administration on the appropriate role of public and private power, working in cooperation is a very clear position which should commend itself to the people of this country, and I believe it does so commend itself to them.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. METCALF. The point I want to call to the attention of the gentleman from Idaho is that before the dire consequences which he predicted would happen to the people who have upstream irrigation facilities in his district, before any of those things could happen, section 8 of the Reclamation Act would have to be repealed. That is a section which has been in effect for 50 years. The Flood Control Act would have to be repealed and specific protective sections of the legislation which was introduced today would also have to be repealed. There is not a Member of this Congress who would not come to the aid of the gentleman from Idaho or the gentleman from Colorado, and I hope the aid of the gentleman from Montana, in the event there was an attempt to take our upstream water rights and repeal those very beneficial and important sections of the Federal statute and the sections that we have suggested be written into the legislation, which we have introduced today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas (at the request of Mr. STAGGERS) and to include extraneous material.

Mr. RODINO and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. VAN ZANDT and include an editorial.

Mr. KEATING in four instances in each to include extraneous matter.

Mr. LESINSKI in three instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FLOOD and to include a statement.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. MCCORMACK (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY).

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. HALE) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BYRD (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Illinois) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, March 10, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

524. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to further amend the act of June 3, 1916, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

525. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to contracts for the conduct of contract postal stations"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

526. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 4720. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; without amendment (Rept. No. 90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 1831. A bill to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act in order to protect innocent purchasers of fungible goods converted by warehousemen from claims of the Commodity Credit Corporation; without amendment (Rept. No. 154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4046. A bill to abolish the Old Kasaan National Monument, Alaska, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2121. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Armed Forces who were required to pay certain transportation charges covering shipment of their household goods and personal effects upon return from overseas, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DURHAM: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 3761. A bill to promote the national defense by authorizing the construction of aeronautical research facilities by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; without amendment (Rept. No. 157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 22. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to matters within its jurisdiction; with amendment (Rept. No. 158). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 151. Resolution to amend the rules of the House of Representatives to provide for a code of fair procedure for committees; without amendment (Rept. No. 159). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 869. A bill for the relief of David Del Guidice; without amendment (Rept. No. 91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 903. A bill for the relief of Harold C. Nelson and Dewey L. Young; without amendment (Rept. No. 92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 906. A bill for the relief of William Martin, of Tok Junction, Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 93). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 989. A bill for the relief of Dr. Louis J. Sebille; with amendment (Rept. No. 94). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 996. A bill for the relief of Robert Francis Symons; with amendment (Rept. No. 95). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1003. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lorenza O'Malley (de Amusategui), Jose Maria de Amusategui O'Malley, and the legal guardian of Ramon de Amusategui O'Malley;

without amendment (Rept. No. 96). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1016. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ida Bifolchini Boschetti; without amendment (Rept. No. 97). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1072. A bill for the relief of Clyde M. Litton; without amendment (Rept. No. 98). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1082. A bill for the relief of Golda I. Stegner; without amendment (Rept. No. 99). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1099. A bill for the relief of Theodore J. Hartung and Mrs. Elizabeth Hartung; without amendment (Rept. No. 100). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1101. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jennie Maurello; without amendment (Rept. No. 101). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1116. A bill for the relief of Paul Bernstein; without amendment (Rept. No. 102). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1134. A bill for the relief of Sullivan Construction Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1171. A bill for the relief of Georg Gahn and Margarete Gahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1189. A bill for the relief of William H. Barney; without amendment (Rept. No. 105). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1401. A bill for the relief of Ewing Choat; without amendment (Rept. No. 106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1404. A bill for the relief of Bernhard F. Elmers; without amendment (Rept. No. 107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1409. A bill for the relief of H. W. Robinson & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1416. A bill for the relief of J. B. Phipps; without amendment (Rept. No. 109). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1420. A bill for the relief of Herman E. Mosley; with amendment (Rept. No. 110). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1426. A bill for the relief of George S. Ridner; with amendment (Rept. No. 111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1440. A bill for the relief of Ciro Picardi; with amendment (Rept. No. 112). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1640. A bill for the relief of Constantine Nitsas; without amendment (Rept. No. 113). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1671. A bill for the relief of Clement E. Sprouse; with amendment (Rept. No. 114). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1692. A bill for the relief of Frederick F. Gaskin; without amendment (Rept. No. 115). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1745. A bill for the relief of Paul E. Milward; with amendment (Rept. No. 116). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1866. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas V. Compton; without amendment (Rept. No. 117). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1886. A bill for the relief of Irving I. Erdheim; with amendment (Rept. No. 118). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1913. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Anna Elizabeth Doherty; without amendment (Rept. No. 119). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1921. A bill for the relief of Alexandria S. Balasko; without amendment (Rept. No. 120). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1933. A bill for the relief of the Dason Equipment Corp.; without amendment (Rept. No. 121). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1941. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mateo Oritz Vazquez, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 122). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1943. A bill for the relief of John G. Zeros; without amendment (Rept. No. 123). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1953. A bill for the relief of Virginia Hell; without amendment (Rept. No. 124). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1965. A bill for the relief of Robert Finley Delaney; without amendment (Rept. No. 125). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1971. A bill for the relief of Leila Park; with amendment (Rept. No. 126). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1989. A bill for the relief of George D. Hopper; without amendment (Rept. No. 127). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 1995. A bill for the relief of Mrs. John William Brennan; with amendment (Rept. No. 128). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2057. A bill for the relief of Edwin K. Stanton; without amendment (Rept. No. 129). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2236. A bill for the relief of Mary Rose and Mrs. Alice Rose Spittler; without amendment (Rept. No. 130). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2316. A bill for the relief of Charlie Sylvester Correll; without amendment (Rept. No. 131). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2366. A bill for the relief of Guy H. Davant; without amendment (Rept. No. 132). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Diana P. Kittrell; without amendment (Rept. No. 133). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2486. A bill for the relief of Gronislav Vydaevich and Leonid Zankowsky; with amendment (Rept. No. 134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Albert Vincent, Sr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 135). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2707. A bill for the relief of Terry L. Hatchett; without amendment (Rept. No. 136). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2709. A bill for the relief of the estate of Rene Weil; without amendment (Rept. No. 137). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2736. A bill for the relief of Roy M. Butcher; without amendment (Rept. No. 138). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2760. A bill for the relief of the estate of William B. Rice; with amendment (Rept. No. 139). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2907. A bill for the relief of Thomas F. Harney, Jr., doing business as the Harney Engineering Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 140). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 2936. A bill for the relief of Clifford Oesterlei; without amendment (Rept. No. 141). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3031. A bill for the relief of Paul Nelson; with amendment (Rept. No. 142). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3045. A bill for the relief of George L. F. Allen; without amendment (Rept. No. 143). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3054. A bill for the relief of Allen Pope, his heirs or personal representatives; with amendment (Rept. No. 144). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3178. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport; without amendment (Rept. No. 145). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3281. A bill for the relief of Herbert Roscoe Martin; with amendment (Rept. No. 146). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3506. A bill for the relief of Lillian Schlossberg; with amendment (Rept. No. 147). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3512. A bill for the relief of Gunther H. Hahn; without amendment (Rept. No. 148). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3638. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Washburn; without amendment (Rept. No. 149). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3957. A bill for the relief of Pauline H. Corbett; with amendment (Rept. No. 150). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4191. A bill conferring jurisdiction

upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims of Roderick D. Strawn; without amendment (Rept. No. 151). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4288. A bill for the relief of the law firm of Harrington and Graham; with amendment (Rept. No. 152). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LANE: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 4320. A bill for the relief of Guerdon Plumley; without amendment (Rept. No. 153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mrs. PFOST:

H. R. 4719. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 4720. A bill to provide incentives for members of the uniformed services by increasing certain pays and allowances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 4721. A bill to create a distinguished decoration to be known as the Washington Order of Merit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BROYHILL:

H. R. 4722. A bill to amend the Public Building Act of 1949 so as to eliminate the 1-year limitation on the period of leases of space for Federal agencies in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4723. A bill to amend the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 removing authorization of projects by the Secretary of Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 4724. A bill to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER:

H. R. 4725. A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED of New York:

H. R. 4726. A bill to repeal sections 452 and 462 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRETELLA:

H. R. 4727. A bill to permit the issuance of a flag to a friend or associate of the deceased veteran where it is not claimed by the next of kin; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 4728. A bill making unauthorized wiretapping a criminal offense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE:

H. R. 4729. A bill to designate the lake created by the Fall River Reservoir, in the State of Kansas, as Lake Meyer; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon:

H. R. 4730. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 4731. A bill relating to the tax treatment to be afforded under section 117 (j) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 in certain cases involving the sale, exchange, or conversion of land with unharvested crops thereon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H. R. 4732. A bill to provide for jury trials in condemnation proceedings in United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 4733. A bill to incorporate the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H. R. 4734. A bill to amend the provisions of the River and Harbor Act of 1954 which authorize the Secretary of the Army to reimburse local interests for work done on a dredging project at Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors, Calif., during a period ending on July 1, 1953, by extending that period of November 7, 1953; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 4735. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide annuities for widows of certain former Federal employees who had rendered 25 years of service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LOVRE:

H. R. 4736. A bill to enlarge and extend the special school milk program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McCORMACK (by request):

H. R. 4737. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide for retirement of certain officers and employees involuntarily separated from positions excepted from the classified civil service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 4738. A bill to provide for the recognition of the Polish Legion of American Veterans by the Secretary of Defense and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 4739. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. METCALF:

H. R. 4740. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

H. R. 4741. A bill to encourage the prevention of air and water pollution by allowing the cost of treatment works for the abatement of air and stream pollution to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 4742. A bill to amend the Classification Act of 1949 with respect to the exclusion of crafts, trades, and labor positions therefrom; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 4743. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 4744. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 4745. A bill to provide for national cemeteries in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin:

H. R. 4746. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STEED:

H. R. 4747. A bill to provide that reversionary interests of the United States in certain lands formerly conveyed to the city of Chandler, Okla., shall be quitclaimed to such city; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana:

H. R. 4748. A bill to amend the rice marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. UDALL:

H. R. 4749. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. R. 4750. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education for the education of any dependent of such individual; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H. R. 4751. A bill to increase from $600 to $700 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemption for old age or blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 4752. A bill to extend coverage under the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system to individuals engaged in the practice of dentistry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VELDE:

H. R. 4753. A bill to amend subsection (e) (1) of section 13A of the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to change from 2 years to 3 years the standard contained therein with respect to the past affiliations of individuals conducting the management of certain organizations; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 4754. A bill to redefine eligibility for membership in AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS:

H. R. 4755. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4756. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 4757. A bill to amend the tobacco marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. CHURCH:

H. J. Res. 247. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to appropriations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. J. Res. 248. Joint resolution to provide tax equity through the taxation of cooperative corporations and to provide tax credits for recipients of dividends from genuine cooperatives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 93. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document 210 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H. Res. 168. Resolution to create a select committee to determine the extent to which

individuals and business enterprises in the United States have lost earnings as a result of the reciprocal-trade program; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to timberland in the Coconino and Sitgreaves National Forests in Arizona; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the appropriation of sufficient Federal funds to be set aside as an emergency fund for Indian relief and welfare of all kinds to be used during the period of adjustment when the United States Government shall withdraw from the field of providing medical, hospital, and other welfare and security needs of the ward Indians of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the long- and short-haul clause of section 4 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the land-acquisition program in the Missouri River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolution were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 4758. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Annie Genser Tritt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN of Illinois:

H. R. 4759. A bill for the relief of Clarence Maxwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAKER:

H. R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Lonnie E. Spangler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BASS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 4761. A bill for the relief of Miss Sayoko Fujimoto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUDGE:

H. R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Antonio Aberasturi Cigorraga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEMPSEY:

H. R. 4763. A bill for the relief of Elzie C. Brown; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4764. A bill for the relief of Arthur Ronald Tower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H. R. 4765. A bill for the relief of William Patrick Flood; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4766. A bill for the relief of James C. H. Paulson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4767. A bill for the relief of Henry G. Mathusek; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. R. 4768. A bill for the relief of Gino Filippelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H. R. 4769. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Barbara (Pearson) Boycott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H. R. 4770. A bill for the relief of Alexandros Kallimanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. R. 4771. A bill for the relief of David Ajuelo, Mrs. Roza Ajuelo, Victoria Ajuelo, and Lizet Ajuelo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4772. A bill for the relief of Atara Couse Headley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4773. A bill for the relief of Philip Cooperman, Aron Shriro, and Samuel Stackman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H. R. 4774. A bill for the relief of Francis Gerbis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN (by request):

H. R. 4775. A bill for the relief of Charles Lang, otherwise known as Lum Sing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

142. Mr. HAYS of Arkansas presented a petition of Carl Olsson and other employees of the Corps of Engineers, Little Rock, Ark., urging approval of an increase in the general schedule of salary rate of at least 10 percent for Federal employees which was referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Thomas G. Masaryk—World Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT D. HARRISON

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HARRISON of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, on March 7, 1850, Thomas G. Masaryk was born.

The world was busy that year. Jenny Lind, the Swedish Nightingale, was giving her first American concert. California was admitted as a State. Senator Henry Clay was striving to bring together the rapidly dividing interests of the North and the South.

But, to the world, nothing that happened in 1850 was more important than the birth of this one child.

Thomas Masaryk might have gone down in history as a great organizer. It was through his dedicated efforts that the diverse peoples of Czechoslovakia were welded into one.

Thomas Masaryk might have had his name graven among the great as a scholar. The brilliance of his pen produced books which will, long after his death, be praised as outstanding contributions to the science of politics.

Thomas Masaryk might have been forever known as a prophet. It was he who said, "A Communist is only a Czarist with his uniform on wrong side out."

But, to me, Thomas Masaryk was more than an organizer, more than a scholar; even more than a prophet.

He was a patriot who lived with his people; for his people. He was a lover of liberty who extended the hand of enduring friendship to all men who loved freedom, irrespective of their breed or their birth.

Thomas G. Masaryk was—and is—a hero of the world.

Tuition Expenses Should Be Deductible

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide an income tax deduction for amounts paid as tuition or fees to public and private institutions of higher education for the education of any dependent of such individuals.

This is a matter of tax justice which should be carried through by this Congress at the earliest practicable time. The average taxpayer can generally provide for his family until he faces the high and ever-increasing costs of higher education for his dependents, over and above the normal expenses of support. While higher education and training for dependents may be a matter of personal pride for the taxpayer—it is also a matter of investment in human life which pays fruitful dividends to the whole economy.

Higher education and training makes for a more useful citizen—in every respect. Not only is the educated or trained dependent more productive—but through such increased productivity he earns more income and pays more income taxes. Therefore, the entire national economy is benefited by the development of its most important resource—its young people. Taxpayers who contribute and help in this important way are certainly entitled to a tax deduction for the costs of education and training for their dependents. We should give the taxpayer credit for his contribution to the national wealth. When a taxpayer educates his dependent, he does so for the benefit of the entire American economy.

Family life is the very bulwark of our democracy—a fact which should be recognized in our tax structure. The family as our most cherished institution must not be allowed to suffer through present tax inequities.

We must recognize that the wealth of the Nation is more in its people than in its atoms. We must help the family develop the latent I. Q.'s buried under N. S. F.—not sufficient funds.

A New Look at Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the press has recently told of this year's A-bomb tests at the Nevada proving grounds of the Atomic Energy Commission. I was privileged to witness one of the previous tests. It is an awesome and unforgetable experience. I dread the day that we are faced with atomic warfare. Though we will be prepared due to the work of the AEC and the Department of Defense, nevertheless it is a terrible thing to contemplate. Worse still is radioactive fallout which according to the AEC report of February 15 had added a new dimension to atomic warfare.

What is radioactive fallout—and how is it brought about? Here is what happens: When an H-bomb goes off, the explosive force is so great and the fireball so huge—sometimes 4 miles in diameter—that great quantities of pulverized material are scooped up in the tremendous blast. They become impregnated with deadly radioactivity. This dust then is carried downwind from the explosion and is deposited over a cigar-shaped area which in last year's Pacific test extended 220 miles and was 40 miles wide.

As my constituents know, Adm. Lewis Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, stated that the radioactive fallout of bombs such as were used in the Pacific tests last year will extend over an area as large as New Jersey—more than 7,000 square miles. If no preventive measures are taken or if the people do not know what to do to protect themselves, casualties would be inflicted upon more than 90 percent of the population and some 45 percent of these casualties would probably be fatal. The situation is not hopeless because there is much that we can do. If we take cover either in a building or in a shelter, preferably covered by 3 feet of earth, we have a good chance of surviving. Radioactive substance also can be washed off. The difficult task is to determine where the radioactivity is because it is invisible and odorless. To meet this problem the Federal Government and our States and cities will have to provide monitoring instruments—Geiger counters—to civil-defense workers, fire and police stations, and probably to high-school science instructors. On the encouraging side, New Jersey has been in the forefront of the States that have had a good civil-defense organization. Gov. Robert B. Meyner has been briefed by the top people in the Government including the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the FCDA Administrator on the importance of the civil-defense program. Newark has budgeted $157,409 for civil defense, including approximately $84,000 which is matched by Federal funds for the purchase of equipment for warning systems and for stockpiling emergency supplies. By July 1 of this year over $130 million worth of medical supplies and other equipment will be stockpiled for civil defense use. Some of these medical supplies and other equipment is available for use in case of attack in the FCDA warehouse at Somerville, N. J.

In concluding these remarks I call your attention to the following words of Gov. Val Peterson, FCDA Administrator, before the Kefauver Subcommittee on Civil Defense during its present hearings:

> As I see it, the need for civil defense will continue until one of these two conditions prevails: until we are satisfied that man has been able to develop a permanent, secure peace; or until our Military Establishment is able to guarantee that no enemy can make an attack on this country. I am afraid that neither of these two conditions will be fulfilled for many, many years to come. Consequently, as long as there are weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them—in other words, as long as we need a military defense—we will need a civil defense.
>
> Lest there be any misunderstanding, I should like to make it clear that the military efforts to build strength to deter attack, or if it comes to defend our homeland, are most important contributions to civil defense. The successful military defense of a city is the best type of civil defense—and I am convinced that our military leaders are doing everything humanly possible to build the required strength. But since we are assured that no defense can be perfect that enough bombers may be expected to penetrate our defenses to pose staggering problems of destruction, we in turn must spare no effort to build a strong civil defense.

The 105th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a tribute to a great and worthy man, whose very life exemplified the highest ideals and traditions, I call attention to the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, the father of the Czechoslovak Republic. It is only fitting that we here in America should note this anniversary because the Communist masters of Masaryk's homeland have banned any celebration, as did the Nazis before them. And why? Simply because they know that as long as the name of Masaryk lives in Czechoslovakia their rule is insecure. The spirit of Masaryk is the spirit of belief in the individual, of tolerance, of respect for truth and hatred of insincerity, and of belief in one's Creator. No dictatorship in the world can permit these truths to flourish and itself long endure.

Even in his personal life Masaryk can serve as an inspiration. He was born to a low station in life, but raised himself to a position of eminence by hard work and perseverance. Yet he never hesitated to jeopardize that hard-won standing by embracing causes that he believed to be right, regardless of popular or official opposition. He was undismayed in defeat, and magnanimous in victory.

A true friend of the United States, he created a Czechoslovakia that was an embodiment of the democratic ideal. We regret profoundly that this anniversary cannot be honored in his own land. The world needs more men like Thomas G. Masaryk.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the consideration of legislation to increase the minimum wage from 75 cents per hour to $1.25 per hour, I include in my remarks certain information prepared for me by a reliable source.

The information follows:

Number and classes of employees covered under Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949 and number and classes not covered or are exempted

	Covered and not exempted	Not covered or are exempted	Total
Manufacturing	15,448,000	683,000	16,131,000
Mining	747,000	21,000	768,000
Construction	614,000	1,951,000	2,565,000
Wholesaling	1,693,000	846,000	2,539,000
Retailing	230,000	6,698,000	6,928,000
Finance, insurance, real estate	1,048,000	744,000	1,792,000
Transportation, communication, and utilities	3,441,000	515,000	3,956,000
Miscellaneous	741,000	3,447,000	4,188,000
Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries	14,000	3,052,000	3,066,000
Domestic service		2,021,000	2,021,000
Total	23,976,000	19,978,000	43,954,000

Source: Department of Labor.

The Fair Labor Standards Act applies, with certain sizable exceptions, to all employees engaged in interstate commerce or in the production of goods for interstate commerce, without regard to size of firm or whether the employee works in factory, office, or at home.

Coverage under the wage-hour provisions deals with the worker individually, rather than with the employing establishment; if the individual's work is in interstate commerce and his job is not exempt, he is covered regardless of the basic nature of the business. Many firms employ both covered and noncovered workers on the same premises.

Exemptions in the act exclude about half of the workers in interstate commerce who would otherwise be eligible. White-collar jobs—executive, administrative, professional, and outside selling jobs—are specifically excluded. Employees in retail or service establishments where more than 50 percent of the annual dollar volume of sales is made within the State are exempted. Also exempt are certain cannery workers and food processors,

workers in logging if the total number of employees does not exceed 12, certain agricultural workers and handlers of agricultural products within the area of production, certain employees of the fishing and maritime industries, workers on small county newspapers, and switchboard operators at exchanges with fewer than 750 stations.

The law permits payment of subminimum rates to learners, apprentices, messengers, and handicapped persons in protected employment. It sets no monetary rates for these categories but authorizes the Wage-Hour Administrator to approve pay scales lower than 75 cents an hour through certification of a limited number of subminimum workers to the extent necessary in order to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment.

HOW IS ENFORCEMENT OF THE ACT SUPERVISED?

Enforcement is in charge of an administrator who has a staff of employees in Washington. The continental United States is divided into 10 regions, each under the supervision of a regional director. The territories embraced by the regional offices are as follows:

Boston: Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

New York: New Jersey and New York.

Philadelphia: Delaware, Maryland, and Pennsylvania.

Birmingham: Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina.

Cleveland: Michigan and Ohio.

Chicago: Illinois, Indiana, Minnesota, and Wisconsin.

Kansas City: Colorado, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming.

Dallas: Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

San Francisco: Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Utah, and Washington.

Nashville: Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia.

In North Carolina enforcement is under the supervision of the State Labor Department under a cooperative agreement. The same arrangement is true with respect to approximately one-half of the counties in Minnesota.

In addition to the continental regional offices there are Territorial offices in Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. Field offices under the jurisdiction of the regional offices are located in almost every State.

The actual number of investigators throughout the States and Territories at present fluctuates between 480 and 500. The investigators have authority under the statute to enter places of business, examine books and records and to interview employers and employees to determine whether the statute is being violated.

The remedies available where violations are found are:

1. Suits for injunctions to prevent future violations.
2. Criminal prosecution.
3. Suits by the Secretary of Labor to recover unpaid wages when such suits are requested by employees.
4. Suits by employees themselves to recover double the amount of unpaid wages.

Number of employees and number of violations for each of the last 8 fiscal years

Fiscal year	Employees	Violations
1947	1,509	20,570
1948	1,131	15,799
1949	1,110	18,180
1950	1,253	13,446
1951	1,821	18,908
1952	1,618	24,321
1953	1,375	22,186
1954	1,046	20,694

Source: Department of Labor.

Capitol Cloakroom Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT S. KERR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] appeared on the CBS radio program Capitol Cloakroom on March 6, discussing various issues before the Congress and the Nation at this time. Inasmuch as the Senator's statements shed considerable light upon several of these issues, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the program Capitol Cloakroom be printed in the RECORD.

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

CAPITOL CLOAKROOM

Guest: The Honorable RUSSELL B. LONG, Democratic Senator from Louisiana.

CBS correspondents: Griffing Bancroft, Wells Church, Paul Niven.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, will this Congress reduce income taxes?

Mr. CHURCH. Can tariffs be lowered any more without hurting American industry?

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, will the South go Democratic in 1956?

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, welcome to Capitol Cloakroom. A lawyer, and youngest man in the United States Senate, you have been here now for 5 years, where you are a member of the Senate Finance Committee which this week has been busy with taxes and tariffs.

Let's start with the first: Will this Congress reduce personal income taxes?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, it is impossible to give you an answer for that. All I can tell you is that we will make a very strong effort to do it on the Democratic side of the aisle.

Right now I suspect we are a few votes shy of what we need in the United States Senate to put through the kind of amendment that the House adopted. I hope that we can gain more votes there, as the fight develops. I believe we have a good case to make for income-tax relief for the average individual. And, of course, I am going to support the kind of relief that the House voted for that the average man would have $20 tax relief, $20 more for his wife and $20 more for each child. For example, a family of 5 would have tax relief of $100 on their income tax.

Mr. BANCROFT. I know, Senator LONG, you were one of those who supported that in the Finance Committee, and were outvoted. Do you think there is a possibility that you can get it through the Senate when it comes up on the floor?

Senator LONG. I do not believe in giving up a fight before you have tried. I believe that we have a good case to make.

This type of tax relief would help to relieve unemployment. At the present time we have 3,350,000 people unemployed, and, incidentally, the press has not noticed particularly that unemployment increased 500,000 from December until January of this year. Those figures are too high in terms of unemployment, and I believe we are losing a tremendous amount of wealth in terms of national production by failure to give some tax relief in the ways of increasing purchasing power among the great masses of our people.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I would like to ask this:

In view of the fact that there are stories and reports going along that you supporters of this $20 tax cut are engaged in stalling the bill—we do not know for sure, it is apparently not coming up on the floor of the Senate until late next week at the earliest; when will that bill come up on the floor, and is there any deliberate stalling on the part of you supporters of it?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, there is no deliberate stalling as far as those of us supporting the tax cut are concerned. But we do want some time to get together the facts and figures upon which we buttress our case.

Now, I have been just today consulting with other minority members on that committee. I say minority, we are part of the majority, we are a majority of the Democratic majority, but the two Democrats voting with the Republicans give them a majority on that committee because Republicans vote solidly against this tax cut. We want that bill to come up. We want to make our fight just as we did last year to see to it that the average individual gets some tax relief because we believe it is in the overall interest of this Nation.

I would like to point this out in connection with this tax relief. We supported last year efforts to reduce taxes in the low-income bracket, and we were defeated by the Republican majority at that time both in the House and in the United States Senate. Now there was some income tax relief. However, it did not reflect itself where it was needed the most, because the increase in social security tax was even greater than the reduction in personal income tax as far as anybody making $3,500 or less was concerned. That meant that more than 50 percent of the people of this Nation really had no tax relief at all because the increase in social security more than offset what the reduction was in their personal income tax.

Mr. CHURCH. But, Senator, what about the Republican charge, as I understand it, that this tax cut will be just enough to cause sufficient inflation to more than wipe it out in some instances, the value of the dollar?

Senator LONG. Mr. Church, a man ought to be ashamed to make argument if he knows what the real facts are.

Last year against a previous budget deficit of $9 billion and a budget deficit of last year that turned out to be $4.5 billion, the administration was willing to go along with $7 billion of tax relief.

Now, for this coming year, we are told that the budget deficit would be only half as much, about $2.5 billion. So, without as much budget deficit, we are now told that it would be inflation to give just $2 billion of tax relief, or one-third as much.

Mr. CHURCH. But the Republicans say that is predicated on the Congress cutting expenditures in this next year.

Senator LONG. The point was that we had a deficit last year twice as big as we will have for this coming year and in spite of that $7 billion of tax relief did not produce any inflation at all.

The $7 billion, however, for the most part, went to the corporations and those who were better fixed financially. Now we want to give about one-third that much tax relief to the people, and there is no reason to think that would be any more inflationary than it was when the $7 billion was given to those who are better fixed economically.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, I presume you have been getting some mail on those proposals. Do your constituents seem interested in this $20? Do they regard it as a political maneuver or are they just bored by it?

Senator LONG. Mr. Niven, the press has made great effort to convince the people that the Democrats are just playing politics by trying to give the average individual $20 tax relief, per person. However, the average person feels that both Democrats and

Republicans play politics, and I believe that if you want to be fair and you ask the man on the street—I do not mean the businessman, I mean the average little fellow who is working for a living by the sweat of his brow—he will probably tell you it was Republican politics when the Republicans gave tax relief to the corporations, and perhaps Democratic politics, when the Democrats tried to give tax relief to the average man.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, you mentioned having gotten licked last year, and last year you had, I think we will all concede, a pretty big asset on tax matters over here in the Senate on your side, in the person of Senator GEORGE, and Senator GEORGE is against you this year. Do you still think with that opposition that you are going to get this bill through the Senate?

Senator LONG. Fortunately, after the people got through hearing the argument about the taxes last year, they elected more Democrats and, therefore, our hand is somewhat strengthened in that regard.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator GEORGE—to come back to him for a moment—while he said he opposed this, has talked about the possibility of a compromise if the House stands firm in its insistence on the $20 cut. Do you look for some possible compromise to come out of this thing, assuming you may get licked on the floor of the Senate?

Senator LONG. It is certainly my hope that the House conferees will stand their ground to the very last. If they will, I believe that there should be some sort of compromise.

For my part, I am ready to agree with the President, or anyone else, that there is no reason why we should reduce the corporation tax at this time. The corporations got relief last year on their dividends from taxation, and they got all sorts of handouts that are too complicated and too lengthy to explain here. But, if you read that 875-page bill, it was almost like an Easter egg hunt for golden nuggets, as far as a corporation executive was concerned.

Now, looking into this next year, it is only fair to say that their corporation stock is now at an all-time high. It has never been that high, even in 1929. Particularly, large corporations are concerned. They are not entitled at this time to expect any further tax relief, and we should extend that corporation tax for a while longer.

The Democrats will go along with the Republicans on that part of it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator Long, suppose it comes to a question of choosing one or the other, and I have in mind there is the possibility of the President vetoing a bill which might combine the two of them. Would you then go along for an extension of the corporation and the excise taxes alone, as he has asked?

Senator LONG. I suppose if we are successful in getting a bill to the President that would reduce taxes for the average individual, that we would stand our ground if the President vetoed the bill. I do not think he would veto it. I do not think he could afford to do it, for many reasons: politically, morally, and many others.

Mr. NIVEN. But you surely could not get two-thirds of the votes to override the veto, could you?

Senator LONG. No; we could not get two-thirds of the votes to override the veto; that would be correct.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I know in your Finance Committee you are involved in another problem now, this week, and this was the question that Mr. Church has asked you about the tariff bill:

What do you think is going to happen to that over here in the Senate?

Senator LONG. I believe we will report out substantially the bill that was sent to us by the House of Representatives. I suspect that there will be some amendments adopted in the Senate committee. I cannot predict just what those amendments will be, but I see that there are quite a few Senators who are receptive to one suggestion or another on that committee, and I would expect that there would be a few amendments drafted over in the Senate committee, in addition to those that were adopted in the House.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think those amendments would take the form of broadening the so-called escape clause, to make it easier for certain industries to get out of tax reductions or tariff reductions?

Senator LONG. I would not be surprised to see an amendment offered that would gain substantial support, along the line of saying that the President could not reverse the judgment of the Tariff Commission if the Tariff Commission recommended protection for domestic industry.

As you know, the President has reversed the Tariff Commission more often than he has upheld the Tariff Commission, when the Tariff Commission has recommended that the escape clause be invoked to protect some domestic industry.

I see substantial support for that, and I just cannot predict what the result will be when that amendment comes to a vote.

Mr. CHURCH. If I follow you correctly, Senator LONG, it sounds to me as though there might be an equally close shave in the Senate as in the House.

Senator LONG. It might very well be that way. As a matter of fact, on the floor of the House of Representatives the rule was that Members could not offer amendments. They could only offer one proposal to recommit the bill to consider one particular amendment.

Now in the United States Senate no one would ever agree to such a thing. As you know, we have this rule of unlimited debate. As long as someone wants to continue to fight, he has the right to stand there and be heard.

We have some Senators, I won't call any names right here, but I have some in mind, who very well might stand and talk at great length about that bill and offer an untold number of amendments. Some of those amendments may be adopted.

Mr. CHURCH. Is there chance for enough amendments to ruin the bill, that is, ruin it in the eyes of the President in what appears to be a Democratic majority in favor of the bill?

Senator LONG. I think that as far as the administration is concerned, they will have a good chance to regain whatever ground they lost in the Senate in conference because the conferees, for the most part, are either Republicans who have pretty well stayed with the President on most issues, or Democrats who believe in expanding trade, if you look at the senior Democrats and senior Republicans on the Finance Committee, so it is possible that the President may gain coming back from conference what he might lose on the Senate floor if a substantial number of amendments were agreed to there.

It is sort of like the man being chased by the bear. He jumps for a limb on a tree. A friend said, "Did you catch the limb?" He said, "I missed it on the way up, but I caught it on the way down."

Mr. NIVEN. Senator, once you start accepting amendments, surely the meat would be knocked out of it completely in a very short time, would it not?

Senator LONG. I do not believe that the committee will recommend accepting any amendments. I think the committee, for the most part, will stay together in trying to beat off amendments that are offered on the floor. Usually the Finance Committee has done that in the past. As a matter of fact, the Senate Finance Committee has a rather good record under Democratic leadership of defeating amendments. I recall on more than one occasion when Senator GEORGE was the chairman of the Finance Committee in which he was successful in getting the committee to stick together and beat off as many as 200 amendments without a single one being adopted. I would not be surprised to see that sort of thing work out again if the committee sticks together.

Mr. NIVEN. Will the committee stick together even in the case of amendments designed to help industries in their home States?

Senator LONG. There will be more difficulty in that case.

Mr. CHURCH. There were some 75 Members of the House, as I recall it, who had industries in their own State which caused them to go against the bill. How about your own State, Do you have anything down there that would make you worry about this bill?

Senator LONG. I have some individuals in my State who are interested in amendments to the bill. I do not expect to support many such amendments because I believe that most of those industries are getting along reasonably well and, after all, although this bill gives the President the authority to reduce tariff 5 percent each year or to reduce tariff on items where there is only a negligible amount being imported at the present time by as much as 50 percent, that is not mandatory upon the President. It is only anticipated that he would reduce the tariffs in the cases where he finds that American industries would not be too adversely affected.

Many of the industries that complain the most bitterly about this matter really cannot show that they are badly hurt or that they would be badly hurt by expanding foreign trade and permitting a few more imports to come into this Nation.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I would like to ask this if it has any bearing on the support of you southerners for this tariff-reduction bill, and that is the matter of the textile industry. As you know, the New England textile Senators are mostly lining up in opposition to this on the ground that it will definitely hurt their textile industry. But I have heard some of you southerners say that a little reduction in tariff might encourage even more movement of the textile industry from New England down South and, therefore, might help your industry. Is there anything to that?

Senator LONG. Mr. Bancroft, looking at the whole picture, we cannot expect everything to be in our favor in this foreign trade picture. You cannot expect to get everything from others without giving something in return.

Now in good years we can sell as much as 50 percent of our cotton to other countries, and they consume that cotton within those countries and I suppose they process most of it there.

We do have some textile imports coming back into this country, but the last figure that I saw on it indicated that we are actually shipping out more manufactured textile products than we are importing. So, what are we complaining about? I cannot see that there is any great reason to feel that the textile industry is being very badly injured.

Now, there has been some reduction in employment in textile industries but, for the most part, that has been because of the improvement in their machinery and increased productivity of their working people.

I think I receive about as much mail from textile workers in my State as almost any other one thing. But I believe that if we are efficient, as you suggest, and we continue to improve our ways of doing business, that we should be able to meet a slightly stiffened competition from abroad, and we should try to expand our textile market just as others try to expand their export to us.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, is anyone in your party contemplating plans for Federal

aid to communities which might face severe distress because of foreign competition, conceivably, for instance, a one-industry town which was going to be injured by foreign competition to take a loan from the Government in order to retool its factories, switch to another field?

Senator LONG. I do not know of any such proposal as that that is being advanced with much support at the present time, Mr. Niven. As a matter of fact, I do not know of any proposal of that sort pending at the moment. There might be.

I have, myself, thought that we should try to work out some way to compensate some of those who are genuinely injured as a result of tariff reductions. I particularly have that in mind when the President reverses the recommendation of the Tariff Commission for relief. Nevertheless, it is so difficult to work out a practicable plan to protect all those who are injured or to help those who are injured in so many different connections. For example, you might help the man who owns the plant, but then the laborers lose their jobs, how are you going to compensate them? The best thing you can do for them is to help them find a job somewhere else. The result is that no one really has anything worked out, that I know of, to help those who might be injured as a result of increased foreign competition.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, there are some other points in the President's overall program, as I understand it, to increase world trade. One of them is stepping up the so-called point 4 program, and another to grant some sort of tax relief for American business investments overseas. Are you in favor of those things in addition to the tariff relief?

Senator LONG. For the most part, Congress is getting rather weary of these foreign giveaway programs. I believe the tendency will be to reduce them, rather than give more in the future.

This economic aid has been going on for so long now that a lot of people would like to get out of the business. Congress, for the most part, will vote to reduce those things.

Insofar as the tax reductions for those doing business overseas are concerned, I would prefer to be selective and try to determine where we want to encourage additional investments or who we want to help and perhaps write into trade agreements if those people have a general increase in their living standards, that we would be willing to reduce our own tariff to help them to continue to sell on the American market. I have that in mind, especially in Central American countries, where many people are only making about 5 cents an hour for their labor. I think that just tends to encourage communism and things of that sort. However, I do not know whether you can attract much support for that sort of proposal.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, you supported the Stevenson ticket in 1952, but the South was anything but solid. Is it going to go Democratic again in 1956?

Senator LONG. Yes; I believe the prospects are very good for the South going solidly Democratic the next time. I would not be surprised to see every Southern State go Democratic. I said that some time ago, and I see nothing in what has happened during the past 2 years to change my mind about it. I would be inclined to think that you will see the South go together. We have been able to resolve many of these party fights during the last 2 years. We have had very good leadership; we have not fought nearly as bitterly. We have divided on some issues, but it has not been nearly as pronounced or bitter as it has been in years gone by. For that reason, I think the South will be inclined to go back solidly for the Democratic ticket next time.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, is this prediction of the South going Democratic based on the assumption that President Eisenhower will be the candidate for the Republicans in 1956?

Senator LONG. Yes; that is based on that assumption. As a matter of fact, I have seen various polls that have been made in my own State that would indicate that there is far stronger sentiment today for the Democrats than there was at the last election, even assuming that Eisenhower would be the candidate.

Mr. BANCROFT. Well, of course, your State of Louisiana went against Eisenhower in 1952.

Senator LONG. We carried it, with difficulty. We carried it by about 40,000 votes, which is not a safe majority when you are polling about 750,000.

Mr. BANCROFT. In other words, you think President Eisenhower is less popular in the South now than he was in 1952?

Senator LONG. That is correct. It is not so much a matter of Eisenhower being less popular; it is a matter of the Democrats as a party, being more popular.

We had many burdens to carry at that time. It was difficult to explain a lot of things that were complicated. A lot of people tried to blame the Democrats for the various burdens that we had to carry during the Korean war, and things of that sort. I think that the next go-around, not having been in power for 4 years, we will be in better shape than we were, having been in power for 20 years.

Mr. NIVEN. Senator LONG, you said a moment ago that your party has avoided a fight in the last couple of years. Perhaps you made a distinction as to other parties. But, do you have reason to believe that the Northern liberals are going to let the race issue and the civil-rights issue lie dormant between now and the election?

Senator LONG. I do not know precisely what moves may be made by our Northern liberal friends, but I believe, on the whole, that they have been willing to join with us on those things that Democrats can unitedly support. And as long as we continue that trend, I believe there is every reason to believe the South should be more happy with the Democratic Party and more anxious to support it.

Mr. NIVEN. Then you do not expect a strong civil rights plan in the 1956 platform in your party?

Senator LONG. I expect a civil rights platform similar to the one we had last time. I do think the Southern Democrats will be somewhat helped in keeping their States in the Democratic column, however, because of the fact it is now clear that the Republican Party is not for the Southern position on civil rights. They are just as much opposed to our position, perhaps, as the Northern Democrats. But that always took a lot of explaining down South and kept some of us very much on the defensive when we were urging some of the people to vote Democratic before.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, this prediction of yours about the South was based on the assumption that President Eisenhower would be the Republican candidate. I would like to ask you if we could take the other assumption that Adlai Stevenson will be the Democratic candidate?

Senator LONG. It is possible that Adlai Stevenson would be, and he would be a good candidate. But at this time I would not be at all prepared to concede Adlai Stevenson would be the Democratic candidate. I think he would run a very good race and stand a very good chance of winning if he were the candidate. However, I think there are other possibilities who might run just as strongly and perhaps a stronger race.

Mr. CHURCH. Could you name some of them?

Senator LONG. I would rather not do it. I have some in mind, but I do not want to suggest any of them. I would rather let them put themselves forth rather than me to advance their candidacies.

Mr. CHURCH. You do agree that the President will run again?

Senator LONG. I do not agree he will run again. I do not know. I cannot speak for him.

Mr. CHURCH. That is what I understood you to say a moment ago.

Senator LONG. Well, I believe if he runs the South will go solidly Democratic, and I believe the Democrats will have a——

Mr. NIVEN. Is there likely to be a southerner in the race for the Democratic nomination?

Senator LONG. I would certainly hope so, being a southerner myself. I am rather proud of our representation from the South. I would certainly hope that we would have some good southerners offer themselves.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think Senator RUSSELL would run again?

Senator LONG. He said he would not. He is a man of his word, and if he said it, he means it.

Mr. BANCROFT. Let me ask you this about yourself: Your term is coming up in 1956. Are you a candidate for the United States Senate next year?

Senator LONG. Well, there is quite a bit of local politics in Louisiana at the present time. I have indicated that I might be a candidate for governor. I have not at all decided that. I think we had better let first things be decided first, and I cannot tell you whether or not I will run for Governor of Louisiana at the present time. Therefore, I could not tell you whether I would be a candidate for the Senate as yet.

Mr. BANCROFT. Could you say that you would be a candidate for one or the other?

Senator LONG. I would rather not answer that question quite that way. I would prefer to decide a little bit later on what my position will be, as far as offering myself for office is concerned.

Mr. NIVEN. Would you exclude retirement from your plan?

Senator LONG. I do not necessarily exclude it, but I would rather leave that to the public to decide.

Mr. CHURCH. You do enjoy being in the United States Senate?

Senator LONG. I have enjoyed it very much, Mr. Church.

Mr. BANCROFT. Coming back to some of the problems in the United States Senate, we have mentioned some of your problems on the Finance Committee. You are also a member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which has this problem of statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

What is going to happen to that in this session of Congress?

Senator LONG. I wish I could predict. I was one of those who supported the President's position that Hawaii should become a State because it had been ready for some time, and Alaska was not ready for statehood. Last year the Democrats were successful in adding an amendment that would put the Alaskan statehood bill in with the Hawaiian statehood bill. You had to vote for both of them or none. Therefore, I voted for statehood for both Alaska and Hawaii.

It looks as though there is not much chance for separating those bills, and so I suppose we will pass such a bill through the Senate again, if we get a chance to consider it.

Mr. CHURCH. Both of them?

Senator LONG. There are some machinations about this legislative mill. For exam-

ple, there is the Rules Committee over there on the House side. If there are any differences of opinion between the leaders on the House side, sometimes they won't let the House vote on it. That is what happened to the statehood bill last time. It might be the fate this time.

Mr. NIVEN. Why are most southerners opposed to the admission of Hawaii and Alaska?

Senator LONG. They can make many arguments, and I would prefer to believe that they are 100 percent sincere in saying that they believe that we shouldn't broaden the representation of this Nation, and that we would be a stronger Nation if we limited ourselves to the continental United States and did not take in outlying areas.

Personally, I believe that we would be a greater country if we did take those areas in.

Mr. NIVEN. Other motives are sometimes ascribed to them, aren't they?

Senator LONG. Oh, yes; there are some that say southerners feel it would be two more votes for FEPC or two more votes to make southerners quit talking when you try to reduce States rights.

I do not think that necessarily would be the case. I am inclined to think that the new States would be even more jealous of their States' rights than existing States.

Mr. BANCROFT. Senator LONG, I know one matter you have taken considerable interest around here in is the matter of civil defense. What do you think Congress ought to do about civil defense?

Senator LONG. About 10 times what we have done. A tremendous number of lives could be saved if we would make some plans to alert the people to the kind of measures that could be taken to save their lives in the event of an atomic attack. Just to give you an example, if you had an atom bomb, let's take a hydrogen bomb, the huge kind that could explode on one of our cities, while that might kill everyone within 5 or 6 miles of the explosion, most people beyond that point would live if they had just a good, deep basement to go into and stay there until the radioactivity of the so-called fallout, the dust that is created by these explosions, had settled and dissipated itself into the atmosphere. But most people would not know that unless you do a better job of educating them. The result is most of them would leave their homes to try to get away, and many of them would be killed as a result of the radioactivity.

Then, too, when those type bombs explode, these clouds of radioactive dust might go as much as three or four hundred miles, dropping the cinders all along the way. A person could be safe from that if he had himself a small cellar, or if he had prepared a little bomb shelter with as much as two feet of dirt over the top of it to protect himself against the radioactivity that would be involved there.

Mr. BANCROFT. Do you think the Federal Government should put up some money to help him do that construction?

Senator LONG. The first thing we ought to do is to tell him what sort of shelter he ought to build. Then I believe it would be good to pass some sort of legislation to make a housing loan to a person, just as you have a title I, FHA, where a person can borrow money to put venetian blinds or a thing of that sort in his home. Perhaps we ought to make them a longer term loan to install a properly specified bomb shelter in their own homes that might save their lives in the event of an atomic disaster. I believe you might save as many as 40 million lives that way if you had the proper type protection from just the radioactivity.

Mr. BANCROFT. I am afraid that is all the time we have. Thank you very much, Senator LONG.

Senator LONG. You are very welcome.

Why the Navy Needs the "Forrestal" Type Aircraft Carrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of the Navy Charles S. Thomas when appearing before the House Armed Services Committee March 7, made the following statement concerning the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program.

While his statement covers the shipbuilding program in general, his reasons as to why the Navy needs additional *Forrestal* type aircraft carriers should be of interest to all persons concerned in that type of a national defense designed to meet any type of aggression that may concern our national security. Secretary Thomas' statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES S. THOMAS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, REGARDING H. R. 4393

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, Admiral Duncan, Admiral Leggett, and I are here today to outline the Navy's fiscal year 1956 shipbuilding program and to give your committee reasons and justifications for it.

At the outset, I wish to note, as indicated in section 2 of H. R. 4393, that the proposed legislation does not grant increased shipbuilding or ship conversion authority to the Navy beyond that already authorized by law. This bill would simply indicate the approval of the committee and the Congress for this specific program. In this bill, the committee would give us a bill of particulars.

On the occasion of my recent appearance before your committee, I stated that President Eisenhower had indicated that the fundamental policy of the Department of Defense (which Admiral Carney, General Shepherd, and I fully and unequivocally support) is to prepare a military program which is adequate, balanced, and long ranged. A program which will prevent war if possible, which will meet a variety of military contingencies and, at the same time, a program which our national economy can support indefinitely.

The naval part of this 1956 program, I feel, meets these demanding requirements, and provides for a strong and balanced Navy and Marine Corps that will have the highest degree of combat readiness and flexibility for discharging our peacetime missions and worldwide commitments, and for carrying out our important tasks if war should occur.

In any size or type of war which can now be foreseen, the need of a strong and adequate United States Navy is more essential than it has ever been before. We must have command of the seas so that we can consolidate our strengths with those of our friends and allies. We must always be able to cross the seas to supply our industrial machine—still the free world's arsenal—with the many critical raw materials we need. We must have a Navy for transporting our armies overseas and for keeping them supplied. We must control the oceans in order to operate and supply our worldwide network of bases. And most important, we must be able to exploit the seas to keep the conflict away from our shores, and to carry the fight into the enemy's own territory.

One of the major and vital parts of that naval program is the procurement and conversion of combat ships. In these days of rapid progress in fields such as atomic propulsion, guided missiles, metallurgy, plastics, and shipbuilding techniques, ordering a combat ship demands much foresight on the part of the planners to insure that the vessels which they design are superior and advanced in the technical, naval, and engineering fields. To provide this superiority, our planners must not only anticipate the period of the ship's construction, as much as 3 or 4 years, but must also calculate the adaptability and potential of each type vessel during its life span of about 20 years.

Moreover, the naval needs of a quarter century in advance must also be foreseen with as much vision and wisdom as we can command. For this difficult task, the best—perhaps the only—parameters are experience, logic, and ingenuity. Careful weighing of the many diverse factors of national strategy, probable naval requirements, technical advancements, budgetary limitations, relationship to other military programs must be taken into account in arriving at a decision.

I assure you that all such factors have been most thoroughly and carefully reviewed by Admiral Carney, Admiral Duncan, and myself, and others in authority, in the presentation of this shipbuilding and conversion program for your consideration. I consider it a vital, sound, and well conceived one. This program also carries the President's approval.

The shipbuilding program for fiscal 1956 can be summarized by reference to four types of ships—the carrier, the cruiser, the destroyer, and the submarine. I will take each one of these in turn.

The Navy is requesting a fifth aircraft carrier of the *Forrestal* type; we are also requesting authority to improve six of our older carriers by conversion.

This carrier program is essential for several reasons. First of all, new carriers are needed as replacements for World War II carriers which are now 13 and 14 years old. A ship has a life of about 20 years, so beginning in 1960 until 1965, we will be reaching the economical limit of their service. This carrier-construction program is a plan to gradually replace our older ships over an extended period.

Secondly, the fleets are now beginning to receive several types of new and larger jet aircraft whose full performance and potential can only be achieved from these modern carrier bases. The new *Forrestals* will have the stronger and larger landing areas, including the angled deck, increased hangar-deck heights, improved steam catapults and faster elevators, stronger arresting gear, and many other new features such as better fire-fighting and damage-control ability. The new families of jet aircraft, such as the A3D, a very advanced attack aircraft weighing 70,000 pounds, the A4D, an equally advanced but light attack aircraft, and several excellent fighter aircraft, such as the F4D and the F9F9, go hand in glove with our newest model carriers which have been specifically designed to operate and accommodate such modern, high performance planes. We are reaching the point, so to speak, where the suit of clothes we bought some 12–15 years ago is getting to be a tight fit for the growing young man of jet naval aviation.

But the most important reason is that our aircraft carriers—which are the key units of our naval task forces—are absolutely essential to the successful execution of our naval missions, and to the security of the country, either in cold war, fringe war, or nuclear war.

In this present period of prolonged tension, the value of having a potent offensive navy, built around our carrier forces, was recently seen in the Tachens operation. In the troubled waters around Formosa—far removed from our normal naval bases, in an

area where our fixed air bases are also limited, and 7,000 miles from our homeland—the importance of having our mobile carrier forces move into the threatened area to reinforce our national policy and to prevent trouble was, I am sure, readily apparent to all. I am confident that the continued presence of our naval task forces in the Formosa area is an effective brake and a great deterrent to the outbreak of general war, giving us time to work diligently for a real peace in the Far East.

The importance of carrier forces during a fringe or local war is best illustrated by the recent Korean war. I will not dwell on this, for I am sure the gentlemen of this committee are very familiar with the 3 years of unremitting and invaluable work which our naval task forces accomplished there. The Navy and Marine Corps flew approximately 183,000 sorties in Korea, totaling 412,000 flying hours from carrier decks.

As for having carriers during an all-out nuclear war, their value and capabilities are even greater. As a matter of fact, I am firmly convinced that a nuclear war would make our carrier forces even more indispensable than they have ever been before.

In a nuclear war, the first task of any air force will be to destroy the opponent's air power at its sources. It is logical to assume that our retaliation system—our planes, our weapon sites, and our bases—would receive the enemy's initial onslaught.

Therefore the integrity and security of our airbase system, from whence our reprisal originates, assume the very highest priority in our defense planning. Ideally our base system should be a combination of both fixed air bases, continental and overseas, and moving air bases. The fixed air bases of the Air Force are designed, and properly so, to carry out the primary mission of strategic air warfare. The moving air bases of the Navy, which are the modern aircraft carriers, serve to carry out the Navy's vital tasks and to complement the fixed bases in order to make our reprisal system varied, versatile, and invulnerable.

Our moving carrier bases make it impossible for any enemy to completely destroy or neutralize our reprisal system in a sneak attack because he can never be sure of their locations. A balanced system of our primary fixed bases, complemented by our moving carrier bases, makes an aggressor uncertain that a blitz attack would succeed. No matter how powerful or pervasive his attack upon it, there will still be a sufficient punch left to devastate him. A partially successful enemy blitz of our retaliation system is tantamount to his suicide.

I am sometimes asked, usually by members of the press, 3 questions about the *Forrestal* carriers concerning their (1) vulnerability, their (2) state of development, and their (3) ultimate use which I think are fair ones, which are pertinent to this shipbuilding program, and which may be in the minds of some of the members of this committee.

Are not the *Forrestals* so vulnerable, I am asked, as to make it infeasible to build them? My answer is "no," because they are extremely difficult to destroy, even with an atomic bomb. Yes, a *Forrestal* can be hit. Any target can be hit under the right conditions. But it is patently obvious that a target moving at speeds up to 40 miles per hour, which can change its location 500 miles in a day, is a harder one to find, to hit, and to destroy than one which cannot move. Finding a carrier task force in the great wastes of an ocean is not an easy task even in these days of electronic magic. Even when it is found, attacking it would be very hazardous. Enemy planes would have to penetrate concentric circles of electronic warning curtains, overcome formidable jet fighter protection, and survive a guided missile and antiaircraft barrage before reaching their release point.

Moreover, the fast moving task force would be operating under dispersal conditions so that even a mass destruction weapon could neutralize but a small part of the force. Individual ships of the fleet might be neutralized, but it is highly unlikely that the task force could be kept from doing its job. Furthermore, the presence of our carriers in proximity to an aggressor's land will force him to divert his own offensive strength to defend against their power (which might otherwise be used against our homeland or fixed bases) and will also dilute his defenses; for he must anticipate attack from every direction from the seas which surround him.

The next question raised regarding the *Forrestals* concerns their state of development. Shouldn't a moratorium be called while these new ships are tested and evaluated? This question presumes that the carrier is an untested vessel, a new type which should be evaluated. My reply is that the aircraft carrier weapons system is a fully tested, repeatedly evaluated, and an oft-proven weapons system, that the new *Forrestals* are simply a logical and progressive step in the Navy's art of building aircraft carriers. We firmly know what they are capable of doing, and we must have them if we are to keep our fleets modern and capable of handling advanced aircraft essential to the fulfillment of the Navy's mission.

And finally, the question is asked, How does the Navy plan to use these ships which will be able to carry large attack and fighter planes capable of transporting nuclear weapons to targets more than 1,000 miles from their flight deck? The answer to that is that the Navy has many legitimate naval targets for which we need such a weapons system—such targets as submarine pens, shipping concentrations, shipbuilding activities, airfield bases, and other targets which jeopardize our command of the seas. Moreover, in the NATO theater, the Navy has been given certain collateral tasks to further prosecute the air battle and assigned certain specific tasks to support the land battle. In no sense does the Navy compete or infringe upon the field of strategic air warfare which is properly the primary responsibility of the United States Air Force.

In summary, then, a fifth *Forrestal* will add to our potent carrier weapons system which is the very foundation of our naval striking power. Without this carrier weapons system, it would be impossible to carry out the Navy's last mission to control the seas. The best military and civilian talent in the Department of Defense, and the President, have approved the building of a carrier this fiscal year as a proper requirement, and I strongly urge your appoval.

Turning briefly now to the other types of ships, we are requesting the conversion of one light cruiser and one destroyer to equip them with guided missile capabilities in order to make effective our guided missile progress. We are also requesting one nonatomic submarine with a guided missile capability. As you know, two guided missile cruisers—the *Boston* and *Canberra*—are virtually complete and will be joining the fleets this year. All of these ships, which are fundamentally prototypes, are indicative of the Navy of tomorrow. In the guided missile field, the Navy is just now crossing the threshold into a field which promises to revolutionize navies as much as did the discovery of gunpowder.

We are also requesting 13 destroyer types—7 destroyers and 6 "frigates." The frigate is a destroyer type, somewhat larger, with better sea-keeping qualities, and with heavier antisubmarine and antiaircraft defenses. These 13 destroyer types being requested are replacements for the hardworking, versatile, and indispensable workhorses of our Navy.

And finally, the submarines. As you know, the modern submarine is a very potent offensive weapon as well as an effective defensive weapon. We foresee that as a guided missile platform, the nuclear submarine with its almost unlimited range, can appear over the horizon or emerge from the depths of the ocean, and send missiles of great destruction great distances with deadly accuracy. Eight submarines are included in the program, 3 nuclear powered ones, 4 conventional ones, and the one I mentioned earlier which will have a guided missile capability. We have been encouraged by the excellent progress of the atomic-powered *Nautilus*, and we are progressing as rapidly as is practicable in this very promising field. However, we do not feel justified in waiting for final completion of this development to request these submarine replacements. The requested four conventional submarines, we feel, with their improved power plants, armament and hull structures, will not become obsolescent during their normal life span.

In summary, I believe the naval program for fiscal 1956 is sound. Throughout our country's history, naval power has always been an indispensable factor in carrying out United States policy in peacetime and in achieving victory in wartime. It is no less important and vital today. In the nuclear era now upon us, I am convinced that the talents of a Navy are even more necessary than ever before.

Anniversary of the Independence of Estonia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1918, Estonia proudly proclaimed her independence. For two centuries Estonia had suffered under Russian domination, beginning with the period when Peter I conquered the territory in 1710. Independence came only after many uprisings and bloody reprisals, of which the most notable was the revolution of 1905. In November of 1918 Estonia declared herself a democratic republic and repulsed an invading Red army. But in 1940 the Soviets seized the country.

It is important for us to remember that the spirit of freedom that lived in the hearts of Estonians in the past is no less alive today. We in the United States should keep faith with the principles upon which our Nation was founded. Ours is a nation forged out of the strength and convictions of people from many countries. Ours is a nation that has the capacity to aid in the rehabilitation of displaced persons. We should not be blinded by our fortunate position so that we cannot appreciate the hardships of others less fortunate. Nor should we forget that a concrete basis of hope is sustained by a generous policy of immigration and by a continued and more revealing congressional investigation of the Soviet crimes against the Baltic peoples. It is desirable that we correct any shortcomings in this respect.

One closing thought that I wish to call to the attention of the House is this: We in the United States are fundamentally one people. We are one people in the

support of the Constitution of the United States. We believe in the freedom and dignity of man. We have faith in the ability of man to learn and grow and to overcome the obstacles in the path of his development. It seems to me that there might be more time spent toward establishing a more certain and a more effective long-run policy of carrying the message of the American people to the world, and this applies to those locked behind the Iron Curtain.

California Fights Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some recent correspondence I have had with the Honorable Edmund G. Brown, attorney general of California, whose continuous efforts to combat crime, especially as it exists in California, are highly commendable. His proposed legislation, as detailed in the following correspondence, if adopted, will provide, I believe, thorough and effective weapons against organized crime, and should make the State of California one of the progressive leaders in our war against crime.

Without hesitation, I would commend to law-enforcement agencies in other States all of Attorney General Brown's proposed legislation, particularly that portion which recommends the coordination of State crime activities with local law-enforcement agencies, crime commissions, State and Federal officials, and agencies, as well as the proposed mutual exchange of information concerning activities of reported criminals, racketeers, and their associates.

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

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
San Francisco, February 21, 1955.

Hon. ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KEFAUVER: Your recent letter addressed to H. G. Robinson has been called to my attention.

I appreciate receiving your comments on the legislation which has been proposed to amend the California Penal Code to provide for surveys of local enforcement and for the establishment and operation of intelligence files.

After the lengthy and detailed studies which have been made of the matter by the United States Senate Crime Committee, the American Bar Association committee on organized crime and the California Crime Study Commission on Organized Crime and the unanimity of the recommendations made by these groups it is appropriate that those recommendations be implemented by appropriate legislation at State level. California, as you have found in investigations by the Senate Crime Committee, has been in the forefront in the matter of crime control and, as attorney general of this State, being charged with maintaining uniform law enforcement, it is requisite that everything be done to keep enforcement in this State at the highest attainable standard.

In further explanation it can be stated that during the past 3 years the work of our Bureau of Criminal Statistics has been strengthened and expanded. The results of this work have been published in two reports, Crime in California 1952 and Crime in California 1953, copies of which are being forwarded under separate cover. Further improvement in our statistical reporting has been programed during the coming year.

A good system of statistical reporting can measure and define the nature and scope of the crime problem but as worth while and necessary as this function is, it requires a further step to explore the factors giving rise to the statistics tabulated. Manpower, equipment, and training deficiencies resulting from unrealistic and budget conscious city administrators all have a material bearing on the general crime picture despite the common practice on the part of the public to relate crime trends to spiritual, moral, or economic factors. Until further survey functions make it possible to probe the underlying factors, there is no realistic way of completely interpreting or evaluating even the most accurate statistics on crime.

Your interest in this legislation and your valued comments are appreciated. Considering your leadership in the field of crime prevention and your continuing interest in this vitally important field, you will perhaps agree that the following acrostic suggests a more objective spelling out of the crime picture:

C-ongressional
R-ecommendations
I-mplemented by State legislation to
M-odernize and strengthen
E-nforcement efforts.

Sincerely yours,

EDMUND G. BROWN,
Attorney General.

FEBRUARY 15, 1955.

Mr. H. G. ROBINSON, Esq.,
Deputy Director, Division of Criminal Law Enforcement, San Francisco, Calif.

DEAR ROBBIE: I have read with great interest your letter of February 9, 1955, containing the proposed legislation to be introduced by Attorney General Brown, which I feel should make effective, the recommendations approved by the United States Senate Crime Committee, the American Bar Association Committee on Organized Crime, and the suggestions contained in the attorney general's two proposed amendments to the California Penal Code, appeal to me, particularly those that recommend the coordination of your State crime activities with local law enforcement agencies, crime commissions, State and Federal officials and agencies, as well as the proposed mutual exchange of information concerning activities of reported criminals, racketeers and their associates.

Your proposed legislation, if adopted without any crippling amendments, should very materially strengthen your law-enforcement machinery, and I am hopeful that other States may emulate the splendid steps that California is taking to combat crime.

With kindest personal regards to Attorney General Brown, yourself, and all other friends in California, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ESTES KEFAUVER,
United States Senate.

The Historical Development of the Conference Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EVERETT M. DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, conference committees of the two branches of Congress have often been referred to as the "Third House" of Congress. This designation arises from the fact that when the House and Senate have worked their will on a legislative proposal, particularly of a controversial nature, conference committees have often reshaped such legislation and thereby developed a very substantial influence on the whole course of legislation.

It has often occurred to me that the historical development of the conference committee and its powers would be of special interest to all Members of the House and Senate, and accordingly some time ago I requested the Library of Congress to make a documented study of this matter. This deserves consideration not only in government but by students of political science throughout the country.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD because I am confident it will be useful to students of political science, useful in science courses, and useful to Members of Congress and others.

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

THE THIRD HOUSE OF CONGRESS

Now that the Federal Government has come to have an intimate impact upon the life and work of all of us, it is important for us to understand how the laws are made which influence our daily lives. Books have been written to describe the process of lawmaking. All I can do here is to hit the high spots of the legislative process as I have observed it work in Congress.

STAGES IN LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

From the introduction of a bill in the Senate or House of Representatives to its proclamation as the law of the land, there are 28 stages in the process of lawmaking. These steps are described in detail by Congressman CLARENCE CANNON in his authoritative manual of parliamentary procedure. The process begins when a Member drops a bill in a basket or "hopper" on the Clerk's desk on the floor of the House. Senate bills may be jointly sponsored by several Senators, but House bills may not be introduced jointly.

After its introduction, the bill is referred by the Parliamentarian to the committee which has jurisdiction over its major subject matter. There are 15 standing committees in the Senate and 19 in the House, set up along roughly parallel lines. The jurisdiction of these committees is defined in the rules to cover every conceivable subject of legislation. The clerk of the committee receiving the bill enters it on his committee calendar which is a schedule or docket showing the number of the bill, by whom presented, date of reference, title, subcommittee to which referred, and any action thereon.

The first major stage in the legislative process is the committee stage. Some committees have regular meeting days; others

meet only at the call of the chairman. When the committee meets, the calendar is called by the clerk and a particular bill taken up for consideration. If the bill is important, it may be referred to a subcommittee, appointed by the chairman, for study. Where a matter is deemed to be of sufficient importance, and the committee or subcommittee desires information on the subject, hearings are held and witnesses are called, or may ask to be heard, to give testimony. A day is fixed for the hearings and interested persons are notified. The hearings may last for 1 day or several weeks, depending upon the importance of the bill under consideration. After the hearings, the committee meets in executive session and votes either to report the bill favorably to the Senate (or House) or to lay the bill on the table. This is commonly known as pigeonholing a bill. If the bill is reported favorably, with or without amendment, the committee staff prepare a report explaining the bill which is then referred to the Senate (or House) Calendar. The House has 5 different calendars, whereas the Senate has but 1.

Subject to various limitations, the committees of Congress have come to play a dominant role in lawmaking. Each composed of a few members, each acting independently of the others, they now determine the agenda of both Houses, which have surrendered to their standing committees the power to determine what matters shall be considered on the floor and to control the proceedings there, subject in the lower Chamber to the terms of its Rules Committee. Committees can amend or rewrite bills to suit themselves. They can report bills or pigeonhole them. They can initiate measures they desire and bury or emasculate those they dislike. They can proceed with dispatch or stall indefinitely. In short, congressional government is still government by the standing committees of Congress, as Woodrow Wilson wrote in 1885.

The second major stage in the legislative process is the floor stage. Numerous ways are provided by the House and Senate rules for taking up a bill once it is on a calendar. In the Senate a bill is taken up either by unanimous consent or on the call of the calendar. In the House there are five routes by which a bill may reach the floor. Admission to the House floor of important, controversial bills usually depends upon getting a special order or green light from its Committee on Rules which has acquired power to prescribe the terms of admission, including a time limit on debate, the conditions of amendment, etc.

When a bill has finally reached the floor, it may be debated, amended, passed, or rejected. Debate is strictly limited in the House under various rules and rarely lasts more than 1 or 2 days per bill. In the Senate debate is unlimited, except by unanimous consent, and may continue for several weeks. Bills strongly opposed by a few Senators may be filibustered indefinitely, i. e., talked to death. The Senate adopted a cloture rule in 1917, but it has been successfully invoked only four times in 35 years, and never since 1927. A majority vote of those present and voting is required to pass an ordinary bill. A two-thirds vote is needed to suspend the rules and for certain measures specified in the Constitution, such as a resolution to amend that document.

After a bill has gone through its several stages in the House where introduced, it is engrossed and transmitted to the other house where the same steps are repeated. If the bill finally survives all the possible pitfalls in its path—pigeonhole, filibuster, Rules Committee blockade, irrelevant debate, dilatory tactics, a single objection on the call of the Senate Calendar—and passes both Houses in other than identical form, it is referred to a conference committee. This is the final major stage in the legislative process. A conference committee is a joint committee composed of Representatives and Senators, appointed by the Speaker and the Vice President, respectively, which is charged with the duty of compromising the differences between the House and Senate versions of the bill. The conference committee, which has been called a third house of Congress, nearly always reaches an agreement, and then resubmits the revised bill to each House for a majority vote. The report of the conference committee is almost invariably approved by the vote of both Houses, although the House surprised the country in October 1951 by rejecting the first report of a conference committee on a tax bill.

ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE

Ada McCown, historian of the origin and evolution of the conference committee, traces its origin back to 14th century England.[1] In that century the English Parliament became a bicameral body, with the lords and prelates sitting in one house and the knights and burgesses in the other. Contemporaneously the custom arose for members of both houses to confer together on the answer to be given to the king's request for funds. According to the historian, William Stubbs, a real conference committee system existed in England before 1378.[2] The first conference recorded in the Journals of the House of Commons was held in 1554. We learn from these early Journals that parliamentary conferences were usually held in the Painted Chamber, that twice as many Commoners as Lords attended them, that the upper chamber fixed the time and place of meeting, and that "the Lords came in a body, expecting the Commoners to await them. They sat with their hats on while the Commoners stood with their hats off. While a conference was in session all other proceedings in both houses were suspended."[3]

Conferences became especially signficant during the 17th century in England when they were used in a series of parliamentary crises. But with the development of the cabinet system in the 18th century they declined in importance; and by the middle of the 19th century they had disappeared. The conference device has been obsolete in England for a hundred years.

While the conference committee was dying out in the mother country with the rise of the cabinet system, colonial records indicate that it was widely used in the American Colonies as a means of reconciling differences between the two houses of the Colonial legislatures, and it continued to be used in the State legislatures after the Revolution. In New York State the Constitution of 1777 provided for conferences between the Assembly and the Senate which were held in public and sometimes excited great public interest, as in the differences between the two houses over the State's support of the Federal Government in the War of 1812.

McCown reports that "from the very beginning of our congressional history, the conference committee was the accepted method of adjusting differences between the House of Representatives and the Senate. At the beginning of the 1st session of the 1st Congress, on April 7, 1789 * * * the Senate charged a committee with the duty of preparing rules for the government of the two houses in the case of conference."[4] The House chose a similar committee of 5 members and the result of their report was a joint rule which read as follows:[5]

"*Resolved*, That in every case of an amendment to a bill agreed to in one House and disagreed to in the other, if either House shall request a conference, and appoint a committee for that purpose, and the other House shall also appoint a committee to confer, such committees shall, at a convenient time, to be agreed on by their chairmen, meet in the conference chamber, and state to each other verbally, or in writing, as either shall choose, the reasons of their respective Houses for and against the amendment and confer freely thereon."

According to McCown, several conferences were held during the 1st Congress on such subjects as the impost bill, Members' salaries, the amendments to the Constitution, judicial procedure, the Treasury and Post Office bills, trade with the Indians, and other matters.

Inherited from England, the conference committee system is an evolutionary product whose principal threads were woven on the loom of congressional practice into a unified pattern by the middle of the 19th century. "By 1852," writes Ada McCown, "the customs of presenting identical reports from the committees of conference in both Houses, of granting high privilege to these conference reports, of voting upon the conference report as a whole and permitting no amendment of it, of keeping secret the discussions carried on in the meetings of the conference committee, had become established in American parliamentary practice."[6]

CONFERENCE PROCEDURE

A large body of law and practice has developed over the years governing conference procedure and reports. They operate under the limitations of a code of rules which occupy 16 pages of the Senate Manual, 14 pages of the House Manual, and 22 pages of Cannon's Procedure. The essential features of conference procedure under the modern practice have been succinctly described by Gilbert Steiner as follows:[7]

"The conference stage is reached in congressional action when disagreement is formally stated by one House or the other. Usually, this will occur when the second House has amended a bill and returned it to the House of origin which refuses to accept the amendment(s). Not infrequently, however, the second House assumes that the House of origin will refuse to accept a change, and consequently votes to insist, and requests a conference without returning the bill to the House of origin. In either case, the Presiding Officer does not dispose of the conference request on his own initiative, some Member will address the Chair; he may ask unanimous consent that the bill be taken from the table with the amendments of the second Chamber, that the amendments be disagreed with (or insisted on), and that a conference be agreed to (or requested). When unanimous consent is not obtained in the House, a special rule may be brought in by the Rules Committee providing for a conference. In the Senate it is, of course, always theoretically possible to filibuster against the appointment of a conference committee. Actually, no cases of real opposition to agreeing to a conference have been found. The reason for this is obvious—the bill has already been passed by the Chamber involved, and presumably sufficient votes to agree to a conference should therefore be garnered. In addition, opponents of a measure may well prefer to wait for the conference report, before taking obstructive action, since the report may result in a modified bill more to the liking of disaffected elements.

"Under House rule X, clause 2, dating back to 1890, the Speaker appoints House managers. By tradition, Senate managers are named by the Vice President or President

[1] Ada C. McCown, The Congressional Conference Committee (1927), ch. II.

[2] William Stubbs, Constitutional History of England (1860), vol. ii, pp. 645–646.

[3] McCown, op. cit., p. 25.

[4] Ibid., p. 38.

[5] Annals, 1st Cong., 1st sess., p. 20, April 15, 1789. Quoted by McCown.

[6] McCown, op. cit., pp. 254–255.

[7] Gilbert Y. Steiner, The Congressional Conference Committee: 70th to 80th Cong. (1951), pp. 7–11.

pro tempore of the Senate. The range of free choice is strictly limited, however, in that the customary practice in both Chambers is for the chairman of the committee having charge of a bill to send to the desk a "little pink slip" bearing the names of his nominees for appointment. The chairman and ranking majority and minority members of the committee are usually named conferees, although as is noted subsequently, there has been something of a problem in determining the membership of conference committees with the growth of the subcommittee device. A tradition has not yet developed as to whether subcommittee members deserve a preferred place on the conference committee over ranking members of the full committee originally involved. Indeed, the seniority principle itself has sometimes been ignored, and this has led to charges of "packing" the conference with proponents of a point of view supported by the standing committee chairman and the presiding officer of the House involved. The number of managers appointed is also determined by the standing committee chairman with the approval of the Presiding Officer, but by precedent it is three, five, seven, or nine. There does not seem to be any correlation between the number of managers and the importance of the legislation. Nor does the number of managers appointed by one House determine the number appointed by the second Chamber.

"A fairly elaborate process governs the possession of conference papers; the original engrossed copy of the bill attested by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate; the engrossed amendments; any special acts concurring in amendments with amendments, and the messages transmitting them between the two Houses, all similarly attested; and later, the conference report signed by the managers. The House agreeing to the conference sends the papers to the House asking for a conference. The managers on the part of the House asking the conference bring the papers to the conference room. At the close of a successful conference, the papers change hands; the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference receive them and take them to their House, which is first to consider the conference report. If the managers on the part of the House agreeing to the conference fail to take possession of the papers, by agreement or otherwise, from the managers on the part of the House asking conference, the report may be received first by that House. A conference report may not be considered when the original papers are not before the House considering the report. If the conference is not successful in reaching agreement, the papers are not surrendered, but remain with the managers of the requesting House, and that Chamber first receives the report of disagreement and takes action. If a conference report is recommitted to the conference committee, the papers are no longer before the House ordering recommittal, and no motion regarding the amendments in disagreement is in order.

"Instructions to conference managers must be given before managers are named, but after the House has agreed to a conference. Once instructions are given, no further motions to that effect are in order. Whether instructed or not, managers may disregard all instructions, and the conference report is not subject to the point of order that it is in violation of instructions. Insertion of new matter, and alteration of agreed matter, is cause for a point of order since the rules of both Houses have presumably outlawed these practices. However, a technique which Miss McCown dates back to the 1860's and 1870's has developed whereby one House may strike out all after the enacting clause of a bill passed in the other Chamber. The second House then substitutes its own bill as a single overall amendment, retaining only the number and the enacting clause of the bill passed by the first House. Under such conditions, it has been successfully argued that everything in the legislation was in technical disagreement, and that the conferees were legally empowered to write a completely new bill eliminating matters agreed on by both Houses or inserting legislation never approved by either Chamber. Section 135 of the Reorganization Act was designed specifically to eliminate this practice. An evaluation of its efficacy is made in this study.

"The operation of the conference itself is very informal. Meetings are usually held on the Senate side of the Capitol, and by tradition, the first named Senate manager is nominal chairman of the committee. Voting is by the unit rule, and a majority of the managers of each Chamber sign the conference report. The minority has no authority to file a separate report, but may do so under unanimous consent.

"A conference committee may secure whatever expert opinion it thinks desirable. Members may bring aides to conference with them so long as no objection is raised by managers of the second House. In at least one instance, the managers on the part of the House of Representatives prevailed upon the House to pass a resolution requesting that Senate aides be asked to depart from a conference. Invariably, House and Senate legislative counsel will be present at a conference to aid in the actual drafting of the report. This is particularly necessary when the conference committee recommends a third bill as a substitute for two bills committed to it. A conference report may not be called up for consideration until the conferees have formally reported the matter back to their respective Houses.

"Under the rules of the House of Representatives, if a conference fails to yield a report within 20 calendar days, it is a matter of high privilege for any Member of the House to move to discharge its conferees from further consideration of the measure assigned to them and appoint new managers. During the last 6 days of a session, the limitation is reduced from 20 days to 36 hours. A conference report may not be called up in the House until 1 day after it is filed, except by unanimous consent or during the final week of the session.

"It should be noted that the motion to send to conference is certainly not the only possible disposition of a bill amended in the second Chamber. Indeed, six other motions are possible, each of which takes precedence over a motion to disagree and ask for a conference. These are a motion to lay on the table, a motion to postpone indefinitely, a motion to postpone to a certain date, a motion to refer to a standing or special committee, a motion to amend, and a motion to agree. As has been stated, however, in the case of important legislation, the motion to disagree and ask for a conference is nearly always made.

"There are no minutes or formal records kept of the sessions of conference committees. On the contrary, members seem to feel that the conference is a confidential matter, and explanations of conference activity made on the floor of House or Senate are sometimes preceded by the comment that the speaker does not wish to violate the confidence of the conference. Usually, influential members of the conference will make a statement to the press on the day-to-day progress at a conference, but only the formal conference report embodying the recommendations of the committee becomes a part of the official record. The rationale for this practice is that publication of debates and votes would subject the managers to external pressure and would hamper the give and take necessary for a successful conference. The process may be compared to international diplomacy; great powers deem it unwise to make public detailed progress reports, out of fear of giving a strategic advantage to the other powers. The process may also be analogous to collective bargaining in labor agreements, since detailed interim statements may adversely affect the results for one group or the other.

"Because the formal conference report is often very little more than a recommendation that each Chamber recede on certain numbered amendments, the House of Representatives has adopted a rule requiring that every report be accompanied by a statement. This statement must be sufficiently detailed and explicit to inform the House what effect suggested amendments or propositions will have on the measure to which they relate. In practice, this statement has been used to make clear to the Members of the House the differences between a bill as originally passed by the House and as it would be if the recommendations of the conference were approved. The statement must be in writing and must be signed by a majority of the House managers. A conference report may not be received in the House without the accompanying statement. There is no requirement in the Senate of any comparable nature.

"Conference reports are considered matters of high privilege in both House and Senate. In general, they are in order except when the body is dividing or when the Journal is being read. The Senate rules specify that when received, the question of proceeding to the consideration of a conference report, if raised, shall be put immediately, and shall be determined without debate. In the House, the previous question may be ordered to decide the question of proceeding to consider a conference report if a challenge is raised.

"A conference report may not be referred to a standing committee, and, in the House, may not be referred to the Committee of the Whole. A conference report may be withdrawn in the Senate by leave of the Senate, and in the House by unanimous consent. It is not in order to amend a conference report, and it must be accepted or rejected as an entirety. This last requirement, of course, greatly enhances the potential power of conferees. This is particularly true near the close of a session when rejection of a conference report, because of dissatisfaction with a single portion of it, may well cause the loss of the entire bill, time being too short to permit a new report to be drawn. Rejection of a report is usually followed by the ordering of another conference, if there is adequate time, and in accordance with custom, the same conferees are appointed to the second committee as served on the first. The only method whereby conference reports may be amended is by concurrent resolution or order, and this is usually reserved for technical corrections.

"Finally, partial reports from a committee of conference will be accepted in both Chambers. In such a case, approval is given to that portion of the report on which agreement has been reached in conference, and the respective Houses indicate whether they desire their managers to insist further, whether they are willing to recede, or whether they wish to propose a further compromise."

EXTENT OF PRACTICE

The conference committee has been a medium of continuous struggle for legislative supremacy between the Senate and House of Representatives. Here behind the legislative scenes many decisive battles of congressional history have been waged. For 2 weeks during the 79th Congress, for example, the conferees on the full-employment bill locked horns.[8] In the 81st Congress the civil-functions appropriations bill was tied

[8] See Stephen K. Bailey, Congress Makes a Law: the Story Behind the Employment Act of 1946 (1950), ch. XI: Conference and Compromise.

up in conference for 4 months—a period longer than any within the memory of living Members. According to Representative CANNON: "The delay was due to the unanimous objection of the managers on the part of the House to agreeing to exorbitant and unwarranted expenditure of public funds proposed by the other body."[9] In the first session of the 82d Congress the House, in a surprise move, rejected a conference report on a tax bill by the combined action of Republicans and Democrats who voted against it for different reasons.

This device has been used extensively by every Congress since 1789. Of the 217 public laws enacted by the 2d session of the 82d Congress, 90, or 41 percent, went through conference and, of these, 13 were appropriation bills. Most important legislation goes through the conference closet and is there revised, sometimes beyond recognition, by the all-powerful conferees or managers.

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

During the 1945 hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, considerable testimony was presented regarding the introduction by conferees of new material into conference reports, and the elimination or substantial change of legislation agreed to by both Houses. While the standing rules are clear regarding the limitation of conferees to the disagreements between the two Houses, parliamentary procedures make it possible for conferees completely to rewrite legislation substantially agreed upon in both Chambers. This is done by one House striking everything after the enacting clause, substituting one overall amendment, and thus technically placing everything in the bill in disagreement and making it subject to complete revision by the conferees.

To meet this situation, the La Follette-Monroney committee recommended in its final report "that conferees of the two Houses be limited to adjustment only of actual differences in fact between the two Houses and that matters on which both Houses are in agreement be not subject to change in conference."[10] This recommendation was followed by the inclusion in the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 of the following section:

"SEC. 135. (a) In any case in which a disagreement to an amendment in the nature of a substitute has been referred to conferees, it shall be in order for the conferees to report a substitute on the same subject matter; but they may not include in the report matter not committed to them by either House. They may, however, include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement.

"(b) In any case in which the conferees violate subsection (a), the conference report shall be subject to a point of order."

Thus, the act restated the old rule that the authority of conference committees is limited to matters which are in disagreement between the two Houses, while recognizing their right to report a substitute on the same subject matter.

Few points of order against conference reports under this rule have been made or sustained in recent years. On June 4, 1947, Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan made a point of order against the conference report on the bill (H. R. 3020) to prescribe fair and equitable rules of conduct to be observed by labor and management in their relations with one another which affect commerce, etc., on the ground (1) that the conferees had changed the text theretofore agreed to by both Houses, and (2) had inserted additional matter which, even though germane, they had no authority to insert. "The House is considering an entirely new bill," said Mr. HOFFMAN, "that was written in conference by seven men * * *." After discussion, the Speaker was "convinced that the conferees had followed well-established precedents" and overruled the point of order.[11]

On October 5, 1951, Mr. SPENCE, of Kentucky, made a point of order against the conference report on the Mutual Security Act of 1951 on the ground that it contained matter not committed to the conferees by either House in a section providing for making the Mutual Security Director a member of the board of the Export-Import Bank. After discussion, the Speaker sustained the point of order.[12]

On October 1, 1951, Senator DWORSHAK, of Idaho, made a point of order against the same conference report on the ground that the conferees had changed identical sections in both the House and Senate bills by changing the percentage of funds which the President could transfer between military and economic aid. After spirited debate, the Chair overruled the point of order and held that the change was a germane modification of the original language. Upon appeal, the Senate sustained the decision of the Chair by a vote of 41 to 36, with 19 absentees. This vote seemed to strengthen the powers of the conferees and to weaken control of legislative action by the Senate.[13]

The ensuing Senate debate on the powers of conferees revealed a loophole in the conference rules which Senator Ferguson, of Michigan, sought to plug by offering a resolution (S. Res. 221, 82d Cong., 1st sess.) to amend paragraph 3 of rule XXVII of the Standing Rules of the Senate by prohibiting conferees from striking out matter passed in identical form by both Houses or from modifying any such matter. The Ferguson resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration which took no action upon it. The effect of the Ferguson amendment would be to restore language in the rule which was approved by the Senate when it passed the legislative reorganization bill in June 1946, but which was deleted from that bill after it had passed the Senate and while it was on the Speaker's table.

On September 15, 1950, and again on April 11, 1951, the Senate agreed to a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 79) providing that every conference report shall be accompanied by a statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee. Seventy years earlier the House of Representatives had adopted a similar rule on February 27, 1880 (rule XXVIII–1b). Compared with the strict code of the House, the rules of the Senate have advanced at a snail's pace.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that in the House the chairman of the House conferees usually asks and obtains unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the conference report. Then, after the statement explaining the conference report has been partially read, the chairman usually requests that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with. Since neither the conference report nor the explanatory statement has yet been printed in the RECORD during the last 6 days of a session, Members have little knowledge of the contents of conference reports, of the changes that have been made by the conferees, or of whether or not the rules regulating conferences have been complied with. In the absence of such knowledge, they can hardly make points of order against conference reports.[14]

EVALUATION OF DEVICE

Comparatively unknown except to the few who are familiar with the mysteries of the legislative process, the conference committee is today perhaps the most unique and powerful legislative institution in America, the least dramatic, and one that has received all too little attention.[15] It is a notable fact that American legislatures stand alone among modern bicameral legislative bodies in providing a formal method for adjusting differences between them. Since few, if any, important bills ever pass both Houses of Congress in precisely identical form, and since the final shape of differing measures must be determined in conference, the strategic role and importance of the ad hoc conference committees will readily be appreciated.

Commenting upon the powers of conferees, Willoughby writes:[16]

"In cases such as these [substitute bill situations] the committee has before it the whole subject and has practically full discretion with respect to the drafting of a new measure for submission to the two Houses. Even where resort has not been had to this form of amendment, conditions are often such as to permit of a wide range of action by the committee in seeking to formulate provisions that will be mutually acceptable. Except, therefore, where the matters in dispute are very specific, these committees have large powers in the determination of the provisions of many important bills that will come before the two Houses for final action. To such an extent is this true that the statement is often made that the real character of the legislation actually had it determined by these bodies * * *."

In general, writers on Congress regard the conference committee as an admirable device for achieving its purpose. The advantages claimed for the system are that it settles differences between the two Houses in most cases, that it serves to expedite legislative business and prevent deadlocks, and that it facilitates majority party control of legislation. Some mechanism for reconciling differences under a bicameral system is obviously essential.

Yet the disadvantages of the system have also been recognized. In her authoritative history of the subject, Ada McCown writes:[17]

"The evils and dangers of this conference committee system are perhaps apparent. It gives too much power into the hands of a few men who are not really held to answer for what they do. In the privacy of the conference mutual concessions may be made which involve provisions which would never pass if considered openly in the House or the Senate. The conference committee has much power of independent action, but it is not held responsible in any such manner as is a ministry under a cabinet system. No conference committee of either House is forced to resign because it has gone counter to the wishes of the House which it represents. Its Members still retain their positions on the regular standing committees and they will be members of the next conference committee which is chosen to settle differences on a bill coming within their province."

Writing in 1946, George B. Galloway remarked that serious evils have attended the

[9] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, October 3, 1949, p. 13970.

[10] S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 8.

[11] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 4, 1947, pp. 6537–6539.

[12] Ibid., October 5, 1951, pp. 12962–12964.

[13] Ibid., October 1–2, 1951, pp. 12678–12681, 12718–12737.

[14] For an example of this situation, see remarks of Representative COLMER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, July 7, 1952, p. A4742.

[15] The books by Ada McCowen (1927) and Gilbert Steiner (1951) are the only full-length studies of the American conference committee system. Brief descriptions of it are given in textbooks and treaties on American government. See, for example, W. F. Willoughby, Principles of Legislative Organization and Administration (1934), ch. XXVI.

[16] Willoughby, op. cit., p. 421.

[17] McCown, op. cit., p. 16.

development of the conference committee system.[18]

"Suffice it to say here that serious evils have marked the development of the conference committee system. In the first place, it is highly prodigal of members' time. McConachie calculated that the average time consumed in conference was 33 days per bill. (He made this estimate by comparing the dates upon which the appropriation bills passed the Senate in the 54th Cong., 1st sess., with the dates when they became laws.) Bills are sent to conference without reading the amendments of the other Chamber. Despite rules to the contrary, conferees do not confine themselves to matters in dispute, but often initiate entirely new legislation and even strike out identical provisions previously approved by both Houses. This happened during the 78th Congress, for instance, when an important amendment to the surplus property bill, which had been approved by both Houses, was deleted in conference.

"'Conference committees, moreover, suffer like other committees from the seniority rule. The senior members of the committees concerned, who are customarily appointed as managers on the part of the House and Senate, are not always the best informed on the questions at issue, nor do they always reflect the majority sentiment of their Houses. Furthermore, conference reports must be accepted or rejected in toto without amendment and they are often so complex and obscure that they are voted upon without knowledge of their contents. What happens in practice is that Congress surrenders its legislative function to irresponsible committees of conference. The standing rules against including new and extraneous matter in conference reports have been gradually whittled away in recent years by the decisions of presiding officers. Senate riders attached to appropriation bills enable conference committees to legislate and the House usually accepts them rather than withhold supply, thus putting it, as Senator Hoar once declared, under a degrading duress.

"It is also alleged that under this secret system lobbyists are able to kill legislation they dislike and that 'jokers' designed to defeat the will of Congress can be inserted without detection. Senator George W. Norris once characterized the conference committee as a third house of Congress. 'The members of this house,' he said, 'are not elected by the people. The people have no voice as to who these members shall be. * * *' This conference committee is many times, in very important matters of legislation, the most important branch of our legislature. There is no record kept of the workings of the conference committee. Its work is performed, in the main, in secret. No constituent has any definite knowledge as to how members of this conference committee vote, and there is no record to prove the attitude of any member of the conference committee. * * * As a practical proposition we have legislation, then, not by the voice of the Members of the Senate, not by the Members of the House of Representatives, but we have legislation by the voice of 5 or 6 men. And for practical purposes, in most cases, it is impossible to defeat the legislation proposed by this conference committee. Every experienced legislator knows that it is the hardest thing in the world to defeat a conference report."[19]

One Senator's opinion of the power of conferees was reflected in a satirical speech a few years ago by Senator FULBRIGHT, who congratulated the conferees on a national defense appropriation bill "for so forthrightly disregarding the wishes of the common lay Members of the Senate and the House." Said he:[20]

"I submit, Mr. President, in all sincerity that there is no need whatever for the ordinary lay Member of Congress to come back to Washington for a special session. It is clearly evident, Mr. President, that to save the world and the people of this country from disaster, all that is needed is to reconvene, preferably in secret, only those incomparable sages, the conferees of the Appropriations Committee. From their deliberations the same results would be achieved and without the expense and trouble to everyone that is involved in going through the archaic ritual of pretended legislation. It is quite clear that regardless of what the common Members of this body may wish, the conferees make the decisions."

The chief criticisms made of this device over the years have been that: (1) bills are sent to conference without reading the amendments of the other House; (2) much legislation has been forced through Congress in the form of Senate riders on House appropriation bills late in the session; (3) conference reports are voted upon blindly without knowledge of their contents, especially during the end-of-the-session log jams; and (4) Congress has docilely surrendered its legislative powers to irresponsibile committees of conference.

PROBLEM OF CONTROL

The central problem connected with the conference committee system is that of controlling it. Various rules and rulings of the Chair have been made to this end during the past century. In 1918 the Senate adopted the Curtis rule which makes it possible to challenge a conference report on the point of order that it contains new matter not committed to the conference committee, whether germane or not, even under a substitute bill situation. This appears in clause 2 of rule XXVII of the standing rules of the Senate which has been strictly construed and which reads as follows:

"2. Conferees shall not insert in their report matter not committed to them by either House, nor shall they strike from the bill matter agreed to by both Houses. If new matter is inserted in the report, or if matter which was agreed to by both Houses is stricken from the bill, a point of order may be made against the report, and if the point of order is sustained, the report shall be recommitted to the committee of conference."

In the House a rule of 1920 (rule XX, clause 2) forbids House managers to agree in conference to a large class of Senate amendments to appropriation bills without a separate vote on each amendment by the House. This rule has been generally observed and is regarded by McCown as "probably the most effective means yet devised of controlling the evils of the conference committee system."[21]

In 1946, as noted above, the Legislative Reorganization Act, in section 135 applicable to both Houses, authorized conferees to report a new bill where one House strikes out all after the enacting clause of the bill of the other House and inserts new language. The defect of this amendment, as noted above, is that it does not forbid conferees to delete or modify matter passed in identical form by both Houses.

In the House of Representatives the Speaker may rule out a conference report if it be shown that the managers have exceeded their authority; and points of order may be made against conference reports in the House before the reading of the explanatory statement. The House adopted a rule (rule XXVIII, clause 2) in 1902 which provides that "it shall not be in order to consider the report of a committee of conference until such report and the accompanying statement shall have been printed in the RECORD, except on either of the 6 days preceding the end of a session."

This rule may be evaded, however, by the granting of unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of a conference report; and by its own terms it is inoperative during the last 6 days of a session when many conference reports are made.

In practice, the rules governing conferees, like all rules, depend for their effectiveness upon their enforcement. Writing in 1927, McCown reports that the rule forbidding the insertion of new matter in conference reports has been "flagrantly violated in recent times."[22] Points of order against infraction of the conference rules are, in fact, seldom made. Committees of conference enjoy largely uncontrolled powers to write new legislation in substitute bill situations where the rules allow them to report any bill germane to the bills under consideration. Sometimes conference reports are brought up in the House of Representatives under a special rule granted by the Committee on Rules waiving points of order against them. Under all these circumstances, it is obivously difficult to control committees of conference, which have long exercised a determining influence upon the shape of much important congressional legislation.

CONCLUSIONS

However, it would appear that effective control of conference committees is possible under existing rules, if they are enforced. McCown concluded "that under the House and Senate rules of the present time a fair degree of control is maintained over the managers * * * since the additions of the Senate rule of 1918 and the House rule of 1920, control of the managers has been increased so that there is much less conference committee legislation than there was at one time. Certainly there is now [1927] more control over the conference committee by the two Houses than there ever has been in the past. It would seem, then, that conference committee legislation is bad," concludes McCown, "but that there is not enough of it that eludes the rules and practice of the two Houses to cause despair."[23]

"The truth is that the conference committee system is a necessary part of the congressional government system. It must, however, be kept under the control of the two Houses. The managers must not be allowed to include in their report any matter not committed to them by either House nor must they be allowed to eliminate items which have been agreed upon by both Houses. On the other hand, the peculiar composition of a conference committee makes it particularly fitted to offer constructive suggestions in regard to a bill that may have been altered several times in the course of its progress through the two Houses * * *."

Similar conclusions were reached by Dr. Gilbert Steiner, of the University of Illinois, in his 1951 study. Steiner made an intensive analysis of 56 pieces of the most significant legislation enacted between the 70th and 80th Congresses, inclusive, which went through conference. He concludes that "the conference committee has not been a consistently irresponsible 'third house' of Congress. Conference committees have sometimes been reckless, and sometimes have flouted the will of a congressional majority, but the number of such instances is small, too small to justify a damning generalization. Conference committees may be and have been controlled by effective rules and precedents. It would not appear, however, that the institution of the conference committee is such as to require closer oversight

[18] George B. Galloway, Congress at the Crossroads (1946), pp. 98-99.

[19] The Model Legislature, address at Lincoln, Nebr., February 22, 1934. Reprinted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 27, 1934.

[20] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 80th Cong., 2d sess., p. 9206 (June 19, 1948).

[21] McCown, op. cit., p. 260.

[22] Ibid., p. 262.

[23] Ibid., pp. 264, 266.

than is given any other congressional committee."[24] Steiner concludes that "the conference committee is both a practical and satisfactory device" of accommodation and that no new method of adjustment is needed.

In the 56 cases studied by Dr. Steiner in the period 1928–48, he found only 3 outstanding instances in which conference committees had deleted matter agreed to by both Houses or had included new matter. These involved the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, the Transportation Act of 1940, and the Surplus Property Act of 1944.

Of special interest is Dr. Steiner's conclusion that the House has been more influential in conference than the Senate. For the period and cases studied, he reports that "the House achieved 57 percent of the victories, the Senate 27 percent, and 16 percent of the cases showed joint influence." House influence was predominant in all cases of revenue and appropriation acts studied, while the Senate dominated in broad fiscal policy legislation.

PROPOSED REFORMS

Thus, we see that the conference committee is a little known institution which operates secretly behind the legislative scenes and exercises large influence over the final form of much important legislation. It takes the handiwork of the two Houses and, in the interests of compromise, can modify the actions of either branch no matter how preponderant the vote therein may have been on the original bills, and submit a conference report which almost always becomes law.

Several suggestions have been made from time to time for changes in the congressional conference committee system. Mention has already been made of Senator Ferguson's resolution to amend paragraph 3 of Senate rule XXVII so as to plug an apparent loophole in it, making it crystal clear that it is the intent of Congress to limit the power of conferees in dealing with a substitute bill. To the same end, Senator Vandenberg sought in 1938 to add the following sentence to the rule:

"It is hereby expressly provided that this paragraph shall be deemed to include reports on measures where one House has struck out all after the enacting or resolving clause and inserted a substitute."

Adoption of this proposal by both Houses would eliminate the loophole still provided by permission to "include in their report in any such case matter which is a germane modification of subjects in disagreement." The problem in the substitute bill situation has been less that of inclusion of new matter than that of deletion of matter agreed to by both Houses, and section 135 of the Legislative Reorganization Act does not meet this squarely.

Another recurring suggestion is to permit conferees to report new matter separately for separate consideration in each House. This requires unanimous consent and has occasionally been done. It has been the practice in the House under the 1920 rule in the case of certain Senate amendments to appropriation bills.[25]

As a remedy for secrecy it has been suggested that conference meetings be open to Members of either House. Open conferences were prescribed by the New York State Constitution of 1777 and the first congressional conference ever held over a legislative disagreement—the conference on the impost and tonnage bills on June 26, 1789—was an open one attended by several Members of both Houses. The annals of Congress record no other such open conference from 1789 until 1911 when a tariff conference opened its meetings to representatives of the press under the influence of Senator La Follette who was strongly in favor of publicity.[26]

In order to avoid inadequate consideration of conference reports during the crowded closing days of a session, the elder La Follette also suggested that a deadline be fixed by rule upon the receipt of bills from the other House. No action was ever taken on this proposal which is probably impractical.[27]

Another abortive suggestion was that made by Representative McRae in 1902 that conference reports be printed in bill form, with changes in italics so that they can be readily recognized and any "jokers" discovered. But Congress has been content to rely upon the explanatory statements for knowledge of the changes made in conference.

Others argue that the real remedy for the defects of the device is to keep it under congressional control by enforcing the conference rules so as to make theory and practice coincide. Congress makes its own rules and only Congress can compel compliance with them.

Several alternatives to the conference device are conceivable. Conference committees are not used in the Legislature of New York State. Amendments made to a bill in one chamber at Albany are returned to the house of origin for acceptance or rejection. And agreement is apparently achieved under the leadership of the Governor.

Under the parliamentary form of government used in England and many other countries, deadlocks between the houses are avoided by the cabinet which originates all important legislation, keeps harmony between the two chambers, and replaces the conference committee as the instrument for adjusting interchameral differences. Under the Cabinet system disputes between the chambers are conciliated by the Government whose ministers move freely between the two Houses, consult with their committees, and defend Government measures on both floors. But adoption of the Cabinet system in the United States would be a herculean remedy for the evils of the conference committee system.

Within the bicameral framework perhaps the most promising remedy is to make more use of joint standing committees in the formulation of important bills. It is easier through such committees to prevent differences from arising in the initial stages of the legislative process than it is to compose them after measures have passed both Houses. Persuasive testimony on this point was presented to the La Follette-Monroney committee by Representative HALE, of Maine. "A committee of conference," he said, "is not nearly as well adapted to framing legislation as a joint standing committee. A joint standing committee having agreed upon a bill can generally procure its passage with minor amendments through both bodies. But a committee of conference finds it much harder to get the coordinate branches of the legislature to recede from a position previously taken and concur with the other branch. All sorts of factors of pride and prestige are involved on the presentation of conference reports which are not involved in the report of a joint standing committee."[28]

Increased executive influence, perhaps in the form of a joint executive-legislative cabinet, has also been suggested as a potential method of minimizing House and Senate differences. This suggestion was made by Thomas K. Finletter in 1945 in chapter XI of his well-known little book Can Representative Government Do the Job? It was also proposed by the La Follette-Monroney committee in its final report which recommended "that the majority policy committees of the Senate and House serve as a formal council to meet regularly with the Executive, to facilitate the formulation and carrying out of national policy, and to improve relationships between the executive and legislative branches of the Government."[29]

The taking of steps to strengthen party government in Congress might be expected to reduce the need of conference committees, except when opposing political parties control the two Houses. Several proposals to this end have been made in recent years. Most noteworthy among them are the suggestions to revive the party caucus as an instrument of policymaking, to create single responsible leadership committees for each party in each House, and to abandon the seniority custom in committee appointments and the selection of chairman.[30]

A drastic remedy for the alleged shortcomings of the congressional conference committee would be to allow the example of Nebraska and adopt a unicameral legislature, thus eliminating the need of conferences. There are those who believe that the United States Senate no longer performs any unique or indispensable functions in the American system of government.[31] Its tolerance of unlimited and irrelevant debate and its frequent absenteeism have been severely criticized by its own Members.[32] The decay of second chambers and the trend toward unicameralism in the democratic constitutions of the postwar world are widespread phenomena.[33] Twenty-nine nations have unicameral national legislatures today. And in several others the role of the second chamber has been reduced to a mere suspensive veto. The British House of Lords was finally emasculated by the Parliament Act of 1949. Some students of representative government believe that under the new order of affairs there is less justification for the bicameral system than it has had in the past. As Walter Shepard wrote in 1935, "The Senate * * * may lose its raison d'etre. A single chamber * * * might constitute a better instrument to do the work which seems to lie ahead of Congress."[34] But unicameralism is probably merely an academic suggestion, for neither House of Congress would sign its own death warrant by submitting such a constitutional amendment to the States.

---

[24] Steiner, op. cit., p. 174.

[25] McCown, op. cit., pp. 267–268.

[26] Ibid., pp. 36, 43, 177.

[27] Ibid., pp. 268–69.

[28] Hearings before the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, 79th Cong., 1st sess., April 24, 1945, p. 342.

[29] S. Rept. No. 1011, 79th Cong., 2d sess., p. 13.

[30] For a full discussion of these suggestions, see Toward a More Responsible Two-Party System, Report of the Committee on Political Parties, American Political Science Association, September 1950; and pertinent testimony on Party Government in Congress before the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, hearings on the Organization and Operation of Congress, June 1951.

[31] Cf. Arthur N. Holcombe, Our More Perfect Union (1950), p. 230.

[32] HUBERT H. HUMPHREY. The Senate on Trial, American Political Science Review, September 1950, pp. 650–660. See also Holcombe, op cit., pp. 231–34.

[33] Arnold J. Zurcher, ed. Constitutions and Constitutional Trends Since World War II (1951), ch. 4, The Position of the Representative Legislature in the Postwar Constitutions, by Edward G. Lewis.

[34] Walter J. Shepard, Democracy in Transition, American Political Science Review, February 1935, p. 16. Presidential address.

Absurd Legal Loophole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, where a person testifies under oath in a completely contradictory manner, he shows his utter contempt for the sanctity of his oath and should be found guilty of perjury. Under the present Federal statute on this subject, before proceeding to obtain an indictment, the prosecution must decide which time he was lying and then allege and prove that was the time he gave false testimony. All he has to do to escape conviction is to show that he happened to tell the truth that time and was lying the other time. Such a situation simply cannot be understood by the layman and should not be tolerated by the lawmaker.

It was to correct this intolerable and absurd loophole in the law that I introduced H. R. 799, to extend the law relating to perjury to cover the wilful giving of contradictory testimony under oath. The Attorney General has recently endorsed the principle behind this measure. I have requested the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to grant an early hearing to plug this loophole. I hope this Congress will act promptly to wipe out this absurdity.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following splendid editorial on this subject from the Washington Star:

ABSURD LEGAL LOOPHOLE

A big loophole in the Federal perjury law will be plugged up if Congress approves an amendment proposed by Attorney General Brownell. Under the present law it is not sufficient to prove that a person made contradictory statements under oath. The Government must show which of the statements was false and which was true. In some cases this is not easy to do—and the Matusow case would seem to be one of those in the difficult category. Yet the former Communist has made false statements, at one time or another, before grand juries, in the courts and at congressional hearings. A grand jury and a Senate committee are trying to sift fact from fiction.

But it ought not to be necessary to spend time and money in such a search when it is plain from two sets of contradictory sworn statements that a person is a deliberate perjurer, or when such a person states that he has lied. Last year, to meet just such a situation, Mr. Brownell asked Congress to amend the perjury law so as to permit conviction on the mere showing that sworn contradictions have been given to a grand jury, a court or congressional committees. The request was made so late in the session, however, that no action was taken. Now the Attorney General, with the Matusow type of case in mind, has renewed his request. (The proposed amendment makes no mention of perjury committed before such an administrative agency as the Federal Communications Commission, to which Mrs. Marie Natvig gave conflicting testimony that has led to her indictment for perjury.) Mr. Brownell is right in describing as "ridiculous" the shortcomings of the present law. No self-confessed perjurer should be permitted to escape the consequences of his falsifications because of Government difficulty in proving which of two conflicting statements was a lie.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 7 marks the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk, the founder and first President of the Czechoslovak republic. He lived an extraordinarily productive life—1850–1937. He is acknowledged as one of the great democratic philosopher-statesmen of this century. A friend of Woodrow Wilson, and married to an American, Charlotte Garrigue, whose surname he adopted as his middle name, he was always an admirer of the United States. Thomas G. Masaryk was born in Moravia, the son of a Slovakian coachman. His unusual ability enabled him to study at the University of Vienna, where he became professor of philosophy. From 1882 to 1911, he taught at the University of Prague. From his youth, he was active in the political education of his people and took a leading part in the movement to liberate his country from Austrian rule. He was elected to the Austrian Parliament, but was forced to flee to Paris at the outbreak of World War I. There, he formed the Czechoslovak National Council, which was recognized by the Allies as the Government of Czechoslovak Republic, and was reelected to the office in 1920, 1927, and 1934. In 1935, he resigned as President because of his advanced age.

It is very befitting that Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of the State of Michigan, issued the following proclamation on behalf of this great statesman:

PROCLAMATION—THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK DAY

This year on March 7 American citizens of Czechoslovakian descent, along with all the other freedom-loving peoples of the world, are celebrating the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas Garrigue Masaryk.

On October 28, 1918, Thomas Masaryk proclaimed from Washington the independence of the Czechoslovak Republic. Mr. Masaryk's great patriotism was equalled only by his belief in liberty and his magnificent intelligence. He contributed much to western culture and our peoples honor him equally for each of these contributions.

Therefore, I, G. Mennen Williams, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim March 7, 1955, as Thomas Garrigue Masaryk Day in Michigan, and urge all our people to join their fellow citizens of Czechoslovakian descent in paying homage and tribute to the memory of this great statesman of peace and independence.

Given under my hand and the great seal of the State of Michigan, this second day of March in the year of our Lord 1955, and of the Commonwealth the 119th.

G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, *Governor.*

By the Governor:

JAMES M. HARE,
Secretary of State.

The Blessings of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, several days ago at the second century convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren, delivered a thought-provoking address entitled "The Blessings of Liberty."

I commend its reading to my brethren in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, and I now ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE BLESSINGS OF LIBERTY

(Address of Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States, at the second century convocation of Washington University, St. Louis, Mo., February 19, 1955)

It is a thrilling experience to participate in the opening session of this second century convocation of Washington University. The time, the place, and the cause to which the convocation is dedicated make it an occasion of major importance. The campus of Washington University enriched by a hundred years of devotion to the highest ideals of education and by the contribution of its thousands of alumni to the good life in America provides an ideal place to reflect upon "the blessings of liberty." To do so at a centennial celebration where the experience of the past, the events of the present and aims for the future can so appropriately be brought into balance adds greatly to the content of the occasion.

The times in which we are living are not normal times. Powerful forces are at work in the world—both to preserve liberty and to extinguish it. The interplay of hope and fear, belief and doubt, determination and frustration keeps the affairs of mankind and the minds of people in a state of turbulence—a turbulence that destroys perspective and clouds the vision. Such times call for constant reflection and reappraisal. In the atmosphere of these surroundings where men and women have devoted their lives to the pursuit of truth throughout an entire century, we can more effectively detach ourselves for the moment from the complexities of everyday life in order to determine what our heritage of liberty is and what we are doing today to preserve it for our children and for those who come after them.

It is imperative that we do this. Notwithstanding the contributions of patriots through the centuries, the farsighted wisdom of the Founding Fathers or the written guaranties of the Constitution, liberty is not necessarily our permanent possession. Both external and internal pressures constantly assail it. It is axiomatic that every generation, to keep its freedom, must earn it

through understanding of the past, vigilance in the present and determination for the future.

It is easier to know how to combat a foreign enemy who challenges our right to these freedoms and thus prevent a sudden collapse of the things we hold dear than it is to subject ourselves to daily analysis and discipline for the purpose of preventing the erosion that can with equal effectiveness destroy them. I say "easier" because Americans have never hesitated to make the choice between liberty and death. Normally we can rely upon our representatives in government to keep our defenses sufficiently strong to enable us to ward off outside attack, but we cannot delegate to any or all of our governmental representatives the full responsibility for protection of our freedoms from the processes of erosion. Such protection can be had only through an understanding on the part of individual citizens of what these freedoms are, how they came into being and whether their spirit dominates our institutions and the life of our country. The protection I speak of is that sense of strength and comradeship which flows from national unity, buttressed by freedom of thought, of expression, of mobility, and of participation by all in the life and Government of the Nation.

I have no doubt it seems strange to some people that we take time to discuss such things almost 2 centuries after the adoption of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights. There are some who regard our freedoms merely as their birthright which they may simply take for granted. There are others who would never shrink from the loss of little freedoms—by the other fellow of course. And there are also those who would procrastinate until the deluge. The fact remains, however, we do have a battle today to keep our freedoms from eroding just as Americans in every past age were obliged to struggle for theirs. Many thoughtful people are of the opinion that the danger of erosion is greater than that of direct attack. I do not mean to suggest—nor do they, I am sure—that outside of the totalitarian menace any substantial group of our citizens would wilfully destroy our freedoms. But the emotional influences of the times coupled with the latent suspicion and prejudice, inherent in human nature, are capable of threatening the basic rights of everyone, unless those emotions are controlled by self-discipline, community spirit, and governmental action.

A few days ago I read in the newspaper that a group of State employees—not in Missouri—charged with responsibility for determining what announcements could be posted on the employees' bulletin board refused to permit the Bill of Rights to be posted on the ground that it was a controversial document. It was reported that the altercation became intense, and that only after the governor in writing vouched for its non-controversial character was the Bill of Rights permited to occupy a place along with routine items of interest to the State employees. And this happened in the United States of America on the 15th day of December 1954, the 163d anniversary of our Bill of Rights, declared by proclamation of President Eisenhower to be Bill of Rights Day.

It is straws in the wind like this which cause some thoughtful people to ask the question whether ratification of the Bill of Rights could be obtained today if we were faced squarely with the issue. They inquire whether we are as united today in defending our traditional freedoms as were the American people in asserting them during the first years of Constitutional government in the United States.

My faith in the sober second thought of the American people makes me confident that it would now be ratified. On the other hand I am not prepared to dispute with those who believe the issue would provoke great controversy.

Have we not had enough controversy over teaching in and the conduct of our colleges and schools, both public and private, to warrant the inference that an effort would be made to curb freedom of speech and thought in that important segment of American life?

Have not sufficient doubts been expressed concerning the rights of individuals to invoke their constitutional privilege against self-incrimination to justify the belief that the proposed adoption of this safeguard against tyranny might provoke heated discussion?

Does not the suspicion that has attached to lawyers who represent unpopular defendants indicate some departure from the constitutional principle that every person charged with crime is entitled to be effectively represented by counsel?

Are there not enough shortcuts advocated, and too often practiced, in our time-honored legal procedures resulting in what we called a denial of due process of law?

Have there not been enough invasions of the freedom of the press to justify a concern about the inviolability of that great right?

Departures from the letter and spirit of our constitutional principles are not the product of any one person or any one group of persons. They are more properly chargeable to the entire body politic; to the suspicion, hatred, intolerance, and irresponsibility that stalk the world today; and also to a lack of appreciation of the age-old struggle of mankind to achieve our present-day blessings of liberty. Government, whether national, state or local, is not the sole culprit in this matter. For it does not operate in a vacuum. In the last analysis it only reflects the mores, the attitudes, the state of mind of the dominant groups of society.

How do we come to have a Bill of Rights, and what is its significance in the history of this Nation?

The Bill of Rights, which became part of our fundamental law in December 1791 does not by any means define all our rights. Many of our rights are to be found in the original Constitution, and others are formulated in later amendments.

The Bill of Rights did not originate the rights which it guarantees; there was at the time of its adoption not a single novel idea in it. It did summarize in a striking and effective manner the personal and public liberties which Americans 164 years ago regarded as their due, and as being properly beyond the reach of any government, old or new.

The men of our First Congress knew, as we may be in danger of forgetting, that each element in the Bill of Rights was a painfully won acquisition. They knew that government must be neither too strong nor too weak; that whatever form it may assume, government is potentially as dangerous a thing as it is a necessary one. They knew that power must be lodged somewhere to prevent anarchy within and conquest from without, but that this power could be abused to the detriment of their liberties. Confronted by this paradox, they turned to the experience of their forebears for counsel.

The English people, in their long struggle to control the monarchy founded by William the Conqueror, hit upon a happy solution: government should remain strong for its proper ends, but its strength should be kept within clearly defined limits. It became the consensus of the English people that certain acts should be clearly understood by all to be beyond power of government, and illegal if committed by any of its agents. Here we have the basis of the Anglo-Saxon legal and constitutional tradition.

The first great document in this tradition was the Magna Carta of 1215. There was little new in Magna Carta. It merely recorded the rights which had been asserted, with varying success, against the Norman monarchy during the previous century and a half, and needless to say, there were reactions and backslidings in the five centuries that followed. But in the main the movement was forward, toward the accumulation of a body of well-established liberties and immunities enjoyed by the true-born Englishman.

The century or so during which the British colonized America was especially important in the development of British constitutional rights. A full century before Madison rose in the First Congress and proposed our American Bill of Rights, the British Bill of Rights had already come into being. It was the culmination of generations of struggle against the arbitrary government of the Stuart dynasty in England.

In the course of the 18th century, the question arose whether the residents of Thirteen American Colonies were true-born Englishmen, and as such entitled to the traditional liberties and immunities enjoyed in the homeland. Since the King and Parliament of Great Britain were resolved upon giving a negative answer to this question, the colonies decided, in the year 1776, that the time had come to make a fresh start, and to adopt a Declaration of Independence.

In one sense, the Declaration is a lineal descendant of Magna Carta. But in another sense, it is a very different sort of document, a characteristic product of the Age of Reason. Instead of appealing to royal concessions and traditional immunities, it takes its stand upon self-evident truths, the laws of nature, and unalienable rights. It was a new turn in human history. It was an experiment which had never been attempted. It is still on trial.

Our Revolutionary forefathers had had their fill of royal governors, and of George III and his ministers, and so they forgot for a time one of the great lessons of constitutional history: that government must be strong for its proper ends. Many of the new State constitutions set up a hobbled and ineffectual executive branch. Our first attempt to create a national Government, the Articles of Confederation, provided for no executive at all. Our attempt to operate under a weak government barely got us through the Revolutionary War. The return of peace began a drift which, all clear minds perceived, was toward anarchy. The inevitable and timely reaction brought about the Federal Convention of 1787, by which our present Constitution was submitted to the American people.

To the American people, the Constitution was a new and permanent legal basis for their Government. They wanted nothing left to conjecture. They insisted upon concrete rights being set down in black and white. If government was to be strengthened, the more apparent became the need to delimit its proper powers, and to itemize the immunities which its citizens ought to enjoy. And so, directly upon the establishment of Government under the Constitution, the first Congress submitted the Bill of Rights to the States.

Such, in the most general kind of way, is the process by which we acquired our Bill of Rights. If you have not read its provisions recently, I urge that you read and reread them. They were never more important. The Bill of Rights contains only 462 words and can be read in only a few moments, but from the American viewpoint it embraces the wisdom of the ages as divined from man's struggle for freedom throughout civilization.

The liberties thus written into our fundamental law have not gone unassailed in the course of our national history, for men in office are still men. Whether men derive their authority from hereditary right or

from popular election, they remain prone to overstep constitutional limitations and invade legal immunities. Periods of domestic dissension and of foreign war are especially liable to produce tendencies to disregard established rights in the name of national safety. Often the tendency persists after the danger which provoked it has passed away, and at such times Americans who cherish these rights have had to fight to vindicate them. The French Revolution, and the deep cleft of opinion which it brought about in our country, led to the notorious Alien and Sedition Acts of 1798. When Thomas Jefferson succeeded to the Presidency 3 years later, he set free all those who had been imprisoned under what he regarded as an unconstitutional statute. Our Civil War saw the tendency to substitute military for civil tribunals which the Supreme Court rebuked in the famous case of Ex parte Milligan in 1866. World War I was followed by a wave of repressive measures, such as mass arrests without benefit of habeas corpus, which were strenuously opposed by the libertarians of that day. In our time, we have seen the greatest of wars give way to a decade of chronic tension and crisis, in which it is to be expected that new encroachments upon traditional liberties may have to be countered.

I have suggested that if there has been damage done to our traditional rights it has been accomplished by a process of erosion. Are the privileges and immunities summed up in our Bill of Rights in danger of loss through subtle changes in our climate of opinion? Is distrust of our fellow countrymen wearing away our traditional concept of the innate dignity of man?

These questions call for constant and intense exploration far beyond the limits of this discussion, but because we are here on the campus of a great university, I would remind myself and you that if our other rights are to be of value to us we must first have the untrammeled right to search for the truth in institutions such as this, and then to teach it in accordance with the dictates of conscience. If that right should ever fail, so will our other blessings of liberty. That is precisely what has happened to people in other parts of the world, and in our time.

But I do not wish to end on a mournful note. Nor do I wish to suggest that our liberties are about to be lost. Erosion may have begun in some respects but the fabric of our liberties is still far from undermined.

Surely the America that sent 12 million men into a world war to preserve freedom everywhere will not allow its own freedoms to be frittered away. Surely the America that has poured out its substance to rehabilitate the free world, and even our former enemies, so that they can resist tyranny, will not willingly pass on to its children less freedom than it has itself enjoyed.

It has been sagely remarked that men more frequently require to be reminded than informed, and I hope that we may all join in the good work of reminding each other of how much we have to lose, and how heedless we would be to lose it.

With a strong belief in the wholesomeness of our objectives and the courage to defend our freedoms, I have no doubt we shall preserve our heritage.

Faith, the apostle tells us, is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen. Faith in America confirms the hope that we shall preserve for our children all that our fathers, by the way of clear thinking, firm resolution, patient endurance, and willing sacrifice secured for us; that our heritage of liberty will not dwindle but increase; and that we will prove worthy of what we have so abundantly received.

It is such faith, I believe, that brings all of us together today to consider the blessings of liberty.

The School-Lunch Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement I have today submitted to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture in opposition to the proposed cut in moneys for the school-lunch program. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to express my opposition to the proposed reduction in appropriations for the school-lunch program. Budget recommendations, if followed, would mean a reduction of approximately $15 million worth of section 6 foods, and such action would seriously affect the school-lunch program in my State. With an increasing number of children participating, we need these section 6 foods along with the donated commodities received each year to keep our children's meals up to standard. If the $15 million were cut off, it would mean less adequate meals, fewer free meals, and the closing of several schools.

Section 6 foods are of value to the school-lunch program because children throughout the country need more vitamin C than they receive at home. Canned fruits and vegetables are very necessary for an adequate and well-balanced diet, a diet that is delectable, interesting, and colorful. Peanut butter is accepted and enjoyed by practically all children, and this product supplies the additional proteins needed by youngsters.

An increasing number of meals are being served under this program in West Virginia, and this might be expected as a result of any normal population growth. Even though our Federal appropriations should continue at $83,236,197, one can see how thinly it has to be distributed when figures from the biennial report of 1947–48 are compared with those of the 1953–54 report.

	1947–48	1953–54
Number of schools participating	1,278	1,478
Number of meals served	13,406,002	21,394,925
Number of free meals served	2,215,750	3,334,503
Average daily participation	86,828	123,862
Total expenditure	$3,097,484.35	$5,149,117.77
Amount paid by children	$1,782,611.87	$3,551,219.87

West Virginia's population, however, is not increasing. Rather, it has been decreasing over the past several months as a result of conditions in the coal industry which have seriously and adversely affected the State's economy. Notwithstanding the fact that there has been a decrease in population, there is an accelerated increase in school lunches served. In December of 1954, we had an average daily participation of 143,474 children, or almost 20,000 more children per day than we had last year.

Gentlemen, these facts are enough to convince anyone that it would be a serious mistake to curtail this humanitarian program. Many children never receive a well-balanced and appetizing meal other than that which is provided under the school-lunch program. Over 225,000 people in West Virginia are dependent upon surplus food commodities at the present time. In such a distressed area, anyone who is willing to look a fact in the eye can see that children are being deprived of adequate diets in the home, and must depend upon meals such as those served at school for additional fruits and vegetables so necessary to proper health and growth.

Gentlemen, if this Government must retrench and curtail its spending, let it not be miserly in a program like this, a program which, in my opinion, is one of the best ever to be devised.

A nation's wealth is not to be found only in natural resources; its greatest wealth is in its human resources, its people, and these must be healthy in mind and in body if America is to be strong. Let us not be penny-wise and pound foolish in our attempts to economize. I am in favor of economizing wherever and whenever it is practicably possible to do so, but I submit that funds for the school-lunch program cannot be and should not be cut in the name of economy. I urge you, therefore, as members of this committee, not to sustain the reduction that has been recommended. I beseech and implore you to restore the amount to the extent that it will equal or surpass the figure within which the States are presently operating. The health and welfare of children cannot be measured in dollars and cents, and the strength of this Nation lies not in its gold and silver but in its boys and girls, the men and women of the future.

Kalewala Day of Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 28, 1835, the Finnish national epic, the Kalewala, first appeared in book form. The 120th anniversary of this great epic was celebrated on the 28th of February of this year. Composed of folk verses about the deeds of three semi-divine brothers of gigantic stature who lived in Kalewala, the epic has had a great effect on all Finnish art.

The Kalewala is a mythical land of happiness and abundance. This epic of rich mythology is composed in the eight-syllable trochaic line that was imitated by Longfellow in Hiawatha. Scholars had known of the Kalewala since 1733, but the verses had to wait until the following century to appear in print.

The verses were first collected by two Finnish physicians, Dr. Zakarias Topelius, who published fragments of the epic in 1822, and Dr. Elias Lonnrot, who was responsible for the 1835 edition and the Kalewala as it appears today.

Appropriately close to Kalewala Day is the date of March 5, the anniversary of the birth of John Ludvig Runeberg, 1804–77. This great national poet of Finland, like all Finnish authors of his day, wrote in Swedish. From 1837 until the end of his life, he served as professor of Latin at Provoo, near Helsinki.

The Finnish national anthem was taken from Runeberg's The Tales of Ensign Stal, 1844. Among his other best known works are the peasant epic The Elk-hunters, 1832, a cycle of romances, King Fjalar, 1844, and Nadeschda, 1841. Runeberg's works have been, in part, translated into English.

The country of Finland, through its struggle to remain free and independent, has endeared itself in the hearts of all Americans. The relations of the United States with Finland have been noteworthy for the respect each holds for the other. It would be a sad day for the world if Soviet imperialism ever endangered Finnish independence. And I know that I speak for all Americans in saying that we intend that a free Finland shall continue the fine contributions that distinguishes her history and traditions.

Commemoration of the 105th Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas G. Masaryk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in observing the birthday of one of those great men of our times who belongs not only to his own homeland but to the entire world. March 7 was the 105th anniversary of the birth of Thomas G. Masaryk, who was such a man. Born in Moravia, of a humble parentage, Thomas Masaryk rose to prominence as a scholar, author, philosopher, and man of affairs.

It was his vision and tenacity that led to the emergence of the Czechoslovak state, out of the wreckage of World War I. He established the Czech National Council in 1917. He organized the famous Czech Legion which marched through the great expanse of Russia in the aftermath of the Bolshevik revolution. He came to the United States and, winning the support and friendship of President Wilson, proclaimed the independence of the Republic of Czechoslovakia and secured its recognition by all the great powers.

Masaryk became the first President of Czechoslovakia, and dominated its sound development as a European power until 1935, when he resigned on account of his health. It is perhaps a blessing that Thomas Masaryk died before the Nazi scourge immersed Europe. His complete dedication to his country and to the ideals of freedom and democracy will live on forever in his memory and teachings. His great friendship for the United States will remain as an inspiration to all of us who feel the strong bond of friendship in return toward the brave men and women who are keeping their country alive through the ordeal of Russian domination behind the Iron Curtain.

Federal Appropriations for Forest-Fire Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. BYRD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a statement which I submitted last week to the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior. My remarks are in opposition to the proposed reduction of Federal funds for the forest fire suppression and control program. The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am deeply appreciative of this opportunity to express my opposition to any reduction in moneys for the Federal forest fire control fund. It is my understanding that the President's budget would cut the appropriation by $1,083,690, and I believe that it would be a great mistake to follow this course.

I am not in a position to speak for the Nation as a whole concerning this subject, but I do know something about the problem as it pertains to my State of West Virginia.

West Virginia, being situated in the heart of the Appalachian Mountains, has an extremely rugged terrain that provided numerous watersheds and produces many streams. These meandering streams are the source of the navigable rivers that serve West Virginia and many other States. Most of the slopes are covered with an indispensable form of plant life—trees. These trees produce a sponge on the forest floor that creates a continuous flow of small streams. Other types of vegetation are not consistent to proper land use of these rugged slopes.

Today we are faced with the tremendous problem of fire that is threatening to destroy this vital natural resource and West Virginia, I am sure, is only one of many States that are confronted with this enemy. Progress has been made in recent years in combating this serious enemy to our forests, but not sufficiently to bring the problem under control. Recently, we have experienced serious droughts that have added to the severity of the problem. In 1952 and 1953, West Virginia suffered a forest fire loss of more than one million acres. During the fall of 1952, the southern part of West Virginia was riding on the brink of disaster and, had high winds prevailed during this period, there is every reason to believe that a loss of human lives and homes would have resulted. Presently, if West Virginia were to experience a severe outbreak of fires, we would be without adequate funds due to heavy expenditures in 1952 and 1953.

United States Weather Bureau records cause some experts to believe that there are more dry years just ahead. Should this be true, we would not be financially equipped to control forest fires.

In view of the fact that more States are increasing their areas of protection and the fact that all of West Virginia's forests are under protection, the Federal appropriations for West Virginia have been on the decline, as shown in the following table:

Federal allotments and State budgets

Fiscal year	Federal allotment	State budget
1955	$136,431	$200,538
1954	136,431	259,974
1953	141,379	283,343
1952	152,918	[1] 325,000
1951	163,462	349,023
1950	163,462	344,001
1949	175,766	232,169
1948	193,329	187,180

[1] Estimated.

Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake to follow a penny-wise and pound-foolish policy in reducing funds for combating this great enemy of our natural resources. It is imperative that, during the critical days and years ahead, years which will spell the destiny of our Nation in world history, we exert every precaution for the protection of our forests which, in turn, preserve the watersheds and conserve the soil of America. I, therefore, urge the Committee not to reduce this important item, but, rather, that it be increased by $2 million in order to provide an equitable Federal distribution of funds for the forest fire suppression and control program.

Incorporation of Veterans of World War I of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would grant a Federal charter to a new national organization known as the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America. This organization meets a need which has become more and more apparent in recent years—a need for separate recognition of the common interests of those who served in our first great world conflict. It is not, of course, that these older veterans want in any sense to dissociate themselves from all the brave young men who carried on so splendidly in World War II and in Korea. But some of their memories and traditions are distinctive, and I can fully understand how there is a growing desire to band together for the purpose of keeping them alive.

Actually, this new group has been operating since 1949, when it was first established by a group of veterans who met in Cleveland, Ohio. In 1953 it held its first national convention, in Baltimore, which was attended by representatives from all over the country, and in 1954 it met again, in Buffalo, with a much larger attendance. It is now formally organized in 31 States and several Territories, including even a post in the Philippine Islands. It has a total of 186 units, some with as many as 400 individual members. There is also a ladies

auxiliary which has organized 84 units to this date.

The organization is, of course, nonprofit, and it has not aspirations which would bring it in conflict with the other large veterans groups. I hope it will be accorded the honor and privilege of a Federal charter.

Tenth Anniversary of Capture of Remagen Bridge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BROOKS HAYS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to comment briefly on the significance of the 10th anniversary of the capture of the Remagen Bridge on March 7, 1945. This was one of the heroic acts which turned the tide of battle during World War II. I quote from the Washington News of March 9, 1945, the report sent by C. R. Cunningham, United Press war correspondent:

> Victory is in the air on this side of the Rhine, where American troops hit the pay dirt of Germany.
>
> It can't be told yet how the Americans crossed the Rhine, but it took only 15 minutes to get at least one company of infantry to the eastern side yesterday afternoon.
>
> The crossing was a case of spotting an opportunity and grabbing it. Maj. Murray Deevers, of Hagarville, Ark., ordered his men across and the company swept into inner Germany.

An earlier dispatch from Cunningham had reported that a Second Lieutenant Burroughs and 1st Lt. Carl Timmerman, of West Point, Nebr., spotted the opportunity and flashed the word to battalion headquarters where Lt. Col. Leonard Engemann, of Minnesota, made the historic decision.

It is with understandable pride that I mention the outstanding contribution made in this historic advance by the late Maj. Murray Deevers, of Hagarville, Johnson County, Ark., at that time within the Fifth Congressional District which I have the honor to represent. Johnson County is now a part of the district represented by our able colleague Mr. TRIMBLE.

I am sure that the Members share my feeling of deep appreciation for the service of Major Deevers, and those associated with him who contributed so much to the defense of our country.

Slovak Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 8, 1955

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today is the national independence day celebrated by the Slovak people throughout the world. For 10 years their traditions and ideals, firmly dedicated to a heritage very like our own, have been kept alive beneath the cruel oppression of Soviet occupation. Let us joint in acknowledging their brave resistance. Let us send them words of hope and cheer. And let us reaffirm our high resolve to help them win freedom and independence once again.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 10, 1955

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

God of all mercy, bowing at this wayside altar of Thy grace, may we be vividly conscious that we need not turn back to bygone centuries to hear Thy voice, as if Thou dost speak no longer to those now upon the earth. Give us ears to hear Thy imperial imperatives above the noise of crashing systems, yea, Thy voice in and through the change and confusion of our day. May we not imagine that the judgment which shall search the secrets of our hearts is postponed to some far-off future assize, when in these days of destiny, by our response to the want and woe of Thy world and of Thy children, Thy throne is set up. Even now Thou art searching out the souls of men before Thy judgment seat. So, hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our compassion help to heal the open sores of the world as we serve the present age, our calling to fulfill. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 8, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In compliance with the provisions of section 10 (b) (4) of the Railroad Retirement Act, approved June 24, 1937, and of section 12 (1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, approved June 25, 1938, I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress, the report of the Railroad Retirement Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 10, 1955.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 829) to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the Second Pan-American Games, the Seventh Olympic Winter Games, Games of the XVI Olympiad, future Pan-American Games and Olympic Games, and certain other international amateur sports competition, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 456) relating to the regulation of nets in Alaska waters, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Government Reorganization was authorized to meet during the sessions of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. BYRD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Finance was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate this afternoon.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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