SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1955)

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

Rev. Harry G. Griffiths, pastor, the First Presbyterian Church, Van Wert, Ohio, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Creator of the Universe, Judge of the Nations, Father of Mankind, we pause to acknowledge Thy sovereignty and to proclaim that Thou art greater than any of Thy gifts.

Thou art always present; it is our awareness of Thee that at times grows dim. Open the eyes of faith that we may endure as seeing Thee who art invisible.

We beseech Thee to give these representatives of the people a deep sense of Thy purpose for the Nation; for except Thou build the house they labor in vain that do build it. Guide them, we beseech Thee, in the way of righteousness and peace; be Thou the cloud by day and the pillar of fire by night. Lead them into the soundest of all measures, obedience to Thee.

We pray for the people. Give unto them such a concern for the true welfare of this Nation that, through their representatives, they shall express truly great statesmanship.

Thou hast seen fit to shed Thy special grace upon our land. Grant that in the abundance of Thy favor we shall be found faithful. May we be instruments of Thine for peace on earth and good will toward men. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 18, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States withdrawing 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. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 230. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681);

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue, in the city of Boston, nonnavigable tidewaters;

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 2194. An act for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida;

H. R. 3560. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3561. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941;

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended;

H. R. 5100. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care;

H. R. 5106. An act to amend the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, so as to authorize loans for farm housing to be guaranteed or insured under the same terms and conditions as apply to residential housing; and

H. R. 5177. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., a portion of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 230. An act to amend the act of July 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 681); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 1816. An act to declare the tidewaters in the waterway (in which is located Fort Point Channel and South Bay) above the easterly side of the highway bridge over Fort Point Channel at Dorchester Avenue in the city of Boston nonnavigable tidewaters; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 1835. An act for the relief of the Board of Commissioners of Sedgwick County, Kans.;

H. R. 2194. An act for the relief of the Military Department of the State of Florida;

H. R. 3560. An act to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3561. An act to further amend the act of January 2, 1942, entitled "An act to provide for the prompt settlement of claims for damages occasioned by Army, Navy, and Marine Corps forces in foreign countries";

H. R. 3996. An act to further amend the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945;

H. R. 4052. An act to amend the act of January 12, 1951, as amended, to continue in effect the provisions of title II of the First War Powers Act, 1941; and

H. R. 4221. An act to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4426. An act to amend section 7 of the act approved September 22, 1922, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

H. R. 5100. An act to amend Veterans Regulation No. 7 (a) to clarify the entitlement of veterans to outpatient dental care; and

H. R. 5177. An act to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to reconvey to Richland County, S. C., a portion of the Veterans' Administration hospital reservation, Columbia, S. C.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 50) commemorating the 200th anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Whereas this year marks the two hundredth anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia and their journey to find refuge and haven in Louisiana and other areas; and

Whereas this exodus, immortalized in Longfellow's poem Evangeline, parallels the landing of the Pilgrims in America and their quest for freedom, independence, and the pursuit of happiness; and

Whereas the original Acadian settlers vigorously participated in the early development of Louisiana, and they and their descendants have contributed in full measure to the history, culture, character, and way of life of the people of that great State; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States joins the people of Louisiana in commemorating the bicentennial anniversary of the migration of the Acadians from Nova Scotia to Louisiana and other areas, and pays tribute to their spirit of courage, perseverance, and loyalty that has inspired the Nation.

SEC. 2. A copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated shall be transmitted to the Acadian Bicentennial Celebration Association.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in pursuance of the duties that go with being a member of the Board of Visitors to the Naval Academy, I should like to ask leave of absence for this afternoon and tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, leave is granted.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSIONS

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was authorized to meet during sessions of the Senate for a period of 3 weeks.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day I requested the consent of the Senate that the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet for the next 3 weeks during the sessions of the Senate. At

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

the time I made the request, I was not aware that the ranking minority member of the committee had not been informed of the request. Therefore, after consulting with the chairman and minority members of the subcommittee, I desire to modify the request so as to provide that the subcommittee may meet during the session of the Senate on tomorrow only.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I may say that, generally, it is the desire to follow the rule of the Senate and not to make such requests for more than 1 day, except in unusual cases, such as in the case of the Committee on Appropriations.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—WITHDRAWAL OF A NOMINATION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States withdrawing the nomination of Jesse T. Smathers to be postmaster at Canton, N. C.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

G. Frederick Reinhardt, of California, a Foreign Service Officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the State of Vietnam; and

Dr. Althea K. Hottel, of Pennsylvania, to be representative of the United States on the Social Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

By Mr. MILLIKIN, from the Committee on Finance:

Orley McGlothlin, of Colorado, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 47, with headquarters at Denver, Colo., vice J. Chalmers Ewing, resigned.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and twenty-one postmasters; and

Floyd C. Hammond, to be postmaster at Myrtle Beach, S. C., reported adversely.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be a United States circuit judge in the Fifth Circuit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be the sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations this day confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the quorum call there may be the customary morning hour for the transaction of routine business, under the usual 2-minute limitation on speeches.

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

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Morning business is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Three letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS—WITHDRAWAL OF NAMES

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, withdrawing the names of certain aliens whose deportation has been suspended, heretofore transmitted to the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON THE ARTS

A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPEAL OF REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT ON NUMBER OF PENALTY ENVELOPES AND WRAPPERS ON HAND

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

SOCIAL-SECURITY COVERAGE FOR MEMBERS OF DENTAL PROFESSION—LETTERS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD letters from two of my constituents, dentists, in Detroit, Mich., who argue cogently for social-security coverage for members of the dental profession.

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

DETROIT, MICH., *February 15, 1955.*

The Honorable PATRICK V. McNAMARA,
United States Senator for Michigan,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am writing you as my representative in the United States Senate to solicit your interest in including the dental profession under the Social Security Act at this present session of Congress.

I am of the opinion that the delegates to the American Dental Association should not be asked to speak for us on social security. They are selected to represent us in matters of policy relating to the practice of dentistry and not in the field of insurance and investments.

I also think the aligning of the dental profession with the medical and legal professions is a mistake. The physican carries on a limited practice while confined to a chair, as can an attorney. The dentist must have all his physical faculties, his hands dare not shake and he must have perfect vision.

May I give you some interesting facts which I have assembled:

On October 15, 1954, a secret ballot was taken by members of the Detroit District Dental Society, a component of the Michigan State Dental Society, all members of the American Dental Association: 946 votes were returned, 599 voted for social security, 260 voted no, 84 no definite opinion, 3 void.

At the national meeting of the ADA at Miami, November 1954: 235 compulsory inclusion no, 150 yes; voluntary inclusion: 180 no; 153 yes; losing the motion by only 27 votes.

The ADA only represents about 60 percent of the dentists in the United States of America. Approximately 25,000 dentists belong to no dental society, many in small towns have no opportunity for expressing a choice. It is my firm belief that 75 percent would favor voluntary inclusion.

Recent polls in Pennsylvania and other States indicate that the majority of dentists in those States favor OASI.

It seems to me that we should be given the same consideration as members of the clergy, as ours too is a personal service. We should be allowed to choose whether we want social security or do not want it.

I resent being told by any association that I cannot have this additional security in the latter years of my life.

I submit this letter for your serious consideration and am sure you will see that the information is presented through the proper channels for action at this present session of Congress.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM N. MOFFETT, D. D. S.

DETROIT, MICH., *March 21, 1955.*

Hon. PATRICK MCNAMARA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Please be advised that in a recent poll of the membership of the Detroit District Dental Society 68-plus percent voted for inclusion. Our membership includes those not self-employed and who are now a part of the OASI program or are in private insurance and pension plans, and they, it is reasonable to assume, will want to practice as self-employed after they get their pension and be exempt from the OASI tax. You can verify above by writing the executive secretary at 4421 Woodward Avenue. Naturally, they voted against inclusion.

I submit that the house of delegates voted against our inclusion; but, Senator, those delegates are uninstructed delegates. Here in Michigan those delegates are not elected by the membership; they are appointed by the president of the Michigan State Dental Association. If the American Dental Association wants the Congress to know what we dentists want, they could poll all their members inside of a couple of weeks' time and give you the result with the questions asked. They are, it appears to me, afraid to do so, fearful that that vote will repudiate them. I further understand that the Chicago Dental Society and some other societies in their polls voted overwhelmingly in favor of our inclusion.

Our Detroit society membership is about one-half of the membership of the Michigan State Dental Association. We are a component of the Michigan State association and the Michigan State is a constituent of the American Dental Association.

I trust that you will use your influence and get your Senate committee to include us and to get the Senate as well as the House to pass it. I understand Ike is favorable.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY W. MACK.

P. S.—I feel that every law should apply to everyone, Senator.

CONSERVATION OF SOIL AND WATER — RESOLUTION OF KANSAS STATE SENATE

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Resolution No. 16, adopted by the Kansas State Senate, relating to the construction of projects for the conservation of soil and water in the State of Kansas.

There being no objection, the resolution was received and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See resolution printed in full when laid before the Senate by the Acting President pro tempore on Apr. 18, 1955, p. 4525, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a series of five resolutions adopted by the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution.

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

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RULINGS BY THE U. N. INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

"Whereas the International Court of Justice has upheld the U. N. administrative tribunal's decision to indemnify, by approximately $179,000, the American employees of the U. N. Secretariat dismissed for refusing to answer questions in regard to subversive activities; and

"Whereas the General Assembly at the last session followed the advisory opinion of the court with our two American representatives, handling the question, concurring; and

"Whereas other incidents have occurred respecting the dismissal of American nationals on loyalty charges employed by the U. N.; e. g., the failure to dismiss Americans from the UNESCO Secretariat in Paris in which matter the Associated Press reported that our Ambassador to the U. N., Hon. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., had criticized this lack of dismissal but said that UNESCO was outside his jurisdiction; and

"Whereas the U. N. Charter has been adopted on a treaty basis whereby, by constitutional provision, treaties shall be the supreme law of the land; and acceptance of such rulings by the United States acknowledges the authority of the World Court thereby paving the way, by precedent, for further implementation of the U. N. Charter into a world government; and

"Whereas doubt is expressed by an eminent legal authority as to whether a constitutional amendment could be drawn that would prevent this type of flagrant abuse to our American sense of propriety and justice since these matters have to do with the internal management of the U. N. in which we have only one voice; and

"Whereas American employees in the United Nations are required to take an oath with the interests of the United Nations only in view and the report on standards of conduct in the international civil service has advised United Nations employees to put loyalty to the United Nations above loyalty to their own countries: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress to deduct from the United Nations assessments on the United States the amount of the awards in question; and to consider legislation for retaining full authority over the activities of American citizens employed by the United Nations and its specialized agencies; and to nullify the loyalty oath to the United Nations; further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to our Senators and Congressmen from Kansas, members of the Foreign Relations Committee, and members of the Internal Security Subcommittee."

"MILITARY AFFAIRS OF THE U. N.

"Whereas the former Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, has recorded in his book, In the Cause of Peace, that the Assistant Secretary-General for Political and Security Council Affairs has been since the inception of the U. N. a delegate from the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas it is further stated that the Big Five in London had agreed to the appointment of a Soviet national to this post, thus setting a precedent which has since perpetuated itself; and

"Whereas this assistant secretaryship and authority includes political questions, atomic energy, disarmament, and the military affairs; and

"Whereas the charter provides for a military staff committee composed of personnel of the permanent members of the Security Council and is to assist the Council in military matters relating to the maintenance of peace, the command of forces, and the regulation of armaments and in addition the responsibility for the strategic direction of armed forces available for use by the U. N. (Report by Subcommittee on the United Nations Charter Staff Study No. 7, p. 3); and

"Whereas our servicemen were under the command of the United Nations in the so-called police action in Korea and our American generals have testified regarding restrictions placed on their military movements by the U. N., thereby creating a sanctuary for the enemy: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, record its opposition to subjecting our armed forces in the future to any such arrangements as in Korea, restraining them to a 'war of containment,' not a 'war for victory,' and go on record for a strong American Armed Forces in these United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge our Congress to thoroughly investigate any such commitments as the London agreement by the Big Five, secret or otherwise, and take measures to protect the welfare and security of our armed forces and national defense of our country."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"TREATY LAW

"Whereas treaties 'shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby' when two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and

"Whereas executive agreements may have the same prerogatives; and

"Whereas the United States is one of the few nations in which a treaty becomes self-executing automatically: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, heartily endorse an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as the Bricker amendment which provides 'that a treaty or other international agreement shall become effective as internal law in the United States only through legislation valid in the absence of international agreement'; further

"*Resolved,* That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, request that the United States Senate consider the advisability of further amending the Constitution so as to require either a majority or two-thirds vote of the entire membership before any treaty can be adopted."

"NATO STATUS OF FORCES TREATY

"Whereas the NATO Status of Forces Treaty, formerly an executive agreement unknown to most of the public and ratified July 18, 1953, by the United States Senate, abolishes the traditional right of the American Armed Forces stationed abroad, both civilian and those in uniform, to the protection of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights; and

"Whereas many countries consider the accused as guilty before trial and have no

conception of the American fundamental belief in the right of the individual: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the Congress and the President of the United States to reestablish the rights guaranteed by the Constitution to Americans on foreign soil."

"AMERICANISM

"Whereas our American citizenship is our birthright to freedom; and

"Whereas to insulate our country against foreign schemes is isolationism in its truest form and the highest essence of Americanism: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the 57th annual conference of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reaffirm its unwavering support of the Constitution of the United States of America and its faith in the Founding Fathers of our country in the preservation of our American way of life."

RESOLUTIONS OF NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN COLONISTS

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, 11 resolutions adopted by the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists.

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

To the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"REVISION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

"Whereas a general revision of the United Nations Charter is to be brought before the United Nations Assembly in 1955; and

"Whereas well-formulated plans are to be presented by world-government proponents which may threaten or destroy the sovereignty of the United States, as per example: A plan for the division of the United States into four unrelated zones, each ruled by a commissar who cannot be a citizen of the zone or a former citizen of the zone he rules: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, is opposed to any revision of the Charter of the United Nations which would result in the weakening of the Constitution of the United States or in reducing its sovereignty."

"REAFFIRMATION OF RESOLUTIONS PASSED AT 33D GENERAL ASSEMBLY

"*Resolved*, That the 34th General Assembly of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, reaffirm the stand taken at the 33d General Assembly opposing ratification of the Genocide Convention and the Covenant of Human Rights; urging that the NATO Status of Forces Treaty be amended to give American servicemen their proper protection while serving in foreign countries; protesting the admittance of Red China to the United Nations; urging continued pursuance of the investigations into the causes of juvenile delinquency; and approving just and proper legislation protecting a man's right to work."

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"AFFIRMATIVE STAND FOR OUR REPUBLIC AND FOR THE CONSTITUTION

"Whereas insidious plans which would destroy the Constitution of the United States and the sovereignty of the United States of America, are now being promoted under the guise of peace campaigns and are being inspired by fear propaganda: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, in meeting assembled, this 13th day of April 1955, reaffirm our adamant stand for the Constitution of the United States and oppose any and all forms of world government, and/or treaties or entangling alliances which would destroy the independence of action of our Republic."

"RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE BRICKER AMENDMENT

"Whereas the Bricker amendment would invalidate treaties and executive agreements in conflict with the Constitution and the laws of the United States and the several States by amending article VI of the Constitution which now provides: 'All treaties, made * * * under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby; anything in the constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding'; and

"Whereas it is our opinion that this amendment should be passed with all possible speed as John Foster Dulles said in 1952, prior to his appointment as Secretary of State, that 'congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution, whereas, treaty laws can override the Constitution. Treaties, for example, can take powers from the States and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body; and they deny rights given the people by the constitutional Bill of Rights': Be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, in meeting assembled, this 13th day of April 1955, reaffirm strong approval and ardent support for the Bricker amendment and urge members of the State delegations in both Houses of Congress to use every effort to hasten the passage of this bill; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leaders in both the Senate and the House and to Vice President Richard Nixon and to Senator John Bricker."

"RETENTION OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

"Whereas admission to the United States is a privilege extended by our Government on certain conditions aimed to promote our country's best interests; and

"Whereas a renewed effort is being made under a recently presented bill, S. 519, which calls for amendments to the McCarran-Walter Act (Public Law 414), generally regarded as the most liberal immigration law in the history of our country, that will greatly reduce the protection afforded the United States in regard to quotas and requirements concerning aliens: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, reiterate its endorsement of the McCarran-Walter Act and urge Congress to retain this law in its entirety, as passed by the United States Congress in 1952, without amendments and modifications that might weaken its rigid enforcement; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leaders in both the Senate and the House."

"RELIGIOUS POLICY

"Whereas an Associated Press dispatch dated March 7, 1954, reported: 'The United States Information Agency announced today the creation of a new post, Chief of Religious Policy, and the appointment of Dr. D. Elton Trueblood to fill it;' and

"Whereas church and state have always been separated in the United States of America since the ratification of the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas this separation of ecclesiastical from political realms is based on the part of the Constitution, namely, article VI, 'no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office of public trust under the United States,' and the first amendment: 'Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof;' and

"Whereas we believe the appointment of the Chief of Religious Policy is a violation of the Constitution: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, in convention assembled, recommend the abolishment of the post at once; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies be sent to the President and other appropriate authorities."

"DISPLAY OF THE FLAG

"Whereas the flag of the United States of America is the symbol of our Nation; and

"Whereas there is an ever greater need for display of our flag, not only on public buildings, schools, and State institutions, but from every home throughout this country; and

"Whereas a general display of the flag by our citizenry would reaffirm faith in our Constitutional Republic: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the 34th general assembly of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, through its active membership, urge all citizens to own and display the flag of the United States of America at their homes on all those days set aside for special display of the flag as designated by section 2 (d) of the flag code, Public Law 829; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the flag code be observed as in section 2 (f) regarding display of the flag in or near every polling place on election days; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That funds be provided by the State and Federal Governments for the supplying, the cleaning, and/or replacement of United States flags in all Federal courtrooms and on Federal properties where United States flags are customarily flown; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the majority and minority leaders in the Senate and House, and to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee."

"CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS

"Whereas duly constituted committees of both Houses of the United States Congress have rendered valiant and in invaluable service to the Nation in exposing Communist infiltration in our Government and many fields of American life: Be it

"*Resolved*, That the 34th General Assembly of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, again commend the efforts of the various investigating committees exposing subversive activities and earnestly request the Congress to appropriate generous funds for the courageous campaign by our legislators and their staffs."

To the Committee on Finance:

"INVESTIGATIONS OF TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

"Whereas the Special Congressional Committee to Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations (approximately 6,000 in number, controling over $7 billion) indicated in a recent report that grants by foundations had been used for 'directing American education toward an international viewpoint, and disregarding the traditions to which they had been dedicated': Be it

"*Resolved*, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, urge that appropriations be allocated for further investigations, that the reports be publicized and that an end be put to tax ex-

emptions and preferential treatment for any foundation or organization found by the courts, the Justice Department, or the Congress to be subversive or disloyal to the United States of America; and be it further

"Resolved, That foundation funds be invested in United States Government bonds bought in the open market."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"REQUIRING THE TEACHING OF AMERICAN HISTORY

"Whereas the correct teaching of a course in American history in all schools, colleges and universities is in keeping with the object of the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists, as it enables our young people to have a better knowledge of our country and its governmental system, which is essential to good citizenship: Be it

"Resolved, That each State be urged to have laws passed requiring that a course in American and State history be taught in our elementary, junior and senior high schools and that at least one course in American history and civics be required for graduation in all State supported colleges and universities."

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

"APPROVAL OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 271

"Whereas there is a bill in Congress to authorize and pay for the copying of names of people whom the English ships brought to America between 1607 and 1807: Be it

"Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Colonists approve the House Joint Resolution 271 and that members be urged to write their legislators to support this bill."

DARK HOUSES FOR SPEARING FISH—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Anoka Sportsmen's Conservation Club on February 8, 1955, opposing the use of dark houses for spearing fish.

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

ANOKA SPORTSMEN'S CONSERVATION CLUB,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 1, 1955.

DEAR SIR: The following is the text of a resolution unanimously adopted by the Anoka Sportsmen's Conservation Club following due and proper discussion at our regular meeting, February 8, 1955:

"Resolved, That we, the members of the Anoka Sportsmen's Conservation Club, do hereby petition the members of the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Minnesota:

"To oppose the use of dark houses for spearing fish.

"To vote against any proposed legislation which would continue to permit dark house spearing, and

"To introduce appropriate legislation prohibiting the use of dark houses for spearing fish within territorial waters of the State of Minnesota."

We would appreciate your support and any comments or views you may have on this matter.

PETER W. LITTLEFIELD,
Recording Secretary.
RAY KEGLER,
President.
RICHARD LEWIS,
Vice President.
PHIL JOHNSON,
Treasurer.

RESOLUTIONS OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, ST. PAUL, MINN.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a series of resolutions adopted by the stockholders of Farmers Union Central Exchange at their 24th annual meeting in St. Paul, Minn., on March 2, 1955, printed in the RECORD. I commend them to the attention of the Senate.

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

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 24TH ANNUAL MEETING OF STOCKHOLDERS OF FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, INC., MARCH 2, 1955

DAIRY PROGRAM

Whereas farm price-support programs have been developed for all major farm crops but dairy products; and

Whereas the Farmers Union believes that dairy products are essential for the health and welfare of our increasing population; and

Whereas the sale of dairy products constitutes the major farm income of the dairy States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the delegates of the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, go on record that dairy products be included as a basic commodity to be supported along the lines of the program adopted by the National Dairy Producers Conference held at Madison, Wis., on January 23, 1954.

FAMILY FARM POLICY

Whereas a bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives by Representative JOHNSON of Wisconsin (H. R. 2000) and sponsored in the Senate by Senators HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, and MURRAY, of Montana, entitled the "Family Farm Policy Act," which sets forth the family farmers bill of rights as a guide and standard for farm legislation and agricultural policy. This bill of rights embodies and enumerates the principles of the family-size farm and security, opportunity, and parity of living for farm families: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates in attendance at this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange go on record in support of the principles of this legislation.

FARM PROGRAM

As a wholesale supply cooperative serving the needs of farmers in a six-State area, the Farmers Union Central Exchange performs a vital function in the overall Farmers Union movement.

It has the endeavor and purpoes in common with the other Farmers Union cooperatives and the National and State Farmers Union educational organizations to preserve the family-type farm for our United States of America, and to secure parity of income and living standards for farm families. This is not just a high-sounding phrase.

The kind of farm program which individuals and organizations develop and support depends on their basic philosophy and purpose. Parity for farmers is not and should not be a matter of partisan poltics, but politicians and political parties must be held accountable for their record.

We condemn the 1954 Farm Act because it is in conflict with the goal and past accomplishments to achieve parity for agriculture. It seeks to regulate production by pluses by eliminating farmers.

When production control becomes necessary, it should be by democratic farmer participation in control programs, not by application of a protracted economic squeeze ending in bankruptcy and foreclosure.

Our State Department has found in a number of foreign countries that monopoly and large-scale land ownership resulted in conditions favorable to Communist expansion. In order to prevent such expansion, our Government has assisted these countries in land-reform programs to replace land monopoly with individual family owned and operated farms. However, the leading proponent and architect of these land reforms for foreign farmers was dismissed by our Secretary of Agriculture as a security risk.

And our present program for American farmers is leading toward, not away from, land monopoly.

We recognize that farming operations must keep pace with modern technology and know-how. And that measures for so-called rural-slum clearance are necessary. Such measures, however, are a supplement, not a substitute, for price supports. Those who say that we cannot achieve parity of income for farmers lack faith in our free-enterprise system and our democratic way of life.

The present administration has promised to develop new farm programs to secure full parity for farm products, both storable and perishable. It has not yet succeeded in doing so, and until it does, we urge that the 1954 Farm Act be repealed and that the 90-percent supports under the old parity formula be restored for basic commodities; that acreage allotments and marketing quotas be utilized to achieve a better balance between supply and demand.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

The management of rural electric cooperatives by the farmers and rural people of the United States has proven to be a success, by the repayment of loans, together with interest on schedule or in advance, where ample wholesale power has been available at reasonable rates. In order to continue this most excellent record and thereby also to more securely safeguard the interests of the United States Treasury in these REA loans, it becomes necessary:

1. That an ample supply of power be available at all times;

2. That the preference clause, as embodied in the Flood Control Act of 1944 be not discarded;

3. That the power marketing criteria of 1954 as announced by the Department of Interior be better clarified; and

4. That rates for electric energy from multipurpose dam installations be not increased above present rates. Especially is this true in the Missouri River Basin, where the feasibility of all REA loans was based on cheap hydroelectric power and where the load growth of these rural electric cooperatives has been such that they will be facing a critical power shortage within a couple of years.

In order to alleviate this shortage of power and also to serve the best interests of all consumers of electric energy in the basin, public development of these installations must be continued until the maximum amount of firm power, which can be economically produced, has been reached.

Since the maximum amount of firm power which could be produced, can readily be sold at a much higher rate than dump power, giving a greater return to the Federal Treasury for the installations made in the basin and since an abundance of fuel is available in the basin, which, if developed, could produce an enormous amount of low-cost electric energy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending the 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., February 28 through March 3, 1955, do recommend that the Congress of the

United States authorize the construction of fuel powered generating facilities in the Missouri basin to firm up and support the hydro generating capacity of these installations; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the congressional delegations in the area served by the Farmers Union Central Exchange.

RURAL TELEPHONE

We favor expansion of rural telephone service and urge the Congress of the United States to provide funds for an adequate rural telephone loan program.

NATURAL RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT

Through the development of our natural resources, many benefits have been brought to the people of the United States, such as the generation of electric power, irrigation, flood control, navigation, recreation, and wild life and soil conservation. These hydroelectric generating facilities have brought to our people, through the rural electric cooperatives, electric power that would otherwise have never been available. Therefore we recommend that the Congress of the United States continue to appropriate funds for the development of such other natural power resources of this country, including Hells Canyon Dam in Idaho and the power and navigation development of the St. Lawrence River in cooperation with Canada.

PUBLIC POWER AND PRIVATE UTILITIES

Whereas the present policy of the administration in regard to private utilities and power development is:

1. To turn over to private utilities much of the Nation's public power construction and output, contrary to customary and legally established preference policies;

2. To permit a type of power construction by private utilities which will bring about the creeping destruction of multipurpose river development.

3. To compel electric cooperatives through so-called partnership agreements to consent to the expansion of private power while public power projects are being halted;

4. To subsidize private utilities by guaranteed profits and by various devices such as are contained in the Dixon-Yates contract: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the delegates attending this 24th annual meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange at St. Paul, Minn., on February 28 through March 3 do hereby go on record as fully endorsing the valiant efforts of the State and National Farmers Union leadership to block the private power policies of the present administration.

DIXON-YATES CONTRACT

Whereas the administration has seen fit to promote a contract authorizing the private power combine Dixon-Yates to provide electric power to TVA for use by Atomic Energy Commission; and

Whereas President Eisenhower ordered this contract signed over the disapproval of both the chairman of TVA and the chairman of AEC; and

Whereas the Dixon-Yates group was awarded the contract in spite of lower bids from other private groups, and in spite of the fact that TVA maintains that it could build steam generators and transmit electricity to AEC at a lower cost than private utilities; and

Whereas the administration has refused to present all facts to answer the charges of preferential treatment: Therefore be it

Resolved, That inasmuch as the administration's conduct in the Dixon-Yates case raised many unanswered questions and inasmuch as there are no apparent reasons justifying such a power contract, the delegates attending this 24th Annual Meeting of the Farmers Union Central Exchange of St. Paul, Minn., from February 28 through March 3, 1955, do hereby go on record calling upon Congress to conduct a thorough investigation of the Dixon-Yates controversy by the proper investigating committee.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR UPPER RIVER HARBOR AT MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., at a regular meeting held March 25, 1955, urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbors at Minneapolis, Minn.

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

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS,
Minneapolis, Minn., March 29, 1955.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Attached you will find copy of a resolution passed by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, Minn., at a regular meeting held March 25, 1955, urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn.

Very truly yours,
ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

Resolution urging continuation of appropriations for Upper River Harbor at Minneapolis, Minn.

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, That Congress be urged to continue to appropriate sufficient funds, as requested by the United States Corps of Engineers, for the continuance of the extension of the 9-foot channel to the north city limits of Minneapolis; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be presented to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and that a copy be sent to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, the Honorable RICHARD NIXON, Vice President of the United States, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of the House, and each Member of the Congress from the State of Minnesota.

Passed March 25, 1955.
EUGENE STOKOWSKI,
President of the Council.

Approved March 25, 1955.
ERIC G. HOYER,
Mayor.

Attest:
ARLENE R. FINKLE,
City Clerk.

DONATION OF SURPLUS FEDERAL PROPERTY TO STATE AND LOCAL CIVIL DEFENSE—LETTER

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from the New Jersey State League of Municipalities endorsing my bill, S. 1257, which provides for the donation of surplus Federal property to State and local civil defense organizations by the General Services Administrator.

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

NEW JERSEY STATE
LEAGUE OF MUNICIPALITIES,
Trenton, N. J., March 30, 1955.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senator From Minnesota,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: The New Jersey State League of Municipalities heartily endorses your bill (S. 1527), which provides for the donation of surplus Federal property to State and local civil defense organizations by the General Services Administrator.

Such surplus properties should be made available to civil defense organizations, and we urge enactment of S. 1527 into law at this session of Congress.

Very truly yours,
Mrs. MADELEINE S. FROST,
Executive Director.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1724. A bill to recognize the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., a national nonprofit, nonpolitical war veterans' organization, for purposes of bestowing upon it certain benefits, rights, privileges, and prerogatives; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL) (by request):

S. 1725. A bill to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly; and

S. 1726. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1727. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 1728. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. George H. Cronin, United States Air Force; and

S. 1729. A bill for the relief of Marie Noelle Nelly Doulet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of Anna Marie Hitzelberger Scheidt and her minor child, Rosanne Hitzelberger;

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Lik Kiu Ding; and

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Nicolas Lalos and his wife, Antyro Panagiotis Lalos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1733. A bill for the relief of Stanislaw Argasinski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLANDERS:

S. 1734. A bill for the relief of Johann Antonius Tudhope and Walda Feodor Tudhope; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. BRICKER, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. POTTER, Mr. BENDER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. BYRD, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 1735. A bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1736. A bill to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the

qualifications of directors of national banking associations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills relating to the armed services. Each of the bills is requested by the Department of Defense, and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from the appropriate military department, explaining the purpose of the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the letters of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of the bills.

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

The bills, introduced by Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), by request, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services, as follows:

S. 1725. A bill to repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1725 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, March 22, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To repeal two provisions of law requiring that certain military personnel shall be paid monthly."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955, and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this legislation is to permit salary payments to be made to members of the Army and Air Force more frequently than once a month.

Section 1268 of the Revised Statutes (10 U. S. C. 861) would be repealed. That section reads "The sums hereinbefore allowed shall be paid in monthly payments by the paymaster." The reference to "sums hereinbefore allowed" is to the sums allowed as pay of officers in the preceding sections of the Revised Statutes (R. S. 1261–1267). Section 1268 relates to the payment of officers of the Army and Air Force. Periods of payment of officers of the Navy and Marine Corps are not covered by specific legislation. There is, therefore, no need for this proposed legislation to be made applicable to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Section 1268 has always created differences of opinion as to whether the word "monthly" was restrictive as related to more frequent payments or should be interpreted as providing merely that payment should not be less frequent than monthly. In this connection the Judge Advocate General of the Army and the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force have rendered opinions to the effect that the intent of section 1268 was to require monthly payments of the pay of officers as opposed to annual payments, rather than to restrict payments to monthly periods. The Comptroller General, however (B–120757, August 9, 1954), has held that section 1268 of the Revised Statutes is a bar to semimonthly payment of officers. Notwithstanding that ruling the Comptroller General granted permission to the Air Force to test a semimonthly pay plan for officers with the understanding that before the plan is adopted on a permanent basis appropriate statutory authority therefor would be obtained by the Air Force. The semimonthly payment plan for members of the Air Force was established on a test basis only after thorough consideration of the need for such plan and the benefits which will result therefrom. Semimonthly payments serve to relate the period of pay of military personnel more closely to present practices in the payment of salaries of civilian employees of the Government and those employed in private industry.

Appropriate regulations of the Department of the Air Force established the basis for semimonthly payments to airmen and aviation cadets, effective in October 1954, on a 6-month test basis. Provision was made for officers and warrant officers to elect to receive payments either monthly or semimonthly. Payment for the 1st through the 15th day of the month will be made on the 20th day of the month. Payment for the 16th day through the last day of the month will be made on the 5th day of the following month.

Section 2 of the bill would repeal the last proviso in subtitle "Pay" of the act of August 30, 1890 (26 Stat. 400; 10 U. S. C. 861a). That proviso reads "That the pay of the enlisted men, including the items of commutation of quarters, and commutation of fuel, shall be paid monthly to each enlisted man entitled thereto by one check upon one properly certified voucher." This proviso applies only to the Signal Service of the Army. The pay of all enlisted men in the Army is governed by the same law. The special provision concerning enlisted men in the Signal Service is not required or used and should be repealed.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation would involve no apparent increase in the budgetary requirements of the Department of Defense.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1726. A bill to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1726 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
Washington, D. C., March 21, 1955.

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

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation "To amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 to authorize the payment of mileage allowances for overland travel by private conveyance outside the continental limits of the United States."

This proposal is a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Navy has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, so as to authorize the payment of mileage allowance for overland travel by privately owned conveyance performed by members of the uniformed services outside the continental limits of the United States.

Under the present provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, mileage allowance for overland travel by privately owned conveyance may only be paid to members of the uniformed services performing that travel within the continental limits of the United States. Members of the uniformed services, performing overland travel beyond the continental limits of the United States at personal expense, are limited to a per diem allowance not to exceed $9.00 per day and a monetary allowance in lieu of transportation which allowance has been fixed under the joint travel regulations at 5 cents per mile. The per diem allowance is payable for the time which would have elapsed had the travel been performed by common carrier. The monetary allowance in lieu of transportation is payable for a distance computed over the shortest usually traveled route, normally the railroad route. Members of the uniformed services performing similar travel within the continental limits of the United States may be paid a mileage allowance fixed under the Joint Travel Regulations at 6 cents per mile. The payment of either the monetary allowance of 5 cents per mile plus per diem, or a flat mileage allowance of 6 cents per mile, results in approximately the same total dollar expenditure. Authority to pay a mileage allowance for travel performed outside the continental limits of the United States would simplify the payment by disbursing officers of mileage claims.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposal will result in negligible, if any, increased cost in the fiscal year 1956. Any increased cost resulting from this proposal will be absorbed by existing appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. FRANKE,
Assistant Secretary of the Navy
(Financial Management).

AUTHORIZATION FOR CERTAIN ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department. I am introducing this bill at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Its primary purpose is to provide basic authority for several legislative provisions which have been included from year to year in Treasury appropriation acts. It appears that points of order might be raised as to these provisions, and basic legislative authority is considered desirable with respect to the items which have been approved annually within provisions of the Treasury Appropriation Act.

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

The bill (S. 1727) to authorize certain administrative expenses in the Treasury Department, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill reflecting in legislative form the proposal made by the President in his most recent message on the state of the Union, in which he said:

> I shall * * * propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country.

I am happy to have as cosponsors of this bill the senior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. POTTER], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. I also invite any other Senators to join in cosponsoring the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that their names may be added when submitted.

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

The bill (S. 1735) to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement, introduced by Mr. SMITH (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, only 7 days ago a waiting world received news of a great scientific achievement, the development and successful mass testing of a potent preventive vaccine against paralytic poliomyelitis. From Ann Arbor, Mich., word came that very nearly all of the thousands of children innoculated with the new vaccine had come through a dreaded polio season unscathed, thanks to the superlative skill of Dr. Jonas Salk and the strong support, both moral and financial, that he received throughout his labors from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis.

It is strange but true that there is at present no established method by which the people of this Nation can honor such great benefactors of mankind as Dr. Jonas Salk, whose name will deservedly shine henceforth among the honor roll of those physicians and scientists who have conquered a dread disease.

There are numerous medals established by the Congress, Mr. President, for our soldiers, sailors, and airmen who distinguish themselves in battle. Last year a complete system of awards and honors was authorized for the benefit of Government employees who contribute outstandingly to efficiency and economy. Persons who distinguish themselves in connection with accidents at sea or on the railroads are also eligible for official awards of the Government.

But what of the scientist, working in his laboratory or hospital to lift from mankind the burden of a crippling or killing disease? What of the educator whose contribution to our society extends from generation unto generation? What of the businessman or industrialist whose activities benefit his fellow men in an outstanding manner? Should we not provide an orderly and considered way in which the gratitude of the entire Nation may be enduringly expressed to those outstanding individuals who contribute meritoriously to the progress of our whole society and of all mankind?

I commend to the earnest consideration of my colleagues the bill I have just introduced, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the letter from Secretary Hobby transmitting this proposed legislation to the President of the Senate, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

Be it enacted, etc.—

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SECTION 1. It is the purpose of the Congress, by providing public recognition for outstanding accomplishments in public affairs, social betterment, science, health and medicine, education, letters, arts, law, engineering, agriculture, labor, industry, and related fields, to foster those cultural qualities and innovations essential to the development of a high civilization and conducive to the maintenance of peace, which are of paramount importance to humanity at all times.

MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT

SEC. 2. There is hereby established the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement, with accompanying appurtenances and devices, which the President may award to persons recommended to him as provided herein as having distinguished themselves by outstanding accomplishments in the fields listed in section 1.

MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED CIVILIAN ACHIEVEMENT BOARD

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established a Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement Board (hereinafter referred to as the "Board") to be composed of five members to be appointed by the President from among persons of recognized competence in the fields listed in section 1. Each member shall hold office for a term of 5 years, except that (1) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (2) the terms of the members first taking office shall expire as follows: One shall expire with the close of the first calendar year which begins after the enactment of this act, one with the close of the second such calendar year, one with the close of the third such calendar year, one with the close of the fourth such calendar year, and one with the close of the fifth such calendar year, as designated by the President at the time of appointment. The President shall from time to time designate a member of the Board to serve as its Chairman.

(b) The members of the Board, while attending meetings of the Board, shall receive compensation at the rate of $50 per diem, and shall be paid travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U. S. C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

DUTIES OF THE BOARD

SEC. 4. (a) The Board shall recommend to the President, citizens of the United States who shall in the judgment of the Board have made the most notable contributions, not necessarily in the year any such recommendation is made, in public affairs, social betterment, science, health and medicine, education, letters, arts, law, engineering, agriculture, labor, industry, and related fields, to receive the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement. In considering potential candidates for awards, the Board shall weigh carefully the relative merits of contributions in the public interest and welfare of great potential effect but not yet widely acclaimed, as compared with contributions already well known and appreciated.

(b) The Board is also authorized to make recommendations to the President for the conferring of the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement posthumously upon citizens of the United States in belated recognition of outstanding accomplishments during their lives. Persons so honored posthumously shall include only those deceased during the previous 25 years.

(c) The Board is also authorized to make recommendations to the President for the conferring of the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement upon noncitizens who in the estimation of the Board have conspicuously forwarded the public welfare in the broader realm of international relations.

(d) All transactions of the Board with respect to the selection of candidates for awards shall be confidential.

(e) The Board shall select the design of the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement and of accompanying appurtenances and devices, and the design of a parchment testimonial to accompany the Medal, and may contract for the designing and making of the Medal and the testimonial in such manner as it deems advisable.

ORGANIZATION OF THE BOARD

SEC. 5. (a) The chief administrative officer of the Board shall be a Secretary who shall be appointed by the Chairman with the approval of the Board. The Secretary shall perform such duties as may be directed by the Board. The Board is authorized to appoint, in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, such technical, clerical, and other assistants and to make such expenditures, within the limits of appropriations available therefor, as may be necessary for conducting its business: *Provided*, That the functions of the Board relating to the processing of personnel actions, budgeting, accounting, procurement, and related routine management functions shall be performed under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare through such facilities of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as may be designated therefor.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this act.

CONFERRING OF HONORS

SEC. 6. The President personally, or through a representative designated by him, shall confer the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement in a suitable ceremony, and shall present at the same time to each person honored an engrossed parchment testimonial recording the conferral of the award and the accomplishments or contributions for which the award is made. In the case of a posthumous award, the medal and testimonial shall be presented to a repre-

sentative of the deceased person being honored, to be designated by the Board.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D. C., April 19, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
The President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am enclosing for your consideration a proposed draft bill to provide for the conferring of an award to be known as the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement.

The proposal is designed to carry out the recommendation of the President contained in his state of the Union message delivered to the Congress under date of January 6, 1955. In that message he said:

"I shall * * * propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country."

We have developed appropriate awards of honor for persons who distinguished themselves in the defense of our country. The Congressional Medal of Honor and other military medals recognize exceptional deeds of valor and outstanding service on the part of military personnel. To a more limited extent distinguished civilian service in furtherance of our national defense or security has been recognized through medals such as the Medal for Merit and the Medal of Freedom. But our National Government has singularly failed to establish a means of honoring those who make notable contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of our country not directly associated with military or civilian service to the country in connection with our war or defense efforts.

It is, of course, true that numerous awards have been created by private institutions and organizations, and even by State and municipal governments, to honor those who have deserved recognition in the various walks of civilian life. Nevertheless, there are those whose contributions to the advancement of our civilization and our country deserve the accolade of a grateful Nation. The appropriateness of a national award for this purpose is manifest.

The draft legislation enclosed would authorize the President to award a Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement in national recognition of outstanding accomplishments in civilian fields. Recommendations for this award would be made to the President by a Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement Board from among citizens who, in the Board's judgment, have made the most notable contributions in public affairs, social betterment, science, health and medicine, education, letters, arts, law, engineering, labor, industry, and related fields. Special consideration would be given to contributions of great potential effect but not yet widely acclaimed, as compared with contributions already well known and appreciated. Posthumous awards could be made to those deceased during the previous 25 years. The Board could also recommend to the President the conferring of the medal upon noncitizens who have conspicuously forwarded the public welfare in the broader realm of international relations.

The Board would select an appropriate medal with accompanying appurtenances and devices, and a parchment testimonial for use in conferring the award.

The President would, in a suitable ceremony, confer personally or through his representative the Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement upon those individuals chosen for such award. Posthumous awards would be presented to a representative of the deceased person being honored.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enclosed measure would be in accord with the program of the President. We respectfully request that the enclosed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration.

Sincerely yours,
OVETA CULP HOBBY,
Secretary.

QUALIFICATIONS OF DIRECTORS OF NATIONAL BANKING ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the National Bank Act relative to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations. This bill is requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and is accompanied by a letter of transmittal from him. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal be printed in the RECORD immediately following the listing of this bill.

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

The bill (S. 1736) to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter of transmittal, presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT, is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, relating to the qualifications of directors of national banking associations.

Section 5146 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, (12 U. S. C. 72) requires that at least three-fourths of the directors of a national bank must reside within the State in which the bank is located or within 50 miles of the location of the office of the bank. In the light of modern day transportation this fifty mile limitation is unrealistically restrictive. Accordingly, to give to national banks a wider range for the selection of their directors, it is recommended that the 50-mile limitation be changed to a 100-mile limitation. It is believed that no serious consequences would result from this change in the law.

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,
G. M. HUMPHREY,
Secretary of the Treasury.

TEMPORARY PLACING IN ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL A STATUE OF THE LATE EDWARD DOUGLASS WHITE, OF LOUISIANA

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself and Mr. LONG) submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Edward Douglass White Memorial Commission of Louisiana is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Edward Douglass White, of Louisiana, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

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. SYMINGTON:

Address delivered by Senator HENNINGS before the Chicago Law Club.

AMERICA'S CULTURAL OFFENSIVE IN THE WORLDWIDE BATTLE OF IDEAS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have been pleased to note the increasing evidences of America's counter-offensive against the worldwide Soviet cultural propaganda effort. That Soviet effort is two-pronged. It is (a) designed to defame American culture as allegedly "crass" and "materialistic;" and (b) it is designed to paint a rosy picture of what is actually the barren and enslaved so-called culture of the U. S. S. R.

I am glad to say that an invaluable instrument in our own accurate worldwide cultural effort is the American National Theatre and Academy, which was wisely chartered by the Congress under a bill signed by the President of the United States as far back as July 5, 1935.

I have earlier referred to ANTA in remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on pages 4000–02, on March 30.

I send to the desk a supplementary statement, and ask unanimous consent that it 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 WILEY

"Man does not live by bread alone," and his attitude in the East-West battle of ideas is not determined alone by its material phases.

Man is a thinking, feeling creature, who searches for beauty and for truth, as well as for his daily bread and for shelter and material things for himself and his loved ones.

In the worldwide battle of ideas, America's arts and artists have an important role to play in upholding the banner of freemen.

It is up to the abundant talent of the American theater and of music, of American films, ballet, sculpture and painting, and other media of expression to get across to free men everywhere the full significance of the devotion of the American people to culture and their splendid achievements in indigenous creations.

We are fortunate that the present administration has wisely perceived the needs for our sending cultural ambassadors abroad throughout the world.

Wonderful reports have come back regarding the constructive achievements overseas of American artists. Time and again we have heard that a single great singer like Marian Anderson, a single outstanding troupe like "Porgy and Bess" can ordinarily accomplish more in establishing fraternal

bonds between our own and other peoples than tons of newsprint and masses of words.

I may say that the United States decision for this cultural offensive has not been a casual one to make because we Americans have been traditionally cautious toward leaving the things of art entirely to private endeavor and encouragement.

We have recognized that the creative artist must have the fullest freedom in which to grow and to express himself.

At the same time, world events have thrust upon us the need for Uncle Sam flashing the green light to private citizens to stimulate a concrete answer to the lies and smears which have been spread so viciously by our enemies throughout the world.

But even if there were no Communist problem in the world, we would want to solidify our relationships with peoples everywhere, and we know that one of the most helpful ways of doing so is by our becoming better acquainted with their culture and by them becoming better acquainted with ours. To send the branches of our culture abroad, we must of course have a healthy cultural tree and root system at home. Fortunately, arts here are flourishing.

Meanwhile, it is most appropriate that America, in particular through ANTA is now sending a "Salute" to our sister Republics of France, a great ally, a country in which the arts have flowered to as high a degree as virtually anywhere else on earth. Mr. Robert Dowling, chairman of ANTA, is in charge of the Salute, Mrs. H. Alwyn Innes-Brown is vice chairman and Mr. Robert C. Schnitzer is general manager.

There follow various items further descriptive of our overall United States cultural counter-offensive. The first is a New York Times article published in its February 28 issue describing our worldwide effort. Next are editorials from the New York Times of January 30 and the New York Herald Tribune of the preceding day on this same general subject. Finally, to indicate the distinguished individuals who give of their time and talent to the overall work of the American National Theater and Academy, I append the list of officers and directors of that fine organization.

[From the New York Times of February 28, 1955]

UNITED STATES LIFTS CURTAIN ON CULTURE DRIVE—BEST OF DANCE, DRAMA, MUSIC TO GO ABROAD TO COUNTERACT SOVIET PROPAGANDA TOURS

WASHINGTON, February 27.—The United States has begun a counteroffensive against Soviet "cultural propaganda."

Thanks to a fund appropriated by Congress last August, the best this country produces in the dance, drama, and music is now being put before foreign audiences on a scale never before possible.

And by next summer more Americans will be singing, dancing, acting and otherwise performing abroad than ever before in time of peace.

For instance, the former National Broadcasting Company Orchestra, now called the Symphony of the Air, will be touring Japan, Korea, Formosa, the Philippines, and probably Hong Kong. These are places to which no major United States orchestra has ventured before because it did not seem commercially possible.

PERFORMERS PLAN TRIPS

The New York Philharmonic will appear at the Edinburgh Music Festival and then tour northern Europe. If plans materialize the American National Ballet Theater and a symphony orchestra will probably be in Latin America. The woodwinds section of the Philadelphia Orchestra will be demonstrating its skills to audiences in the Middle East, India, and Pakistan.

These and other tours are being underwritten by half of a $5 million congressional appropriation. The other half is devoted to financing United States representation in foreign trade fairs.

Officials of the State Department's international exchange program today described the cultural operation as follows:

The State Department has contracted with the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) in New York to select likely performers and plan their overseas trips.

By preference those selected should have planned a trip abroad on their own, on a strictly commercial basis. If they cannot quite make it financially, or an extension of their tour into "no profit" areas seems desirable, ANTA may recommend them for a grant. ANTA has panels of professional advisers to pass on artists' merits in the dance, drama, and music.

The State Department's international exchange program (which also handles exchange of students and leaders) then approves the project in consultation with an interagency committee. This committee is composed of representatives of the State Department, the United States Information Service, the Foreign Operations Administration, the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, and the Labor Department.

Budgets for projected tours are approved by the State Department's international exchange program, although the ultimate pursestrings are held by Theodore Streibert, director of the information agency, who has the title of executive agent.

Once overseas, information officials look after the performers. One objective is to see that the Americans meet the leading artists abroad.

Here is one way in which the United States hopes to make its cultural representation more effective than that of the Soviets.

As State Department officials noted today, the United States program does not begin to compete quantitatively with the Russian. But whereas the Soviet artists are closely watched by agents who accompany them and are prevented from getting too friendly with their capitalistic counterparts, the Americans are encouraged to circulate freely.

PORGY TOUR HAILED

The officials thought this had worked out well during the Mediterranean tour of the Broadway musical Porgy and Bess. This show closed a commercial tour in Paris last December and did not have another European booking until it was to appear in Italy this month.

With a United States Government subsidy, the group, in the meantime, was sent on a tour of the western and eastern Mediterranean, including appearances in both Arab and Israeli territory.

In Cairo one reviewer wrote: "If this is propaganda, let's have more of it." Other reviews indicated that observers had been impressed by the distinguished role played by Negro artists in the cast and by the artistic maturity of the performance.

The Philadelphia Orchestra will take part in a show called Salute to France in May and June. Others in the show are the New York City Ballet, the cast of "Oklahoma," Judith Anderson in "Medea," and a production of Thornton Wilder's, "The Skin of Our Teeth," with Helen Hayes and Mary Martin.

[From the New York Times of January 30, 1955]

CULTURAL AMBASSADORS

Next spring, Parisian theatergoers will have the chance to view samples of American artistic achievements in the fields of music, dance, ballet, and drama. This venture, privately financed with the assistance of the international exchange program of the American National Theater and Academy, will offer the Philadelphia Orchestra, under the baton of Eugene Ormandy; "Oklahoma" which has never been seen in Paris; "Medea," by Robinson Jeffers; "The Skin of Our Teeth," by Thornton Wilder; and a limited engagement of the New York City Ballet, starring Maria Tallchief and André Eglevsky.

The importance of this cultural exchange, which cannot be too strongly stressed, was best expressed by President Eisenhower in a recent letter to Robert W. Dowling, chairman of ANTA, who organized the project at the request of French and United States officials. The President said: "This will be of vast significance to the cause of friendship and understanding between the people of America and Western Europe. I wish you every success."

The artistic program, labeled "Salute to France," represents an attempt to repay that great nation, if only in a small measure, for its long tradition of friendship and assistance to this country. Since revolutionary days, France's men of letters, artists, and great military figures have had profound influence on American life. It is only fitting that we demonstrate our appreciation and goodwill through this cultural exchange.

ANTA is to be congratulated for wholeheartedly accepting the responsibilities of organizing this worthwhile project. It already has achieved a notable artistic success with the tour of Porgy and Bess in Yugoslavia and in the Near East, and with the sponsorship of the José Limon dance company in its tour of South America.

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 29, 1955]

SALUTE TO FRANCE

Bringing ballet, music, and drama to Paris may seem like an approximation of carrying coals to Newcastle, but the American Salute to France project scheduled for the spring should win wide approbation on both sides of the Atlantic. Under plans just announced—plans which American Ambassador C. Douglas Dillon played a large part in formulating—some of the brighest ornaments of American cultural life will be put on display in France as a tribute to French leadership in the development of Western culture. The Philadelphia Orchestra, conducted by Eugene Ormandy, will give concerts at the Paris Opéra; the New York Ballet Co. will put on 8 performances; Oklahoma will have a 2-week run; and 2 dramas, Robinson Jeffers' Medea, and Thornton Wilder's The Skin of Our Teeth, will be staged.

At about the same time that America will be saluting France at this festival, an interesting art exhibition will be taking place at the Orangerie, the lovely little museum near the Tuileries Gardens. Here will be placed on view 100 paintings, watercolors, and drawings, the work of French artists, but long ago acquired by American museums and collectors. Many of these works, largely of the 19th century, have not been seen in France since their acquisition by American connoisseurs; now they are back on loan in their land of origin.

Mutual respect and understanding between the two nations are certain to be enhanced by these two intelligent programs. Although both are arranged under private auspices, they have received official blessings in the form of good will messages from President Eisenhower. Citizens of both France and the United States can take pride in these salutes to France, and many an American will be tempted to cross over to Paris this spring for a firsthand look.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL THEATRE AND ACADEMY

President: Clarence Derwent.
First vice president: Sawyer Falk.
Second vice president: Peggy Wood.
Third vice president: Benjamin Kaye.
Fourth vice president: Richard Hoover.
Treasurer: Roger L. Stevens.
Secretary: George Freedley.
Honorary presidents: Helen Hayes, Vinton Freedley, Guthrie McClintic, Robert E. Sherwood, A. Conger Goodyear.
Honorary treasurer: Gilbert Miller.
Honorary chairman: C. Lawton Campbell.
Counsel: Walter H. Liebman.
Board of directors: Robert W. Dowling, chairman; H. Darkes Albright,[1] Campton Bell, Aline Bernstein, Mrs. Anthony Bliss, Robert Breen, Thomas Brock, Gilmor Brown, C. Lawton Campbell,[1] Mrs. Sara Spencer Campbell,[1] Warren Caro,[1] Lucia Chase, Arthur Cloetingh,[1] Edward Cole,[1] John A. Conway, Blevins Davis, Clarence Derwent,[1] Howard Dietz, Robert W. Dowling,[1] Marjorie Dycke, Fred Emmett, Sawyer Falk, George Freedley,[1] Vinton Freedley,[1] Mary Stewart French, Rosamond Gilder, A. Conger Goodyear, Paul Green, Verner Haldene, William Halstead, the Reverend Gilbert V. Hartke,[1] Helen Hayes, Mary Virginia Heinlein, Hubert Heffner, Barnard Hewitt,[1] Richard Hoover,[1] Mrs. H. A. Inness-Brown,[1] Rowena Woodham Jelliffe, Margo Jones, C. Robert Kase, Benjamin Kaye, Charles Lane, Walter Liebman,[1] Monroe Lippman, Gertrude Macy, Gilbert Miller, Albert Mitchell, Jack Morrison, Donald Oenslager, Thomas E. Poag, James E. Popovich, Donovan Rhynsburger, Elmer Rice,[1] Beardsley Ruml, Mrs. Dorothy Schwartz, Samuel Selden, Claude L. Shaver, Louis M. Simon, Roger L. Stevens,[1] Wesley Swanson,[1] Frederick G. Walsh, Winifred Ward, Margaret Webster, Milton Weintraub, Robert Whitehead, Peggy Wood, John Wray Young,[1] William Zeckendorf.
Executive director, Willard Swire.

[1] Member of executive committee.

PUBLICATION OF THE YALTA PAPERS—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement made this morning by the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, in an appearance before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. At that time Mr. Dulles gave a very forthright and complete statement on the events leading up to publication of the Yalta papers, and furnishing the committee with the information on that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MCCLELLAN in the chair). Is there objection?

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

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE JOHN FOSTER DULLES BEFORE THE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE

Let me say at the start that I believe that it was right that the Yalta papers should be made officially public. I believed—and still believe—that the American public, historian and citizen alike, is entitled to all relevant information on this remarkable chapter in world history that could be divulged without jeopardizing the national security. In this respect I share the view expressed by the late Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., who as Secretary of State participated in the Yalta Conference. He said, in 1949, that "it is important for the public to know exactly what took place in the Crimea, and, almost equally important, what did not take place." That was said in the preface to his volume Roosevelt and the Russians which very fully reproduces his detailed record of the Yalta Conference.

The official United States publication has now taken place. I am glad to review with you the background and the chronology of events in connection with it.

I

The volumes on the Malta and Yalta Conferences were two of a number of volumes in the Foreign Relations series requested by the Senate Appropriations Committee in its report for fiscal 1954. The request grew out of the supplemental hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations on May 15, 1953, which considered a 4-year publication program submitted by the Department of State. This program involved the reduction of the backlog of 26 volumes which had been compiled but not published, along with the publication of a series of volumes on our relations with China during the 1940's and another on the World War II Conferences of heads of Government. The Senate Appropriations Committee's report of May 28, 1953 requested the Department of State to "allocate sufficient funds from the appropriation 'Salaries and expenses, 1954' to provide the necessary personnel and other related expenses essential to start reducing the backlog" of the Foreign Relations volumes, and referred with approval to the 4-year program submitted by the Department.

In the hearings for fiscal 1955 the Senate Appropriations Committee had before it a report from the Department showing the proposed schedule of publication which listed the Malta-Yalta volume as having top priority for publication in the series on World War II conferences.

The Senate Appropriations Committee's report for fiscal 1955 stated:

"The committee reiterates its firm conviction that the historic and documented record of our international relations as compiled in the Foreign Relations volumes should be continued aggressively and in unexpurgated form. Every effort should be made to make these documents available just as soon as security considerations will permit. Accordingly, the committee is recommending $227,280 for this specific purpose."

The Yalta papers were ready to be sent to the printer early last September. If they had been printed at that time they would have been ready for publication in October. The question of whether to publish in October was put to me while I was in the Far East in September. On my instructions, Assistant Secretary Carl W. McCardle cabled the Department from Tokyo on September 11, 1954, as follows:

"With respect to date of publication, Secretary believes that it should not be published until after the congressional elections. If the publication could have taken place a monh ago, that would have been all right; but to publish only 2 or 3 weeks before elections would, he thinks, damn the entire operation as political, and in the eyes of students discredit it as politically motivated. They would be suspicious that the selection and omission of documents had been politically motivated. He would, therefore, recommend publication sometime about the 1st of December."

That December date was not met because of unexpected developments. The British Foreign Office, in accordance with customary practice, had alerady been shown the documents of British origin, and had cleared these, with very minor exceptions, which did not affect our foreign policy. But toward the end of November 1954 the Foreign Office asked to see the entire collection of documents, including those of United States origin.

In view of the understandable British interest in the minutes and related conference papers, the Department sent the entire set of galleys to the Foreign Office for its information. This was done on December 2, 1954.

By early January, no comments had been received. So, on January 10, 1955, I sent a personal message to Foreign Secretary Eden telling him of our desire to proceed with publication without further delay and expressing the hope that he had no objections. On January 13, he replied that he still had some questions which he suggested we could discuss together at Bangkok the following month. He requested delay until then.

In deference to the Foreign Secretary's wishes, I postponed the publication. However, under the pressures of other matters, Sir Anthony Eden and I failed to talk about this at Bangkok.

Accordingly, upon my return from Bangkok I decided that, while awaiting British approval, a limited number of galleys should be printed and made available on an official basis for departmental use and use by those committees of the Congress who had a special interest in them. On March 10, I cabled Sir Anthony recalling that he had planned to talk to me at Bangkok about the publication of the Yalta papers, but that in the pressure of business we had both overlooked this. I said that, in deference to his views, I was still holding up general publication, but that I did plan to make copies of these documents available to the appropriate congressional committees, for their official use.

On Monday, March 14, at the regular noon briefing of the correspondents who cover the State Department, the State Department spokesman, Mr. Henry Suydam, announced this program. This announcement was premature, in the sense that it was made before Assistant Secretary Morton had had the opportunity to consult with the appropriate members of these committees.

Shortly after lunch on March 14, I saw news ticker reports which indicated that the chairmen generally preferred that their committees not take custody of the papers, but thought it would be better that the State Department make them generally public.

Assistant Secretary Morton confirmed this, and I then asked him to send the following letter to the respective congressional leaders:

"Pursuant to congressional authorization and appropriation concerning special conference volumes the State Department has compiled the papers relating to the Yalta and Malta Conferences of 1945. It is deemed inadvisable at this time to issue these papers in volume for public distribution. Since, however, the papers have actually been compiled and since they may be of interest to your committee members in their official capacity, but not for publication, the Department of State will, if your committee so desires, make a limited number of copies available on a confidential basis."

These letters were written Monday evening, March 14, and delivered by hand on Tuesday morning, March 15.

The Tuesday morning press indicated that the delay in publication was widely ascribed to British objections. So, at 9 a. m. on Tuesday, March 15, I telephoned the British Ambassador. I expressed the view that, in the light of the wide public interest which had, by then, been aroused, it was better for Anglo-American relations to publish at once rather than to allow the impression to gain ground that the United Kingdom had something to hide—which was not the case. The Ambassador indicated his concurrence. I said I would advise Sir Anthony

Eden of my views, and the Ambassador said he would do the same. He indicated that he felt confident that I would get a quick answer from Sir Anthony. Accordingly, at 10:30 a. m., I sent a message to Sir Anthony saying that I thought it undesirable to perpetuate a situation which created an atmosphere of mystery and concealment, and that, accordingly, unless he felt strongly against it, I proposed to publish.

I should, at this point, observe that I had already carefully considered the possible impact of publication upon the international situation and particularly upon the pending ratification of the Paris Accords by the German Bundesrat and the French Council. I had concluded that that impact would not be unfavorable.

At 10:30 on Tuesday morning, I spoke over the telephone with Senator GEORGE and informed him generally of the position and that I hoped shortly to be able to release the documents generally.

At 11 on Tuesday morning, I had my regular press conference, at which I said:

"The Yalta papers are at the present time in galley-proof form. They are available here in the State Department for consultation on a restrictive basis by Members of the Congress who are on committees that might be concerned with them, and we are still studying the matter of their full publication."

While Assistant Secretary McCardle and I were preparing for my press conference, Mr. James Reston of the New York Times telephoned Assistant Secretary McCardle's office and left the following message for him:

"Tell him while he is with the Secretary that I have had a long talk with George about the Yalta business and I think I ought to see the Secretary after the press conference if I can."

When my press conference was finished, Assistant Secretary McCardle brought Mr. Reston to my office. Mr. Reston said that his impression of his conversation with Senator GEORGE was that the Senator wished to see the Yalta record made public by the State Department. Mr. Reston urged that it was of the utmost importance that the papers be published as a whole and not in garbled form; that unless the New York Times did this, no one else would, but that this would be very expensive and take time. Therefore, if there was to be any comprehensive publication, they had to have an advance copy since it would involve setting up an enormous printing job.

I said that such matters fell under the jurisdiction of Mr. McCardle, Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, who was a former newspaperman. Thereupon the two left.

I subsequently learned that Mr. McCardle gave a galley proof to Mr. Reston about 8:30 p. m. that evening (Tuesday). This involved an exercise by Mr. McCardle of a discretion that was his. It involved no breach of security. On November 5, I had taken and recorded a decision to publish without deletion on an expedited basis. This constituted authority to declassify under Executive Order 10501. The galley proofs, on March 3, were marked "For official use only," under Mr. McCardle's instructions. This was not a security classification but a purely internal classification which Mr. McCardle himself had imposed and which he had full authority to remove.

At 10:12 a. m. Wednesday, March 16, the British Ambassador phoned me that his Government agreed to publish and that a confirmation cable from London was on its way to me.

At 12:45 on Wednesday I lunched at the Capitol with Senators KNOWLAND and BRIDGES. This appointment had been made 5 days before, on March 11. They mentioned that they had heard a rumor that the New York Times was going to publish the Yalta documents on March 17. I expressed surprise, but said that I thought that we would release the documents that afternoon to all news media. When I returned for lunch, I found the confirmation cable from Sir Anthony Eden agreeing that we should now publish.

Also, shortly after I returned from my lunch with Senators BRIDGES and KNOWLAND, Mr. James Hagerty phoned me that he, too, had heard that the New York Times was planning to run the Yalta papers the next morning and I made to him the same reply I made to the Senators, namely, that I planned a prompt general release.

At 3:45 I talked with Assistant Secretary McCardle and asked him to arrange promptly to release the documents generally. This was done and there was a general publication the next morning (Thursday, March 17).

II

The decision to publish the Malta-Yalta records required decision as to just what to publish. As to this I relied primarily upon Dr. George B. Noble, who has served as Chief of the Division of Historical Policy Research or of the Historical Division since 1946.

The task was not easy. There were no agreed tripartite minutes. The only records available are those which were made by certain members of the respective delegations. These were done on a national basis and no distinction was recognized between formal and informal conversations.

At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, minutes were kept of the meetings not only of the Council of Ten, but for the most part of meetings of the Big Four (France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States). These were circulated among the interested delegations and became substantially agreed minutes. These minutes, which have been published, contain many casual comments of the nature of those to be found in the records of the Yalta discussions.

Where the participants in a conference do not themselves make any distinction in their remarks, as by asking that certain remarks should be treated as off the record, it is extremely difficult for subsequent historians themselves to make the distinction. Secretary of State Stettinius in his volume did not eliminate all of the so-called chit-chat. The record published by the Department of State was the actual record as complied by certain of the participants and supplied by them to the Department of State for its records.

The most complete record is that of Mr. Bohlen who acted as interpreter. Early in 1949 he had checked and cleared for accuracy the proofs of Mr. Stettinius' book, and in July 1949 Mr. Bohlen transmitted his own record to the Division of Historical Policy Research.

It will be recalled that the report of the Senate Appropriations Committee for fiscal 1955 called for publication of the unexpurgated record. I should, however, say that a very few casual or informal remarks have nevertheless been omitted which might have done harm without adding anything of substance to the record.

In some cases remarks which otherwise might have been omitted by the above test have been included because they had previously been incorporated in authoritative memoirs and given wide publicity. The harm, if any, was done, and omission in the official record would merely have served to raise question as to the validity of the publication.

III

To sum up:

1. At no time have I had any doubt about the desirability of publishing the story of Yalta. This, indeed, seems to have been the view of three of my predecessors who have held office since the Yalta conference. I have already quoted Mr. Stettinius, the Secretary of State at the time, as to how important he judged it for the public to know exactly what took place at Yalta. His successor as Secretary of State, Secretary Byrnes, published in his memoirs his notes on the Yalta Conference. Secretary of State Acheson early in 1949 cleared the publication by former Secretary Stettinius of his extensive record of the conference.

The view that there should be publication was not only an executive judgment, but also explicitly endorsed by the United States Congress which appropriated the funds for prompt and full publication.

It has been a matter of common knowledge for approximately 2 years that publication was in process, and this has seemed to meet with general approval.

2. The timing was judged opportune, in the light of the general international situation, and I think it has proved opportune. Furthermore, the timing was such as to avoid any approximation to a domestic election period.

3. When publication was finally agreed upon, there was full publication of the volume which covers the Yalta Conference. I believe that at least two newspapers, within a few hours of the release, carried the full text of about 300,000 words, while others carried very substantial portions. This served the indispensable purpose of assuring that the American people and interested peoples abroad would easily and quickly get the main story in full and not be dependent upon extracts which might have been selected for partisan purposes or for reasons of pure readability.

4. The Yalta papers are now where they belong—in the public domain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

RELIEF TO FARMERS AND FARMWORKERS IN CERTAIN CASES

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on April 1, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], and the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], I introduced a bill which proposed to afford a small measure of relief to farmers and farmworkers who suffered crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes. Very frankly, Mr. President, the bill grew out of the severe distress the farmers of my own immediate section of the country were undergoing, because of the unusually cold weather, which brought the temperature down to 12 or 14 degrees in the latter part of March, and destroyed their crops.

Mr. President, I regret very much that the Department of Agriculture has seen fit to put the kiss of death on this proposed legislation, by addressing a letter to the chairman of the committee, under date of April 11, disapproving the bill and recommending against its passage. I realize that it might be possible for the Senate to proceed to go through a course of hearings, consider the bill and pass it; but if that were done, it would be too late to afford any relief to those who are genuinely in distress.

Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture does not suggest any alternative. It says it is opposed to the bill, but it does not suggest any other measure which might afford relief to the multitude of farmers who are facing economic disaster. The Department says it sympathizes with them; but I say its whole attitude toward these disasters is one of careless indifference to human suffering and evinces no regard whatever for the economic distress of the farmers whom the Department of Agriculture is supposed to serve.

Mr. President, it is ironic that at the time when the Department says it sympathizes with these farmers who are in such great distress the Department has raised to 5 percent the interest rate on the disaster loans which were authorized by Congress. The interest rate on these loans has now been made practically that of bank loans, namely, 5 percent, which is charged to farmers who are supposed to be entitled to some assistance from their Government because they are unable to secure the means of relief elsewhere—farmers who have seen their crops destroyed by freeze or who have seen the products of their labor washed down into the rivers by flood or dried up on the vine and on the stalk as result of drought.

Mr. President, to me, it is almost shocking that the Department of Agriculture, which was created to assist the farmer and which at one time was a living, vital agency interested in the welfare of the farmer, could have become so deplorably indifferent to those in distress, and to the real privation and suffering of those whom it is supposed to serve.

I deplore, indeed, Mr. President, I resent the action of the Department in disapproving of this bill, without suggesting any alternative. I can understand why the Department might not like the bill, although, in my opinion, the objections the Department raises are captious and specious. If the Department were really desirous of fulfilling its mission as an agency of service to the farmers of the Nation, it would at least have offered some alternative rather than to increase the interest rate to the farmers, who can obtain credit nowhere else.

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

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

Mr. STENNIS. I wish to commend the able Senator from Georgia very highly for his effort to meet the distressing situation which exists throughout what might be called the southern freeze belt. I remind him that the freeze struck great areas of my State long before March of this year. It struck last November.

To meet that distress situation, certain changes were proposed in the law with reference to the allotment of cotton acreage. The situation was brought to the attention of the Congress, and aroused sympathy in the minds of a great many Members. The situation was not confined to my State.

Many officials of the Department of Agriculture were sympathetic, but, so far as the top level recommendations of the Department were concerned, no recommendation was ever made which would help the Congress to cope with the situation. In fact, the administration was opposed to the bill.

The recent freeze in March added to the distress which already existed. Many crops were destroyed. A proposal was made to allow a slight increase in the cotton-acreage allotment—only 2 acres—to take the place, in part, of perhaps 15 or 20 acres of tomatoes or cabbage which were destroyed.

As the Senator from Georgia has said, it was certainly reasonable to expect some constructive recommendation from the Department with reference to the bill he introduced. Instead we receive word that the Department is opposed to the bill. No alternative is suggested. Furthermore, there is the announcement of an increase to 5 percent in the interest rate on distress loans. The Senator from Mississippi has searched, but he cannot find any other Government loan which carries an interest rate as high as 5 percent. I ask the Senator from Georgia if he knows of any Government loan which carries such a high rate of interest?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not. Furthermore, when the Congress was dealing with the question of the interest rate on agricultural loans, in the case of rural electrification and telephone operation loans, it fixed the interest at the rate the Government was currently paying, which I believe was about 2½ percent, although I am not an expert in that field. That showed the congressional intent. However, the attitude of the Department of Agriculture in increasing the interest rate, while offering no relief in other directions, is the equivalent of saying to the farmers in my area, "root, hog, or die."

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I do not want to acquire the reputation of being a complainer. I do not approach the question in that spirit. However, after we have made every possible effort to meet the situation by means of constructive legislation, I think a vigorous protest ought to be expressed here, and some ways and means should be devised to bring the question to a vote. The Senator from Mississippi agrees that if we could ever obtain a vote on this question, some relief measure could be passed.

I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly share the belief of the Senator from Mississippi that the United States Senate would not be so indifferent to human suffering and distress as the Department of Agriculture has been in these circumstances.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I wish to commend the Senator from Georgia for his alertness in bringing to the attention of the Senate and also of the people of the United States the condition which has arisen.

This bill was not introduced merely because Senators wished to introduce a bill. It was introduced because we found that in a great many of the States there was dire distress. For example, in my particular county in South Carolina, Spartansburg County, the loss in connection with the crop of peaches was approximately $10 million. The same situation will be found to exist in the State of Georgia. All the peaches in that State have been wiped out. The same is true in other States.

Mr. RUSSELL. The most conservative estimate of the loss to farmers in my State is $70 million.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Losses have been incurred throughout that section of the Nation not only in connection with the peach crop, but other crops.

The bill referred to was introduced to provide for an increase of 3 percent in the national acreage allotment. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that it is predicted at the present time that approximately 7 percent of the allotments which were given to farmers in the first instance will not be used. That being so, the result would not be an increase in the national allotment originally given to farmers, so far as cotton is concerned. The proposal advanced referred not only to cotton, but other crops. It provided for an increased allotment of 3 percent on other crops, which still is 4 percent less than the predicted unused allotments. This was an effort to relieve the condition of distress.

What do we find? As the Senator from Georgia has said, the Department makes no recommendation whatsoever to relieve the condition of distress. However, we find in Saturday morning's newspaper a United Press dispatch stating that the interest rates on disaster loans were increased some 2 or 3 months ago, but the Department forgot to announce it to the people of the United States until after the recent disaster had occurred. Then it was announced that the rates had been increased from 3 to 5 percent.

I wrote the Secretary of Agriculture a letter telling him exactly how I felt, and pleading with him to change the interest rate back to 3 percent. I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of my letter printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks.

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

APRIL 19, 1955.

Hon. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Department of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BENSON: I am writing you to protest in the strongest possible manner the Agriculture Department's order increasing disaster-loan interest rates to stricken farmers from 3 to 5 percent and your belated announcement of this action.

When Congress passed the law giving the Agriculture Department authority to establish rates of interest on these emergency loans made by the Farmers' Home Administration, Congress felt sure the Department would understand that the act was intended to help farmers in distress and not to make money. It is almost inconceivable that a Government agency would raise interest rates on emergency loans to farmers

who have lost their crops and who are looking for assistance to save their farms.

This holds especially true when the Agriculture Department is still lending money in other fields at rates as low as 2 percent. I seek your cooperation to immediately reconsider your order raising interest rates on disaster loans and return these interest rates to 3 percent.

I have seen at first hand the tragic situation which the elements have brought about in the South and elsewhere, and unless immediate and practical aid is made available to farmers in these areas, the result will be disastrous. The farmers just cannot pay 5-percent interest on emergency loans and ever get back on their feet. I have discussed this matter with other Senators and find a number of them deeply concerned about this situation.

I was shocked at the Department's action in raising the rates and can only conclude that such a policy is one of "blood money." Also, I must call to your attention the seriousness of taking such a step without any notice (to my knowledge) to Congress or to the farmers who are affected the most. To take such a far-reaching step and then just "forget" to tell anyone about it until those concerned are in the depths of distress, reflects careless and loose handling of the affairs of the people. I wish to cooperate with the Agricultural Department in every way possible for the welfare of the farmers of this country, but I cannot stand idly by, approving such policies.

Again I request you to reconsider this move which has increased loan interest rates under Public Law 38 more than 65 percent, and urge you to return to the 3-percent level.

Thanking you for your immediate consideration, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

OLIN D. JOHNSTON.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. In my letter I say that the policy involved in the Department's action in raising the interest rate is one of exacting "blood money" from those who are suffering distress, and will suffer for the next 2 or 3 years, before they can get back on their feet. When they are charged such a rate of interest as 5 per cent, it amounts to "blood money."

I thank the Senator from Georgia for calling the situation to the attention of the Senate. I wish him to know that I am willing to try to bring about some affirmative and helpful action. However, as the Senator from Georgia has said, it is almost too late to afford the necessary relief if the Department of Agriculture does not place its stamp of approval upon the bill so that it can pass the House and Senate in time to be of some avail. Such relief is needed in my State, as well as in the States of Georgia, North Carolina, Florida, and other Southern States, where the freeze wiped out our crops.

Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, dated April 11, 1955, to the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 11, 1955.

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER, Sr.,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in response to a telephone request on April 5 from the clerk of your committee asking for the Department's views on S. 1628.

The purpose of S. 1628 is to provide relief to farmers adversely affected by weather or other natural disasters. It authorizes and directs the Department to increase farm acreage allotments of farmers who apply for an increase and whose livelihood is endangered by the destruction or damage by natural hazards of one or more of their important crops. The amount of increase to be granted in such cases is to be that acreage which, together with the other crops produced on the farm, will enable the operator to earn a livelihood for himself and his family. The Department would be limited in the acreage to be used in this manner to the smaller of (1) 500,000 acres, or (2) 3 percent of the national allotment established for any commodity.

The economic effect of disasters is recognized and the difficulties of the farmers affected are sympathetically understood. It is the desire of the Department to alleviate insofar as possible the difficulties caused by disaster. The Department is in complete accord with the laudable purpose of this bill which is to help relieve farm distress wrought by natural disasters. However, we believe the acreage allotment and marketing quota programs are not the proper vehicle for providing such relief. As you are aware, the purpose of these programs is to help keep production in line with effective demand. However, the provisions of this bill are contrary to this purpose.

All of our major crops except peanuts are in surplus supply, and for the first time in many years, acreage allotments are in effect for corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

We oppose S. 1628 for the following reasons:

1. It would be difficult to administer. Disasters of varying intensity occur in many parts of the country almost every year. There are few farmers who could not justifiably claim that they have suffered severe damage from the vicissitudes of weather, disease, and pests at one time or another during the growing season. This could involve us in a continuous review and adjustment of allotments of individual farmers adversely affected. It appears unfair that farmers adversely affected late in the growing season could receive no relief from this source, whereas their neighbors adversely affected at an earlier date, could. Also, it would be difficult, if not impossible to determine how much increase in allotment should be granted to individual producers. How much acreage would be required of any crop to assure a livelihood for the operator and his family, taking into consideration other crops on the farm and the size and economic status of the farm family, would involve the exercise of judgment decisions by our more than 3,000 farmer committees, which neither they nor we could discharge with a fair degree of accuracy or equity as between farmers.

2. The bill would be expensive to administer. As you are aware, our present budget includes $39 million a year to administer acreage allotment and marketing quota programs. The additional work in making necessary adjustments entailed in carrying out the bill would add greatly to the present expense. The exact amount would be difficult to determine in the absence of experience. In addition to the administrative expense, additional program expense would be involved in supporting the price of the commodities grown on the additional acreage allotted over and above that presently authorized or required.

3. The bill would set a dangerous precedent by using acreage allotment programs for insurance or relief purposes which they are not designed to serve. The bill is completely contrary to recent legislation authorizing additional reductions in Burley tobacco acreage allotments to adjust supplies in line with demand. The additional allotments called for by this bill can only serve to further aggravate existing disparities between supplies and market outlets for crops under control. Producers of basic commodities who are making very steep reductions in their acreage in an effort to bring about better balance in production should not be required to shoulder the burden of providing disaster insurance. Disasters are a matter of concern to everyone, and we believe that any relief granted should be through recovery measures in which the general public participates.

Under existing law the Department has authorized the making of emergency loans to eligible farmers who have suffered substantial losses as a result of the recent freeze and are not able to obtain from other established sources the credit needed to continue their normal operations, including the maintenance and care of orchards. Although it is expected that these loans will be repaid as rapidly as possible, consideration is given to the circumstances of the farmers in each area in the determination of terms and security policies relating to the making of these loans.

If the Congress feels that something more than the disaster loans or drought-relief programs presently provided by legislation is needed, such relief should be provided outside the acreage allotment and marketing quota program.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that, from the standpoint of the program of the President, there is no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate bill 500.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement of yesterday, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is entitled to the floor.

COLORADO RIVER PROJECT NOT IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the session yesterday I was attempting to describe the main features of the Upper Colorado project and to give the reasons why I thought it was not in the public interest that the pending bill be passed.

I pointed out that the bill authorizes the expenditure, within the not too distant future, of $1,658,000,000, and that, of this authorization, $656 million was to be allocated to power, $915 million to irrigation, and a little more than $72 million to the supply of municipal water.

I also pointed out that, in all probability, this was a gross underestimate of what the actual costs would be, because in the past the final costs have been more than double the costs originally estimated by the Bureau of Reclamation. So, in all probability, we face an ultimate capital expenditure of at least $2

billion, and possibly very much more than that sum.

Moreover, no interest is to be paid on the amounts allocated to reclamation, in the minimum figure of $915 million. In the case of power projects, as we know, not only is the principal repaid, but interest is paid. In the case of irrigation, only the principal is repaid, but not the interest.

Since there is to be a 10-year developmental period, during which no interest is to be paid, and no return on the capital is to be paid, and a subsequent 50-year period during which the capital is supposed to be repaid, this means that for 60 years the public will either pay interest on bonds which are floated, or will forego the interest which might otherwise be collected. A rough computation, based on figures submitted by the Department of the Interior, indicates that the interest costs will be, at a minimum, in excess of $1,100,000,000. Therefore, the irrigation costs now run to approximately $2 billion, at a minimum, and the power costs are set at $656 million. In view of the fact that the Bureau chronically underestimates the final costs, we may be dealing with total costs vastly in excess of $3 billion.

In my opinion, the huge size of these sums requires much more careful consideration than the Senate and Congress have in the past given to this proposal.

POWER COSTS ARE EXTREMELY HIGH

Toward the end of the session yesterday I turned to the question of power, and pointed out that this would be extremely high-cost power. The flow of the Colorado River is only one-tenth the flow of the Columbia River. It is only one-tenth the flow of the Niagara River. It is less than half the flow of the Snake River, in connection with which there has been considerable debate as to whether a high dam should be erected at Hells Canyon.

As a result of all this, the costs of installing generating capacity are extremely high.

EXCESSIVE CONSTRUCTION COSTS PER KILOWATT INSTALLED

I pointed out that at Glen Canyon, the cost of construction per kilowatt capacity was $463; at Echo Park, $640; at Central Utah, $765; at Cross Mountain, $605; at Curecanti, more than $1,000; and at Flaming Gorge, more than $700. The average cost for the power feature of the project as a whole is somewhat in excess of $500 per kilowatt of capacity.

Let us compare that cost with the average cost in the Tennessee Valley of $166 per kilowatt of capacity. That is the figure for the 17 multiple purpose dams on the Tennessee River. In other words, the average cost of building the dams and installing the generators and the equipment necessary to generate power would be 3 times as great in the projects contemplated on the Colorado than in the 17 projects already completed on the Tennessee.

Furthermore, at Bonneville, the average cost was only $115. Therefore, the relative construction cost on the Colorado is between 4 and 5 times the cost at Bonneville. At Hoover, the cost was only $112. Again we have a figure for the Colorado which is between 4 and 5 times as high. At Grand Coulee, the cost was only $90. As a result, we have a cost on the Colorado more than 5 times and possibly somewhere around 6 times what the cost was at the great dam at Grand Coulee.

In other words, we are being asked to spend $656 million for power in about the worst place in the United States where hydroelectric power could be developed. This fact shows up in the figures on the generating cost per kilowatt-hour.

EXCESSIVE GENERATING COSTS

I cited the testimony of Gen. U. S. Grant, III, to the effect that the generating costs at Glen Canyon—the dam just above Lee's Ferry—which is the prize project, would be between 4.2 and 4.7 mills per kilowatt-hour. This is the best of all the dams.

I cited the fact that at Echo Park—the much discussed Echo Park—power would sell for 6 mills per kilowatt-hour and the costs are probably not far from that figure. At the dams higher up the river from Echo Park the cost would be in excess of 6 mills.

How do those costs compare with the costs in other great hydroelectric projects in the country? I pointed out that at Bonneville the generating cost per kilowatt-hour was a little more than 6 tenths of a mill, but if depreciation and interest were included, as they should be, the costs are about 1 mill per kilowatt-hour.

At Grand Coulee the power generating costs are less than a half mill per kilowatt-hour, and would still be less than 1 mill even if interest and depreciation were taken into account, as I believe they should be.

At Hells Canyon the estimated costs, with all items taken into consideration, would be approximately 2½ mills per kilowatt-hour.

On the TVA for 17 multiple-use dams, all costs, including depreciation and interest, amount to only 1.1 mills per kilowatt-hour; and on the 10 single-use dams, where nothing is written off, either for navigation or for flood control, the costs are less than 1.6 mills per kilowatt-hour.

In other words, Mr. President, we are being asked to authorize projects where the generating costs will be from 4½ to more than 6 times the costs on the Columbia River; from 2 to 2½ times the costs at Hells Canyon; from 4½ to 6 times the cost of the multiple purpose dams on the Tennessee River; and from 3 to 4 times the costs of the single-use dams. So, we are being asked to plunge hundreds of millions of dollars, and, indirectly, some billions of dollars, into the most unfavorable location in the United States.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION IS INCONSISTENT

I pointed out that it was extraordinary that an administration which has declared public power to be creeping socialism, which has put the lid down on additional dams on the Columbia River, which has opposed Hells Canyon, and which has certainly turned a cold shoulder to the power development of the Niagara River, should go up into the mountains of Colorado and there locate public power projects where the costs will be 3, 4, or 5 times what they would be at these other locations.

Mr. President, I am not saying that the administration wishes to have this project fail. I wish to be very careful in what I say. But I will say that if the administration had wished to discredit the public power system it could not have proceeded in any better fashion than it has done in this instance, because it is turning over the favorable locations to private industry and concentrating enormous expenditures in high-cost areas where, in my judgment, the losses will be extremely heavy. Is it possible that this administration believes in the socialization of losses.

The power thus generated is to be sold at 6 mills per kilowatt. That will be about the cost at Echo Park, probably will be slightly less than the cost at the dams to the north of Echo Park. Therefore, the Glen Canyon Dam is expected to carry the whole burden of the program, to bring in virtually the only profit which will accrue, and then, in addition, to carry 85 percent of the enormous capital expenditures for irrigation. In other words, Mr. President, upon a very slender foundation of earning power there is being erected a tremendous superstructure of expenditure. If construction costs at Glen Canyon go up, if it turns out that instead of the $370 million allocated to power at Glen Canyon, the actual costs amount to $500 million, and if the Bureau of Reclamation runs true to form, and grossly underestimates the ultimate cost, as it commonly does, we shall find Glen Canyon costs approaching close to 6 mills per kilowatt-hour; so there will be no profit.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, but not for a speech.

Mr. WATKINS. I had no intention of making a speech at this point.

Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the figures of costs of power at these various projects the matter of retirement of capital is also included?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes.

Mr. WATKINS. Is the Senator also aware of the fact that the costs include transmission lines as well?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I do not think they include transmission lines. I think these are costs at the bus bar. The 6-mill figure is the price at the bus bar.

Mr. WATKINS. At the load center.

Mr. DOUGLAS. At the site or close to the site of the dams themselves. It is not a delivered price.

Mr. WATKINS. It is the price at the load centers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is not the price in Denver, Salt Lake, or Albuquerque. It is the price at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, and the other power points.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand there is a difference between the price at the bus bar and the price at the load center.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What I am trying to show is that it is not a delivered price. It is the price at which the "juice" is fed

from the generating turbines into the system.

Mr. WATKINS. I understand it is the price at the load centers.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What does the Senator mean by "load centers"? Does he mean it is the delivered price for Denver?

Mr. WATKINS. It would probably be the price at the load center at Denver. I shall try to discuss that particular matter. I think the Senator from Illinois has been given figures which do not correspond to ours.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If it is a delivered price, then the costs of the transmission lines must be figured in addition, and the margin of profit would be still less. If the generating costs at Glen Canyon are 4.5 mills, if the price of electricity delivered in Denver is 6 mills, and depreciation and maintenance costs of the transmission lines have to come out of that, then it is even less profitable than I thought it was. I was trying to give the Senator the benefit of every doubt. He has now convinced me that the project, even at Glen Canyon, about which I had some doubts, is totally unjustifiable.

Mr. WATKINS. I do not see how the Senator can take the line of reasoning that the cost would be 6 mills at the point of use.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The price is 6 mills. The cost at Glen Canyon is from 4.2 to 4.7 mills, according to General Grant. If the price is 6 mills in Denver and this includes transmission costs, then, obviously, the margin between the two is less than has been assumed, the profit will be less, and the ability to support the huge irrigation system which the Senator from Utah is advocating will be still less.

Mr. WATKINS. The fact of the matter is that the actual cost of producing the power at Glen Canyon and at Echo Park is approximately 2 mills.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have always thought General Grant was an extremely competent engineer and an extremely fine citizen. He was for many years a member of the United States Corps of Engineers. I think at one time he may have been the commanding officer of that corps. He is a grandson of the great Civil War general and post-Civil War President. His testimony will be found in the hearings at page 385. It is to the effect that the costs——

Mr. WATKINS. I simply wanted the Senator to have in mind, in connection with this discussion, that I intend to discuss the subject later.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. But the Senator has raised this question. Let me now read the testimony of General Grant, which appears at page 385 of the hearings:

> The Glen Canyon Dam is all important in the program because it is the one and only one at which electric power can be produced at a cost, estimated by the Bureau at 4.7 mills and by the Federal Power Commission at 4.2 mills, or less, that will insure a substantial profit when sold at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour.
>
> If the Federal Power Commission's estimate of cost is correct, the differential in cost between the cost of Glen Canyon and Echo Park power will be five or more times the profit possible on Echo Park power at the lowest estimate of its cost.

I only wish such figures as the Senator now brings out had been included in the report which was submitted to the Senate on yesterday.

I take it that the Senator from Utah has no further observations on this point.

STEAM POWER WOULD BE LESS EXPENSIVE

If the upper Colorado were the only source of power for this region, perhaps we might say, "Well, let us go ahead with the power features, at least." But there are alternative sources of power. There are coal deposits in both Wyoming and Colorado. We hear much about the shale deposits of Wyoming. There is also oil in Wyoming.

The TVA experience has shown that power can be generated from steam, and therefore ultimately from coal, at 3 mills per kilowatt-hour, with all costs included, or appreciably less than the cost at Glen Canyon, and very much less than the cost at Echo Park.

So what is likely to be found, if the project should be undertaken and completed, is that the power, to the degree that it is needed, will not be supplied by the hydroelectric projects, but that private industry will be coming in, installing powerplants near the mouths of the mines, transmitting power, underselling the Government power, putting the Government out of business, and wrecking the whole public project. This can quite likely happen.

So while the Tennessee River was admirably adapted to hydroelectric development because of heavy rainfall in the Appalachian Mountains and I think could have been developed only by a public corporation; and while the Columbia and the Snake have a tremendous flow of water for the same reason, and while the Niagara River is admirably adapted to the development of electric power—and the scale of investment on the Columbia would have been impossible under private ownership—the upper Colorado is one of the worst places in the country in which to develop hydroelectric power.

PUBLIC POWER PROJECTS SHOULD BE JUDGED ON THEIR MERITS

I am distressed, because I find that the doctrinaires on the public power side and the irrigation side are falling in with the upper Colorado project simply because it is called public power and irrigation. I have talked with a number of Senators who have voted with me in the past to support Tennessee Valley Authority and Columbia River appropriations and who, with me, favor the public development of Hells Canyon. I am distressed to find now that they favor this project because it means public power.

Each of these projects should be judged on its own merits, without regard to doctrinaire considerations. If it is the purpose of Senators to discredit public power, then let them vote for this project, because I do not believe it will pay out. It will result in high-cost power.

But if it is desired to develop worthwhile facilities, then let the money be spent at Hells Canyon or on the Niagara or on some of the other dams of the Columbia. In fact, I think power could be transmitted down into this area through the interconnected power lines of both private and public power companies from the upper portion of the Columbia River Basin far more cheaply than it could be generated on the Colorado River itself. So I submit that the power feature of the program is unjustifiable and should not be carried out.

THOSE CHARGING CREEPING SOCIALISM AT TVA SUPPORT THE COLORADO PROJECT

Ironically, it is very interesting to note that a number of Senators who have opposed public power in the Tennessee Valley and in the Columbia River Valley, now suddenly emerge as great champions of public power when it is proposed to be placed in these areas of the mountains of Colorado. This is an extraordinary, "deep sea" change. These Senators, our good colleagues, at various times have denounced the TVA and the Columbia projects, but now they emerge as champions of the public development of the upper Colorado.

Was it Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes who once said that "abstract considerations have no effect on concrete decisions"?

IRRIGATION COSTS EXCESSIVE

What about the irrigation costs of the project? It should be remembered that $915 million admittedly will be spent upon irrigation, and in all probability additional hundreds of millions will be spent in the future.

It should be remembered that while the principal is to be repaid, 85 percent of it is to be repaid from the hoped-for profits over and above the cost of the power features of the program. In reality it will be paid from Glen Canyon, because that is the only possible feature of the program which can earn any net surplus—and, to my mind, it is very doubtful whether any net surplus will be earned at Glen Canyon.

Furthermore, it should be remembered that during the long life of the reclamation law, there has been a steady lengthening of the period during which no interest is paid.

When under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt and Francis G. Newlands, of Nevada, an eminent predecessor of our colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], who now occupies the chair, the Reclamation Act of 1902 was passed—and it was one of the great acts in the history of this country—it contained a provision that interest was to be forgiven for a 10-year period, in order to start the projects and get them under way.

As I pointed out yesterday, in colloquy with the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the original projects tended to be at low altitudes and in fertile soil, and to involve low costs. The first project was in the Salt River region of Arizona, in the Phoenix area where Roosevelt Dam was erected, the last of the great masonry dams, before concrete came into use. I have gone over Roosevelt Dam and have inspected it rather carefully. That project and other irrigation projects were successful.

But gradually, as the accessible sites were exhausted, and the hunger for reclamation continued, the influence of the

arid and semiarid States in Congress, particularly in the Senate, was great.

As Senators probably have observed, an interesting tendency exists for Senators from those States to congregate on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations, which consider irrigation and reclamation bills. There is a sort of affinity. Just as sugar draws flies, so those committees draw members from the States which can benefit from the authorizations and appropriations which are made for such projects.

REPAYMENT PERIOD WITHOUT INTEREST EXTENDED

In 1914 the repayment period of 10 years was extended to 20 years. In 1924 it was made a 5-year developmental period plus 20 years for repayment. During the developmental period no payments upon the principal were to be made. So for 25 years there was to be no interest paid.

In 1926 this arrangement was changed to a 40-year repayment period during which no interest was to be paid. In 1939 the time was extended still further, to a preliminary period of 10 years during which no payment on capital or interest was to be paid, and then to a period of 40 years of gradual repayment but without interest. At no time in the 50 years was any interest to be paid.

Now Congress is being asked to authorize the projects provided for by the pending bill upon the basis of a 10-year developmental period, with no payments on the principal, and a 50-year period of retirement of principal at straight-line rates, presumably, or a total of 60 years during which no interest is to be paid.

The result is that the interest component in the cost, though hidden, has been constantly increasing. It was only slight 50 years ago; but now it amounts to appreciably more than the principal itself. According to the Department of the Interior, which is advocating this project, the ratio is about 1.25 to 1. That is, the interest cost will be about 25 percent greater than the cost of the construction itself.

So, Mr. President, the actual costs of the irrigation projects, and I am one who believes that interest is a cost, will be in excess of $2 billion, at a minimum, and may, to the degree that costs are underestimated, run to $3 billion.

IRRIGATION COSTS PER ACRE EXCESSIVE

Now we can figure out what the costs an acre will be. I have been making some computations to that effect. A total of 132,360 acres of new land, so called, will be irrigated in the first 12 projects, and 250,000 acres of land will receive what is known as supplemental water. A very interesting question is how one can equate the land which receives supplemental water with the land on which water is furnished for the first time, and which apparently will be the almost exclusive recipient of the water.

We have canvassed that situation, and the facts seem to be as follows: It is contemplated that on the so-called new land, water will be furnished to a depth of 18 inches a year, or 1½ acre-feet a year for each acre. On the supplemental land, so-called, it is understood that the average amount of water furnished a year will be approximately to a depth of 6 inches per acre or one-half acre-foot a year.

Therefore, for irrigation purposes 3 acres of supplemental land can be taken as the equivalent of 1 acre of new land. This produces a figure of 216,000 acres of "equivalent new land."

We have the irrigation figures of cost for these various projects, and I shall read them, first excluding interest costs, dividing the total cost allocated to irrigation by the number of acres of "equivalent new land."

In the LaBarge project, in Wyoming, $210 an acre.

In the Seedskadee project, in Wyoming, $383 an acre.

In the Lyman project, in Wyoming, $780 an acre.

In the Silt project, in Colorado, $878 an acre.

In the Smith Fork project, in Colorado, $670 an acre.

In the Paonia project, in Colorado, $949 an acre.

In the Florida project, in Colorado, $618 an acre.

In the Pine River project extension, in Colorado-New Mexico, $332 an acre.

In the Emery County project, in Utah, $922 an acre.

I would appreciate it if my good friend the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] would give me his very close attention now.

In the Central Utah project, $1,757 an acre—more than $1,700 an acre on an equivalent acre basis.

On the Hammond project, in New Mexico, $627 an acre.

On the Gooseberry project, in Utah, $1,047 an acre.

There is a general average of $952 an acre for the 12 projects taken as a whole.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre for irigated land in the 12 authorized participating projects on the Colorado River storage project be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Project	New land irrigated (acres)	Supplemental land (acres)		Total acres irrigated (2 plus 3)	Total acres irrigated equivalent new land (2 plus 4)	Construction costs allocated to irrigation (report, p. 187)	Average project cost per acre (report, p. 187)	Cost per acre on equivalent new land acre basis
		Actual	New land equivalent					
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
1. LaBarge	7,970			7,970	7,970	$1,673,300	$210	$210
2. Seedskadee	60,720			60,720	60,720	23,272,000	383	383
3. Lyman		40,600	13,533	40,600	13,533	10,564,000	260	780
4. Silt	1,900	5,400	1,800	7,300	3,700	3,282,400	450	887
5. Smith Fork	2,270	8,160	2,720	10,430	4,990	3,343,000	321	670
6. Paonia	2,210	14,830	4,943	17,040	7,153	6,791,600	398	949
7. Florida	6,300	12,650	4,217	18,950	10,517	6,503,600	343	618
8. Pine River project extension	15,150			15,150	15,150	5,027,000	332	332
9. Emory County	3,630	20,450	6,817	24,080	10,447	9,636,500	400	922
10. Central Utah	28,540	131,840	43,947	160,380	72,487	127,354,000	794	1,757
11. Hammond	3,670			3,670	3,670	2,302,000	627	627
12. Gooseberry		16,400	5,467	16,400	5,467	5,727,500	349	1,047
Total	132,360	250,330	83,444	382,690	215,804	205,476,900	537	952

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, we should add to the costs given in the table the interest costs. We have applied the ratio of 1.25 for interest as compared with one for principal. In this connection we should remember we have made no allowance for construction periods. If the construction period is 10 years, the period of no interest is 10 plus 10 plus 50, or 70 years. We have been using a lesser figure than that, in our desire to be fair to the sponsors of this project.

If the interest is added, the figures of costs of irrigation are as follows:

For the LaBarge project, $472 an acre.

For the Seedskadee project, $861 an acre.

For the Lyman project, $1,755 an acre.

For the Silt project, $1,995 an acre.

For the Smith Fork project, $1,507 an acre.

For the Paonia project, $2,135 an acre.

For the Florida project, $1,490 an acre.

For the Pine River project extension, $747 an acre.

For the Emery County project, $2,074 an acre.

For the Central Utah project, $3,953 an acre.

For the Hammond project, $1,411 an acre.

For the Gooseberry project, $2,355 an acre.

The grand average for the 12 projects is $2,142 an acre.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the cost per acre of irrigated land, including interest, in the 12 authorized participating projects be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

Exhibit 1

La Barge	$210×$1.25=	$262.50+	$210= $472.50
Seedskadee	383× 1.25=	478.75+	383= 861.75
Lyman	780× 1.25=	975.00+	780=1,755.00
Silt	887× 1.25=1,108.75+		887=1,995.75
Smith Fork	670× 1.25=	837.50+	670=1,507.50
Paonia	949× 1.25=1,186.25+		949=2,135.25
Florida	618× 1.25=	872.50+	618=1,490.50
Pine River project extension	332× 1.25=	415.00+	332= 747.00
Emery County	922× 1.25=1,152.50+		922=2,074.50
Central Utah	1,757× 1.25=2,196.25+		1,757=3,953.25
Hammond	627× 1.25=	783.75+	627=1,410.75
Gooseberry	1,047× 1.25=1,308.75+		1,047=2,355.75
Total	952× 1.25=1,190.00+		952=2,142.00

IRRIGATED COSTS AN ACRE ARE 3 TO 4 TIMES HIGHER THAN THE VALUE OF AMERICA'S MOST FERTILE LAND

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, in my State of Illinois there is a belt of land which runs across the State, through what is known as central Illinois, continuing on into Iowa, which, we believe is the most fertile natural land in the world. The price of this most fertile land in the world is now between $600 and $700 an acre. In the project now under discussion it is being proposed to use arid and semiarid land—and I shall go into the question of the crops which can be raised on that land in a moment—and to put that land under cultivation by the use of water, when in only one case will the cost be less than $400 an acre, and that is the LaBarge project, which is a relatively small project. In only one other case would the cost be less than $800 an acre. In one case the cost would be $861 an acre. In the remaining nine projects the cost would be more than $1,000 an acre. In the largest project of all, the central Utah project, the cost would be nearly $4,000 an acre—six times the cost of the most fertile land in the world—all done in the name of development. Paraphrasing Madame Roland I say, "Development, development, what crimes have been committed in thy name."

IRRIGATED LAND TO BE USED FOR LOW-VALUE CROPS

What is to be grown on the land? The Senator from Utah yesterday challenged the Senator from Illinois as to the accuracy of his statement about the crops to be grown. I have before me an abstract, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, taken from the hearings, beginning on approximately page 60, and continuing for some 25 pages thereafter, which shows the crops to be raised.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, of the 16 projects reported, 8 of them were stated as being suitable for livestock only, through the raising of alfalfa and pasture. Seven were stated as being primarily for livestock, but with some vegetable and fruit production; but I believe such production is incidental. Ninety-five percent of the projects contemplate the production of alfalfa or grain or are intended directly or indirectly for the feeding of cattle. As a consequence, this land, after irrigation, will not be worth very much—probably not more than from $100 to $150 an acre—$150 an acre at the outside. Yet we are being asked to make an average expenditure of $2,000 an acre on land which, when the projects are finished, will sell for only $150 an acre.

A BOONDOGGLE PROJECT

Mr. President, the WPA was attacked as a boondoggling operation, although I do not think it was boondoggling. But this proposal, so far as I am aware, is the biggest boondoggle I have ever heard of. Of course, the result will be, after the period of repayment is extended for 50 years, in addition to 10 years during which no payment is to be made, that even then the owners of the land can bear only 15 percent of the cost. Eighty-five percent of the cost will supposedly be laid on power, and on high-cost power—not low-cost power, as in the case of the Tennessee, the Columbia, or the Niagara, but on high-cost power, almost as high relatively as the Rocky Mountains themselves.

So, Mr. President, neither on the irrigation features nor on the power features is the expenditure of these vast sums of money justifiable.

WATER RESERVES AVERAGE THREE TIMES FLOW OF COLORADO RIVER

The third consideration is, of course, the water resources or water reserves. I do not pretend to be an expert on this question, although I have been in the Colorado Valley a number of times. The flow of the Colorado River in the past 10 years has been something less than 14 million acre-feet a year. The reserves contemplated in the big storage lakes lying behind the dams will be something over 43 million acre-feet, or about three times the average flow of the river. But this is not all, Mr. President. Seven and one-half million acre-feet, or half the flow—whichever we may wish to take—is pledged to the lower Colorado Valley, so that the amount available for the upper valley will not exceed 7½ million acre-feet, or possibly a little less than that. Yet the reservoirs will hold 43 million acre-feet, or six times the amount of water to which the upper Colorado is annually entitled or which it can obtain. In view of the fact that the dam which is farthest down, namely, Glen Canyon Dam, will have to generate a great deal of power at almost full capacity in order to pay out, although I am not an expert, personally I would be very doubtful whether these reservoirs would even be largely filled. In order to fill the Glen Canyon Reservoir it may not be possible to fill Echo Park Reservoir and the others.

The point I should like to make is that the reservoir capacity of the project is grossly overpledged, with enormous capital outlays which will not be utilized.

PROJECT PAID FOR BY STATES NOT BENEFITED

Mr. President, who is going to bear the cost of all this? It will not come out of the air. I think we are in for great and heavy losses in this region, and the burden will be borne by the taxpayers of the country as a whole. Only 2 percent of the burden will be borne by the taxpayers of these four States. It will be the great industrial States of the country, whose citizens pay the largest proportion of the Federal income and corporation taxes, which will bear the great part of the burden. The drawing down of the income of the rest of the country will diminish their ability to consume and hence to stimulate industry. These are the unseen costs which far outweigh the benefits derived from this project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield for a question, and I think I know what the question is going to be.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois is mistaken. He asked a question, and I should like to answer it, briefly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be very glad to have the Senator from Wyoming answer it, if he does so briefly, so that the flow of my argument may be preserved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has asked, "Who is going to pay for this?" In reply, let me state that it will not be paid for by the taxpayers of the country as a whole, not by the taxpayers of Illinois or New York or Pennsylvania, but it will be paid for out of the wealth which will be developed in this great storehouse of natural resources through which the Colorado River has been flowing, unused, for millions of years, until the Congress of the United States, with the vision to see that the water could be put to productive uses, authorized the Colorado River compact and the building of the dams. That is where the payment will arise.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank my friend, the Senator from Wyoming. His eloquence is always charming, and at times is almost overwhelming. But, Mr. President, even the eloquence of the Senator cannot overcome the facts of high power costs, enormously higher irrigation costs than the subsequent value of the land, and the tremendous losses which in all probability will be suffered by the community if it launches upon these projects.

No, Mr. President; I say to my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, that the cost of these projects will not be paid for by the wealth of this particular region. It will be the governmental deficits, the forgiving of interest, and the burdens heaped upon the rest of the country which will pay the cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield for another moment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be happy to yield, provided it is only for a few moments, and provided the Senator from Wyoming does not attempt to take the floor away from me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not do so, and I did not attempt to do so before.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming did not attempt to do so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And I shall not attempt to do so now. But, Mr. President, when the time comes for me to take the floor, to speak my piece about this matter, I shall display to the Senator from Illinois, and to other Senators who may be willing to listen, photographs which will show what the lower Colorado River Basin was before the dams were built, and what it is now.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me say, in reply to my good friend from Wyoming, that I do not wish to enter into a discussion as between the claims of the lower Colorado River States and the claims of the upper Colorado River States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not raise that controversy.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I so understand and I do not wish to enter into it, and I do not wish to have it thought that I am advocating the claims of Arizona, California, or Nevada in this respect. But

I should like to point out that the irrigation projects of California and Arizona to which the Senator from Wyoming has referred are in low altitudes, with long growing seasons and extraordinarily rich land, so that, when water was turned upon those projects at an earlier date and at low cost, the total investment has probably in the main been beneficial, although not in all cases.

But in this case we are being asked to irrigate lands in the uplands, at altitudes between 5,000 and 7,500 feet, where the growing season is short, and where the chief products will be hay, corn, livestock, and alfalfa. These are low-value crops.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois permit me to ask a question at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I can see that, as usual, I have stirred up the lions, in the form of my two dear friends who now are encompassing me.

Mr. ANDERSON. No, Mr. President; I only wish to ask a question. I have been hearing the constantly repeated statements of the Senator from Illinois that the land in California and Arizona is so fertile, and that the land in the area of these projects is so infertile. Has the Senator from Illinois ever examined a map of the United States dated about 1860, and seen on it the area which was labeled "The Great American Desert"? Yuma was about the capital of it. The very areas about which the Senator is speaking, which are so fertile today—areas such as the Coachella Valley and the Salt River Valley—were so bare that the areas in northern New Mexico looked like a paradise. It is possible to change that picture by putting water on the land. That is what has happened at Yuma. There was not a blade of grass at Yuma prior to the building of the project there. The soil is not a particle different from other areas along the Colorado River. On my own farm in New Mexico, there are areas which were formerly known as the Hubbell Lakes. We plowed up the sand in this area and eventually turned the land into fertile acres. I believe a similar distinction should be made in discussing the types of soil in this debate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Let me touch briefly on this point. Am I not correct in saying that nearly all these proposed irrigation projects are at an altitude greater than a mile? I think one of them is at an altitude of 4,500 feet.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The one in Wyoming is as high as 7,500 feet. At these altitudes the winters are long and cold and the summers short.

Mr. ANDERSON. I am sure that is so; but at the same time, it is also true that hay is valuable when it is scarce. I had some alfalfa which, last fall, was worth only $20 a ton. In the past few days I have received telephone calls offering from $45 to $50 a ton, because hay is scarce in other areas, and has finally become scarce in the Rio Grande Valley.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad my good friend from New Mexico is now implicitly admitting that hay and alfalfa are to be the chief crops grown on these irrigation projects.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has anyone been denying that these lands would be agricultural lands?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] denied that yesterday. He implied that forage crops would not be the chief products.

Mr. ANDERSON. No. He pointed out that other products would be grown. All I am trying to say to the Senator from Illinois is that grass is not the worst crop that can be grown for the welfare of the people of the United States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. All service ranks with God. All crops are beautiful and valuable; but grass is a relatively low-value crop.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the Senator from Illinois will write to his experiment station he will find that within the past few months there was published a document dealing with the products to which grass can contribute, and the value which grass has, pointing out that 6½ tons of grass was recently taken off a pasture. This document was published in either the Farm Journal or Successful Farming within the past 6 months. I believe the Senator from Illinois ought to go back and persuade his farmers in Illinois who are getting 6½ tons of grass to the acre that they are doing wrong—that they ought to be growing high-value crops, which the Senator from Illinois says they should find desirable.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In the main, we grow very high-value crops in Illinois. Primarily we grow corn and soybeans. We grow a little wheat, but primarily corn and soybeans. Not much hay is being grown in the great central belt of Illinois. That Illinois land, the highest valued land in the country, is worth only $600 to $700 an acre. However, in the upper Colorado, in the central Utah project, it is proposed to spend $4,000 an acre for land which, when we are through, will be worth $150.

MOST PROFITABLE IRRIGATION IS ON FERTILE LAND

I should like to mention one further point. I have said that if we wish to develop hydroelectric power we should not go to the Colorado, but to the Columbia, the Snake, and the Niagara. If we wish to obtain a greater yield of crops, we should not try to bring additional acres of arid or semiarid land into cultivation at enormous cost, but we should put a little water on the fertile lands already in cultivation and raise the output per acre still further.

Yesterday I referred to a recent article by Paul B. Sears, an eminent geographer, who some years ago wrote a very fascinating book entitled "Deserts on the March." This article appears in the annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. It shows that if we put additional water on the lands of Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Ohio, upper New York, and the Cotton States of the Mississippi Delta, at a cost of from $30 to $60 an acre—I believe in no case more than $100 an acre—we can obtain vastly greater production than by putting water on the arid lands of the Mountain States at a cost of many hundreds of dollars an acre.

So if we wish to enter upon a program of putting water on land to increase the acreage yield, let us do it on the already rich lands by taking water from the great rivers of the country, notably the Mississippi, the Hudson, and the Connecticut, and possibly the Great Lakes, although international complications might arise in that instance in connection with the level of the lakes.

RECREATION VALUE OF UNDEVELOPED AREAS

Having discussed power, irrigation, and water reserves, I wish now to touch upon one final point. I refer to the point of recreation. That subject is involved, not at Glen Canyon, but at Echo Park, because the Echo Park Dam would flood a large portion of Dinosaur National Monument. This monument was started on a very small scale 40 years ago. The purpose was to protect the paleontological remains of the prehistoric dinosaurs which once roamed this region, believe it or not, and whose skeletons have been encased for all time in the rocks of this region, where they are visible from the canyon walls. By order of President Roosevelt, the very small reservation was extended to include a total of approximately 210,000 acres.

I wish to make it clear that the preservation of the dinosaur remains is not involved in the Echo Park Dam. They are downstream from the dam. They will not be flooded. It is very important to make that clear in the RECORD.

I see the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] bows to me at that point. However, I hope he will not regard this as an unusual performance on my part, because I at least try never to overstate my case.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield for a question, or for a brief comment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to acknowledge what the Senator has just now said. There is no Member of this body for his true sincerity, ability, and diligence I have greater respect than I have for the distinguished Senator from Illinois. I am sure he knows that to be so.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are close and fast personal friends, and always will remain so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator very much. That is a very great compliment to me.

I was happy indeed to have the Senator say explicitly upon the floor that the dinosaur quarry will not be touched by any arm of this project.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. However, I wish to add—and this is why I bowed to the Senator—that those who are taking the position he takes in opposing this project are seeking to condemn the upper basin of the Colorado as the graveyard of the dinosaurs, not to be developed, not to be inhabited, not to be used by the American people who are seeking land.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That brings us to the point upon which I wish to touch.

What will be affected by the Echo Park Dam is not the dinosaurs, but the beautiful, awe-inspiring, tremendous canyons which lie in this region. The Echo Park Dam is to be 525 feet high, and the water level is supposed to approximate a level 10 or 15 feet below that. In other words, there will be a depth of approximately 500 feet, provided everything turns out as the sponsors suggest, although I have previously indicated my doubt as to whether there will be sufficient water to raise the lake level above 500 feet. But let us take the claims at their face value. That means that the beautiful canyon there will be submerged for a great many miles, and there will be a placid lake in its stead.

I know that there is an honest difference of opinion on this last question. I know that those who live in the mountains and in the wide-open spaces of this region have nature in plentitude. They are surrounded by nature. They see the beautiful mountains with the occasional snow-capped peaks. They drive enormous distances, by eastern and even middle western standards, to see their friends. They experience hail storms and snow storms, and occasionally a little rain, though not too much rain. Nature is all about them. They have so much of it that it does not have too great an attraction for them. To the splendid outdoor residents of this region, men and women brimming over with vitality and virility, the preservation of a set of canyons does not seem particularly important.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois has correctly stated that we have little rain. These are the semiarid land States we are speaking about.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I say to him: "Pity us. Let us store the rainwater which for thousands of years has been rolling down the Colorado Valley without use. Let us save it. Let us keep it for awhile. Please have some pity on the area, which is the arid land area of the country. It wants to conserve the great natural supply of water which the Almighty placed there, for man to use, if he has the intelligence and the courage to use it."

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Wyoming, with his characteristic eloquence, is now making an appeal for pity. Pity is not the most desirable of human qualities. Friendship is better than pity. Of course the Senator from Wyoming is so superior to the Senator from Illinois that I cannot pity him. I look up to him, not down at him. I have for the Senator from Wyoming, as for all the Senators from this mountain area, the warmest friendship. I should like to help them. But the Senator in his appeal that the rest of the country be merciful to those arid or semiarid States has forced me to say something I had hoped I would not be compelled to say. It is that already the rest of the country is paying through the nose for the 16 votes which the great Mountain States have in the United States Senate. It is a region with a population of only 5 million, representing only about 3 percent of the population of the whole country. However, that region has 16 percent of the representation in the United States Senate.

The Senators from those States are fine gentlemen, able Senators, good ambassadors from their States, and they are able to secure the enactment of legislation which enormously benefits their States at the expense of the rest of the country.

LIST OF BENEFITS RECEIVED BY MOUNTAIN STATES

Let me call the roll for a minute. Reclamation, with interest forgiven. Sometimes I think the arid and semiarid States enter into joint combinations with the States of the lower Mississippi in a process of rolling each other's logs, the States of the lower Mississippi getting big appropriations for rivers and occasionally for harbors, and the States in the mountain areas getting appropriations for reclamation, but in neither case is interest being paid, and in the case of the lower Mississippi States not even principal is being returned for the land that is reclaimed by the deepening of the Mississippi.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was citing specific instances in which we have been extremely generous to the Mountain States.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Illinois was in full flight with a very eloquent castigation.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Oh, no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. He spoke of the Senators from the arid States.

Mr. DOUGLAS. No; I insist I was not. I merely pointed out——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Was the Senator not indulging in a little castigation?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Not in the slightest; no.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Did he not refer to logrolling?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Strike out logrolling. Strike out "logrolling", and insert instead "mutual and tacit agreement upon essential features which will benefit the respective areas."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should like to say to the Senator, speaking for the State of Wyoming, that the oil revenues of the Federal Government from that State have produced millions of dollars for the Reclamation Service. From this arid ground, upon which I would like to spread a little water, we have produced great quantities of oil, and that oil——

Mr. DOUGLAS. Is it not said that water and oil do not mix?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We can mix them if only the Senator from Illinois will devote his great talents to our cause. I believe he will before we have finished.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I was just beginning to call the roll of the great benefits which the rest of the country has conferred upon this region. I believe the Senators from those States have not been passive on such issues.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know the Senator will permit me to say that the people of those States are people of high standards.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. They are worthy Americans.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, they are; but so also are the people of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, New York, and the other States of the Union.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I know many people in my State who came from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And they probably have regretted it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I should hesitate to say that. They are in Wyoming and in the other Rocky Mountain States, where there is the plentitude of nature to which the Senator from Illinois has referred. We have certain great advantages which the teeming cities of the East do not have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is true. That is a point I shall come to, if the Senator will be forebearing enough to let me continue my remarks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sure the Senator will permit me to go to lunch now. We can continue this exchange when I return and I take the floor in my own right.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Very well.

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

Mr. DOUGLAS. Having been attacked by Wyoming, I now yield to New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. It is not for the purpose of attacking the Senator. I listened very carefully to what the Senator from Illinois said about a tacit agreement between the States of the lower Mississippi Valley, under which we have voted sums of money for flood control to them, and they in turn have taken care of our reclamation projects.

I merely wish to state for the record that never in my life has a Senator from the lower Mississippi Valley approached me and asked me to vote for a flood-control project, with the understanding that he in turn would vote for a reclamation project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I echo what the Senator from New Mexico has stated.

Mr. ANDERSON. Never have I gone to a Senator from any one of those States and told him that I would vote for a flood-control project if he in turn would vote for a reclamation project.

It is a rather serious reflection upon the Senators from the Western States and upon Senators from the lower Mississippi Valley States, and I believe that the Senator from Illinois ought to produce evidence that such an arrangement has been entered into if he makes that charge.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I did not charge that any open agreement was ever entered into. I am sure that the Senator from New Mexico, who is a highly honorable man, never entered into such an agreement. I merely wish to say that frequently there has been a tacit understanding, which is sometimes more binding than a definite pledge.

The Senator from Wyoming had been making a plea for mercy. In a sense, since he has left the floor, what I have to say may seem to be taking advantage of his absence. However, it was by his

choice, not by mine, that he absented himself.

In addition to the reclamation funds which are appropriated from the taxes contributed by the rest of the country and on which no interest is paid, when those reclamation funds are repaid, they do not go back into the General Treasury. Instead, they are used for further reclamation projects. Therefore, when the original appropriation is made for irrigation from tax funds, it is gone forever.

To paraphrase the old miner's song, Oh, My Darling Clementine, the irrigation money once appropriated is lost and gone forever; no matter how dreadfully sorry we may be, it will avail us nothing.

In addition to the funds voted for reclamation, we purchase as a government every year, as I remember, approximately $30 million of silver. That is a big subsidy to the silver mining industry of the Western States. I am aware of the fact that the silver is purchased at less than the amount at which silver is minted into silver coins or is used as a reserve for silver notes. However, we could use Federal Reserve notes at a cost of 1 cent per dollar, and save 49 cents. So, we are virtually keeping the silver mining industry going, keeping up the price of silver, and striking a heavy blow at the jewelry industry of the country in so doing. We are raising the price of the silver sets which the young brides have to have when they start housekeeping, and we are raising the price of jewelry in the city of North Attleboro and other manufacturing cities in New England.

Then, Mr. President, there is the high price of sugar, maintained, in part, as a subsidy for the cane-sugar growers of Louisiana but also for the beet-sugar growers of Nebraska, Colorado, and Wyoming.

Then there is the price support upon wool, not at 75 percent, as Mr. Benson would have the price support on corn and wheat, but more than 100 percent; I believe it is 110 or 120 percent of parity.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] says, sotto voce, that it is maintained between 105 and 110 percent. It would be much cheaper if we obtained our wool from Australia; but, no; we maintain a high price to keep the wool growers of the Mountain States in business.

Then, of course, we help to maintain the cattle industry in those States, because, somehow, the Argentine cattle never pass the health tests, and, as a result, cheap Argentine beef is kept out of the United States.

I am not tilting against windmills in this matter, but when the Senator from Wyoming implied that the rest of the country was being mean to the Mountain States, I thought a full record should be made on that point. I would say that if these supports were not held up, directly and indirectly, for the Mountain States, the population of that area would decrease and the prosperity of that area would decline.

The country is already paying through the nose for the support of those States. By the terms of the Constitution they have great political power, with equality of representation in the Senate, which cannot be changed, against which I do not protest, but which it is not unpatriotic to point out.

RECREATION VALUE OF UNDEVELOPED NATURAL AREAS

Mr. President, let us go back to the fourth point, namely recreation. What would be affected by the Echo Park Dam would not be the remains of the dinosaurs, but the destruction of the deep canyons, enormously deep, with swift-flowing rivers, even with relatively low-water content, and high, towering cliffs. I have not had the privilege of taking a canoe trip through that portion of the Colorado River. I have seen photographs of it, and I have seen a brief movie of it. I have on two occasions been down to the very depths of the Grand Canyon and pitched a tent there and lived there for a weekend. It is, of course, one of the great sights of the country.

It is highly important for persons who live in closely packed centers, who live in the great cities, to be able to visit places of natural beauty which are awe-inspiring, which give to man a sense of his littleness in the presence of the mighty forces of nature, which cause his imagination to go back into the deep aeons of time, and enable him to feel the exhilaration which comes from personal knowledge that nature is powerful and that man is mighty little. This is something which we city folks lack in our ordinary lives and which the people of the Western States always have. How inestimably richer the country is because of the great national parks which have been constructed, such as the Yosemite, the Yellowstone, Rainier, Glacier, the Smokies, and perhaps most of all, the Grand Canyon.

I have been in most of those parks. As a young man I used to tramp through some of them in the summertime. Those summer experiences are some of the features of my life upon which I look back with the most intense pleasure and the greatest deepening of consciousness. But these parks, as we all know, are now being overused and are overcrowded. I have not had the opportunity or the time to visit Yosemite Park or to go into Yellowstone Park or Glacier Park in recent years, but I receive letters from my constituents regarding them. The universal complaint about these parks, and, indeed, about the park at Mt. Rainier, is that they are overcrowded and badly maintained, particularly in the past few years. There are swarms of people there. Therefore, some of the glory of the parks is being rubbed off by overuse. Millions of distraught city folks, pressured by the strain of city life, are not getting the exhilaration and revivification which contact with nature brings.

The Dinosaur National Monument has opportunities in this direction if properly developed. It has enormous canyons where, with proper trails and roads, people can go down to the very bottom, where others can take canoes and float down the river and have a quickening of life from contact with the awe inspiring features of nature. A sense of humility and of peace would come to them.

This would be largely lost if the canyons were to be replaced by a placid lake. I know there are those who say that a lake is just as recreational as a deep gorge. I have spent a day on Lake Mead, which is back of Boulder Dam. I would say that in the case of Lake Mead it has not decreased the recreational facilities of the region, but has greatly improved them.

But, certainly, Mr. President, we should keep some wild places. We need these wild places to enable and benefit the human spirit. Dinosaur National Monument could, with proper development, become such a place. What is going to become of this country if we dam every stream and create placid lakes in every portion where wild water formerly flowed. We shall reduce the entire country to a stale, tepid, flatulent level, good for weekend excursions with a picnic basket, but with the sternness of nature, the awe-inspiring cliffs and scenery, obliterated. Excellent as chautauqua is would we like to have the whole country converted into an extensive chautauqua?

If that should happen, a great glory would have passed out of the country. This, I think, is what the Bureau of Reclamation, with the best intentions in the world, is seeking to do. It is trying to dam all the streams, install power, provide irrigation, displace the gorges, and turn scenery into the growing of hay and corn and the production of electricity—all well in their own way, but not all of life, because men must live by something more than beefsteak and fruit. As our population increases, the need for such wild places will be still greater.

There is another feature about the proposed project. If a power dam shall be erected in the Dinosaur National Monument, may we not have power dams in Yosemite, in Yellowstone, and in Glacier National Park? The National Park Service has been fighting a rearguard action for many years to keep the Bureau of Reclamation out of these areas. If the wall is broken, or if the foot goes in the door, we can be pretty certain that it will be harder to resist the raids when they are made, as they will be made, on the other national parks of the country.

SUMMARY

So, Mr. President, the upper Colorado project from any standpoint is unjustifiable. It is unjustifiable on the basis of power, because it contemplates about the highest cost power that could be generated. It is unjustifiable on the basis of irrigation, because the costs are astronomical compared with the benefits. It is of extremely doubtful value on the basis of the actual amount of water which will be put in reserve as compared with the reserve capacity behind the dams.

The upper Colorado project would cripple the recreational features of the country and tend to transform the Nation physically, into a placid, tepid place, greatly unlike the wild and stirring America which we love and from which we draw inspiration.

Thus, while I have the friendliest feeling for the Senators from that region, who in defending the interests of their States are doing something which is very natural, I hope that the Senate of the United States and the other House as well, will disapprove this project in its entirety.

In yielding the floor, I now ask unanimous consent that certain data which I shall submit may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

The data are as follows:

Exhibit 2

Project	Acres	Chief crops
LaBarge project, Wyoming (p. 59)	7,970 new; no supplemental	Hay, pasture, small grain, dairy cows, and sheep. Project lands would generally be utilized for support of livestock enterprises.
Seedskadee project, Wyoming (p. 61)	60,720 new; no supplemental	Hay, pasture, and small grain, dairy cows, and sheep. With project development, the irrigated lands would be utilized primarily for the support of live stock enterprises, particularly dairy cows and sheep.
Lyman project, Wyoming (p. 62)	40,600 supplemental; no new	Hay, pasture, small grain, dairy cows, and beef cattle. Only grasses for hay and pasture, alfalfa, and some small grains can be produced to any extent because of short growing season.
Silt project, Colorado (p. 65)	1,900 new; 5,400 supplemental	Alfalfa, small grains, sugar beets, potatoes, dairy cows, and beef cattle. Would increase with late season water.
Smith Fork project, Colorado (p. 68)	2,270 new; 8,160 supplemental	Alfalfa, pasture, grains, dairy cows, and beef stock.
Paonia project, Colorado (p. 70)	2,210 new; 14,830 supplemental	Alfalfa, grain, apples, peaches, dairy cows, and beef cattle.
Florida project, Colorado (p. 72)	New: 900 Indian; 5,400 new non-Indian; supplemental: 100 Indian; 12,550 non-Indian.	Alfalfa, grain, dairy cows, beef cattle, largely livestock, some beans, potatoes, and fruits.
Pine River project, Colorado and New Mexico (p. 75).	New: 14,520 Colorado; 630, New Mexico.	Utilized largely for support of livestock.
Emery County project, Utah (p. 72)	3,630 new; 20,450 supplemental	Livestock, some small farming, 90 percent of area produce hay and grain for livestock.
Central Utah project, Utah (p. 78)	28,540 new; 131,840 supplemental	Alfalfa, grain, fruit, vegetables, sugar beets, beef cattle, and sheep.
Hammond project, New Mexico (p. 85)	3,670 new	Alfalfa, corn, beans, barley, dairy cows, and sheep.
Eden project, Wyoming (p. 87)	10,660 new; 9,540 supplemental	Hay, pasture, dairy cows, and beef.
Curecanti project, Colorado (p. 88)	Power unit	
Gooseberry project, Utah (p. 91)	16,400 supplemental	95 percent alfalfa, pasture.
Navaho project (p. 95)	137,250 new Indian land	Alfalfa, grain, pasture, some fruit and vegetables.
San Juan-Chama project, New Mexico (p. 96)	225,000 supplemental	Municipal and industrial use.

SUMMARY

Projects reported	16
Stated as being for livestock only—alfalfa, pasture, etc	8
Stated as being for livestock with some vegetable and fruit production	7
Stated as power unit	1

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARY, Mr. PASSMAN, Mr. SIEMINSKI, Mr. MURRAY of Illinois, Mr. CANNON, Mr. CANFIELD, Mr. WILSON of Indiana, Mr. JAMES, and Mr. TABER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, and it was signed by the Vice President.

CONSTRUCTION OF COLORADO RIVER STORAGE PROJECT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 500) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] well knows, there are very few issues which seem to divide us. I rejoice in that fact. But I must say that upon this issue I find it impossible to refrain from commenting on some of the things which have been said.

I agree fully with what the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said with reference to the delightful Senator from Illinois, namely, that he is fair; that he tries always to present a fair picture.

The only things I desire to comment on, although I shall deal with agriculture at substantial length later, are some of the inferences which have to do with the character of soil. If the fine, rich, fertile soils which have been referred to were always the sources of the greatest agricultural returns, we would find record crops being produced each year in the States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and, yes, in Pennsylvania and similar areas.

Strangely enough, some years ago there was a discussion of the areas which raised surpluses of potatoes. For reasons which many persons may recall, I had a deep interest in the surplus of potatoes. It was found that the great surplus was being grown not in the areas which had been the normally large producers of potatoes, but was coming in large measure, from the State of California. The record yield of potatoes, which only a short time before had been in Lancaster County, Pa., one of the richest of the agricultural counties in the United States, had suddenly shown up in Kern County, Calif. Whereas the area in Pennsylvania had set a record of some 150 bushels of potatoes to the acre, it was only necessary to sit back for a few years until Kern County, Calif., in the desert sand, produced 1,400 bushels to the acre.

The distinguished junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], now occupying the chair of the majority leader, has in his State a small valley called Pahrump Valley. Only a few years ago that valley was a desert of marching sands, which Paul Sears talks about. A group of farmers had the courage to go into that valley and try to make it an agricultural empire. Today the valley has an agricultural production which can equal anything that can be done in what were the old fertile areas.

I am not opposed to increasing agricultural production in other parts of the United States, as well, because I say that this land of ours will need greater agricultural production if the population continues to increase.

I only point out that the areas which we regard as desert finally end by becoming extremely fertile land, and that light soils, even though they be very largely sandy, respond to certain types of crops. Farmers now think nothing of getting a production of 150 bushels of oats to the acre in irrigated areas.

As to the parks, let me say that there are many, including myself, who have a record for supporting, maintaining, and protecting the park system of the United States. I was a Member of the House of Representatives when, in the first few years of World War II, an effort was made to economize in almost every possible direction, and the appropriation bills which came to the floor of the House carried very drastically reduced appropriations for the national parks. A group of Members from the Rocky Mountain States, Republicans and Democrats alike, gathered together and, at

my insistence, decided that we would fight for the parks and for appropriations which would protect and preserve them during the period of the war emergency. We succeeded in having our amendments carried and in raising the appropriations by narrow margins, thus taking care of the parks of the Nation during the period of the war.

There exists in my State a fine national park known as Carlsbad Caverns. That park was owned at one time by the State of New Mexico. A group of individuals, of whom I was happy to be one, felt that ownership of that park should be transferred to the United States Government. It was transferred by the State of New Mexico to the Government of the United States and thus became part of the national park system. Not 1 cent was paid by the United States to the State of New Mexico to acquire it; yet if one will examine the returns from the national parks, he will find that Carlsbad Caverns has been a bread winner for the other parks in the national park system, because Carlsbad Caverns has returned a profit to the Federal Government year after year, and that profit has been used for the benefit of the other parks.

We in New Mexico have not regretted that. We are happy that Carlsbad Caverns has been able to accomplish this purpose.

I merely point out that there are some Members who have been interested in the park situation for a long time; that there are some of us interested in the preservation of wilderness areas.

I can say that when, about 6 months ago, the Wilderness Society decided to dedicate a plaque to Waldo Leopold, who had taken the leadership in the development of the first wilderness area under the Park Service of the United States, the society did not have to go outside the State of New Mexico to find an individual who, they thought, deserved to make the address on that occasion. They chose me to speak because it had been my privilege to go into the area when an effort had been made to destroy the wilderness. I think I was the only elected public official who faced the proponents of division and said they could not invade the Gila Wilderness.

So I say, from long experience, that I do not regard myself as an enemy of the Park Service, nor an enemy of the national parks, nor an individual who tries to destroy the wilderness areas of America.

Today, however, I am very anxious to talk about another facet of this matter—farm surpluses and the whole problem that is posed by a series of bills which I hope will come from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I am hoping these bills will deal with the subject of irrigation development of additional lands and the production of additional crops, which I think will be badly needed.

Very soon, within the next 10 years, according to a study made by the Department of Agriculture as late as 1953, we may well be speaking of farm shortages, and the need for an adequate supply of farm lands. Crop surpluses will have vanished.

How can this be? I am going to do my best to show my colleagues. I am speaking as a former Secretary of Agriculture and as a man who has had a rather extensive association with the food problems of the United States and the world.

Part of what I have to say will be based upon my experiences as chairman of the World Food Board a few years ago, and upon the knowledge I gained in food matters as chairman of the United States delegation to Quebec in the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organization. Certain conclusions I will draw will rest, in part, upon facts I gathered as United States War Food Administrator, and later as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Sometimes the things we keep may not be of significance to anyone but ourselves, but they are found to be interesting later. Shortly after becoming Secretary of Agriculture I asked what was going to happen when the wars finally ceased and agriculture was placed on a wholly different basis in a peacetime economy.

We created in the Department of Agriculture a long-range planning committee. We charged it with the responsibility of surveying what had happened after every great war, not only in this country but abroad. We asked it to make a study of what might happen to food habits of the people of this country, what was happening to the soil of the Nation, what unusual burdens were being placed upon it during the war period, and what we might expect in the years that would follow?

April 21 and October 6, 7, and 8, 1947, testimony on those subjects was presented to the Congress for the formulation of a long-range policy and program. I refer to that only because in the preparation of the report of the hearings we had to prepare a balance sheet. Opposite page 12 of the hearings, that balance sheet is set forth. We tried to survey, through every available governmental organization, every acre of ground about which we had any knowledge whatever. We tried to ascertain how many acres were suitable for intertilling, how many acres were fit for grazing only, and how many acres were suitable for forests only. In general, we tried to see what the general land pattern should be.

This was the work of the Department of Agriculture, of the Soil Conservation Service, and of the Department of the Interior. We queried every available official we could find. We then began making a study of diets, and a study to ascertain what would be the economic and agricultural needs of this country if the people ate the foods they ought to consume in order to produce fine and sturdy children.

We found that if the land then in cultivation were cultivated in the fashion best designed to preserve and conserve it, not having pastures plowed which should not be plowed, we would produce only enough for the people of the United States to eat, if they were going to eat the diet they should, at the right time of the year. We learned that within only a few years we would not be producing enough to meet our needs.

Most of the figures I quote, and nearly all of the facts I intend to outline, will be drawn from documents which Senators can check for themselves. I shall attempt to list them as I go along.

I have asked the question: How is it possible to have food shortages within 10 years when today we are speaking of food surpluses?

First of all, though, let us define the extent of our present surplus. We do not have an overabundance of most foods. We do have an oversupply of certain crops. One of them, cotton, is not edible, although some of its byproducts are. And, believe it or not, the United States imports some foods important to our diets.

So we can scale down the overall picture of surpluses right from the start. The foods now in oversupply soon will be used up, if present population trends continue. The first way in which we can predict that farm surpluses will vanish is through population increases, more people eating more food.

John H. Davis, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture in charge of Commodity Marketing and Adjustment, and president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, made a speech at Cedar Rapids, Iowa, on July 31, 1953, in which he said:

> Looking ahead, say to 1960, we are likely to have a population total close to 175 million people. And if our rate of economic growth continues as it has in the past, the average person should have a level of living at least 15 percent above that of today. Such a rise in the general level of living for this higher population total would mean greatly expanded domestic markets for food and other farm products produced by our agriculture.
>
> And even if the people we will have in our country by 1960 consume food and other farm products at the same rate as in 1952, our domestic consumption of farm products would then be 9 percent higher than in 1952. On this basis alone, by 1960, we would need to have each year about 2 billion more pounds of meat, an additional 500 million dozen eggs, an extra billion pounds of milk solids, and about 8 million tons more of feed grains than we produced in 1952 as well as greatly increased quantities of fruits, vegetables, and other products.
>
> I want to stress that * * * over many years there has been a very distinct trend in this country to upgrade diets. This desire to expand food consumption and improve nutrition will express itself as long as our people continue to have adequate buying power.

I have been reading from a speech by Mr. John H. Davis, who said that, based on a population of 175 million people by 1960, that was exactly the point where we would find a balance existing between what this country could produce by sound agricultural policies and what the diet of the people of the country would require.

More can be said about population. Its growth in the next 10 years was predicted by Dr. Grover W. Ensley, staff director of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, who said here last October 25:

> On the basis of present fertility rates, our population can be expected to increase to about 190 million persons by 1965, compared with just under 160 million in 1953 and something over 162 million today. * * * The effect of these population changes during

the next decade will be to increase the demand for food.

Mr. President, I have not tried to bring to the Senate floor today a library which deals solely with the problem we are discussing. I have, however, picked up three books from my own library which deal in a minor way with the problem. One of them is a book by Robert C. Cook, entitled "Human Fertility: The Modern Dilemma." I should like to read from that book, beginning at page 321:

> The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization frankly admits that in spite of local surpluses of food in North America, on a global basis the per-capita ration is smaller today than it was in 1940.
>
> The evil does not stop there. The world's growing population will force the use of marginal lands, which in general are extremely expensive to exploit. More and more human energy will have to be devoted to the basic problem of producing food, and the standard of living, instead of going up, will remain at the subsistence level in the areas where it now stands at that level, while the wealthier areas will find their standards of living declining. Already the pressures of population in most parts of the world have compelled an unwise exploitation of the good lands. Erosion has become a world-wide problem.

Mr. President, I listened while the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] talked about using these lands, which are not the most fertile in the Nation. Yet, as Mr. Cook, the author of Human Fertility, states, the world's growing population will force us to use the world's marginal lands; and of course he is as accurate as can be. A little later in his book he says:

> In Japan the multiplication of those in want has now reached the point where each day it grows more doubtful whether the industry and technical skills of the people can ever bring about a balance of mouths and of loaves.

Then, Mr. President, if we consider the calculations of population which are made in this text, we find that the author believes that starting with the 1950 population of 2.3 billion, the population of the world will double by the year 2020, and then again will double in another 70 years, and finally will reach the figure of approximately 10 billion persons on this planet. Of course, it takes only 30, 40, or 50 years to reach a figure which already puts in jeopardy all our agricultural lands. That is why I say that the Senators who represent the Western States, which are interested in this problem, are not interested in it only as it exists today, but are interested in what will happen 20, 30, or 40 years from now.

Mr. President, I now call attention to the fact—and later I shall refer to it again—that in dealing with this problem, we are dealing with a proposal to construct dams and irrigation projects which will not be completed in 30 or 40 years.

At this time I should like to refer to a book entitled "Population on the Loose," by Elmer Pendell. In it we find the following:

> The population of the rice-eating areas has increased by nearly 100 million people in the 1939–49 decade—about 10 percent.

Mr. President, recently we were trying to ship a great deal of rice to other countries of the world. Then we found that temporarily a sufficient supply existed there. But if this trend continues, and if the rice-eating areas continue to grow by 100 million people in a decade, or if perhaps they have a substantially greater growth than that, then we shall face some real problems in a very short period of time.

Finally, Mr. President, I read from the same book the following passage appearing on page 45:

> As their population becomes dense in relation to soil, the inhabitants have to give a larger and larger proportion of their energy to the production of food for themselves.

Yes, Mr. President, the story by expert after expert is that we have some great problems; and in a few minutes I shall have more to say about population and its effect on the supply of food.

But there is already present in the picture a factor which should be mentioned now, because it increases the seriousness of the problem we face as our population grows and our food consumption goes up. That factor is the Nation's supply of farm land. It appears—and I shall tell you, Mr. President, where I gathered my facts—that we shall be faced with a demand for more food at a time when our total farm acreage is decreasing.

Volume I of the President's Materials Policy Commission Report in June 1952, says the United States will need 40 percent more food production by 1975 than it had in 1950. But it estimates that during that interval, 15 million acres of farmland will be lost in the construction of airports, highways, cities, and other nonproductive activities. I say nonproductive in terms of a source of food supply—not that cities are not productive in other ways. In that period we shall also be losing 25 million acres of land to soil erosion.

So here we are, Mr. President, needing 40 percent more production at the same time we are losing 40 million acres of farmland. The situation is not hopeless, thanks to technological advances in agriculture and increasing yields per acre; but, as we can see, the situation is not good at all.

In passing, let me make this observation: We can improve the use of our lands, we can farm every available inch, and still fall short. We can do the best we know how, and fail. We can do much worse than we know how, and create a crisis close to treason. What did Ghandi say? "To the millions who go without two meals a day the only way God dare appear is in food."

Mr. President, can you imagine Americans that short of food?

I say that while we are deeply concerned with conditions in other parts of the world, we should concern ourselves with the development of these United States lands, which offer a possibility of adding to the food supply of America—not now, to be sure, but 20, 30, or 40 years from now, which is when this land will come to its greatest usefulness.

Mr. President, Walter Prescott Webb, author of The Great Frontier, which was published only 3 years ago, has this to say of the productivity of farmland:

> The land has only so much to offer, and when it is crowded, it has less to offer each one * * * regardless of any techniques which may be developed to extract more from the land, there is a limit beyond which we cannot go. And if our techniques speed up the process of utilization and destruction, as they are now doing, they hasten the day when the substance * * * on which a swollen population temporarily subsists will approach scarcity or exhaustion.

We can look to the crowded nations of the world to see what Mr. Webb had in mind. Food, to the teeming lands of China and India, the miniature gardens of Japan and Europe, holds a different meaning than it ever has held in this country.

It might be said that we are talking in terms of guesses. That is true; but if our guesses sound too high, think back about 5 years. The 1950 census was being completed, and the experts were estimating a 1975 population of 175 million persons. I have already read to you estimates which place the figure at 190 million—estimates revised in 5 years of zooming birth rates and longer lives for the aged. The Census Bureau placed the Nation's population at the end of March—only about 3 weeks ago—at more than 161 million persons. This represents an increase of 400,000 individuals in 1 month—or more than 13,000 per day.

In the next 20 years there will be 7,300 days. If we multiply 7,300 by 13,000, we get 94,900,000. Add 94 million persons to the total today, and we get 255 million United States citizens by 1975. So it can be seen that our figures are decidedly conservative.

Mr. President, all these remarks are preliminary to what I really came here to say; they are a sort of introduction to certain facts already demanding attention. They indicate—today—that food surpluses are beginning to solve themselves. How? First, through population increase; second, through increasing consumption by the individual; third, through the usual inroads of drought, insects, and day-to-day farming hazards.

Our surplus stocks of certain items have not increased at the old rate during the past 2 years, although production has been at an all-time high. At my request the Agriculture Department checked its figures, and found that the rate of increase in surplus commodities is leveling off. It found that consumption has been gaining on production, and that in these surplus commodities, a balance soon will be achieved.

Officials in the Department of Agriculture, in testimony before congressional committees and in their various publications, point out that as early as 1962—only 7 years from now—a balance of production and consumption could be reached. This was mentioned by Mr. Davis, the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, in the same speech to which I referred a few moments ago.

It is my conclusion, based on these facts, that an increase in per capita consumption or more severe drought could

bring the date of balance by 1958 or 1959.

Where does that leave us? It leaves us with the problem of finding more farmland, increasing the yields of present farms, and easing the effect of drought. Strangely, no one has an adequate answer for any of these alternatives, although partial answers can be found for each.

Where are we going to find new farmlands? Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service, testifying before the agricultural subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, said:

> If we were to consume 156 pounds of red meat, which was the consumption in 1954, it would require in 1962 some 35 million acres more land to grow feed than was used in 1953.

These figures are for the production of meat only, acres for pasture and grazing, as well as more acres in feed grains.

I have said that lands available for agriculture are diminishing, and I told where I got the figures. Is there any land not being used at present which could be put into cultivation? On page 17 of a study, How Can America Best Provide Food and Fiber for Its Future Population, Hon. John P. Saylor quotes the Department of Agriculture as follows:

> There is an estimated 50 million acres of wet land suitable for agriculture, once it has been properly drained (and) * * * an estimated 20 million acres * * * that could be brought into production.

If we need 35 million acres by 1962, as the statements I have read indicate, we shall have to look to these unclaimed lands—and look soon. We shall have to drain them, get them into production, and look around for still more lands.

I know where about 600,000 acres of potential farmlands are now awaiting the plow. They are in the upper Colorado River Basin. Compared with the 35 million acres we need, this acreage is a very small drop in a very large bucket. But when every additional acre becomes important, we must develop land in any quantity, large or small.

Some persons assert that farm yields have increased in the past to meet increased food demands and that it is likely that yields will be expanded in the future. This probably is true—up to a point. Mr. Webb, whom I quoted earlier, seems to believe that there is a limit on how much can be wrung from a given plot of earth. We got all the speed we could out of propeller-type aircraft and had to turn to jets for more speed. Perhaps there is just so much speed in an acre of farmland.

Let us do something about the drought if we can. Shortage of water affects the yield per acre, so this subject is tied closely with farm yields. Mark Twain said there was not much we could do about the weather. His observation still holds water, if I may use such an expression. We cannot do much about how much snow falls in the winter, or have much choice as to where it falls. But we can make better use of certain moisture we now have. Not only can we do this, but we can do it in a way which will answer, in a small way, each of the problems I have mentioned—finding new land, increasing farm yields, and easing the drought situation.

I refer, of course, to reclamation. I feel very strongly about this subject—the development through reclamation of currently arid and idle farmlands of the West. It appears foolish in the extreme for a nation facing agricultural shortages to sit idly on a stream bank while one of the means of meeting a shortage flows unhindered into the sea.

Senators know that I am referring to the upper Colorado River Basin and the water which accumulates as snow on the mountain peaks of the upper basin and flows, unused, past potentially valuable agricultural lands by the millions of acre-feet every year.

Some of this water has been put to use. It generates abundant and cheap electric power and has created one of the world's agricultural marvels. This use is in the lower basin—in California, the Golden State. Everyone has prospered, including United States citizens living on the eastern seaboard who manufacture products which prosperous California farmers consume. But there is much of the Colorado River water still unused by the States to which it belongs by law.

It has been suggested that if more land is brought into production by the use of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin, it will increase our stock of surplus commodities. Few suggestions have ever been made so foolishly. For one thing, the total new farm acreage contemplated in the completed upper Colorado project is somewhat less than 600,000 acres. As I said a moment ago, this is a very small drop in a very large bucket compared with the Agriculture Department estimate that we shall need 35 million acres of new land by 1962.

Even if every one of the proposed upper Colorado projects could be undertaken tomorrow and completed without delays of any kind, it would be 27 years before the full acreage would be in production. These figures come from the Bureau of Reclamation.

Why be concerned about so few acres? Because our population is expanding and we shall need every acre we can get. Furthermore, the people will have to find more than food. They must find work in order to live.

The power generated by the upper Colorado projects could create a vast inland empire, based on the virtually unlimited mineral, timber and agricultural resources of the upper basin.

It appears a reasonable guess, in my opinion, that not too many years will pass before Americans living in overcrowded areas will be looking around for somewhere to go. They may be emigrating to the very lands now under discussion, but presently incapable of accepting them.

I am hoping, in this discussion, to make a case for full development of the upper Colorado River Basin based on agricultural necessities. There are other reasons why the project should be authorized, and they have been eloquently enumerated. They fit into the picture and help carry the load. If the project were designed for agriculture alone, it would be too costly to undertake. But since one of its benefits is agriculture, I believe I should point out how great the benefits really are.

So let us take another look at what we like to call "unbalanced agricultural production," or surpluses. This is one of the least understood problems now facing the United States, although the effect of this production has been the accumulation by the Federal Government of more than $7 billion in stored, price-supported agricultural products.

Of all our price-supported stored crops, the one of major concern is wheat. Cotton and rice are beginning to become problems, but the economists do not anticipate their getting as out of hand as wheat has.

According to the most recent complete figures of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Federal Government has on hand approximately 702 million bushels of wheat, valued at $1.9 billion. This includes 500 million bushels, worth approximately $1.3 billion, which has been declared as a set-aside commodity by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Agriculture Act of 1954. If we deduct that amount from the supply owned by the CCC, which certainly was the intent of Congress, we have adjusted Government stocks of about 202 million bushels valued at about $534 million.

While the 1954 act has done much to eliminate a depressing effect upon the market, it has done little to reduce the annual carryover of wheat. Unless some of the marginal acres are taken out of wheat production and diverted to some other use such as pasture, the wheat problem will be with us for several years in spite of the continued upsurge in population.

A billion dollars worth of wheat sounds impressive, but wheat cannot be measured in dollars alone, due to the nature of the market and varying weather conditions. So let us measure the stock of wheat on hand in terms of annual supply.

According to the Department of Agriculture, we have enough wheat on hand to meet all our demands, both domestic and foreign, for 1 year. Does that sound impressive? Does that meet the growing demands of our population 5 years from now? Senators know how quickly that grain would vanish if we were to experience another drought as ruinous as that of the thirties.

As for our other price-supported crops, the supply, while it cannot be classified as short, certainly could not be considered in overabundance. In fact, we have only a 3-month supply of stored feed grains. This is serious, when you consider the dust bowl conditions in Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Wyoming.

On April 18, 1955, Life magazine published a very interesting article entitled "A Stormy Start for Farm Year." Picture after picture is shown of the effects of wind blowing in the Western States. It is an article which all should read because of its great significance.

Fairfield Osborn has published a book called The Limits of the Earth. The Conservation Foundation has circulated a great many copies of it. In that book he said, at page 77:

> The episode in the spring of year 1935, when the sun was darkened from the Rocky Mountains to the Atlantic by vast clouds of soil particles borne from the denuded grasslands of the Western States, jolted our people into action and gave birth to a conservation movement that is now well begun, though as yet far from adequate. We may hear dimly, like a navigator at sea, the low and distant warning from another vessel, but we persuade ourselves that she is horizon-distant and bearing another course. There are as yet no scarlet flashes on our roadway to the future, and should these appear we would assure ourselves the road is broad and the accident somebody else's.

To be sure, scarlet flashes have appeared on the roadway within the past few months. The New York Times printed a special article, written at Denver, entitled "Dust Bowl Looms in a Four-State Area. Only if Rain or Snow Falls in Next Few Days Can Blow Be Averted."

Mr. President, I flew to my home in New Mexico during the Easter recess. When we left Kansas City and had reached a flying altitude of some 16,000 feet, and were flying over western Kansas, the dust was all around the airplane. It was 16,000 feet in the air, Mr. President. The dust stayed with us across all of New Mexico. We dropped down over the Sandia Mountains into Albuquerque, but we were not able to land at the airport there. Occasionally we could see a little strip of runway, and a small white stripe on a highway, but, although the airplane made three or four attempts to land, it could not land and had to go on to Phoenix. When I wanted to return to Washington, the airplane in which I was to be a passenger could not reach the ground because of the mountain of dirt which was steadily floating through the atmosphere.

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

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator well knows, I am very much interested in the development of all the land of our country and, as he has suggested, in getting more of it under cultivation. I feel that sooner or later—and perhaps the day is not far off—there will not be in this country enough land producing agricultural products.

I notice at page 15 of the committee report that the estimated total cost of the projects contemplated by the bill is $1,658,460,000. Does that include the cost of building canals, of reclaiming land, and of the various processes preparatory to the irrigation of the land?

Mr. ANDERSON. I would say to the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry that it does not include the cost of putting the water on the land of the individual farmer. It includes the construction of dams. It includes the construction of the high-line canals. It takes care of the construction of the headgates and other diversionary apparatus, and it carries the water to the farmer's land.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, the farmer can then use the water. It is brought to his land.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Has the Senator from New Mexico any estimate of what the cost will be? I have reference to some of the projects mentioned in the report. For instance, at Fruitland Mesa, according to the report at page 11, there would be water for 7,700 acres of presently irrigated land, with a potential of 11,700 additional acres. How will the cost, so far as that additional land is concerned, be financed? Would it be necessary for Congress to appropriate funds in order to reclaim that land, or to build canals or to help construct facilities to carry the water, not only to the farmer, but onto the land?

Mr. ANDERSON. No; it has not been necessary on reclamation projects to go that far. If the water is available at the edge of the land, the farmer has always been able to obtain financing to carry it onto his land.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that financing done through commercial channels?

Mr. ANDERSON. It is generally done through the Farm Credit Administration. Sometimes it is done by the individual farmers themselves; they are able to borrow money from relatives or friends.

Mr. ELLENDER. How will the repayment of the cost of bringing the water to the farmer be made? Will it be made in the same way as now provided by law?

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes; in the same way as now provided by law, with the exception that a basin fund would be set up, and receipts from the power projects, after the power projects are paid off, would be utilized to take care of the costs which are beyond the ability of the farmer himself to finance.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the present law, as I understand, the farmer pays whatever assessment is made on a per acre basis over a period of 30 or 40 years, without interest.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That principle will apply?

Mr. ANDERSON. That principle will apply to this project.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator has the figure, what percentage of the entire cost of this project will be repaid through the development of electric power? In other words, has the Senator separated the cost of developing electricity from the cost of bringing the stored water to the farm?

Mr. ANDERSON. I am afraid that my answer will be a little unsatisfactory to the Senator, but I shall try to give it in this way: We cannot calculate that figure exactly, because we do not know what projects Congress will finally approve. Under the pending bill, certainly, we would proceed with the construction of the Glen Canyon Dam, which involves a cost of approximately $420 million. We would then proceed with the construction of the next dam, the one at Echo Park, which would involve an expenditure of approximately $176 million. We would then build the small dams, which run to approximately $700 million.

Mr. ELLENDER. So far as the larger dams are concerned, most of their cost will be amortized through the sale of electric current; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. Perhaps I should have had the figures available, except they vary so much, because we do not know what is going to be built in the final analysis.

We have provided for some Colorado projects, but we do not know how many will be found to be feasible. About 80 percent or perhaps as much as 85 percent of the cost will be paid eventually by the electricity users, and only about 15 percent by the irrigators themselves.

Mr. ELLENDER. Can the Senator tell us what is the maximum amount of money that could be spent under this bill per acre to irrigate land?

Mr. ANDERSON. There is no maximum figure set up. However, I believe that the largest sum runs in the neighborhood of $1,000, possibly $1,200, an acre.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does not the Senator believe that that is quite a large sum for the Government to expend in order to develop land? It strikes me that there should be some kind of limitation placed on the amount that can be spent per acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator's question is, What would be the largest sum? I would say that at one time I leveled 180 acres of ground on my farm. The total leveling operation cost $21,000. I could say that the average cost was $120 per acre for the leveling. However, I spent $2,600 to level 1 acre. I undertook to take away some ground, and when the operation was finished, it proved to be very expensive. There will be certain expensive operations in connection with this project, but they will all fit into the general pattern.

On the La Barge project, the average cost per acre is $210. On the Seedskadee project, the average cost is $383. On the Lyman project the average cost is $260, and so on. The highest average cost would be at Central Utah, where it would be $794.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the average cost?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. That means that some costs may be as high as $1,200 or $1,500 an acre.

Mr. ANDERSON. Yes. All the land does not lie exactly in the same way. It is not all flat. In some areas there is hilly land, and in those areas the cost will run relatively high.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the cost be prorated to the farmers in proportion to the average cost in a particular area?

Mr. ANDERSON. Within a specific project; yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, it would be possible for a farmer to acquire a tract of land that may have cost $1,200, but on which the average cost to him would be only $700?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. In the instance I mentioned I acquired 1,700 acres of land. An average value per acre was fixed for the entire project, although my land had been in a state of cultivation for more than 250 years and

did not require one piece of leveling equipment on it. However, I paid the same rate as the man whose land was as hilly as any land could be. Once a man goes into an irrigation project, he becomes a participant and partner in the entire project. It takes the contribution of all in order to make the project complete.

Mr. ELLENDER. The sum derived from the sale of electric current will be used exclusively to repay the debt until when?

Mr. ANDERSON. Until every dollar of it is repaid.

Mr. ELLENDER. In other words, every dime collected will be applied to the repayment of whatever sum is necessary to pay for the project, and thereafter, as I understand the Senator, it will be used to relieve the farmers where the cost may be excessive?

Mr. ANDERSON. That is correct. The Senator has stated it exactly.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, feed and forage crops are in short supply. Livestock growers in these drought-stricken States have been forced to reduce their herds. In many instances foundation herds have been liquidated entirely. With per capita consumption of red meat increasing steadily and herds being reduced due to drought conditions, we might already be facing a shortage of red meat.

It is interesting to note that since 1951 the consumption of red and poultry meat has reached record highs of about 180 pounds per person. Of this, we eat about 80 pounds of beef—an increase of nearly 24 pounds per person during the past 3 years. Total red meat consumption in 1954 was 154 pounds per person—a 12-pound increase since 1950. This figure was estimated at 156 but has been revised to a more accurate 154 pounds. I wanted to be accurate and submitted a draft of what I was to say to the Department of Agriculture for a careful check. Here is what the Agriculture Department has to say about the consumption of meat:

> In checking the draft of the speech it should be noted that a 1954 per capita consumption of red meat of 156 pounds was used. This, of course, was the latest figure available at the time Dr. Shaw's testimony was prepared. The latest revision indicates a per capita consumption of red meat of 154 pounds in 1954. In view of the complications that would arise with respect to estimated acres needed for feed grains, hay, and pasture by 1962, it is recommended that the 156-pound figure be retained.

This means that within 7 years, as I have said, we will need an additional 35 million acres of land or its equivalent in increased yields per acre. Then the question arises: "Will we be able to put that much new land into production and, if not, will we be able to increase our yields to meet this increased demand?"

During the past 15 years cropland and available pasture and range lands, combined, have decreased slightly. During the 10-year period ended in 1950, more than 13 million acres of this land went out of production—swallowed up by expanding cities, new highways, parks, reservoirs, game refuges, military reservations, airports, and erosion.

But let us get back to the red meat consumption and our needs 7 years from now. I have said we will need an additional 35 million acres of land for feed-growing purposes.

It is estimated by the Department of Agriculture that we could divert 17 million acres which were planted to wheat and cotton in 1953 to feed and still produce enough wheat and cotton to meet our anticipated demands for wheat. However, we will need an additional 35 million acres, and subtracting 17 million acres from this would still leave a deficit of 18 million acres. The surplus of 17 million acres which would be diverted from wheat and cotton allows for 5 million more acres in wheat and cotton in 1962 than was actually grown in 1954 and would allow for 14 million acres more wheat and cotton than is provided in the 1955 allotments.

In other words, economic conditions could be such that the farmer would be forced, or at least encouraged, to raise more feed grains and reduce his acreage in wheat and cotton.

The shifting of land into forage to meet livestock demands can only be made by the farmers if it is profitable to them. Certainly they would not make the change if it were to mean a financial loss or increased work with the same return and neither could it be expected of them.

Even assuming that the farmers will make this change, we would still have a deficit of 18 million acres. We can look at this in two different ways: One, it would tend to absorb any increase in acre yields between now and 1962, or two, if the acre yields were not increased substantially, it would reduce the period required to reach a balanced production.

The history of increasing crop yields per acre shows that there is a tremendous lag in transferring the gains made in the laboratory to the fields and that the production reached in the lab under ideal conditions is never attained in the field.

I am reminded of the story of the farmer who did not attend the extension meeting, and when he was asked why he did not go, because there he would learn how to farm better, he said, "Well, I do not farm as well as I know how, now."

The Connecticut egg-laying contest is an excellent example which shows how much of a lag there is in transferring gains in the laboratory to the field.

In 1920, the average of the hens in this contest layed about 160 eggs—or, about 70 eggs more than the United States average. By 1930 the contest average jumped to 210 eggs, but the United States average increased by only 5 eggs during the same 10-year period. In 1936, the contest hens reached what appears to be very close to maximum production—about 235 eggs. Since then, the average production of the contest hens has dropped as low as 200, but in 1950 it reached the 235 average again. It must be remembered that hens entered in this contest are the best available and that the owners were taking full advantage of the new information about as rapidly as they possibly could. Their primary interest is to break records no matter what the cost of production would be.

Now let us take a look at the United States average egg production per laying hen and see what it has done during the same period. In 1920 it was 90 eggs per year. Taking the following consecutive 10-year periods, it was 95, 105, and 140. In other words, by 1950 the United States average had not reached the 1920 average of the hens in the Connecticut contest. Granted, the average United States production is on the upswing, but research has done little to increase production in the laboratory.

A similar situation exists in corn production. In Iowa, the number one corn-producing State, acre yields increased only 2½ bushels from 1870 until 1937. Then, from 1937 to 1944, yields increased 15 bushels per acre. We are now in a leveling-off period.

The Iowa average began to increase in 1935, but the United States average did not show appreciable increases until the late forties.

In view of these statistics, it would appear that acre yields will not increase to the extent necessary to meet our coming food demands.

By 1975, with a projected population of about 200 million—if we take the lowest Census Bureau estimate—we will need at least an additional 100 million acres of cropland. Again, this much new land is not available. From the birth of our Nation until the first decade of the 20th century, we have always been able to expand westward to fill the needs of our increase in population. Now we have literally reached the Pacific.

From 1880 until 1920 the number of acres in cropland increased at an accelerated pace. We had 188 million acres of land in crops in 1880 with an additional 935 million available pasture and range. Ten years later we added 60 million acres to our cropland total—43 million of which came from pasture and range land. By the turn of the century, 71 million more acres were added—about 7.1 million per year.

Again the biggest share of this land came from the plowing up of former pasture and range land, plowing up these acres in defiance of sound conservation practices.

Mr. President, I do not speak of this theoretically. In 1934 or 1935 I was a representative of the Federal Emergency Relief Administration. I drove to a small community and loaded the people of that community into boxcars and moved them into the Rio Grande Valley where they had a chance to farm, because drought had taken away their opportunity.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Mexico yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator remember seeing any irrigated area which had been farmed for a number of years that ever became a dust bowl?

Mr. ANDERSON. No. That is a sight which fortunately I have never seen. Perhaps I would be even more enthusiastic about this project if I had ever seen

such a thing, but irrigated areas do not blow. I remind the Senator that we have developed in one of the eastern counties of New Mexico—Curry County—some pumping projects. They were in the very heart of the dust area at one time, but we can go through that area today and see how water has tied down the soil, reducing the blowing, although nonirrigated acres nearby are blowing as badly as in the past.

Across the Texas line from Curry County there are a number of farms which are irrigated by wells, and the entire county looks like paradise. Just below this county in Texas, where they have depended upon dry farming and do not have irrigation, the dust is blowing.

I thank the Senator from Utah for reminding me of the fact that with irrigation duststorms do not occur.

Mr. WATKINS. That is my belief. The soil is firmed down by plant growth, and the moist soil will not blow as it does in some other sections of the so-called dust bowl areas which we are constantly called upon to help. In such areas, one of the best things to do would be to get water on the land, and then the soil would not blow away.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator is correct. There are sections in western Kansas which possibly could be irrigated. If irrigation comes to those areas we will not see the dust blowing as it has been doing in the past few weeks.

While the United States was adding 7.1 million acres per year to the cropland before 1900, pasture and range land was being reduced at the annual rate of 6.1 million acres. The difference in range and pasture being put into cropland and the total acres in cropland was made up from clearing new land for crops.

Between 1900 and 1920, 83 million acres were added to our productive cropland, most of which again came from pasture and range. Although some tractors were in use by 1920, 90 million acres were being used to produce feed for horses and mules. We are now using only about 14 million acres for this purpose. So we gained 76 million acres there, but that day has ended.

For 60 years from 1880, the pendulum swung out, taking acres from pasture and range and converting them into cropland. Since 1940, the pendulum has begun to swing back. Land experts and economists see an increasing number of acres being converted to improved pasture and range with a proportionately increasing number of acres going into feed and forage crops.

I believe that a great saving can be made if these drought areas are protected.

The overall land area of the United States includes mountains and deserts which cannot be used for cropland. Of course, about 17 million additional acres can be placed into production through irrigation, but this is not anticipated within the next 50 years. Assuming that this much is placed under irrigation, it would still not be enough to meet the demands of our population 20 years from now, although it would be a needed supplement.

Assuming that the new land is placed under irrigation, we will lose at least that much land in the next 25 years through erosion, urban growth, airports, and highways. The land taken out of production for these reasons frequently is good farmland. Often we fail to realize the very large area of land taken out of production by highways.

For example, most of us see only the tremendous benefits to travel which will come when the Pennsylvania Turnpike is extended from Canton, Ohio, to Chicago. Others say it will be wonderful when we have a four-lane highway spanning the United States. I agree wholeheartedly—the roads will be excellent.

However, the turnpike extension from Canton to Chicago will take between 80,000 to 100,000 acres of excellent cropland out of production. Anyone familiar with the topography of that area knows what excellent farmland will be lost. It is not difficult, therefore, to visualize the number of acres which will be taken out of production by the President's proposed highway plan which calls for several thousand miles of four-lane highways. Highways and airports have one thing in common—airports need flat terrain and frequently it is excellent farmland; highways usually follow the flattest line and this too is often excellent farmland.

At present we are using about four-fifths of our land area for agricultural purposes—this includes pasture, range forest and woodland. Only 409 million acres, or about a fifth of all our land area, is used for cropland purposes. In 1954 crops from only 345 million acres were actually being harvested.

But a more important observation is that the number of crop acres per person has declined. In 1920 it was 3.8 acres per person and by 1950 it had dwindled to 2.7 acres. Estimates for 1954 have it at 2.5 acres per person.

Of course, increased yields per acre have made it possible for us to meet the demands of our population and some persons believe that we will continue to be able to meet these demands by increasing our yields. Research has done much to increase our yields, but nearly all of the increase was experienced during the 1939–49 period. In the years before 1936, total farm production was neither very much above nor very much below the 1935–39 average except for the drought period.

After 1939, total production started a fast climb, hitting its peak in 1953. Many persons believe these production records were attained only because we were on a war economy and practically everyone took advantage of the modern farm methods which were made available by American ingenuity and know-how. Everyone also was doing what he could for the war effort and this aided production.

It must be remembered that since 1940, at the direct request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President of the United States—during which time we were trying virtually to feed the world and win World War II—farm output has been at a greater rate of increase than the increase in population. One of the factors behind this increased farm output was the favorable weather which prevailed. In weather, we never had it so good.

Let us assume that we will continue for the next 20 years on a strictly peacetime economy. We will have to increase our yields more than a fifth above the 1950 average. This increase makes allowances for some additional cropland coming into food production for the first time and relies partly on placing at least 6 million more acres of land under irrigation. It might be well to point out that the 6 million figure is considerably more than all of the land which has been brought under irrigation by the Bureau of Reclamation during the 52 years of its existence.

Will we be able to increase our yields per acre by the minimum 20 percent that will be required? In research and any other field there is a ceiling on how far we can go. Where that ceiling is, I am quite certain no one knows, but I do believe a parallel can be drawn to the track stars of our time even though they are completely unrelated fields.

For years, the 4-minute mile was the dream of many. The first time our modern day runners ran the mile, it probably took 5 or 6 minutes. As they trained, they were quick to reduce their time by the ten's of seconds. Yet, as they approached the dream mile the time it took to run the mile would be reduced just by a second or two or even by tenths of a second. I cannot help but believe that this is what will happen to agriculture. In improving anything, the first gains are the most pronounced—after that, they become less and less impressive and more difficult to attain.

There has been a rather parallel increase of farm output with population since 1880—the first year records were kept. Principal factors, landwise and researchwise, behind the increased output between 1910 and 1930, were bringing in more acres for agricultural production and the release of millions of acres from growing of feed for horses and mules.

The first 6 years of the thirties saw a pronounced decrease in farm output due to the drought. It is interesting to note that crop yields per acre have remained rather static since 1948 and that the increase in overall farm output has been due, primarily, to increased output per livestock unit.

Further evidence of this is the amount of carryover of major farm commodities. Each year this has become less. In 1953, for example, the excess of farm output over population requirements was about 6 percent. In 1954 it was less than 6 percent and estimates for the current year are even lower. The Agriculture Department says the rate of excess build-up is leveling off.

I need not remind my colleagues that America has become a great Nation because we have had abundance. We are known the world over as the land of plenty. Not only have we had an abundance of crops, but we have also had an abundance of people who were not afraid to look to the future and people who continually are looking for ways to do things easier and better. Many nations have become weak with decreasing standards

of living because they lacked the ability to produce enough to meet the food needs of their people. They lacked leaders with enough insight to prepare their country to meet the ever-increasing demands. I hope we who are entrusted with this great responsibility, will not lose sight of preparing for our future growth and development.

Our country is growing in many ways—in people, in resources, in ingenuity, in standard of living and in energy which makes progress possible. It does not take much vision to see the great expansion which is ahead.

I have been discussing various crops which are presently in overproduction and have predicted that we could reach a balance in their production by 1962.

Now let us look at a few specialty crops—crops without which the American diet would be incomplete—fresh vegetables, fruits, and others which once were seasonal crops but now find their way to the basic American table the year around.

The American standard of living demands more and more of these speciality crops.

Dieticians stress the importance of having these foods in our daily meals. A large share of these crops is produced through irrigation and reclamation. We are producing enough to meet our present demands, but only at the present rate of consumption. Here, again, we must increase production and this can be done in part by bringing new land under irrigation.

To illustrate how much we depend upon irrigation and reclamation for these speciality crops, I have had a table prepared showing the total production of these speciality crops in the United States and the amount raised under irrigation in the 17 Western States.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table, entitled "Crop Production," printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Crop production

Year	Crop	Total for United States (million pounds)	17 Western States	
			Total (million pounds)	Percentage
1954	Asparagus	307	189	62
1954	Carrots	1,550	1,108	72
1954	Celery	1,496	837	56
1954	Lettuce	2,834	2,527	89
1954	Peas	850	329	39
1952	Olives	114	114	100
1954	Tomatoes	7,390	3,766	51
1952	Apricots	354	354	100
1954	Cantaloupes	1,322	1,101	83
1954	Cherries (sweet)	200	170	85
1952	Grapes	6,347	6,028	95
1952	Plums	122	106	87
1954	Strawberries	427	265	62

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, it must be remembered that only through the year-round growing season of the irrigated Southwest are most of these crops made available to the rest of the country during the late fall, winter and early spring seasons. In summing up the picture, there are certain facts which we must recognize.

First. We have approximately 1,904,000,000 acres land area of which about four-fifths is being used for agricultural purposes. A fifth of this is actually used for cropland.

Second. We are losing about 1.4 million acres per year through use of land for highways, airports, reservoirs, military reservations and expanding cities and erosion. Population increase could bring agriculture production in balance if production is adjusted to demand.

Third. We need, with the diet that we currently use, an equivalent of production from an additional 6 to 7.5 million acres each year.

Fourth. We need, by 1975, at least 20 to 30 million acres of new cropland.

Fifth. Present crop yields per acre will have to be increased at least 20 percent during the next 7 to 10 years. This assumes we will place at least 6 million additional acres under irrigation.

Sixth. A drought of 1 year's duration with as ruinous effect as experienced in the 1930's would almost deplete our present supply of stored crops.

Seventh. Population of the United States is now 162 million, increasing nearly 3 million per year.

Eighth. For 1975 the population projection now considered as the most reasonable is about 207 million persons. Five years ago 190 million was considered the most likely projection for 1975.

I have discussed what we can expect in 1962 so far as our agricultural supplies are concerned and brushed only lightly on what we can conservatively foresee by 1975.

Many persons believe this work can be done quickly and that the participating upper Colorado irrigation projects will be planted at once. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table entitled "Projected Acreages and Completion Times for S. 500 Projects—Irrigation."

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

Projected acreages and completion times for S. 500 projects (irrigation)

	Years	Acres
1. Central Utah	26	28,540
2. Emory County	9	3,630
3. Florida	9	6,300
4. Hammond	10	3,670
5. La Barge	11	7,970
6. Lyman	10	--------
7. Paonia	8	2,210
8. Pine River extension	13	15,150
9. Seedskadee	17	60,720
10. Silt	8	--------
11. Smith Fork	8	2,270
12. Gooseberry	9	--------
13. Navaho	27	137,250
14. San Juan Chama	15	--------
15. Savery Pot Hook	10	18,380
16. Dolores	12	35,450
17. Sublette	14	60,000
18. Fruit Growers Dam extension	6	1,850
19. Bostwick Park	7	1,040
20. Dallas Creek	10	15,750
21. East River	3	1,780
22. Fruitland Mesa	8	11,700
23. Grand Mesa	11	11,070
24. Ohio Creek	7	6,200
25. Tomichi	8	12,180
26. Battlement Mesa	7	6,780
27. Bluestone	6	8,660
28. Eagle Divide	6	8,990
29. Parshall	8	24,410
30. Rabbit Ear	6	13,955
31. Troublesome	7	8,990
32. West Divide	14	40,500
33. Woody Creek	4	645

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, how does the upper Colorado Basin fit into this picture?

Let us consider what has been proposed. We have the initial storage projects. They will not add an acre of farmland. They will generate power, control the river flow, and provide downstream irrigation.

Next come the 12 participating projects. They will take as long as 26 years to complete.

The total for these 12 starting projects comes to 130,660 new acres—little more than 5,000 acres per year. We said a while ago that we would be needing more than a million acres a year. This is hardly adding to the surplus, is it?

Most of the acreage would come into cultivation toward the end of the 26 years, not at an average of 5,000 acres a year, due to construction requirements.

But let us say that every one of the projects could be started tomorrow and that every one of the contemplated acres would be in production at the end of 27 years, the length of time required to complete the biggest project—the Navaho project.

What would the increased farm output amount to?

At my request, the Agriculture Department this week made a projection based on a possible utilization of 270,000 acres, the new acreage planned under the upper Colorado bill. This figure was used because it represents the earliest acreage to be developed.

Here is what the Department found—

About 50,000 acres would be devoted to raising oats; 50,000 acres would be planted to barley; 105,000 acres to alfalfa hay, and 65,000 acres to irrigated pasture.

Converted to approximately 670 million feed units, this acreage would support annual production of approximately 60 million pounds liveweight of cattle and calves, or about 0.1 percent of our estimated requirements for cattle and calf production in the next 25 to 50 years.

Is this a threat to agriculture? An addition to surpluses?

Agriculturally, the upper Colorado River project will make very little difference in the total United States picture.

But when the acreage is fitted into the demands of the region, it becomes more significant, supplying a livelihood and sustenance to farmers in an area now lying unused while the water which could turn it into paradise flows unhindered into the sea.

From a power standpoint the upper Colorado project has perhaps even wider significance. Power could bring industry to these high, dry tablelands, exploiting the virtually untapped mineral and timber resources of the region.

There are many facets to the upper Colorado Basin story. Each of them has fabulous promise if allowed to develop. Each hinges, at least to some extent, on the other.

Therefore, the overall project should be undertaken and work should be started as early as possible.

It has been said that we are asking for huge sums of money, to be taken in one lump from the United States Treasury. This is not so.

The amounts we are asking will be spent over a period of 1 to 30 years. The smallest amounts to be spent will come first, with largest amounts coming between 5 and 10 years.

To show just what is being asked, I have prepared a short listing of the amounts needed and when they will be needed. As will be seen, they hardly can be considered a threat to the budget.

I desire to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the amount of money which would be asked, year by year.

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

1956	$5,000,000
1957	30,000,000
1958	48,000,000
1959	91,000,000
1960	118,000,000
1961	134,000,000
1962	127,000,000
1963	133,000,000
1964	117,000,000
1965	91,000,000
1966	59,000,000
1967	47,000,000
1968	35,000,000
1969	21,000,000
1970	9,000,000
1971	5,000,000
1972	3,000,000
1973	9,000,000
1974	7,000,000
1975	1,000,000

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, now I wish to state my conclusions, as follows:

First. Surpluses will end.

Second. We need to start now to meet expected food shortages.

Third. The upper Colorado Basin is more than a reclamation project. It can supply jobs, food, and wealth.

Fourth. It will mean the creation of an empire to be built from materials at hand.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, there is at the clerk's desk a proposed unanimous-consent request for an order limiting debate, which I should like to have stated. It is offered in behalf of the majority and the minority leaders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOUGLAS in the chair). The clerk will read the proposed unanimous-consent request.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That on Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of S. 500, the Colorado River storage project, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the proposer of such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or someone designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the bill shall be received.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the bill, debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have conferred with the distinguished minority leader, who in turn has consulted with the ranking minority Members. I have also talked to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and other Senators interested in the pending legislation. The proposed agreement seems to be agreeable to those concerned, and it will permit us to make plans for the remainder of the afternoon. Following the morning hour on tomorrow, the time limitation would start to run.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the proposed unanimous-consent request? Without objection——

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I did not hear the proposal from the beginning. I wonder if I might look at it for a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, with respect to the limitation of debate on amendments, I suggest that the limitation should be 2 hours to a side, because I understand there will be only one principal amendment, and that will require some discussion.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish to say that I shall have possibly three amendments to offer tomorrow. I am quite content with the half hour that would be allotted to those of us who would propose the amendments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to remind Senators that we have the remainder of today to discuss the bill. Any Senators who desire to do so may offer amendments today.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unanimous-consent requested is agreed to.

The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. NEUBERGER rose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I listened with great interest to the very able discussion by the Senate from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] with regard to his views on the important issue before the Senate. In general I agree with the Senator from New Mexico. He and I part company on only one phase of the project involved. The upper Colorado project calls for 6 storage units, 12 participating units, and 21 projects which are subject to further authorization.

NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM ENDANGERED

One of the storage projects, Mr. President, would be constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument. It would constitute a most dangerous precedent in that it would lead to the breaching by a dam of our national park system for the first time in its history. If that happens, the entire national park system would be exposed to commercial development.

The theory of our national park system is that the beauty, the grandeur——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will suspend until Senators take their seats and attendants retire to the rear of the room.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Thank you, Mr. President. I gather it might be more quiet in one of the magnificent national parks to which I was referring.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon will proceed. Let us have quiet in the Chamber.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The theory of our national park system, Mr. President, is that the grandeur, the majesty, and the scenery of the national parks shall be unimpaired. The word "unimpaired" does not mean that a park or a national monument shall be inundated beneath a vast reservoir. The language means precisely what it says.

Before proceeding further to discuss the Echo Park phase of the Colorado River project and what it would mean to basic recreational and scenic policy, Mr. President, I wish to associate myself in general with the statements made by the Senator from New Mexico in defense of the development of the Far West.

LEWIS AND CLARK EXPEDITION WAS ATTACKED AS WASTEFUL

Mr. President, throughout the entire history of this country, there have been men who have disparaged the inexorable movement toward the West. This year of 1955 marks the 150th anniversary of the greatest exploration in the history of America. Exactly 150 years ago this year Meriwether Lewis and William Clark arrived at the shores of the Pacific Ocean with the American flag, and for the first time Americans had crossed this continent. Yet, even then, there were people who felt that this was a foolish undertaking. Thomas Jefferson, that illustrious President, asked the Congress for the vast sum of $2,500 to finance this most important of explorations, which Theodore Roosevelt was to say later ranked in history with the explorations of Columbus. Yet there were Members of Congress who felt that the $2,500 requested by Jefferson was a waste.

Indeed, after Lewis and Clark had returned, and had brought back almost the first information Americans had ever had about the Rocky Mountains, the grizzly bear, the prairie dog, the bighorn sheep, and the mountain goat, there actually were in political life men who still insisted that the expedition had been a folly, and who seriously predicted that the area through which Lewis and Clark had traveled never again would be visited in the course of American history.

Mr. President, Daniel Webster was outstanding in his service in the Congress. Yet when it was proposed that cavalry be sent to protect the pioneers who had gone into hostile Indian territory, Daniel Webster insisted that tax dollars should not be spent in protecting those who had risked their lives in a foolhardy rush into the wilderness; and he said he would not give a silver dollar for all of Oregon—meaning, not the State of Oregon, but

the vast realm then known as the Oregon Country.

There also served in this Chamber, Mr. President, a man who felt that the western borders of the United States could never possibly be thrust beyond the Continental Divide. That Member of the Senate was one of the most famous of Senators; I refer to Thomas Hart Benton. On March 1, 1825, he said to the Senate:

> Westward, we can speak without reserve, and the ridge of the Rocky Mountains may be named without offense as presenting a convenient, natural, and everlasting boundary. Along the bank of this ridge, the western limit of the Republic should be drawn, and the statue of the fabled god, Terminus, should be raised upon its highest peak, never to be thrown down. In planting the seed of a new power on the coast of the Pacific Ocean, it should be well understood that when strong enough to take care of itself, the new government should separate from the major Empire, as the child separates from the parent at the age of manhood.

In other words, Mr. President, that very distinguished Senator, Thomas Hart Benton, believed it would be impossible to thrust the boundaries of the Nation beyond the divide formed by the Rocky Mountains, or the Shining Mountains, as they then were called; and he believed that if people were so foolish as to live beyond that boundary, there would have to be two separate sovereign nations.

LONG VIEW NEEDED IN WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

I cite these things in support of what the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has so eloquently said about the need for developing the West and about the need for challenging those who would take the short view and the narrow view regarding the West.

I cite the fact that even in the time of Jefferson there were those who felt it was unwise to spend the trivial sum of $2,500 to send the first Americans westward to extend our sovereignty from St. Louis to the Pacific Ocean. In other words, there were then in the Nation those who believed it was silly to spend $2,500 on an expedition to increase by nearly two-thirds the size of the United States.

Mr. President, I consider it opportune to say this because this is the 150th anniversary year of that greatest of all treks westward, the Lewis and Clark exploration.

I know that the Reclamation Act of 1906, passed during the administration of a great, progressive Republican President—and would that his views still prevailed in the Republican Party—has been a vital factor in the development of our Western States, particularly the 11 States which lie westward of the Continental Divide, in the vast area which Thomas Hart Benton thought could never become a part of this sovereign nation.

Parenthetically speaking, Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that when the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs 2 weeks ago held hearings on the Hells Canyon Dam bill, there were present a number of persons who opposed the bill—and they were members of Theodore Roosevelt's party, I may add—and who told us that the public-power preference clause was socialistic and un-American. I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the public-power preference clause first appeared in the Reclamation Act of 1906, drafted under the supervision of Theodore Roosevelt, and passed during his administration. I said of several of those witnesses that that was the first time I had ever known that the man who founded the Rough Riders and led the cavalry charge up San Juan Hill was socialistic and un-American.

Mr. President, the party of Theodore Roosevelt has traveled a long distance since Theodore Roosevelt's time; but it has not moved forward. However, the policies that Theodore Roosevelt began in the Reclamation Act of 1906 have resulted in making possible the settlement of large areas of the West, which without irrigation supported by the Federal Government never could be inhabited to any considerable extent. We need to think only of the Central Valley of California; or of the Columbia Basin, near Grand Coulee; or of the Salt River section, in Arizona; or of the Madras project in Oregon; or of the Yakima Valley; or of many other great areas which, without Federal reclamation, certainly would not be the prosperous agricultural regions they are today.

CAPITAL INVESTMENTS IN WEST JUSTIFIED

So I say to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico that when we point out that often it is necessary for the United States Government to make capital investments in areas of the Nation which need development, this is part of the history of our country and part of the forward march of progress of our country, and without these developments our country would not be the great, free, prosperous, and powerful nation it is today.

Mr. President, I should like to say that it is not so far-fetched a policy for the United States Government to make capital investments in reclamation projects, even though they may not seem to be sound economically when they are first undertaken. As I recall, the Government of the United States in its infinite wisdom gave the Northern Pacific Railroad some $171 million in land grants so it could build a $70-million railroad line to the Pacific Northwest. Perhaps that was not wise economically. Yet if those land grants had not been parceled out in that way, the development of the Northwest could have been retarded from 30 to 60 years, because the railroad might not have been put through during the time in which it actually came. I believe the Northern Pacific arrived on Puget Sound in 1884 or 1885.

RIVERS AND HARBORS WERE DEVELOPED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Other parts of the country, Mr. President, have benefited by vast investments, and investments which have not returned a direct dividend, although they certainly have been justified in terms of the progress and prosperity they have made possible for the Nation as a whole. In that connection, let us consider the millions, if not the billions, of dollars which have been spent on the Mississippi River to develop navigation with locks and levees. Let us also consider the funds which have been invested in improving the waterways on the Great Lakes and the funds which have been invested to make New York Harbor the greatest harbor in North America, and perhaps the greatest harbor in all the world. Those funds have come from the Federal Government. They have been spent in dredging for locks, for canals, and so forth. No one has suggested that those expenditures were not wise, although relatively little of that money has been returned directly to the Treasury.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me that the vast areas of the intermountain West and of the West along the Pacific seaboard are entitled to Federal support in the form of reclamation and irrigation.

I say this as a matter of preface, because I support the bill. I believe that the upper Colorado storage project, as a whole, is justified. I feel that the intermountain region, which certainly has lagged behind the rest of the country in population with respect to area, is entitled to a capital investment which will enable it to support a far larger agricultural economy.

But, Mr. President, I do not believe that the upper Colorado project, however justified it may be, warrants the establishment of a precedent which could lead, through all the years to come, to the impairment, if not the actual destruction, of one of the great institutions of America; namely, our national park system.

At this point in my remarks I should like to associate myself with a very brief statement of policy drawn up at an emergency meeting in November 1954 by nearly all the leading conservation and outdoor groups of America, called together by the National Parks Association. This statement makes it very clear that these conservation groups are not opposed to the upper Colorado storage project in its entirety, but they do oppose the Echo Park phase of that project, which would lead to the flooding out of the Dinosaur National Monument, which is an integral part of the United States national park system.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the statement by leading conservation groups of America, representing people in all 48 States—indeed, I may say, in perhaps every county of the United States, including those in the upper Colorado area. This statement makes it clear that the Echo Park project would breach our national parks system.

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

> 1. The national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being enjoyed and supported by millions of people. The conservationists represent the public interest in the preservation of these areas. That is what brings us together in this crisis.
>
> 2. We are opposed to any legislation that would authorize building the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah—or any other dam that would

flood any portion of any national park or monument.

3. We are mindful of the extreme importance of water in the West. And we are sincerely interested in any sound upper Colorado water development that can effectively utilize the water without threatening the national park system. We point out that the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been demonstrated. It has only been asserted. We also point out that the alternatives to Echo Park Dam have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proved inferior.

4. We invite all citizens to join with us to make sure that areas set aside for preservation in the national park system are not needlessly invaded or destroyed.

Signed by the American Museum of Natural History, the American Nature Association, the American Planning and Civic Association, the Conservation Department, Yale University, the Conservation Foundation, the Council of Conservationists, the Dartmouth Outdoor Club, the Emergency Conservation Committee, the Garden Club of America, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Izaak Walton League of America, the National Audubon Society, the National Conference on State Parks, the National Council of State Garden Clubs, the National Life Conservation Society, the National Parks Association, the National Wildlife Federation, the North American Wildlife Foundation, the Outdoor Writers Association of America, the Sierra Club, the Wilderness Society, the Wildlife Management Institute.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I think we of the Pacific Northwest who are supporting the upper Colorado project really are showing a great deal of forbearance. I should like to point out that this national administration has taken an attitude with respect to power development which I do not believe can be justified by any stretch of facts or statistics, or by any operation of logic.

THE ADMINISTRATION CONTRADICTS ITSELF

This administration has said to the people of the country, "Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River is creeping socialism, but Federal dams on the upper Colorado are just good old free enterprise, which the Federal Government ought to support."

I should like to say that the distinguished governors of Oregon and Washington, who are members of the party which is in power—perhaps I should not use the word "power" with respect to this administration, because it might be confused with hydroelectric power—members of the party which is in authority in the National Government appeared at the recent Hells Canyon hearings and denounced the proposal to construct a Federal dam in Hells Canyon. Yet the very political party which thinks it is dangerous to the future of the Republic to build a Federal dam in Hells Canyon is for constructing many dams on the upper Colorado River.

My position is consistent. I believe that the upper Colorado project should be built, with the exception of Echo Park, but I also believe that the Hells Canyon Federal project in the Pacific Northwest should be constructed.

This administration has a policy of turning over to private utilities the cream of hydroelectric power sites and leaving for public development, out of the Federal Treasury, the dregs of the power sites. Let me point out exactly the situation.

The Echo Park project would cost $176,426,000. It would produce about 1 billion kilowatt-hours annually.

The Glen Canyon project, which is closely related, would cost about $421 million and would produce about 3,813,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually. In other words, these 2 projects together would cost nearly $600 million, and produce about 4,830,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually.

Hells Canyon, which this administration has shunned, would cost $357 million and produce 5,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours of power annually.

In other words, Echo Park Dam would cost about half as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 20 percent as much power. Hells Canyon Dam power is about 2.65 times more economical than Echo Park power.

Glen Canyon Dam would cost 1.18 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 20 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is about 1.7 times more economical.

Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams together would cost 1.67 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 87 percent as much power. Therefore Hells Canyon Dam power would be 1.9 times more economical, in respect to power production.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a brief table comparing the relative costs and power output of these projects.

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

Comparative costs and power output

Project	Cost of project	Net annual output (millions of kilowatt-hours annually)
Echo Park	$176, 426, 000	1, 017
Glen Canyon	421, 270, 000	3, 813
Total	597, 696, 000	4, 830
Hells Canyon	357, 000, 000	5, 504

Echo Park Dam costs about half as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produces less than 20 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is about 2.65 times more economical.

Glen Canyon Dam costs 1.18 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produces less than 70 percent as much power. Therefore Hells Canyon Dam power is about 1.7 times more economical.

Echo Park and Glen Canyon Dams, together, cost 1.67 times as much as Hells Canyon Dam, but produce less than 87 percent as much power. Therefore, Hells Canyon Dam power is 1.9 times more economical.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What does this mean? This is what it means: Power from Echo Park Dam would cost around 6 mills a kilowatt-hour. Power from Hells Canyon Dam would cost between 2.1 mills and 2.6 mills. The national administration, which only a few weeks ago said that the average American citizen could not have a cut in his or her taxes because of the need for balanced budget, says, "We will finance out of the Federal Treasury the marginal, uneconomical power sites, where electricity is extremely expensive to produce, but we will give away to the private power companies the power sites where cheap power can be produced, which power would be in great demand by industry."

If the policy of this administration with respect to power sites were adopted with respect to the United States post office system, the administration would turn over to Sears, Roebuck or Montgomery Ward—once the fight is settled at Montgomery Ward—the few profitable post offices, such as New York, Chicago, the great city of the Senator now occupying the chair [Mr. DOUGLAS], Cleveland, perhaps San Francisco, Los Angeles, Detroit, and Philadelphia, and say to them, "You operate these post offices. You can make a profit from them. We, the Government, will continue to operate the small, remote, scattered, isolated post offices. You could not make any money out of them."

ADMINISTRATION POLICY CANNOT BE MADE CONSISTENT BY ADVERTISING SLOGANS

The policy of this balance-the-budget national administration with respect to hydroelectric power is this: It says that it will use propaganda turned out by advertising agencies to convince the people that it is creeping socialism to construct a dam on the Snake River, because power on the Snake River can be sold to industry, and because such power can be produced economically, but the Government will develop the marginal sites on the upper Colorado River.

I may be very dense. I admit that I am a very new Senator, occupying seat No. 96. But no matter how dense I may be, I do not see how a Federal dam in Hells Canyon on the Snake River can be creeping socialism, but a Federal dam on the upper Colorado River, particularly one which damages the national park system, can be good old Republican free enterprise. If some of the master minds of this administration can explain that to the people, I certainly will be interested in the explanation, because so far I have been unable to understand the logic of the administration's statements.

What the administration is saying to the people of the country is this: "We will build the dams on the upper Colorado, even at the risk of wrecking the national park system; but the sites in the Columbia River Basin, the finest hydroelectric power sites in North America, are too good for the United States Government. Therefore we must give them to the Idaho Power Co., or to the Washington Water Power Co., or to Pacific Power & Light Co."

Was there ever before such a policy? Power produced at Hells Canyon, and selling for about 2.5 mills, would be in demand by every great industrial and manufacturing concern which uses large amounts of power. How many manufacturing concerns want power from the upper Colorado at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour? Mr. President, if you were in the manufacturing business would you buy power at 6 mills a kilowatt-hour on the upper Colorado River

when there was power available at Hells Canyon on the Snake River, or at John Day, or Bonneville on the Columbia River for 2 mills or 2.5 mills?

Of course not, because if your competitor had 2.5 mill power, you would be out of business; you could not compete.

I am not saying that we should not build some of those so-called uneconomic projects, because, as I have already stated in my opening remarks, a capital investment from the United States Treasury is just as justified in arid areas as are projects to improve navigation on the Mississippi River, for instance. However, I say that the administration now in power should not try to turn over to private industry the cream of the power sites in the country.

DOES THE PRESIDENT KNOW THE ADMINISTRATION'S POWER POLICY?

Mr. President, in that connection, I was interested recently in reading in the New York Times the text of one of the press conferences held by the President of the United States. At the conference the President cited approvingly a book called Big Dam Foolishness. I believe it was written by a man named Elmer Peterson. I bought the book. The general thesis of the book is that it is foolish, to use an understatement, for the United States Government to build these big dams.

That is all right for the President to say. It is certainly the privilege of our distinguished and illustrious President to believe that the building of big dams is foolishness. However, has anyone told the President what the policy of the Government is?

The policy of the Government is that it is "big dam foolishness" when the Columbia River or the Snake River are involved, because both have excellent power sites with deep and steady flows of water, with heavy snowfall in the mountains. That is "big dam foolishness," according to the policy of the present administration.

However, on the upper Colorado, where there is infinitely less water, where it is much more expensive to produce power, through some sort of legerdemain, by some kind of wizardry of a Merlin or of a Houdini, that is not "big dam foolishness." In other words, when the President looks at the Snake River and the Columbia River, he has under his arm the book Big Dam Foolishness, and he quotes from the book at his press conference. However, when he looks at the upper Colorado River he puts the book away. He does not have that book with him when he looks at the upper Colorado River.

I still fail to see how hydroelectric development can be "big dam foolishness" at Hells Canyon, but not foolishness on the upper Colorado, where a Federal dam would flood out a national monument.

DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT A PART OF OUR PARK SYSTEM

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of discussion about the creation of the Dinosaur National Monument. Let me say that the Dinosaur National Monument is a part of our national park system, as is every other monument. Many of our national parks today, such as the Olympic National Park or the Grand Canyon National Park, were originally national monuments before they were advanced to the status of national parks. If there is any one feature of our national life to which all Americans are devoted, it is our national park system.

I dare say that there are people in every State of the Union, including Colorado and Utah, who have expressed themselves against the proposed Echo Park Dam. I have letters from the upper Colorado area in which people ask that the Echo Park Dam be not authorized. People in every part of the Nation are pleading and praying that Congress will not, for the first time in history, authorize a commercial power development within the borders of a national park or monument.

Congress itself has been aware of this potential danger to the proper preservation of these areas in accordance with their fundamental purpose.

Less than a year following its enactment, the Congress, on March 3, 1921, amended the Federal Water Power Act to provide that thereafter no permit or other authorization should be granted for reservoirs or other works for storage or carriage of water within the limits as then constituted of any national park or national monument without specific authority of Congress. The language of the amendment is comprehensive and absolute, and its meaning clear.

In any event, all possible doubt as to the purpose of the act would be resolved by its legislative history. In calling up the bill in the House, Representative Esch stated—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 66th Congress, 3d session; volume 60, part 4, page 4204:

> Mr. Speaker, the object of the bill is to modify the Federal Water Power Act so as to eliminate from its provisions national parks and monuments. When the act was originally passed we supposed we had sufficiently safeguarded national parks and monuments so that there would not be constructed therein any water power or reclamation projects. However, the President was in doubt as to whether he would sign the bill which was presented to him on the 4th day of June, the day before we adjourned. He referred the bill to the Secretaries of the Interior, War, and Agriculture. The Secretary of the Interior had great doubt as to the policy of giving to a commission control over national parks and monuments in the matter of water-power development. Senator Jones, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, and Senator Walsh, of Montana, called upon the Secretary and conferred with him regarding the signing of the bill. The Secretary conferred with Senator Underwood and the majority leader, Mr. Mondell, and an understanding was reached whereby the bill was to be introduced at this session eliminating the parks and monuments from the operation of the Federal Power Act, and this bill carries out that understanding.

Similar statements were made in the Senate by Senator Jones, of Washington, and Senator Walsh, of Montana.

Since the 1921 act was, by its terms, restricted to areas embraced within national parks and national monuments on the date of the act, it was necessary, until 1935, to include in proposed legislation for establishing or extending national parks or national monuments a provision to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from granting power licenses therein. This is no longer necessary. When the Federal Water Power Act was amended by the Federal Power Act in 1935, the definition of the "reservations" to which the act was to apply was amended to exclude national parks and monuments, thus removing these areas from the authority of the Federal Power Commission with respect to the issuance of power licenses, without regard to the date of their establishment. The intention of the Congress, by this amendment, to afford unlimited protection to all national parks and national monuments from encroachment of power development, is made undeniably clear by the legislative history. In the report—No. 1318, 74th Congress—of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House of Representatives, accompanying the bill, S. 2796, which became the Federal Power Act of 1935, it is stated, page 22:

> The definition of the former term ("reservations") has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. Under an amendment to the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue licenses in national parks or national monuments. The purpose of this change in the definition of "reservations" is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses.

The question whether the authority of the Federal Power Commission to issue power licenses could be preserved by an appropriate provision in a proclamation of the President reserving lands for national monument purposes under the Antiquities Act of June 8, 1906, has been considered by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior. In an opinion dated December 5, 1939, he held:

> Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an Executive proclamation of this character.

ECHO PARK DAM COULD BE BAD PRECEDENT

I now wish to speak about the proposal to build the dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. There are pending in various parts of the Nation, generally in the West, not fewer than 15 or 16 requests or demands that within national parks or monuments there be built dams, diversion canals, diversion tunnels, irrigation flumes, and similar undertakings. This is natural, Mr. President, because our national parks and monuments have been deliberately placed in realms of great scenic beauty. Water is a great contribution to the scenic beauty of many areas in the West. This means rivers and lakes.

For example, Yellowstone Lake is, I believe, the highest large body of water in the United States. Some irrigationists would like to get into the park and utilize the waters of that lake which can be coasted downhill in a great gravity sweep for reclaiming arid land. In my own region, the Olympic National Park encompasses the greatest rain forests left on the North American Continent.

I have camped with my wife in those forests. I have not been fortunate enough to visit tropical forests, but if there are any forests which can match the denseness of the tropics and still retain the cool grandeur of evergreens, it is the groves which grow within the Olympic National Park.

Some of the largest lumber operators in the country would like to get in there. There are some of the most compelling reasons why they should. In the northwestern part of the State of Washington, which is represented in part by the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who is now present on the floor, a large number of trees have been cut out. Some families are jobless. Mills have lost their log supply. If 60,000 or 70,000 acres could be trimmed from that magnificent park, many mills would have a supply of lumber for years and years to come, because the trees are the old virgin, original growth, comprising the highest quality of timber ever grown in North America. The timber was standing when Christopher Columbus landed in the New World, and it was old when the members of the Lewis and Clark expedition reached the mouth of the Columbia River.

If the timber companies could log the trees of the Olympic Park, it would assist the families who need jobs and the mill owners who want to amortize their investment. There are sound economic reasons elsewhere, as well as in the upper Colorado Basin.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has asked a question. The question was, if the Echo Park Dam is permitted to be constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument, will it not open up the Olympic area for the construction of dams? The answer to the Senator's question is, emphatically, no.

The entire argument which the Senator has been making with respect to the Echo Park damsite is based upon a mistaken set of facts. The Echo Park site was withdrawn for power purposes by the full authority of the Government of the United States long before the Dinosaur National Monument was extended to include that site. As the record made at the hearings of the House and Senate, and upon this floor, clearly demonstrates, when the executive order of President Roosevelt was issued, these lands had already been set aside for the development of power. Dinosaur National Monument was created by Woodrow Wilson under the Antiquities Act, which specifically recited that although the President would be entitled to withdraw from the public domain sites of historical and scientific interest, in so withdrawing them he was compelled to withdraw the smallest area possible. So, when Woodrow Wilson created the Dinosaur National Monument by Executive order, he withdrew 80 acres.

Mr. NEUBERGER. To protect dinosaur bones.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. To protect dinosaur bones. Then, in the effort to deceive the conservationists and to take land which had been set aside for power purposes, the National Park Service and its adherents sought to bring about an extension of that monument, taking over 200,000 acres of land, including power sites.

The Department of the Interior, under Harold Ickes, specifically stated that the power sites were conflicting rights which were not to be affected. The invasion was an invasion by the National Park Service of the law, in the first place, and, in the second place, an invasion of the power rights which had been previously established.

National parks are created by acts of Congress. National monuments are created by Executive orders under specific limitations. Whatever may be done with respect to a monument is by no means a precedent with respect to what may be done with a national park.

I stand with the Senator from Oregon in favor of the Hells Canyon project. I was one of the sponsors of the bill. I have spent many years in this body, and I venture to say that the national parks have not had a more persistent defender than I have been; but when the Senator from Oregon suggests that a national monument created by an Executive order which specifically preserved existing rights would set a precedent for invading national parks, I say the facts are all against him.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that if national monuments which often preceded national parks in the same location had not——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Can the Senator name one?

Mr. NEUBERGER. Yes; the Olympic National Park.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. How was it created a national park?

Mr. NEUBERGER. By act of Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly. Was this monument, with 203,000 acres along the river, ever by act of Congress declared to be a national park? It was not.

The law authorizing national monuments provides that they must consist of the smallest acreage possible and that existing rights must be preserved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. If we had not in the early days protected national monuments there would be very few national parks.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want to protect public-power sites just as much as the Senator from Oregon does, but the Senator is speaking of destroying power sites which the people in the upper basin need, power sites which would help Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I am supporting the bulk of the power sites called for in the upper Colorado storage project.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And for that I am grateful.

Mr. NEUBERGER. What I am saying is that I believe an alternative site could be found that would not result in flooding out the Dinosaur Monument. I am fully aware that a national monument is created by Executive order and that a national park is created by an act of Congress. I am aware of that. But very often our great national parks have begun as national monuments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I correctly understand the Senator to say that if it could be demonstrated to him that the Dinosaur National Monument would not be flooded out he would have no objection to the proposal?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would say that if there would be no commercial development within a national monument, I would not object to the Echo Park Dam. But it would flood out the Dinosaur National Monument——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It would not. It would flood a part of the 203,000 acres within the extension, preserving the power rights. It would not cover the entire extended national monument, and not 1 acre of the original monument.

Mr. NEUBERGER. The Senator from Wyoming and I could argue from now until next Christmas about what the Executive order accomplished. The Executive order reserved only the Brown's Park site, on the extreme northern edge of the monument. If it reserved anything, that was the only part it reserved. It did not reserve the Echo Park site.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Oregon is now making interpretations of the Executive order, which contains specific language. The Senator acknowledges that he is not a lawyer. I say to him that his argument ought to be satisfactorily answered for him by the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior under Harold Ickes, who was a defender of conservation of the national parks, that the power rights were being preserved.

Mr. NEUBERGER. One of the specific things which Solicitor Margold said was that the Federal Power Commission Act did not apply so far as national monuments were concerned.

Again, I return to the status of national monuments and national parks. In most instances, if the original monument had not been preserved, there would have been no park later on for Congress to create. I cite the Olympic National Park as an example.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There was no national monument preceding Yellowstone; there was no national monument preceding Grand Teton; there was no national monument preceding Glacier National Park in Montana. In fact, I do not know of any national monument which preceded a national park, except Olympic; and I would have forgotten that had not the Senator referred to it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I believe there is still a Grand Canyon National Monument. Am I not correct? I cannot say definitely, because I do not have the documents with me. I believe there is still Grand Canyon National Monument.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is in Arizona. I am not certain about that. The fact is that a national park is created by act of Congress; a national monument is created by an act of the Executive. In this instance, although the Senator may argue about it, there was specific language in the Executive order, and there were interpretations of the order, making it clear that what is happening now, on the part of those whom the Senator is now defending, is a raid on the possibil-

ities of power development in the upper Colorado Basin. If the Senator from Oregon wants power development in his area, I hope he will give it to us in our area.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I wish to say to my good friend, whose career I have so long admired, that I remember, when I was a new member of the Young Democrats in 1934, hearing a speech by the man who is now the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming. I believe that then he was an Assistant Postmaster General of the United States. He came to my city of Portland, where I heard him deliver a very eloquent and persuasive address. The 21 years which have intervened certainly have not dimmed his ability to make his point.

I appreciate his support of the Hells Canyon project. There are 39 various projects comprised in the upper Colorado Basin. I am supporting 38 of them. I wish, because of my admiration for the Senator, I could support all 39; but I am supporting 38 of them with all the vigor at my command.

If the Senator had been present during the early part of my remarks, I think he would have observed, as he will if he has the patience and forbearance to read my remarks tomorrow, when the RECORD is delivered at his doorstep, that my support of those 38 projects is no less enthusiastic than is his own.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I listened to almost every word the Senator has uttered. I listened with a great deal of pleasure to the argument he presented at the beginning of his address. It seems to me that he has completely answered and utterly destroyed the arguments on the ground of alleged subsidy which have been made against the general subject.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator sincerely. I also wish to say to him that although he may not agree with me as to my stand on Echo Park—and it is obvious that he does not—I have tried to be consistent. I have applied to my own region the rule which I have tried to apply to his region.

RULE SHOULD APPLY TO PACIFIC NORTHWEST

In the Pacific Northwest, where I live, and where I was born and reared, various demands have been made, which are still in progress, to bring about commercial development within the national park system. Much of that pressure has been brought to cut lumber in the Olympic National Park. This I have opposed. I have opposed it as a member of my State legislature, as a journalist, and as a Member of the United States Senate.

I have opposed the proposed construction of Glacier View Dam, within the Glacier National Park, although such a dam would provide storage that would increase the power production on the lower Columbia River, which is, of course, very important to my own State.

So the Senator from Wyoming can at least see that I am willing to apply to my own State and my own region the same standard concerning the national park system as I am applying to his region. I am not trying to propose one law for the goose and another for the gander.

Mr. President, I have been sent carbon copies of a number of letters which have been written to the distinguished senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] with reference to the views he has expressed in supporting the construction of Echo Park Dam.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the text of a telegram of April 16, 1955, from Mr. Richard M. Leonard, president of the Sierra Club; a letter dated April 15, 1955, from Mr. Charles H. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation; a letter dated April 16, 1955, from Mr. Fred Smith, Council of Conservationists; a letter of April 15, 1955, from Gen. U. S. Grant 3d; and a letter dated yesterday, April 18, 1955, from Mr. C. R. Gutermuth, secretary of the North American Wildlife Foundation.

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

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *April 16, 1955.*

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: We acknowledge that this message is being rushed, but in view of the haste with which the Colorado River project is being considered in Congress we are wiring.

Thank you for your courteous letter of April 5, transmitting a copy of your statement of March 31 before the Senate.

The documents you cite concerning the effort of the 1938 Presidential proclamation on early power and reclamation withdrawals present arguments that have been fully set forth in the hearings before the previous Congress. Those arguments have been known for years to the Sierra Club and other competent national conservation organizations. They have been fully and objectively analyzed. The true situation can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Brown's Park withdrawal: There seems to be no question concerning the authority and intention of the President to enlarge Dinosaur National Monument, "Subject to the (repeat the) Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." The Federal Water Power Act of 1920 was made applicable to confirm the authority of the Federal Power Commission to administer that withdrawal.

2. All other withdrawals were superseded by the Presidential proclamation. It is part of our American way of life to have the opportunity for strong presentation of diverse viewpoints and then to have a final decision made by one who has authority and responsibility to settle the matter. The Federal Power Commission quite properly took a strong parochial interest in refusing voluntarily to release its jurisdiction over a number of the power filings and withdrawal which have been cited. The President concluded, however, after review of both sides of the matter, that the national interest would best be served by establishing the enlarged national monument subject only to the one (repeat one) reclamation withdrawal at Brown's Park at the extreme upper edge of the monument.

3. Evaporation: It is indeed amazing to see that the evaporating arithmetic of the Bureau of Reclamation is still being cited nearly 11 months after Under Secretary Tudor formally apologized to the previous Congress for the Bureau's miscalculations.

4. Finally, a precedent is established. I am sure you will agree, whenever Congress does something it has never done before. Congress has never permitted a dam to invade the national park system in any circumstances.

In the foregoing we use the repeat device only because Western Union has no better way to transmit emphasis. We appreciate your courtesy and again wish to stress that the Sierra Club does not oppose a sound upper Colorado project that does not adversely affect national parks, national monuments, or dedicated wilderness areas.

Respectfully,

RICHARD M. LEONARD,
President.

APRIL 15, 1955.

Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Thank you for your long letter of April 5 in which you sent me a copy of your statement and brief which you presented at the House subcommittee hearing on the Colorado storage project. I had picked up a copy of your brief from the press table in the hearing room and, therefore, had enjoyed a previous opportunity to study it.

I have been interested in this latest argument advanced by yourself and other proponents of Echo Park Dam: That Dinosaur National Monument is subject to various previous withdrawals and reservations for power and reclamation, and that as a result Echo Park Dam would not be an invasion but rather the national monument "invaded the previous reservations." This conclusion, Senator WATKINS, can be arrived at only by the kind of double-jointed logic which lawyers have to be capable of in order to represent clients on either side of a case.

Because opposing advocates in the legal profession can take the same set of facts and arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions, yet pretended to be completely logical, the court has to use commonsense in reaching a decision. I am not a lawyer, but it is obvious to me that Congress and the public are going to have to use commonsense to arrive at a fair and intelligent conclusion in the Echo Park Dam controversy.

All of the old withdrawals and reservations listed in your brief and cited in your arguments were made by proclamation or Executive order by various departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government. It seems to me only commonsense that a later proclamation by the highest executive officer, namely, the President, in the 1938 proclamation enlarging Dinosaur National Monument, takes precedence over and cancels the previous withdrawals and reservations. Such was the opinion of a Department of Interior Solicitor who was quoted by your distinguished colleague in Congress, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, shortly after you left the House committee hearing on March 28. As I recall, that particular document was overlooked in your own argument.

As you know, the 1938 proclamation made the national monument enlargement subject only to one previous reservation, and that was the reclamation withdrawal for a dam at the Brown's Park site near the extreme northern edge of the area.

Here is another point of commonsense that I feel the Members of Congress will understand: Even the Brown's Park site reservation does not authorize construction of a hydroelectric dam by the Bureau of Reclamation in the national monument area. Only Congress can vote such authorization. For that reason the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of Interior are at the present time asking Congress to enact authorizing legislation.

Congress has been asked to authorize dams and reservoirs in national parks and monuments before. It has never done so since the establishment of the national park system in 1916. Hence, if Congress should vote to authorize Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument, it would be the first time. It would be a clear precedent. And it would be a precedent that would be used

as a powerful argument in favor of any future proposals to build a similar project in another national park or monument.

I agree entirely, Senator WATKINS, with the view expressed in the last paragraph of your letter. There is no place for bitterness in the discussion and debate on the issues.

Sincerely yours,

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
CHARLES H. CALLISON,
Conservation Director.

NEW YORK CITY, *April 16, 1955.*

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your very long and involved speech concerning the needless invasion of Dinosaur National Monument discloses several routine documents and makes interesting speculations about them. The case it sets out to build, however, is academic.

Your point is that power withdrawals were made in the present protected Dinosaur area long before this area became a national monument. The proclamation specifies that valid existing rights would be honored. You contend that the withdrawals are valid existing rights because the Federal Power Commission did not voluntarily vacate the withdrawals, but gratuitously offered to let the President proclaim a monument as long as he did not interfere with the Federal Power Commission; therefore, the Federal Power Commission claims are still in force. This point of view is concurred in by the Federal Power Commission, which is not surprising, but since when does the unilateral declaration of a participant in a dispute settle the dispute?

You attempt to bolster your case in an oblique way by slipping in commentary and references to law intended to convey the impression that the enlargement of Dinosaur National Monument may in itself be illegal or improper because the area is now larger than necessary to protect the bed of bones in the original 80 acres. But do you find anything in the proclamation of 1938 indicating that this enlargement was intended to provide further protection for the bones? You will find evidence of such intent in Wilson's original proclamation, but not in Roosevelt's. Isn't it possible that the new area was set aside for quite different reasons—for the preservation of the historic canyons and the striking evidences of early Indian life that abound in Echo Park and other parts of the new area? You will recall that your evidence reveals the new area was originally planned as the Yampa Canyon National Monument, obviously to protect the Yampa Canyons, which you now propose to flood out.

Sometime before the proclamation the name was changed and the new and old areas were consolidated, probably because it would simplify matters to have one national monument rather than two in tandem.

Since it was the obvious intention of Messrs. Roosevelt and Ickes to prevent invasion of the Yampa Canyons, perhaps because they knew these dangerous withdrawals had been made in the area, there is little wonder that repeated efforts were made to eliminate possible bureaucratic conflicts by getting the Federal Power Commission to vacate its claims, which your legal advisers say could have been established by "the mere filing of an application for water privileges." And the continued refusal of the Federal Power Commission might easily have inspired the President to insert the important word "valid" before "existing rights" in the proclamation. Looking forward to the day when the Federal Power Commission might want to invade the area, he determined to protect the public interest. Only Congress could determine the validity of a claim staked out prior to the establishment of an area in which the claimant has, by law, no rights.

So the matter falls back into the lap of Congress. There is no easy way out. If Congress decides to continue protection of the area which is now threatened, the area which the monument was proclaimed to protect, then it can strike Echo Park from the upper Colorado project, and can do it without seriously interfering with the lives or economics of the 3 million people you speak of, a small portion of whom will be served by Echo Park Dam, and no other. Such an action will automatically nullify the withdrawals, if indeed they still exist, as a result of the very same law which specifically places national parks and monuments beyond the reach of the Federal Power Commission.

It may be a neat legal question as to whether the proclamation of 1938 actually creates a monument, or whether it only provides elbow room for mud flats. But it will be settled finally and forever by the action of this session of Congress when it rejects, as we hope it will, or authorizes Echo Park Dam. And there is only one issue before Congress on this matter—whether or not it wishes to nullify the fundamental intent of President Roosevelt in creating what was originally conceived as Yampa Canyon National Monument, in which it is reasonable to suppose he hoped there would be only 1 power development out of the 11 staked out by the Federal Power Commission. This one was at Browns Park. It would not interfere with the Yampa Canyons, and it was specifically excepted, by name, in the proclamation.

Whatever profusion of words is hurled about to confuse the issue, posterity and lobbyists for private interests will regard this vital congressional decision as either a reaffirmation of the traditional policy of protecting national monuments and parks—or as setting a precedent that in the judgment of Congress such areas have lost their value.

Sincerely yours,

FRED SMITH,
Director, Council of Conservationists.

APRIL 15, 1955.

Hon. ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your sending me a copy of your recent speech on the upper Colorado River storage project, together with your letter of April 5, was very much appreciated, especially as I had not previously been able to obtain a copy. Your speech and the exhibits accompanying it are evidence of your ability as a lawyer and advocate, a fact which I have never doubted and for years appreciated.

It would be presumptuous on my part to attempt to argue at length any legal points with you. Moreover, I do not have the means or facilities to search for possible evidence upon which to base such an argument. Therefore, I am constrained to accept the withdrawals preceding the enlargement of the monument and the refusal of the Federal Power Commission to vacate them as established facts. However, since the Utah Power & Light Co. voluntarily withdrew their application, it appears that the withdrawals in force in 1938 were not vested rights in private property, but merely the earmarking of certain areas by a bureau of the Federal Government (by authority of Congress, to be sure) for a certain future use, that they did not establish any vested private property right, but were an administrative reservation of those areas for a use subsequently not made of them. Therefore, they were not recognized or protected by the subject to all valid existing rights clause, a general formula to protect the Government against the possible unintentional taking of private property without due process of law.

I do not believe it can be denied that such an earmarking of an area for a future use by one Government agency, which could have been disallowed by the President in the first place, may, if not so used in a reasonable length of time, be transferred to other Federal use by the President. This is what it seems to me to have been done by the 1938 Executive order enlarging the monument. To my simple mind, it seems logical to assume that the writer and issuer of the Executive order said what they meant and meant what they said. This view is confirmed by the explicit exemption in the order of one withdrawal (the Brown Park site) and no others, and by the specific provision for any exceptions to the full park use in the laws establishing certain national parks. I have always understood that the courts have generally held that the explicit mention of one exception in a legal document precludes others from being inferred.

It is pertinent and conclusive that the Executive order, after the clause "subject to all valid existing rights," goes on to say explicitly that the lands added "are hereby reserved from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws and added to and made a part of the Dinosaur National Monument"—manifestly all the withdrawals for power or irrigation previously made under the public land laws, which the courts have held do not apply to national parks and monuments, were explicitly rescinded by the proclamation with the one exception of the Brown's Park site. I do not see how there could be a clearer prescription contrary to your interpretation and in support of mine. The inter-agency correspondence between Mr. Demaray and Mr. McNinch was manifestly and intentionally overruled by the President and is no longer pertinent. It is hardly necessary to point out that, in order to prevent any doubt, the proclamation goes on to warn explicitly all against any inconsistent invasion or use of the land within the enlarged monument and even rescinds previous Executive orders making certain withdrawals.

The subsequent paragraph makes the specific exception of the Brown's Park site, but, in order that there could be no misunderstanding, says that the Federal Power Act shall prevail and it, as amended in 1935, denies to the Federal Power Commission any authority to issue permits for power development in the national parks or monuments.

Thus, Senator, on a mere layman's analysis of the question—and I have truly studied your presentation before the Senate carefully and conscientiously in the light of my nearly 50 years experience in Government administration—I am constrained most respectfully to stand by my previous interpretations of the legal status of the case against the Echo Park and Split Mountain dams, and as Shakespeare said—

"It must not be; there is no power in Venice
Can alter a decree established;
'Twill be a precedent;
And many an error by the same example
Will rush into the state."

We are more fortunate than Venice and Congress can by direct legislation, as now proposed, provide for this exception to its own previous enjoinder as to the maintenance of national parks and monuments to "leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations"; but it will still be a precedent, a breach of a sound policy adhered to since 1916, and we hope the Congress will be wise and foresighted in this case, as in the past, and not pass the legislation.

Of course, I am confident that in your advocacy of the proposed legislation you are conscientiously acting for what you believe the best interests of your constituents and of the Nation; just as I am conscientiously advocating the contrary. How the Bureau of Reclamation has been able to convince so

many intelligent and experienced men that this program is sound and economically feasible, is a great mystery to me. Having felt that Mr. Brown's and my statements sufficiently showed the contrary, and that the water your region so much needs and the requirements of the interstate compact can be otherwise provided for at less expense and with greater actual benefit to the region, it is hard to understand the ignoring of these statements and the continued support of a program which is evidently going to be so damaging to the Nation both economically and by destruction of one of its important assets, which should be preserved as part of our natural heritage.

The fact that the impossibility of the Echo Park Dam paying out, as claimed by the Bureau of Reclamation, and the extravagance of power costs in its program, certainly established the fact that its cost estimates and economic analysis do not merit your confidence. As president of the American Planning and Civic Association, I was more or less constrained to focus my statements on the objections to the Echo Rock Dam and the fact that it is unnecessary because there are alternative and better solutions. But as a citizen and a former officer, owing so much to the Government and loyal to what I believe to be the best interests of the country at large, I did venture to indicate the program's unsoundness and the superficiality and probably untrustworthiness of the Bureau's analysis. But nothing has come of it. Neither the Chief of Engineers nor the Federal Power Commission, nor even the National Park Service, have been called in to testify, nor any nationally known engineers or economists. Only we conservationists, former Governor Miller, and the opponents from the lower basin were heard, and our statements have been treated with courteous disregard. We have been voices crying in the wilderness. While I realize that your committee could not expect to take my lone statements, however carefully prepared and still unanswered by the Bureau, without supporting views of competent persons in whom you had more confidence, you have continued to believe in a bad and unsound program, and in the assurances of those proven wrong in so many instances.

My high regard for you personally, and your splendid services in the National Congress, make it very painful to differ with you so radically on this subject; and my appreciation of human fallibility apprises me of the audacity of my differing with one of such long experience and great ability. However, I can find nothing in my 4 years connection with this case to raise a doubt as to the correctness of my analysis and conclusions, so I am constrained to continue to differ with you and to believe that the Congress and the Nation are entitled, when the question is raised, to a candid statement of the views to which I have been impelled.

Respectfully yours,

U. S. GRANT 3D.

NORTH AMERICAN WILDLIFE FOUNDATION,
Washington, D. C., April 18, 1955.

The Honorable ARTHUR V. WATKINS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WATKINS: Your 5-page letter of April 5, and the enclosed copy of your March 28 speech on the upper Colorado River storage project, have been studied carefully. While we expected that an eminent lawyer of your known ability would present a strong legal argument for that billion-dollar project, it occurs to us that the Echo Park Dam issue was documented too well.

When you charge that the Dinosaur National Monument actually constituted an invasion of previously authorized power withdrawals, and that those withdrawals have priority over the use of the land, you should not have so conveniently included that December 5, 1930, opinion of Nathan R. Margold, former solicitor of the Department of the Interior. All of your contentions were refuted by Mr. Margold's statement that "It is clear that the Federal Power Commission is by statute expressly prohibited from granting licenses for power works within national monuments. In my opinion of August 19, 1938, I so held. It follows that if the lands affected by the power site classifications are included in the national monument, the Federal Power Commission will be without authority to grant licenses affecting them. Any attempt to preserve this authority in the Commission by specific provision in the national monument proclamation would be ineffective since the authority of the Commission has been prescribed by Congress and cannot be extended by provisions in an executive proclamation of this character."

It has been charged repeatedly that the National Park Service promised in the 1936 hearings in Utah that Echo Park Dam could be built within the expanded boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Surely, an agency vested with the tremendous responsibility of administering our national park system was cognizant of the 1921 and 1935 amendments to the Federal Power Act, which provides that no power licenses shall be issued in any existing or new national parks or monuments. The National Park Service had no authority to make such a promise—that authority rests with the Congress. Furthermore, the Park Service representatives who conducted those Utah hearings were instructed by the then Interior Secretary, Harold L. Ickes, that the future development of water, power, and minerals would be determined by the Congress. In fact, the recorded proceedings of those hearings show that not one word was said about water development.

Sincerely,

C. R. GUTERMUTH,
Secretary.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to say further, with respect to the general policy of protecting scenic areas, that in the Pacific Northwest it is my opinion that the last commercial projects which should be undertaken anywhere, be they in the national parks, the national monuments, the national forests, or elsewhere, should be those which will destroy scenic or wildlife values.

FISHING SHOULD BE PROTECTED

For example, the Governor of Oregon, in testifying during the Hells Canyon hearings in Portland several weeks ago, suggested that perhaps greater flood control than that to be achieved at Hells Canyon could be gained by damming the Salmon River in Idaho. Perhaps the Governor of Oregon is right; I do not know. But if the suggestion of the Governor of Oregon were followed about possibly damming the Salmon River in Idaho, that would be the end of commercial fishing and of sports fishing on the Columbia River, because about 80 percent of the annual spring run of chinook salmon spawns in the headwaters of the Salmon River. I have been camping at the headwaters near Agency Creek and have seen the fish spawning where Lewis and Clark came. They nearly form a bridge across the Salmon River. But if we would follow the notion of the Governor of Oregon and dam the Salmon River for flood control, needed though it might be, the salmon-fishing industry and the great sports fishing on the lower Columbia would be destroyed.

We have proposals in the Northwest to build dams at Bruce's Eddy and at Penny Cliffs on the Clearwater River. They would be great dams. Yet those dams would flood out the great Selway Wilderness area and the Lochsa Wilderness area.

I have camped with Mrs. Neuberger on the Lochsa and on the Lolo Trail, which is one part of the original Lewis and Clark trail that is still wild. I think it would be shameful, now, to have a lake or reservoir at the Lochsa and at the Selway and to flood out those great elk meadows and to eliminate the areas that stretch up the Lolo trail where Lewis and Clark bivouacked and which is the last place where Americans can see what our country must have been like as the first white men camped there. I think to build dams in scenic areas before the very last potential kilowatt is utilized elsewhere would be a crime against future generations of Americans.

I have taken the position, and have held to it all my adult life, that the last power and irrigation projects that ought to be built are those that destroy scenic and recreational values and the wildlife of our country.

As we pass the 160 million mark in population, we have all too few places like the Lochsa Wilderness area and like the Dinosaur National Monument, where people can go and somehow get away from the tensions and anxieties of the civilization we have created.

OREGON WILDLIFE FEDERATION OPPOSES ECHO PARK DAM

On April 14, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] wrote to me a letter stating that the State wildlife federations of some States had dissented from the stand against Echo Park Dam taken by the National Wildlife Federation.

The resolution of the National Wildlife Federation opposing the construction of Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur Nation Monument was adopted at the Federation's 19th annual convention in Montreal last month. The letter of the Senator from Utah said that the delegate from the Oregon Wildlife Federation, which supported this stand last year, had voted against the resolution at the Montreal convention this year.

However, Mr. Carl B. Ramsey, the fine president of the Oregon Wildlife Federation, has wired me that the Oregon group is still opposed to construction of any dam within a national park or monument. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the National Wildlife Federation opposing Echo Park Dam, the letter of the Senator from Utah to me, and Mr. Ramsey's telegram to me, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION 9, NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION, OPPOSING ECHO PARK DAM

Whereas the national park system, established by law, is urgently needed and is increasingly being supported and enjoyed by millions of people; and

Whereas progressive losses of recreational facilities in the various States apparently

cannot be stopped, and recreational lands increased for the use of all of the people; and

Whereas such continuing loss in the light of increased use of outdoor recreational opportunities makes this condition alarming; and

Whereas any legislation that would authorize the construction of the proposed Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument in northwestern Colorado and northeastern Utah would open the way for further destruction of other recreational areas in our monuments and parks; and

Whereas the alternatives that have been offered have never been adequately studied by the Bureau of Reclamation, and have never been proven inferior; and

Whereas the necessity for Echo Park Dam has never been fully demonstrated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the National Wildlife Federation, in line with its policy of fighting for increased recreational opportunities for all of the people, take every action possible to oppose the construction of Echo Park Dam and to preserve the Dinosaur National Monument as it is now constituted, and to do everything possible to see that our national park system is not needlessly invaded or despoiled.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR
AND INSULAR AFFAIRS,
April 14, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: It may have escaped your attention, but the sportsmen in your State affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation recently reconsidered their previous opposition to Echo Park Dam and voted against a 1955 resolution of the national organization, which opposes this unit of the proposed Colorado River storage project.

This was disclosed by Charles S. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in an appearance before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee on March 28. The Federation's resolution, opposed by 11 States which had favored a similar resolution in 1954, actually was approved by only 30 States represented at the organization's annual convention in Montreal, Canada, March 11 to 13. It is my conviction that many of these remaining States also would change their position if they had access to all the facts.

I felt obligated to bring this matter before you, because the House hearing record has not yet been printed, and because I feel assured that the propagandists of the National Wildlife Federation will not direct your attention to such a reversal of position by so many of their State affiliates.

Wildlife groups in these 11 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming—now have joined the national Congress of Industrial Organizations in taking a public stand in favor of Echo Park Dam, after examining all the facts. The Utah Wildlife Federation has always supported Echo Park Dam.

Some of the facts on Echo Dam are set forth in the enclosed reprint of my recent floor speech on this subject.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

WALLA WALLA, WASH., *April 17, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The Oregon Wildlife Federation is on record as opposing any legislation that would constitute an invasion of our national park system. If F. R. Brown, our alternate delegate to the National Wildlife Federation meeting in Montreal, voted favoring Echo Park Dam, he voted uninstructed and certainly did not express the sentiment of the Oregon Wildlife Federation.

CARL B. RAMSEY,
President, Oregon Wildlife Federation.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, as I said earlier, I was impressed by the able speech of the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico when he cited the reclamation history in our country. Yet, a very illustrious American who was closely associated with the Senator from New Mexico when the Senator served so ably as the Secretary of Agriculture in the Cabinet of President Truman, and who has great affection for the Senator from New Mexico, has taken an opposite position. When the Senator from New Mexico was Secretary of Agriculture, the Chief of the United States Forest Service, who served under the Senator from New Mexico and served so closely with him, was Lyle F. Watts. Mr. Watts is not a man who opposes sound commercial development where it can take place. Under his tenure as Chief of the Forest Service, timber cutting showed an increase of 200 or 300 percent to meet the exigencies of our wartime needs during World War II. Yet Mr. Watts, who is now one of the most beloved and most distinguished residents of my home community of Portland, Oreg., has taken the position that the proposed dam at Echo Park should not be built.

I realize, I might point out, that Echo Park is not in the truest sense a park, but is merely a point within the Dinosaur National Monument. I should like to read the letter which I received from the distinguished ex-Chief of the Forest Service:

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 15, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: For many years I have been interested in the development of the upper Colorado Basin. I lived in the intermountain region for 18 years and know that the area badly needs to store its available water for agriculture, power, and industry. I retired as chief of the United States Forest Service on June 30, 1952.

Again I have opposed the invasion of our national parks and monuments for commercial purposes. Generally we have too little rather than too much area set aside for that purpose. The present overuse of existing areas coupled with the rapid increase in our population substantiates that belief.

It is my considered opinion that the above two premises need not be conflicting as related to the Colorado River.

S. 500 now before the Senate would authorize the development of the upper Colorado Basin. As the bill now reads one of the many projects for which authorization is sought is the Echo Park Dam in the Dinosaur National Monument. It is my interpretation of the situation that the rest of the development would be feasible without Echo Park Dam.

I strongly urge that the Senate approve S. 500 only if the Echo Park Dam is excluded.

Sincerely,

LYLE F. WATTS.

I have read the full text of this letter so that I may call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that many of the people who oppose Echo Park Dam are not enemies, in any sense of the word, of the upper Colorado storage project as a whole. Mr. Watts, up to the time when he reached the pinnacle of his career as chief of the United States Forest Service, was regional forestry director at Missoula, and he served in Utah, Montana, and Colorado. He knows the Upper Colorado region. He knows the truth of what the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] have said about the need for putting water on this arid land, which can support many crops if only it can receive irrigation. He supports the project as a whole, but he, like many other people who understand the situation, are opposed to the Echo Park Dam.

Mr. President, at this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD a considerable number of messages which I have received from other persons who are interested in conservation and the protection of our resources, regarding the Echo Park feature of the upper Colorado project.

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

MAZAMAS,
Portland, Oreg., April 15, 1955.

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NEUBERGER: We are very pleased and proud of your stand against the inclusion of Echo Park Dam in the upper Colorado project.

We believe that any breach in the national park system will result in further violations, and we can see no justification for the violation of Dinosaur National Monument at this time.

In appreciation for your action, we shall do all we can to support you.

Sincerely,

ROBERT and MARTHA PLATT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you oppose outrageous inclusion Echo Park Dam in upper Colorado River development.

PAMELA S. OLMSTEAD
Mrs. H. C. Olmstead,
VIRGINIA B. OLMSTEAD
Mrs. L. S.,
ROBERT S. BOUTELL.

EVERETT, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Hope you go through with your amendment to the upper Colorado bill. It is certainly desirable.

PHILIP H. ZALESKY.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

I wish to be on record as supporting the amendment to S. 500 for the deletion of Echo Park Dam from the upper Colorado River storage project.

WILLIAM A. DEGENHARDT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We object to Echo Park Dam being included in upper Colorado River storage proj-

ect and urge your support in having it deleted from present bill.

WARD and LOIS.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The questionable economic soundness of upper Colorado project is poor excuse for wrecking Dinosaur National Monument. Urge deletion of Echo Park Dam from S. 500. Reservoir recreation abundantly available elsewhere but no amount of money can ever replace the national park system. Let's save it.

V. L. and M. L. FISCHER.

BOZEMAN, MONT., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge your continued and unswerving opposition to inclusion of Echo Park Dam in upper Colorado development. Genuine justification entirely lacking. Log-rolling and political back scratching passes rivers and harbors bills but whole national park principle is at stake today. Delete Echo Park site and upper Colorado development acceptable to all.

NICK ELBURN.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

I am opposed to Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument. I strongly urge you to support an amendment to upper Colorado bill to eliminate this dam from project. I appreciate need for water in West's arid regions but also see increasing need for national parks of exceptional natural beauty.

VICTOR JOSENDAL.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We proudly commend your stand for the deletion of Echo Park Dam from the upper Colorado project. We strongly oppose any invasion of Dinosaur Monument and urge Senate consideration and study of alternate sites without the monument. Best wishes.

MARTHA and ROBERT PLATT.

SEATTLE, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please help preserve Dinosaur National Monument by voting against the inclusion of Echo Park Dam in the Colorado River project.

Mr. and Mrs. JOHN D. HEATH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Protest against Echo Park Dam Dinosaur National Monument.

Respectfully,

VIRGINIA WIRTANEN.

OSWEGO, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Dinosaur National Monument must not be scuttled to build Echo Park Dam. The National Park System was created to perpetuate singular irreplaceable natural features and violating its policy for cheap hydroelectric power is false economy and shortsighted with atomic power's potential uncertain.

Mr. and Mrs. W. H. OBERTEUFFER.

TACOMA, WASH., *April 19, 1955.*
Hon. R. L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.:

Knowing your interest in our national parks I urge that you work for deletion of Echo Park Dam site in Dinosaur National Monument from the upper Colorado storage bill.

LEO GALLAGHER.

PORTLAND, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*
Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

I oppose any needless encroachment upon our national parks and monuments and urge the deletion of Echo Park Dam from S. 500.

DONNEL N. WILLIAMS.

PASADENA, CALIF., *April 16, 1955.*
Hon. RICHARD NEUBERGER,
United States Senator from Oregon,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: While I don't live in Oregon, I lecture to about 2,000 Oregonians a year and could perhaps influence quite a few. I don't like the Echo Park Dam. I hear you oppose it too and hope you can persuade a lot of Democrats to go along with you.

Any breach in our National Park System would encourage other selfish groups to try it. Our National Parks are shabby, rundown, understaffed, and overwhelmed by the crowds of tourists already. It seems almost treasonable that the Department of Interior should propose to destroy one of the very areas it is entrusted to protect. Dinosaur is the only sanctuary on the whole upper Colorado that was supposedly safe from that type of venal exploitation.

Echo Park Dam's proponents should be reminded: Strike out the Echo Park Dam and its pressure groups will in time forgive and forget. But conservationists will never forgive those responsible for desecration like that. The dam would stand as a reminder for all time. In fact, I can be counted on myself to remind a few hundred thousand people a year about the folly of Echo Park Dam. Let's hope I don't have to.

Sincerely,

STAN MIDGLEY.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE,
Hanover, N. H., April 17, 1955.
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: Comparable letter to the attached has been mailed this date to each United States Senator from New England and New York.

Good luck with the Echo Park amendment. We appreciate your interest—and your promise of action.

Yours truly,

ROBERT S. MONAHAN,
College Forester and Manager of College Outing Properties.

APPALACHIAN MOUNTAIN CLUB,
Boston, Mass., April 17, 1955.
Hon. NORRIS COTTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR NORRIS: I have been authorized by the officers of the Appalachian Mountain Club, with 5,000 members sufficiently interested in its outdoor program to pay annual dues of $7.50, to express the club's opinion on the following subject.

We have followed with understandable interest congressional action with respect to S. 500, which authorizes the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River storage project with amendments, as reported (No. 128) on March 30 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

We understand that when this bill reaches the floor shortly, probably on April 20, Senator NEUBERGER will offer an amendment that would exclude the controversial Echo Park Dam from the project.

Proponents of the Echo Park Dam, having failed to present a convincing case for its need for national defense, irrigation, or power purposes are currently concentrating on its alleged recreational benefits. We have personal knowledge and firm convictions in that field which oblige us to express our opinion that the Dinosaur National Monument will produce far greater public recreational benefits by not allowing the invasion of its unique terrain with a man-made dam and a fluctuating flowage.

The Appalachian Mountain Club hopes you will support the Neuberger amendment, thereby eliminating that portion of the project to which we strenuously object and leaving the balance of the program for such authorization as the Congress may consider feasible.

I have not forgotten your comment at the last session that you had received more correspondence on this one subject than upon any other, even those affecting New Hampshire directly. Vote for the Neuberger amendment and you'll hear no more from the opponents of the Echo Park Dam.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT S. MONAHAN,
Chairman, Conservation Committee;
Forester, Dartmouth College.

APRIL 16, 1955.

Senator NEUBERGER: I am in favor of the amendment excluding Echo Park from the upper Colorado project.

JUNE HAIGHT.

ALAMEDA, CALIF.

BERKELEY, CALIF., *April 16, 1955.*
Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: I am writing to sincerely commend you for your vote in committee to delete the proposed dam in Echo Park of the Dinosaur Monument. I am sure conservationists all over the country were happy about that evidence of your understanding of the value of our national park system, and your intention to resist their invasion. I suspect too few of our law makers in Washington do have that clear understanding, and do recognize that outstanding values, even if in intangible denominations, are sometimes too great to sacrifice for local or regional economic gain. In this case there are so many other solutions to the problem, by which both park values and the desired conservation of the water can be secured, that it seems incomprehensible that the sacrifice should be condoned. Not incomprehensible for men from Utah, western Colorado and perhaps New Mexico and Arizona. Human nature does not change much—and the presentation of potential billions to the economy of the region, in the form of pork barrel, can be counted on to submerge more logical and far-sighted attitudes.

I do not happen to be one of your constituents—though I know a good many of them quite well. Your election was not entirely a surprise, because Secretary McKay did some very telling campaign work for you among those dedicated to preserve our fine parks unimpaired. Needless to say he did not realize it at the time he was adding his verbal approval for a tramway up Ranier, to his written approval of the Dinosaur sacrifice. I was delighted that you won the election. I have the feeling that we desperately need a Senator who really understands park values, and who is not unwilling to fight to preserve them. Your newness in the Senate may indeed be an advantage—if you are willing to take up the challenge, and take

upon yourself the role of park champion. So far as I know there is a vacancy at that very point—and I am sincerely hoping you will fill it, and that you can do so very effectively. It will be a grand role to play—and will bring you the sincere admiration and gratitude of millions of our people who do love our park system because they enjoy it, and other millions who have in the past visited and enjoyed the parks. One fifth of our total population will visit them this year, and the number mounts each season. The number actually visiting the Dinosaur—by the river route, which is the only way it can be really seen—will be up way above the number who visited Yosemite in 1893 when I first saw it. Yosemite now attracts a million a year.

My congratulations and sincere good wishes.

Respectfully yours,

HAROLD C. BRADLEY,
Professor Emeritus,
Medical School, University of Wisconsin.

S. MCFARLAND CHAPTER,
IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE,
Colorado Springs, Colo., April 15, 1955.

SENATOR NEUBERGER: We are in back of you 100 percent and we are writing our opposal of the Echo Park Dam, in hopes that it will be of some value when the fight comes to the floor.

We oppose Echo Park Dam, but not sound development of the Colorado River.

Respectfully,

S. MCFARLAND CHAPTER,
FRANCES SWIMM,
Secretary-Treasurer.

P. S.—Letters have been sent to Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, of Illinois, and HARRY FLOOD BYRD, of Virginia, also opposing this dam.

BOULDER, COLO., *April 15, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: This is just a line to tell you that "we the people" are greatly pleased at the stand you have taken on the Echo Park Dam controversy.

We were asked to send copies of our letters of protest to you. I cannot do that—but I can say that I have just written to Senators HARRY F. BYRD and PAUL DOUGLAS.

Very truly yours,

AMY M. BOWEN
(Mrs. Albert).

COLORADO CONSERVATIONIST OPPOSES ECHO PARK DAM

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I stated earlier in my remarks that one of the things which surprised me very much was the fact that I had been receiving a number of letters from people in the upper Colorado Basin who themselves are opposed to Echo Park Dam. I have not chosen to put these letters into the RECORD, because I realize that perhaps feeling in those States is quite tense on this issue, and I would not want to subject the persons to embarrassment. I should like, however, to read parts of a letter from one of the most distinguished Colorado conservationists, Mr. Arthur H. Carhart, whose articles and books in the field of conservation are well known. I read from his letter:

The most serious issue involved in this controversy is the breaching of national park policy. Proponents of the dam argue it was contemplated that dams would be permitted in the Dinosaur National Monument at the time President Roosevelt's proclamation enlarged that park unit in 1938. * * *

The comparatively few who seem to think they will benefit or fulfill some commitments if they can force this dam into the national park unit will cry out that this will not be a breach in protections we have maintained for our parks, but the record denies their contentions. Congress can not afford to be confused in this issue; the future of the entire national park system is at stake.

Mr. President, I shall not read further from the letters; but I desire to comment on two editorials which have appeared in one of the finest newspapers in the intermountain West, namely, the Denver Post. The Denver Post, which supports the upper Colorado River project and the Echo Park phase of that project, has been critical of my position in this matter. I now ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two editorials from the Denver Post, one being from the issue of April 10, 1955, and the other being from the issue of April 14, 1955, both taking the opposing viewpoint from mine, and urging that the Echo Park feature of the upper Colorado project be authorized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). Is there objection?

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

[From the Denver Post of April 10, 1955]

A BAD ENTRANCE

It is reported that Senator NEUBERGER, Oregon's new Democratic Senator, will try to kill the Echo Park Dam when the upper Colorado River storage project bill comes before the Senate for vote. Mr. NEUBERGER is siding with the conservationists who believe the dam is a precedent-setting invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument.

The young Senator rejects the relative need and merits of that dam, as an essential unit for power production and water storage. He does not, in other words, accept the findings of engineering and economic justification which have compelled the Bureau of Reclamation to insist upon the Echo Park barrier as essential to the whole upper Colorado Basin project.

NEUBERGER does accept, however, the Bureau's case for the construction of the high Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Oregon and Idaho. He embraces that project as an essential part of a basinwide river-control and power-producing plan to harness the Columbia and its tributaries. His whole case for the Hells Canyon Dam rests upon the studies and recommendations of the Bureau of Reclamation—the same Bureau whose findings of fact and firm proposals in the case of Echo Park he rejects.

The legal questions involved in withdrawing the dam site from the national monument, and the effect of such withdrawal upon the inviolability of other monuments and national parks, were exhaustively explored a few days ago in the Senate by Senator WATKINS of Utah. NEUBERGER, we feel sure, is somewhat less of an authority on the administrative history of the monument and the statutory implications in the Colorado project bill, than is his colleague from Utah.

This suggests to us that the freshman Senator from the Pacific coast is plunging somewhat blindly into a controversy, and exposing himself to the grossest inconsistency of viewpoint in doing so. As champion of the Bureau's choice on the Snake his neck is out a mile for spurning one of the two essential facilities for the Bureau's plan on the Colorado.

Lacking full information on the history of the monument (as we believe he does), NEUBERGER appears to be working both sides of the street on this issue.

[From the Denver Post of April 14, 1955]

THE WHOLE TRUTH ON ECHO PARK DAM

On March 28, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, demolished the objection to the Echo Park Dam on grounds that it would "invade" the Dinosaur Monument and thereby establish precedent that would "threaten" the national park system.

WATKINS introduced records and correspondence which:

1. Established incontrovertibly that the Echo Park site was only one of several sites in the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that had been withdrawn for power purposes by the Federal Power Commission several years before the monument was expanded in 1938.

2. Proved that the Department of Interior, including both Secretary Ickes and the National Park Service, were aware not only of the withdrawals, but of their lawful effect upon the nature and administration of the Dinosaur Monument before it was expanded by Presidential proclamation.

3. Revealed that the Department of Interior had been advised in 1939, through an opinion of its own solicitor, Nathan R. Margold, that a monument could be created "subject to the reclamation withdrawals and power site classifications and thereby preserve and continue the effectiveness of the withdrawals and classifications."

4. Affirmed that the "reservation" in President Roosevelt's monument proclamation was not (in Roosevelt's own words) to "affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 * * *." That is precisely the act under which the Echo Park and other sites were withdrawn by the FPC and described in 1934 by Chairman McNinch as * * * "one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale."

5. Supported his (WATKINS') contention that if "invasion" is taking place, the aggressors are those who are trying to set aside lawful power withdrawals and override the Federal Water Power Act to superimpose a national monument on an area that had been staked out for other purposes many years before 1938.

Before Roosevelt expanded the monument from its original 80 acres (1915) to 203,885 acres, the matter of "vacating" the power withdrawals was taken up with the FPC twice. The issue was raised first in 1934 by A. E. Demaray, Acting Director of the National Park Service. It was brought to the attention of the FPC again in 1935 by Secretary Ickes, who asked about the "possibility of releasing the power withdrawals" * * * thus to place the "proposed monument * * * in a much better position from the standpoint of administration."

The power withdrawals were never vacated. The conservation groups opposed to the Echo Park Dam have not, to our knowledge, claimed that they were.

Apparently those opposing this dam are asking us to believe that the President himself, in his proclamation creating the monument, personally "vacated" the power withdrawals by failing to include them, specifically, in the exemptions of his statement. But if that were so why did Roosevelt specifically refer to "affect operation of the Water Power Act of 1920," under which the withdrawals were made and sustained by the decision of the FPC in 1934 and 1935?

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project are not "invading" this national monument. The conservationists, in an emotional and unreasoning mood, are trying in effect to rewrite both the record and the law by misleading the friends and champions of our natural playgrounds.

Listen to this: "Construction of Echo Park Dam * * * would set a fatal precedent for other inroads on our national recreational

reserves. Once the inviolability of the park system is breached in Dinosaur Monument, it will be imperiled everywhere. Echo Park Dam is the beachhead from which a coordinated onslaught could be made by private interests against the boundaries of national parks. * * *"

What about the "inviolability" of the Water Power Act or, for that matter, of the President's proclamation which cited it? Since when has a program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, proceeding upon the clear authority of public law, become an "onslaught" similar to that of "private enterprise" imperiling the national park system?

Senator WATKINS' thorough, documented chronology of events up to and immediately following the act expanding the Dinosaur Monument exposes the error, presumably innocent of those who believe the dam "would set a fatal precedent."

If the power priorities on the Yampa and the Green may be thus arbitrarily ignored or set aside, then the Water Power Act of 1920 is without meaning, and the purposes and authority of the Federal Power Commission are canceled by implication. That we doubt will be accepted by Congress or was intended by Roosevelt in 1938. And it is a public disservice for the conservationists—with whom we have pleasurably joined in many worthy programs for the defense of natural values in this country—to proceed further down the wrong path they have taken.

PRESERVE OUR PARKS, REGARDLESS OF THE REGION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I should like to discuss very briefly my reply to the editors of the Denver Post. I wish to say that these editors are personal friends of mine, and for them I have very great personal affection and respect. I should like to say that my reply points out what I said earlier to the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] namely, that the position I have taken regarding Dinosaur National Monument is the same as the position I have taken regarding proposals that there be commercial development in the national parks within my own Pacific Northwest region. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my reply, dated April 19, 1955, to the editors of the Denver Post, be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

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

APRIL 19, 1955.

To the EDITOR OF THE DENVER POST:

Because of my respect for the editors of the Denver Post and their integrity, I would value the opportunity to reply to your editorial criticism of me because I am opposed to the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Dinosaur National Monument.

1. You claim I am inconsistent because I favor Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River but oppose Echo Park Dam on the Green River.

If Hells Canyon Dam were inside a national park or monument, I would not recommend it. As a resident of the Northwest, I favor commercial timber-cutting in many areas but I oppose such cutting within the forests of the Olympic National Park. Is this being inconsistent? For many years, I have been against any commercial activity inside parks and monuments. I oppose Glacier View Dam in Glacier National Park, for example, quite as much as I oppose Echo Park Dam—although the Glacier View project would add to power production in the Columbia River basin, where I live.

2. You criticize me for accepting the recommendation of the Bureau of Reclamation at Hells Canyon and rejecting them at Echo Park.

The engineers who made the recommendation to build Echo Park Dam may not have given much weight to the intangible values of protecting the scenic beauty of a national monument, which they may have felt too irrelevant, but which the Senate has an obligation to consider. Remember that until Secretary McKay, no Secretary of the Interior had recommended authorization of Echo Park Dam. Secretary Chapman, himself from Denver, Colo., modified the report of the Bureau of Reclamation to omit Echo Park Dam pending further study of alternative sites.

For your information, it was the Army engineers—in their famous 308 report—who made the original and basic recommendation that Hells Canyon Dam be erected.

3. You might comment on the inconsistency of some of the Senators from the Rocky Mountain States who advocate Echo Park Dam, Glen Canyon Dam, and others on the upper Colorado, but subscribe to the administration viewpoint that Hells Canyon Dam is "creeping socialism."

4. You accept without question Senator WATKINS' claim that the 1938 proclamation reserved the Echo Park waters for irrigation, power, etc. Yet this is by no means the only legal viewpoint. Legal experts as familiar with the upper Colorado as Senator WATKINS claim that Browns Park, and that alone, was the sole site preserved by the 1938 proclamation—and this on the extreme edge of the monument. Furthermore, the Solicitor of the Interior Department held as early as 1939 that the proclamation could not give the Federal Power Commission authority over dinosaur sites which exceeded prevailing national monument policy.

To argue these legal points could become endless without reaching the basic question at issue, as I see it: Shall a commercial dam be authorized by Congress, for the first time in American history, for construction within the boundaries of a national park or monument?

I believe the answer ought to be in the negative.

There are approximately 15 similar proposals all over the land for dams, tunnels or water diversions in parks and monuments. I oppose them all—those in my own region and in other regions.

You contend Echo Park would not be a fatal precedent, leading to these further invasions. Can you safely make so categorical a statement?

I fear Echo Park would lead eventually to the other invasions. After all, the irrigationists and power users proposing the other park and/or monument invasions can make arguments quite as compelling as those of the upper Colorado advocates.

I believe there can be found alternative sites to Echo Park which would leave our national park system intact. This is important in an era when so few wonder spots actually have been preserved for future generations.

I believe you will be interested to learn that my mail, including letters from the State of Colorado, is running heavily in support of the conviction that our national park system should be left alone so far as any exploitation or diversion is concerned.

You have said I plunged blindly and recklessly into the controversy. For 20 years as a journalist and a State legislator, I have held firmly to the position that commercial activity was undesirable in national parks and monuments. I have maintained this stand in the Pacific Northwest, despite the desire of major lumber interests to fell some of the magnificent fir and spruce "rain forests" of the Olympics. It has not always been easy to stick to such a stand in the face of local pressures and opinion, but I have not deviated.

I hope that the editors of the Denver Post, for whom I have a high personal affection and regard, will come eventually to think that my stand on Echo Park Dam is at least worthy of their respect—if not their agreement.

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
United States Senator.

BOOK DEPICTS GRANDEUR OF DINOSAUR MONUMENT

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, through contributions from conservationists throughout the country, there has been sent to every Member of the Senate, I believe, during the past week, a book entitled "This Is Dinosaur." The book is published by Alfred A. Knopf & Co., one of the leading book publishers in the United States. The book includes essays by leading advocates of conservation, by river runners, by wildlife experts, by geologists, by botanists, and by others, who do not wish to see a dam constructed in the Dinosaur National Monument. I should like to read three paragraphs from the book, so that the gist of what these conservationists have said will appear in the RECORD. I shall read from the chapter entitled "The National Park Idea." It is a contribution to the book by Mr. Alfred A. Knopf, himself.

Incidentally, Mr. President, the book was edited by Mr. Wallace Stegner, one of the most widely known and talented novelists in the Nation.

I read now what Mr. Knopf says:

Thirty-five years ago one George K. Davol wanted to build a cableway across the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. To Stephen T. Mather, the first Director of the National Park Service, this seemed, as it would seem to almost anyone today, simply monstrous. John Barton Payne, his Secretary of the Interior, supported Mather's denial of the request, and that was that. Another proposal called for the building of an elevator alongside the 308-foot Great Falls of the Yellowstone. And Secretary Franklin K. Lane was at one time eager to use Yellowstone Lake—the largest body of water in America at so great an altitude, 7,731 feet—for irrigation. That would have made it a draw-down reservoir, with results to its beauty that we can imagine but do not like to visualize. In his 1919 report, Mather wrote: "Is there not some place in this great Nation of ours where lakes can be preserved in their natural state; where we and all generations to follow us can enjoy the beauty and charm of mountain waters in the midst of primeval forests? The country is large enough to spare a few such lakes and beauty spots. The Nation has wisely set apart a few national parks where a state of nature is to be preserved. If the lakes and forests of these parks cannot be spared from the hand of commercialization, what hope can there be for the preservation of any scenic features of the mountains in the interest of posterity?"

The story of the years-long attempt by Ralph Henry Cameron, onetime Senator from Arizona, to keep the Grand Canyon region from being adequately developed as a park is too long to tell here. Mining claims were the chief basis of Cameron's power, and only the Supreme Court was able finally to polish him off.

There are always some people who want to mine in the parks, cut timber, graze cattle, build ski lifts and aerial tramways, turn into four-lane superhighways the roads that now are quiet and self-effacing and built

so that those who drive them can see in peace and relaxation what they came to see. There is constant pressure to develop resort and recreational facilities which could not be placed in any park without impairing it for the present as well as for future generations. Such facilities, moreover, are not needed in the parks; they exist in abundance outside, in hundreds of resort areas as well as on most reclamation lakes and to a limited degree in the national forests.

Mr. President, that is the end of the quotation I shall read from Mr. Knopf. I cite it merely to show what a very distinguished representative American thinks of this basic issue.

WOMEN'S CLUBS URGE CONSERVATION OF SCENIC WONDERS

Mr. President, before I conclude, I wish to say this issue is important to many Americans. I now hold in my hand a telegram from a very beloved lady in my own State, Mrs. Marion T. Weatherford, of Arlington, Oreg. She is conservation chairman of the General Federation of Women's Clubs of the United States. She supports the upper Colorado project, but urges deletion of the Echo Park plan.

I also have before me a telegram from Howard Zahniser, Washington representative of the Council of Conservationists. His telegram is along the same general theme. I ask unanimous consent that both telegrams be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ARLINGTON, OREG., *April 19, 1955.*

Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Urge you to delete Echo Park Dam from Senate bill 500.

MRS. MARION T. WEATHERFORD,
Conservation Chairman,
General Federation of Womens Clubs.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 17, 1955.*

Hon. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The upper Colorado storage project, S. 500, is scheduled for Senate action today, Monday, April 18. This bill includes the unnecessary location of a dam, the Echo Park Dam, in the Dinosaur National Monument. This dam would destroy the natural beauty of the scenic wild canyons of this monument and would set a dangerous precedent. Millions of Americans are relying on you to take the Echo Park Dam out of this bill and thus protect the national park system from invasion by dams.

HOWARD ZAHNISER,
Washington Representative,
Council of Conservationists.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, it is not a particularly pleasant task for a freshman Senator, who has been a Member of this body for less than 4 months, to oppose his views to those of such distinguished Members as the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and many other outstanding Members of this body. However, this is a stand which means a great deal to me. It was a part of my general philosophy long before I entered politics. My wife and I share it together. If anyone will take the trouble to do so—although I am sure no one will, because people have more urgent things to do—he could see many articles, listed in Readers' Guides, which I have written, and which have been published in leading periodicals, setting forth the definite conviction that there should be no commercial development—whether by private industry or by the Federal Government or by any other unit of government—in our national parks or national monuments. I have adhered to that philosophy, whether it affects the regions represented by other Senators or whether it affects the region I represent, as a United States Senator from the State of Oregon.

PROJECT SUPPORTED IN GENERAL—SAVE FOR ECHO PARK

Mr. President, I have tried to be fair about this matter. When I made the motion that the Echo Park proposal be eliminated from the pending bill—which motion I made as a member of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs—I did not do so in opposition to the entire upper Colorado storage project. Indeed, my name is signed to the majority report; it is signed as one of the supporters of that project. My dissent applies only to Echo Park. I think the other Senators know that; and I have made that position abundantly clear, not only here today, but also in speeches and writings which have taken place off the floor of this Chamber.

Mr. President, I say to the Senators who are supporting the upper Colorado project that I urge upon them this position: Some day, perhaps, as our vast Nation develops, not only in the intermountain region, but everywhere else, it may be necessary to flood the Dinosaur National Monument, in order to obtain kilowatts costing even 6 mills per kilowatt-hour, and to get water storage. It may even be necessary to cut down the trees in the Olympic National Park, if we then have come to the end of our timber supply everywhere else. It may be necessary to flood out the Lochsa Wilderness area and the Selway Wilderness area, and to flood out Glacier National Park. It may be necessary to take water from Yellowstone Lake to irrigate land when we are near the end of our food supply, as the Senator from New Mexico prophesies might happen some day. I agree with him that despite our present food surplus, this eventually could occur, as this vast Nation increases so rapidly in population. But I say to Senators who are sponsoring the upper Colorado project, "Do this last, when every other single kilowatt has been developed, when every other canyon which can be filled with water has been filled with water. Develop Echo Park at the very last. Wait until the end of all our other resources to flood out this magnificent scenic area and to breach our national park system." I say that to Senators, just as I have said to those in the lumber industry in the Northwest—and the lumber industry is still the basic industry in my region—"When every other tree has been felled and there is not another stick of timber left, then cut down the trees in the Olympic National Park, but not one day before then."

So I announce in conclusion that it is my very firm belief that the Senate should pass Senate bill 500, providing for the upper Colorado storage project, but that we definitely should eliminate the authorization for Echo Park Dam in order to preserve the integrity of our national park system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wish briefly to discuss some of the economic implications and aspects of the pending legislation.

It is fair to say that in my judgment the economic and financial feasibility of the program proposed by S. 500 is open to serious question. Even the limited plan of development recommended by the Interior Department has been challenged on the ground it would require a tremendous subsidy in the form of interest payments added to the national debt. The justifications for the more ambitious and comprehensive plan embodied in the bill, by reason of the amendments recommended to the Senate by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs are even more difficult to accept.

The findings of feasibility are achieved by a very novel approach to the problem of reclamation projects.

The novel bookkeeping used to justify the projects in this bill acknowledges that the agricultural lands to be served by the participating projects cannot bear the costs that would have to be charged if the established repayment formula for irrigation projects should be applied. This is true even in the case of the 11 new participating projects recommended by the Reclamation Bureau. It is even more true as regards the 22 other units the committee saw fit to add.

The Interior Department figures show that $164,702,600 of the construction cost of $304,356,000 for the participating projects it proposed would be repaid by revenues from sale of power generated at the six main dams. The dependence upon sale of hydroelectric-energy is even more pronounced when the projects added by the committee are examined. The 22 additional units would cost $569,925,800. Irrigation water users would repay only $73,165,700 and $492,983,300 of the reimbursable outlay is expected to come from power revenues.

This means that if the Federal Treasury ever is be reimbursed for the repayable portion of the outlay of $874,281,800 for the 33 participating projects contemplated by this bill it will have to collect $657,685,900 through sale of electricity. The repayment by agricultural water users would be less than one-eighth of the expenditure to build the works which would put water on their land.

Two of the participating projects would provide municipal and industrial water. From these, San Juan-Chama and Central Utah, the repayments would be increased by an estimated $72,275,000. Even including this figure, the total return by water users would be only $180,487,200 toward an investment of $874,281,800, or less than 22 percent.

The percentage of cost to be repaid by irrigators varies amazingly. It ranges from 1 percent in the case of the Ohio Creek unit, estimated to cost $3,402,000,

to 100 percent for the small Woody Creek unit, which would require an outlay of merely $177,700.

The repayment by water users ought to be vital to consideration of this legislation. Federal money is being sought on the grounds these projects will carry out the principles and aims of the Reclamation Law of 1902. The analysis demonstrates that the repayment ability of the irrigators on the 22 units added by the committee is only 13.8 percent overall.

Another test of financial soundness is the actual cost of putting water on the lands to be served. For the 22 projects added by the committee this figure is $680 per acre just to get water where it can be used. For the 11 more carefully surveyed and planned units recommended by the Interior Department, the cost would be $410 per acre. There is a question whether an average cost of $545 to get water to land where irrigators can repay such small fractions is an economically feasible expenditure.

The participating projects can be justified only by using a rubber yardstick. The construction cost in terms of land to be served ranges from $60 per acre on the Woody Creek unit to $1,530 per acre on the Navajo unit.

Uncertainty about economic feasibility extends beyond the participating projects. The soundness of some of the major storage dams and hydroelectric plants can be questioned on the basis of Interior Department reports.

I recall, for example, that during the hearings some discussion occurred with respect to the background of Glen Canyon, and the feasibility of that particular project. On page 108 of the hearings on Senate bill 500 I quoted from a letter which the present Secretary of the Interior had written to a citizen of my State. I wish now to quote from that letter. The Secretary wrote:

"MY DEAR MR. BROWER: On October 21, 1954, you were informed that further reply would be made to your inquiries of September 28, 1954, addressed to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Reclamation, concerning the effect of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir upon the Rainbow Bridge National Monument. We now have the necessary information from the field to complete that reply.

"It is our intention to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the Rainbow Bridge National Monument from waters of the proposed Glen Canyon Reservoir and to ask Congress to provide for such protection in the authorizing legislation. Cooperative studies are underway by the field offices of the Bureau of Reclamation and the National Park Service to determine the best means of providing this protection, and to date these studies have revealed no unsurmountable problems. The topography of the area surrounding the monument indicates that a barrier dam 1 mile below the natural arch and outside the monument would provide adequate protection. Details of such a plan will require extensive study and are not available at this time."

On the basis of data available at the time of writing the 1950 report on Colorado River storage project and participating projects, a 700-foot dam (580 feet above stream level) at Glen Canyon was the maximum height which met the criteria of economy, safety of the structure, and adequate protection of the Rainbow Natural Bridge. Subsequent to writing the 1950 report on the Colorado River storage project, the Bureau conducted grouting tests in the drift tunnels driven 50 or 60 feet into each canyon wall of the Glen Canyon Dam site. Also, special bearing tests of 6-inch cores and large fragments of the foundation materials were made in the Bureau's Denver laboratory. The poorly cemented and relatively weak condition of the materials in comparison with the foundations common to most high dams has given the engineers who prepared the preliminary designs of the dam some concern as to the competency of the foundation to support any structure higher than 700 feet. Experiments to improve the strength of the foundation through a chemical grouting process were unsuccessful. These are the geological reasons why Commissioner W. A. Dexheimer made his statement in Denver about the limitation on the height of the proposed Glen Canyon Dam.

Following congressional authorization, more intensive studies will be made of the foundation conditions and of the Bureau's preliminary design to secure information for the preparation of plans and specifications for construction of the Glen Canyon Dam. If such intensive studies indicate the advisability of modifying the present selected height of dam, appropriate changes will be made in the designs prior to construction.

Mr. President, some of us on the committee, who are admittedly not experts in the technical and professional fields, assuredly possess the right to have some concern when the Secretary of the Interior indicates in a letter that his professional advisers feel some anxiety with respect to one of the major projects involved in the proposed legislation.

Mr. President, let me cite, as an instance, the Curecanti project. That is one of the key structures to be built only after plans are reviewed by the Department, and after the Secretary has certified to Congress and the President that he is convinced the benefits will exceed the costs.

The Reclamation Bureau report on the Curecanti unit, according to the printed hearings, says that "detailed studies are necessary to refine the economic scale of development and to confirm the present reconnaissance appraisal."

Another major structure to be built only after further investigation is similarly doubtful as to feasibility. This is the Juniper Dam, which the committee substituted for the original proposal to build a major structure and powerplant at Cross Mountain. The Reclamation Bureau told the committee that the combined Juniper and Little Cross Mountain units would be "less attractive for power development than the large single Cross Mountain unit" which was dropped from the original plan.

Another question can be raised about Juniper. The Reclamation Bureau has failed to come up with any estimate of revenues from the Juniper powerplant, although it includes in the cost figures an item of $4,584,000 for generating equipment, and another of $1,250,000 for transmission lines, and says the hydroelectric output will be 125 million kilowatt-hours annually. Apparently the Interior Department has some reservations about the marketability of the power from this plant.

Mr. President, again I wish to refer to the hearings before the committee, at page 232. Forty lines of type are devoted to a description of the Juniper project, upon which there is no kind of feasibility report whatever.

There is considerable doubt whether the demand for energy from the six big units will be as great as sponsors of the development believe will be the case. Since the feasibility of the whole program depends so much on power revenues, I want to point out that the record made by the Interior Committee does little to remove this uncertainty whether the sales will bring in the tremendous amounts expected, or the $1,566,838,200 shown in Bureau reports as prospective income from power sales.

The price which will be charged for energy from these units will be 6 mills per kilowatt hour. This hardly can be called low-cost power, when compared with rates of 2 mills for Hoover Dam power and 2.5 mills for Columbia Basin power. The Reclamation Bureau acknowledges that in two cases, Curecanti and Flaming Gorge, "a power rate of more than 6 mills would be required for these units to repay their construction cost in 50 years at 2.5 percent interest."

The difference between the financing proposed for the Upper Colorado River project and the first development in the Lower Basin, Hoover Dam, is startling. Before any work was started on Hoover Dam, firm contracts had been negotiated for sale of power. The private utilities operating in the Upper Basin have told the committee merely that they are ready to take large blocks providing the price is right.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. KUCHEL. I would prefer not to yield until I have concluded my remarks, which will be within 3 or 4 minutes.

On the question of feasibility, I want to point out that according to the principal spokesman for the upper basin utility companies water is needed more than power. In addition, according to this witness before the committee, the market is much thinner, with only an average of 3 persons per square mile as compared with a national population density of 51.

David Moffatt, vice president of Utah Power & Light Co., testified that the upper basin is "one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world. The potential thermal power resources of this area stagger the imagination." He qualified his offer to take large blocks of power by saying the energy must be "reasonably competitive with present or future generating costs."

On this point, I quote from page 312 of the hearings, Mr. Moffatt testified:

We believe that the financial feasibility of the project depends upon the sale to private utilities of the power output of the project plants not contracted for by such customers as may be entitled to preference and that such sales should be made at the powerplants or along the backbone transmission tie line upon terms such as that the cost of project power will not exceed the cost of power from alternate sources.

The proponents of the bill maintain there is an assured market for the hydroelectricity to be produced. Yet Mr. Moffat said:

We are willing to buy the entire output provided the plants are put in on a schedule in consonance with the load requirements of the area. If too many of the units were put

in at one time, of course, we could not contract to buy all of that at one time.

Furthermore, Mr. Moffat said in response to an inquiry that no tentative contracts have been worked out and the companies have only discussed prospective purchases with the Interior Department.

The doubts about economic feasibility as it relates to power revenues can be illustrated by a quotation from the testimony of Mr. Moffat. He told the committee:

> Electric power from this project is not a necessity; it can be used and that is our principle for cooperation. * * * I do wish to reemphasize that what we need in our area is water.

Since the construction of these dams might undermine the financial structure of the existing lower basin projects, I must emphasize the contrast between the conditions which preceded building of Hoover Dam and those in which the projects proposed in this bill might be constructed. I will quote the testimony of Ben Griffith, president of the Board of Water and Power Commissioners of the City of Los Angeles. He told the committee:

> California * * * succeeded in obtaining congressional approval of the Boulder Canyon project. But not, it must be noted, until the city of Los Angeles, through its department of water and power, and other California agencies, had underwritten the entire cost of its construction by obligating itself to purchase the energy generated at such a price as would amortize the Government's investment and pay 4—later reduced to 3—percent interest.

There are a few other items of testimony that are of minor significance but have the effect of heightening uneasiness about statements this program is economically feasible. I wish to cite some statements from Reclamation Bureau reports. According to the hearings, it is assumed that sufficient water can be made available to supply higher lands in the Grand Mesa project but if this assumption is wrong the development could be "considerably less desirable economically than indicated."

Bureau admitted that payments by water users on Tomichi Creek will not be sufficient to pay operation and maintenance costs and replacement. The plans for the Eagle Divide unit may need to be modified "to provide the greatest degree of economic justification." These comments relate to projects we are being asked to approve with a condition that before any work is done they will be brought back to Congress for further authorization.

Of the 39 separate works enumerated in this bill, formal feasibility reports exist only for 14 at this stage. There is 1 partial report on 2 units and a report subject to review on a 17th. In the light of these facts, it is exceedingly difficult to see how the sponsors of this program can maintain as they do on page 13 of the majority report that "the Colorado River storage project and participating projects plan is financially sound."

Mr. President, as I stated yesterday, and wish to repeat today, as a Member of the United States Senate I desire to cast my vote in favor of proposed legislation which will be of benefit to the States in the upper Colorado River Basin, and, indeed, to the benefit of all the States of the American Union, but I think I have a duty to recall that when we dealt with problems concerning Hoover Dam, we followed one yardstick and made the people of that area guarantee in advance that they would reimburse the Government of the United States for all costs, and I think I have a duty to point out that a different yardstick has been followed in this instance. It seems to me that the Department of the Interior ought to give the Senate committee and the Members of the Senate a complete feasibility report upon the project, and that we should follow with reference to this proposed legislation exactly the practice followed in days gone by, and on that basis, not in advance of a departmental determination of feasibility, the Congress could then proceed in an orderly fashion and determine on the merits of the report whether we should pass authorizing legislation.

Mr. President, those are some of the views which I wished to present today; and in view of the comments I made yesterday and today, I shall tomorrow offer some amendments to the bill.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I had expected to ask to be recognized at this time, but I yield that privilege to my senior colleague.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] has told me that he has a very short statement he wishes to make at this time, and I should like to extend him that courtesy if, by unanimous consent, I shall not lose my place on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Senator from Wyoming may proceed.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, at the outset, let me thank the Senator from Utah for his kindness in yielding at this time. It so happens that I have an engagement early this evening and it is necessary for me to leave the floor very shortly.

I should like to say, Mr. President, that the REA's in my State are finding themselves in great difficulty in obtaining sufficient power to satisfy their needs. As a matter of fact, two groups of REA's, one in the southeastern section of my State and another in the northeastern section, are presently endeavoring to obtain a loan for a plant to generate electricity so they can have available a sufficient volume to meet the needs of their subscribers. In both cases they are required to pay an amount in excess of that quoted by the distinguished junior Senator from California. So I have no reason to doubt the veracity of the statement furnished by the Bureau of Reclamation that power companies in the upper Colorado River Basin area will take all the power which can be produced at the various sites involved in the project.

Mr. President, the great State of Wyoming falls like a saddle astride the top of the Continental Divide. We are blessed with an abundance of water. It flows from our mountains in all directions. The snow that is packed on our mountain tops in the wintertime and the rain that falls on the hills of Wyoming in the summertime contribute tremendously to the welfare of each of our neighboring States. Sometimes our water comes down in a soft and gentle fashion for the accommodation of man, and at other times it rushes down in terrific torrents and wreaks destruction, devastation, and death on its march to the sea.

The Colorado River rises high in the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, and its major tributary, the Green River, rises in the high mountains of Wyoming. These mountain streams are formed on that pyramid which forms the backbone of North America. The Colorado River cuts deeply into the living rock, gouging out literally thousands of spectacular canyons.

Water, when controlled, can be one of man's greatest assets, yet when uncontrolled, it can be a terrifying liability of devastating force. Congress long ago determined to do something about our water problem. And so it was, Mr. President, that Congress in its wisdom set up some very definite water policies. The Congress determined to control the water where there was too much, and to save and conserve it where there was too little. The twin programs of flood control and reclamation have been the accepted policy of the country for many years. In the long run probably as much money has been spent for one as the other. Both are sound policies in the public interest.

Reclamation is the cornerstone upon which the hopes and the aspirations of our Mountain States are built. It is the hallmark upon which our progress is based. The growth of the western empire depends largely upon the wise use of our water resources. We want to make water serve as many masters as possible and to use it time after time. We want to use it to produce power not once but many times.

About $2.4 billion has been spent on Federal reclamation projects in the 17 Western States in the last half century. But, Mr. President, the crops produced on these lands have brought to the farmers over $8 billion. Reclamation has poured thousands of dollars into the pockets of not only the farmers, businessmen, and manufacturers, but also large sums in the form of taxes into county, State, and national treasuries. In 1952 nearly 7 million irrigable acres under Federal reclamation works produced a little less than a billion dollars worth of crops. Our reclamation States have been helped immeasurably by the new wealth created by these projects. The tax base has been broadened and our economy has been placed on a sound basis. The irrigated farms of the West produce crops that do not compete to any large extent with crops grown elsewhere in the country. The steadily expanding population of the West has created a market not only for its own agricultural products but those grown in other areas. Some people may say that we have more irrigated lands than the country needs. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, the 5½ million acres of irrigated lands only offset our losses in

farmlands through soil erosion and depletion.

Federal tax revenues since 1916 from Federal reclamation areas now stand at more than $3 billion. This sum alone exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all our federally constructed projects to date.

The construction of the upper Colorado River project will signal the development of the last big water hole in the mountain west. The Colorado River compact, negotiated nearly a third of a century ago, is now known as "the law of the river." Under it the upper States are bound to deliver to the lower States at Lee Ferry 75 million acre-feet in continuing 10-year periods. There is the sticker. The upper States cannot deliver the water unless dams are built to conserve and store floodwaters in wet years so that delivery of water to the lower States can be made during dry years. And another thing, big dams and powerplants must be constructed on the main stem of the river to supply badly needed power which, in turn, will produce the revenue to make the project pay out.

Mr. President, we are here today knocking at the door of Congress with a plan of action looking toward the development of the immense water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin States. The project is sound and feasible. By and large, Mr. President, the passage of this bill will serve as a guarantee to the people of these sovereign States that they will not be deprived of their heritage to use the waters bestowed upon them by a beneficent Creator. It will serve as an insurance policy protecting them against the loss of the right to use their rightful share of their own water.

The Colorado River storage project consists of a team of dams, reservoirs, and powerplants to be constructed in conformance with the compacts and the Mexican Treaty. The bill would authorize storage units at Glen Canyon, Echo Park, Curecanti, Juniper, Navajo, and Flaming Gorge.

The Flaming Gorge Dam would be a concrete structure 440 feet high, costing $82 million. It would store 3,940,000 acre-feet of water and would produce 72,000 kilowatts of power. That dam would be located 2 miles south of the Wyoming line just above the junction of the Green River and Henry's Fork in Utah. The reservoir behind Flaming Gorge Dam would back up the water to within 3 miles of Green River in my State.

I can say to my distinguished friend from California that all the power will be needed and used very readily in the towns of Green River and Rock Springs, in my State.

The 12 initial participating projects also authorized are supported by reports showing their economic and engineering feasibility. Except for approximately 3 percent allocated to recreation the upper Colorado River storage project is self-liquidating. The costs assigned to power features will be repaid, with interest, in less than 50 years. The costs assigned to irrigation will be repaid, without interest, by the water users within their ability to repay and the balance will be repaid out of power revenues.

Now, Mr. President, let me take a few moments to mention the Wyoming projects. Under the 1948 compact, Wyoming was allotted 1,043,000 acre-feet of water each year. Wyoming now uses about 248,000 acre-feet, and thus 795,000 acre-feet will be available for new uses each year.

As previously mentioned, the participating projects in our State are the Seedskadee, Lyman, and LaBarge. A fourth project, the Eden project, was authorized in 1940 and is now under construction.

The Seedskadee project, largest of the Wyoming group, is located about 35 miles east of Kemmerer. It will irrigate more than 60,000 acres of virgin land located along both sides of the Green River between the mouth of Fontenelle Creek and the town of Green River. The Seedskadee project appears to present the best opportunity for a substantial development of new land in southwestern Wyoming, if not in the whole upper Colorado River Basin.

The LaBarge project includes approximately 7,600 acres of land that will be irrigated by diverting flows of the Green River at a point between Big Piney and LaBarge.

The Lyman project would provide supplemental water for irrigation of approximately 40,000 acres of land along Blacks Fork, now badly in need of late season water. The type of farming on Wyoming's participating projects is limited by climatic conditions. Because of relatively high altitudes, the crops grown will be largely forage and small grains. The construction of these four participating Wyoming units will bring water to 79,390 acres of land for the first time, and supplemental water to 49,900 acres presently under irrigation. The Eden project, north of Rock Springs, involves construction of a 40,000 acre-foot storage reservoir on the Big Sandy and will impound 40,000 acre-feet of water and will irrigate 10,660 acres of new land and supply water for nearly that much more of irrigated lands.

Mr. President, I was very pleased to see the Sublette and Savery-Pot Hook added as additional participating projects with construction to commence when feasibility reports are made and authorization by the Congress is obtained. The Sublette project is located in Sublette County. It will provide water for 72,000 acres of new lands and supplemental water for 12,000 acres of presently irrigated lands. The lands are located along the Green and New Fork Rivers. The project includes three reservoirs, namely, Kendall, Burnt Lake, and Boulder Lake, and a 2,200 kilowatt powerplant.

Kendall Reservoir site is located about 100 miles upstream from the Seedskadee project lands. Studies of development possibilities of the Kendall Reservoir have disclosed that a revised plan can be developed for the Seedskadee project which would give a greater economic utilization of the available land and water resources. By providing storage at Kendall Reservoir site some 15,810 acres of additional land in the Seedskadee project area can be served.

By using surplus flows of streams in the Little Snake River, the Savery-Pot Hook project will provide additional water for 13,000 acres presently irrigated and water for 18,000 acres of new lands. The project lands are near the Colorado-Wyoming line and located in both States.

Mr. President, in the long run the yardstick by which you can measure the growth and development of our section of the country is in the amount of water that can be and is applied to our dry lands and, secondly, the volume of power that can be generated for use by industries now located in the area and that may be attracted to our country.

It is true that this is a large project. Certainly it will cost a lot of money, but it will be under construction for more than a quarter of a century, with the appropriations spread over a long period of time. More important, Mr. President, it will pay its own way.

By building this project the people in other sections of the country will, in the long run, pay less rather than more taxes. Thousands upon thousands of new taxpayers who will produce new wealth from the soil of this great valley, year after year, will be added to the tax rolls and will bear their full share of the tax burden. We believe in the Christian precept of "live and let live."

Mr. President, this project has the approval of the Bureau of Reclamation, of the Secretary of the Interior and of the President himself. Mr. President, simple justice demands the passage of the proposed legislation.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I attempted to interrupt the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] when he was speaking a few minutes ago about the requirements with respect to contracts and guaranties which were met before Hoover Dam was built.

After some 14 years of experience in working with the reclamation program before I came to Congress, while representing a group of water users, not the United States, I had some opportunity to observe what the United States actually requires before projects are constructed.

We are now at the authorization stage; we are not asking for appropriations at this moment. If the Bureau of Reclamation follows its usual practice, this is what will likely happen: A project may be authorized, and then appropriations will be made and contracts entered into before the project itself will be allowed to go forward. I refer to all the kinds of contracts which are necessary to insure the repayment of the costs of the construction program.

That is precisely what happened in the case of the Provo River project, which I represented as general counsel. All contracts governing the repayment of the entire cost of that project had to be entered into, signed, properly executed, and approved by the Department of the Interior before one shovel full of dirt could be turned in connection with the construction of the project.

What the Senator from California said was that before the construction of a

project in California could proceed it was necessary to enter into a firm and binding guaranty or contract that the costs of the project would be repaid. That is the usual practice. What was being argued, apparently, was that Congress might not proceed with an authorization before contracts were made. I have never heard of a case in which a legal, binding contract could be entered into before a project actually was authorized. United States officials never would be permitted to enter into that kind of contract unless firm authority was granted by Congress. So, as to the objection made with respect to that particular requirement on the part of California, there is no reason on earth why that case was any different from the case we are now considering.

Before Glen Canyon and the other projects can be built, it will be necessary to have definite, concrete, final checks on everything. As to all the participating projects, it will be necessary to have some sort of guaranty or contract for repayment.

Thus, as to storage and power projects on the main stem of the river, much has been learned from the past. Hoover Dam was the first of the great dams to be built. Since that time it has been demonstrated beyond any doubt that there is a power market, and that all the power can be sold. Today there is no longer the gamble that there was in the days when Hoover Dam was authorized. In those days there was much doubt expressed whether the cost of construction ever could be repaid. It was said that the cost was too large; that there would be too much power produced; that there would be no market for the power.

Of course, the Government was then embarking upon a pioneer project and wanted to be secured. Before construction began, after the authorization, it was necessary that there be contracts. That will be the case with respect to the upper Colorado project. I take it for granted that the United States will require the utilities, including the REA's and the other public agencies, who are preference customers, to have contracts for the purchase of power before the dams are actually built.

Under the program the building of the dams is not to proceed with all of them at once. They are to be developed in accordance with the report which I believe has been submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

The development under the program will go forward, as the Engineers have planned, with the construction, first, of Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams. Those dams will have to be built in advance, in order to bring about the filling of the reservoirs with surplus waters. Those reservoirs, it has been estimated, could have been easily filled in past years with surplus water which has been wasted by being allowed to flow into the Gulf of California.

Since a number of years will be required for the filling of the reservoirs once the dams have been constructed, it is important to have that program move ahead; and for that reason Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams will be the first to be built.

After those dams have been constructed, power operations can begin, and the consumers will be able to take the power, thus enabling that program to go forward.

At the same time, some of the smaller participating projects may be started. The Emery project, in eastern Utah, can be begun, as can the Central Utah project. Projects in Wyoming and Colorado can be started, and in New Mexico the building of the Navaho project can proceed.

This is a program which will not call for construction all at once. That point should be kept in mind. This is a program for the future. In my judgment, it will take at least 10 years to build the big dams. My judgment is based on the experience I have had with the Reclamation Bureau and other agencies. Some of the smaller projects can be gotten under way and be finished a little sooner; but the demands upon the Treasury will not be for huge sums in any single year. Construction will be started and will proceed over the years until the final program has been consummated. This may take all the way from 35 years to, I should say, based upon my experience, 50 years.

When the total cost is divided among 4 States, possibly 5, the money which will be appropriated will not be very much per State over that period of time.

All that is necessary to be done, to ascertain how the proposed project will compare with others, is to consider California and note the number of reclamation developments which have been made in the Central Valley, Los Angeles, Sacramento, and in the other sections of the State.

I have been very much in favor of those national investments, although they run into huge sums. I point out to the distinguished junior Senator from California that in the case of the Central Valley projects, there were no contracts of any kind for the repayment of any of the costs before the great dams were built. Those dams were built during the depression; they were started in a hurry. Some of them were begun by the Army engineers and later were turned over to the Bureau of Reclamation to operate. The Bureau went ahead without having contracts for repayment of or guarantee of the construction costs. They do not have contracts even today for the repayment of the costs of that great project.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator is acquainted with the fact, is he not, that the people of California approved legislation to have themselves build the Central Valley projects?

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator mean to buy it?

Mr. KUCHEL. No, sir; to build it. The State legislature of my State enacted legislation to provide for the construction of the Central Valley projects and thereafter, at a referendum election, the people of my State approved the Central Valley legislation, and subsequent to that time, during the depression days, it is true, as the Senator suggests, the Federal Government, of its own motion or ipse dixit, came in and built the Central Valley projects.

Mr. WATKINS. I remember all of that history, but the fact is that California did not go ahead with the construction, and the United States did not require contracts before the construction was started. It is one of the most costly projects in the history of reclamation. The Army engineers also had a hand in its construction.

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

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. The Senator from Utah is my good friend, and he is an able and honorable Member of this body. I do, however, want to suggest, with respect to the Central Valley project, that, from the standpoint of economic feasibility, it is one of the soundest projects in this country. I have figures, which I shall subsequently ask to have printed in the RECORD, which the Department of the Interior prepared.

Mr. WATKINS. I wish to say that the upper Colorado River project is one of the soundest in the country, and probably has been studied more closely than has any other project in the history of the United States. The project will be expensive, and that is one reason why there had to be such extensive study of it. Nature was not so kind to us as it was to the people of southern California.

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

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

Mr. BIBLE. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. If I understood his statement correctly, it was to the effect that the upper Colorado River project will be paid for by 4 or 5 States. Did I understand correctly?

Mr. WATKINS. Yes. The States in which the actual participating projects will be located are Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. One of the storage dams on the main stem of the river will be in a fifth State, Arizona. Of course, we count in the area the State of Nevada, which is close by, with respect to the purchase of power.

Mr. BIBLE. It was the purpose of my question to determine the Senator's thinking as to the sale of power from Glen Canyon. Would the Senator care to elaborate as to whom the power which will be developed at Glen Canyon, which will be the largest of the dams to be constructed in the upper Colorado River, would be sold?

Mr. WATKINS. First I should like to say there are the 4 States I have just mentioned, the upper basin States. Secondly, Nevada is in the area, and there undoubtedly will be power to sell for a long period of time before Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams will be constructed in Arizona, which will be even nearer to Nevada. There is not any doubt that the people of Nevada will be able to obtain power from the project.

Mr. BIBLE. How will that be determined?

Mr. WATKINS. By the Bureau of Reclamation, which will have charge of the operation of the dams.

Mr. BIBLE. Can the Senator indicate the power rate?

Mr. WATKINS. I think the Bureau of Reclamation will be required to get from the customers downstream the same rate it will get from the customers upstream, within the basin States. That will be about 6 mills delivered at the load center; that is, at the market center. Of course, there can be no absolute guaranty of that until the authorization and the construction, but the testimony was that 6 mills will be the approximate market price of the power at the load center.

Mr. BIBLE. Would the Senator care to indicate the duration of the contracts the Secretary would enter into with the public agencies involved?

Mr. WATKINS. I cannot answer that, because I cannot speak for the Bureau of Reclamation and the Government which will be operating the power plants. All I can say is that I have a very strong feeling and belief that no one in that area will be deprived of power before there is other power provided to take its place. If the power should be required in the upper basin, it will never be taken away unless there is other power to take its place.

As the Senator knows, there are other big developments contemplated on the Colorado, at Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon. Even if the project at Bridge Canyon alone were to be built, it would furnish an immense amount of power, which would be easier to transmit to Nevada users.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator yield for a further question?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. Am I correct in understanding that the cost at the load center will be somewhere between 4.2 and 4.7 mills?

Mr. WATKINS. I understand the Engineers arrived at a figure in that neighborhood. I think I know what the Senator has in mind. The situation is very much like that which would obtain in a power company with a half dozen plants. It might have plant A, which would produce power at a certain cost; plant B, which would produce power at a different cost; and perhaps two or three of the plants in its system would produce at rather high cost, but all the power would be sold at one rate. The power would probably be sold at the same rate. In other words, all the power should be pooled and should be sold at one established rate.

Mr. BIBLE. Will the Senator yield for a further question along that line?

Mr. WATKINS. I yield.

Mr. BIBLE. It is my understanding that Glen Canyon will be the first of the projects to be completed, or among the first, as now planned.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it will probably be the first. If not the first, it will be completed at about the same time as Echo Park, if that project should be authorized.

Mr. BIBLE. Between the time Glen Canyon is completed and other dams are completed, will there be the same differential in power cost?

Mr. WATKINS. I think so, because the projects were planned on a comprehensive basis. It was impossible to consider only one unit and say it would be built according to certain costs and standards and say that others would be built under another plan.

Let us get back to the planning work with which the Bureau of Reclamation was confronted. It was a very difficult project to get the water out of the deep canyons, store it, and find some economically feasible way in which it could be used and paid for. So the program had to be operated as one, and the States had to cooperate in order to get a program which would be feasible. We could not plan as has been planned in other projects where the problems were not so difficult, and in which one project could be proposed at a time and completed. We have had to present the whole program, which would take into consideration the highest cost and the lowest cost, and arrive at a feasible program. I do not know what the Bureau which will operate the dams will do. I cannot commit it, as I think the Senator understands.

Mr. BIBLE. I understand.

Mr. WATKINS. I should say the theory would be that even in the beginning the power must be sold at about 6 mills in order that the program may work out.

Mr. BIBLE. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. WATKINS. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that aspect of the question. I know he has a great interest in the project, and that he is watching and following the debate with an eye to the welfare of his State.

I firmly hope we may make plain to the people of the entire Colorado River system the fact that there is only one way we can succeed in building the projects out of the resources which God has given us, and that is to cooperate, to live and let live, as my distinguished friend suggested a while ago.

Mr. President, that brings me to the matter of cooperation in the building of these great projects. I have mentioned the difficulties we have in the upper Colorado. The canyons are deep. There is a steep gradient. Not only is it necessary to build one large storage dam, such as the one that was built at Boulder Canyon, known as Hoover Dam, but it is also necessary to build others. We have to build nine, as I understand, in the beginning, in order to completely regulate and tame that river and store the water which must be used for consumptive purposes in the lower basin States and in the upper basin States. All that must be done before we can really get anywhere with the program. We must tame and regulate the river. That is one of the big problems we have.

By examining the map which has been placed in the rear of the Chamber—a map published by the Bureau of Reclamation, and bearing the title "Colorado River Storage Project and Supporting Projects"—it will be seen that we have, by means of the map, a portrayal of the situation in that area. The Uinta Mountains cross the area. There are a number of streams, beginning with the Strawberry River, which runs into the Duchesne, the Rock Creek, the Lake Fork, the Uinta, and the Ashley Creek, all of which flow into the Green River. Those streams are fed by snows which fall in the winter on that high mountain range which runs east and west, by the way. It does not have sharp peaks and ridges, as does the Wasatch Range, which runs north and south through Utah. But it is a natural watershed. On the north, the water runs into Wyoming. On the east slope, the water runs into Colorado. The water runs into the Green River, from the various short tributaries which come from the mountains.

In order to give to the States in the lower basin the amount of water the compact calls for, it is necessary to build these storage dams. That statement has been repeated so many times that it should now be well established.

The reason for building the storage dams, largely for irrigation purposes, has not been sufficiently emphasized. The water users in Utah, Colorado, and Wyoming must take their water from the higher tributaries of the Colorado River; and before they can take the water, they must be sure that the commitments to the lower-basin States will be fulfilled. In order to do that, it is necessary to build the large dams, such as the one at Glen Canyon. The dam will be built below the Utah border, just above Lee Ferry. Then, going up into the basin, we have the Echo Park, the Flaming Gorge, just over the Utah boundary from Wyoming; and then the Juniper, which was substituted for the Cross Mountain; and the Navaho, in New Mexico, all of which are shown on the map.

When the water is taken from the smaller streams, it will have to be stored again, because the water falls in the wintertime in the form of snow. Some rain falls on those mountains, and seeps into the ground, and comes up later as springs; but the major runoff occurs at the time of the year when very little water can be used for irrigation purposes. The water runs down the steep mountain slopes and the steep canyons and the streams with heavy gradients, and flows into the Green River, and thus down into the Gulf of Southern California. It is necessary to store the water which is in the tributaries. We have to have secondary storage there, in order to hold the water until the time when it is needed.

The big dams on the main Colorado require holdover storage. That is a term which many persons, including some Members of Congress, do not understand, I am sure. Holdover storage means holding over from year to year, from the wet cycle of years to the dry cycle of years, a supply of water sufficient to take care of the needs during the droughts which occur at times. As history shows, there will be a series of wet years, and then a series of dry years. During the dry cycle, the Colorado River becomes a very small stream; and in its natural condition, before any reservoirs at all were built, there was hardly enough water in the Colorado during the

dry cycle or the so-called low-water season, to take care of the commitments to the farms and other areas downstream, which had commitments and priorities by means of early use of the water of that stream.

After Hoover Dam was built, the lower river was regulated; and, of course, that made it possible for the users downstream to obtain a sufficient supply of water. But it did not regulate the water upstream.

By means of a series of exchanges, we can take the water from the dams we build downstream, below where we make our diversions, and send it down for use in the lower basin States; and then we can take a corresponding amount of water out of the tributaries in the higher streams or mountain valleys, and use it on our lands. That is a common practice at present in the West, namely, the exchange of waters. It is about the only way by which we can make such a project work satisfactorily.

A while ago I stated that cooperation is one of our greatest programs in the West. When the pioneers first went into that area, they came into the valleys where small streams were running across the land—for instance, in Utah, to the great Salt Lake. They decided to take out the water, because the land was barren. Instead of having each one take water through his own canal or ditch, leading directly from the stream, they decided to take the water from one canal, with each to take the water in his turn, as the canal passed through or around his land. That meant that the man at the end of the canal would have to pay—if the same system of economics was followed—more than anyone else would pay, because it would cost more to bring the water to his end of the canal than it would cost to bring the water to the land owned by those who would first take water from the canal. They soon found that those who had the advantage of being at the head of the canal, and who would take out the water a short time after it left the rivers or streams, would have to cooperate with the others, and would have to pay an equal part of the cost of taking the water from the stream through the ditch. That is where we learned about cooperation.

I know that at times, strong individuals decided they would take what they wanted from the streams. But if every farmer had done that, there would have been a whole series of canals which would have cut up the land to so great an extent that it would not have been usable. Moreover, enormous amounts of water would have been wasted. The necessities of the situation forced cooperation.

We have followed cooperation, now, and have applied it to the large projects. Today, the States are cooperating in very much the same fashion in which the farmers cooperated in the early times, in connection with the development of their communities. That is an excellent thing. We have combined the resources, and we have planned to pool the water resources which come into full development in the large dams on the main stem; and even in central Utah there is a power situation which can be developed and will go into the common pool.

At any rate, we take the total income from the sale of water and the sale of power, and put the total income into one pool, and from it pay for the cost of the project. We even form local entities known as conservancy districts, which bring into the picture even those who do not use water for irrigation. That situation or system exists at the present time. For instance, in the Weber Basin project, in north-central Utah, a conservancy district has been formed; and it brings in the cities, counties, towns, and irrigation companies. The irrigation companies pay, through assessments; but the districts and towns pay for their water; and even the counties which do not use water from the project will levy and pay taxes to help the project, on the theory that everyone who benefits directly or indirectly from the water, should help pay for it.

So the program is, with respect to all these participating projects, to have the conservancy type of organization provided, so that the contracts will be with the communities, the cities, counties, and town governments, and the taxpayers generally, as well as those who use the water for specific purposes such as irrigation.

It should also be kept in mind that all the people of the States will get the benefit from the use of the water. Most of the people of the States under modern conditions, use power. In a measure, it is correct to say that it does not make any difference, so far as the people are concerned, whether they are billed for the costs on the basis of all power, all water, or simply "power and water," or "water and power." The same people would largely pay both the water costs and the power costs. Under those circumstances we cannot understand all the concern for the power users of our State. It is said, "Look at the load the power users have to carry for irrigation. They are going to pay a large percentage of the cost of these projects, at least that part which is allocated to irrigation. Why should they do that?"

Why should they not do it, if they are willing to do it? That is exactly the situation. They have considered that situation. They say, "We are willing to help. We need the water. We cannot get anywhere without water. Power is of no use to us without water. We cannot build industries in our States without water. We need power as well." It so happens that by reason of the combination of the two and the building of the big storage dams to store water primarily so that we can complete our commitments downstream and at the same time have water for irrigation and other important uses, we can also, as an incident thereto, produce great quantities of electric energy.

I wish to say something about a situation which has been described a number of times by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER]. They say that this is one of the most expensive places to produce power. I will not undertake to argue that point with them. I think actually, when we consider the increases in costs which have occurred in recent years, power can probably be produced as cheaply under this project as it can be produced in some other areas. But after all is said and done, we cannot move, and do not want to move, to the Columbia River Valley. We do not want to move to the Missouri River Valley. We are not anxious to go down to California, even with all the advantages of climate. We want to live where we have established our homes—in our own States. We know that there are vast quantities of raw materials, such as zinc, lead, copper, chemicals, uranium, coal, oil, oil shale, and numerous other minerals and natural resources in that area, which will require a great deal of refining before they can be used. That work can be done only by having an abundant supply of water, an abundant supply of labor, and an abundant supply of power.

We have lived there before, on the basis of paying more than 6 mills for our power. We can still continue to do it, and I believe we can compete with other areas which have cheaper power. It is unfortunate that our power in that area will cost more, but that is the way it is. That is where we want to live. We want the same rules to apply as are applied in other areas of the United States, and we want to receive the same benefits as have been received by other areas of the United States, such as the Columbia River area, southern California, northern California, and other areas. All we ask is that the program be not changed, now that it is our turn to receive some benefits.

Other areas have received large benefits in past years, and the people in those areas now tell us how cheaply they obtained their power. It may make us feel sad because we cannot duplicate their experience upstream. At any rate, we are willing to try. Our record is good. We have been repaying the costs of the smaller projects according to contracts and we know we can do it in connection with the larger program. Four States are involved. Some power will be sold in Nevada, and possibly some in California. We know that under that arrangement, with what we can pay for water and power, we will pay the cost of the entire project and all its units. If need be we can take care of it in the upper basin States. We shall have firm commitments for the purchase of power and for the repayment of costs of participating projects before construction actually is under way. I am sure the Bureau of Reclamation will go ahead with the other program. There will be firm contracts for the purchase of power from powerplants on the main stream, and there will be firm contracts with the conservancy districts for the repayment of other costs, in accordance with the overall program.

I wished to explain that situation, because there has been much misunderstanding. I feel that those who discuss the problem are sincere. There must be a misunderstanding, when they try to make it appear that we cannot carry that burden.

The Bureau of Reclamation—at least, Region 4, with which we are acquainted, and which has developed this program—

is one of the most conservative groups of public officials I have ever worked with. I have worked with them for 14 years. I know how conservative they are. They will want contracts before construction begins. They want to be sure that the costs of the projects will be repaid, and that a heavy burden will not be cast upon the rest of the United States.

I have before me a series of questions and answers with respect to specific problems which have been raised in the debate. I know that these questions bother some Members of Congress.

I read:

1. Water supply: Why is the Colorado River so difficult to control and why has its development been so long delayed?

(1) The Colorado is one of the longest rivers in the United States. It drains the most rugged topography. In the upper basin, the canyons along the main stream are so deep that direct divisions are impossible except on the tributaries. Basin-wide development is mandatory because the entire river must be put under control before its waters can be made available for consumptive use at the time they are needed.

2. Why does the river have to be controlled before its waters can be made available for consumptive use?

I have partially answered that question.

(1) The Colorado River is a snow-fed stream.

(2) Its maximum flow occurs during the snow-melting period.

(3) This period of high flow does not coincide with the demand for consumptive use.

(4) The low-water flow occurs during the late summer when the irrigation water requirements are greatest. The high-water flow may be as much as 100 times the low-water flow.

(5) Storage reservoirs are necessary to hold the early runoff from snow melt so that it will be available for late summer use.

(6) The total annual discharge of the Colorado varies widely from year to year. A high year may be as much as six times a low-water year.

(7) In order to fully utilize the entire flow of the river it is necessary to put the water available during wet years into large holdover storage reservoirs so that it will be available for use during the dry years.

3. What do you mean by consumptive and nonconsumptive uses of water?

Strange as it may seem, some persons are in doubt on that question.

(1) Uses which consume the body of the water such as domestic and irrigation are consumptive uses.

(2) Uses which do not consume the water such as power generation, navigation, recreation, and cooling are nonconsumptive uses.

4. What is the primary objective of the storage portion of the proposed project?

By that I assume is meant the five main stream reservoirs on the Colorado River, the Green, Yampa, Gunnison, Grand, and San Juan, which run into the main stream.

(1) To provide water for consumptive use by direct diversion or by exchange at the time and in the quantities needed to meet the demands for irrigation and other consumptive uses.

(2) Such storage is mandatory in order that the wet season flow may be held over to the dry season and the flow during wet years held over to meet the consumptive use demands during the dry years.

(3) Regulation of the river flow by storage is also necessary to insure delivery of water to the lower basin to meet the requirements of the Colorado River compact and at the same time permit the consumptive uses apportioned to the upper basin by the same compact.

5. How can the storage of water in Glen Canyon and Echo Park reservoirs, for example, supply water for consumptive use in the upper basin participating projects?

(1) Water may be used by direct diversion out of Echo reservoir by pumping, to replace water owned by lower users in Utah which is intercepted on the high tributaries in the Uinta mountains for diversion by gravity to the Bonneville Basin.

That fact has not been sufficiently emphasized in connection with the Echo Park project. Echo Park is tied in intimately with the use of the Central Utah project, at least in its advanced stages, although perhaps not in its initial stages. If we take water from the Uinta Mountains, which runs into streams which flow into the Colorado River, we must have water to supply to the present users of the waters of the tributaries in that basin. In order to do that, probably it will be necessary to take water out of Echo, and it may have to be necessary to pump it from Echo.

Two alternate programs have been suggested. One is to bring in water through a tunnel from Flaming Gorge. The other is to take it out of Echo. It may be that when the final program is set up it will be found to be cheaper to take it out of Echo by pumping it.

That is one of the strong reasons why Echo is necessary to irrigation. All of these dams would be built for the primary purpose of the consumptive use of water. Otherwise we could not consume the water from the other stream, because it would run into the Colorado River and on down below to satisfy the rights of the people there.

(2) Water out of Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs will be used to replace water diverted to the participating projects from the high tributaries of the Colorado, which water during periods of low flow before regulation belonged to water users in the lower basin.

(3) Therefore, water out of the storage reservoirs in the upper basin will be used consumptively, by exchange, for irrigation, domestic, and industrial uses.

6. It has been said that the proposed project is a power project and that the production of power is the primary objective. Where does power fit into this program?

(1) Power is an incident, and a very important incident, in the proposed project, but not the primary objective.

(2) It is energy resulting from water, falling from the high watersheds to the valley floor.

(3) This energy is made available at the storage dams which provide river regulation and water for consumptive use.

(4) It would be a gross waste of a resource not to use it. Furthermore, this energy resource will provide revenues, not only to pay for power features with interest, but to help pay the costs of the participating irrigation projects.

(5) Summarizing, the proposed storage project will:

(a) Provide water, controlled and regulated, for consumptive use in the upper basin States without interfering in any way with water rights in the lower basin.

(b) Provide for longtime holdover storage to make water running off during wet years available for use during dry years.

(c) Provide power, the revenues from which pay costs of power facilities with interest and help pay the irrigation costs.

I might mention the fact that storage in Glen Canyon and Echo Park may be carried over for a period of as long as 25 years, at least in part. That is what makes those dams so necessary. They are called key dams, and they are that, because of their qualities for holding large quantities of water with the lowest evaporation cost.

7. Why was Hoover Dam built?

We in the West have always assumed that everyone knew the answer to that question. However, in discussion with people in the East and with Members of Congress, I find that many people still do not know why it was built. I will give the reasons why I believe it was built:

(1) To provide for river regulation and flood control, so as to store the water and prevent floods, and to store the water that was running into Salton Sea and destroying the farming areas in that area.

(2) It was not built primarily to provide water for consumptive use or power.

(3) Once the river was controlled, however, the water from Lake Mead became available for both consumptive uses (irrigation and domestic) and for power.

(4) The consumptive users of this water pay nothing for the cost of river regulation and control which made their consumptive use developments possible.

By that I mean that the people who get the benefit of having water in the low seasons do not pay anything for the cost of the storage. That is why it is possible for some persons to talk about the low costs in Imperial Valley and Coachella Valley, and other valleys. They have not had to pay for the storage.

(5) The power from Hoover Dam is sold at very low rates. We hear a great deal about the cost of power being 1½ mills for emergency power, and probably 2½ mills for firm power.

(6) Water for consumptive use and power resulting from the Hoover Dam construction have made the remarkable growth of southern California possible.

In that connection it should be stated that the cost of the power that has been quoted is the cost at the busbar, at the generator. It has cost Los Angeles and the other power districts a considerable amount of money to build the transmission lines, which is one of the heaviest costs connected with a power investment. Los Angeles does not get its power at 2½ mills. Los Angeles pays a little more than that. That fact has not been brought out too clearly.

8. Why it is necessary to plan for a basin-wide development?

(1) The full development of the Colorado River is totally dependent upon storage reservoirs to make early season flow available during the late season of any one year and to hold water running off the watersheds during wet years so that it can be made available during dry years.

(2) The widely fluctuating and erratic flow of the Colorado River requires large capacity reservoirs and long time holdover periods.

It should be mentioned that not only are large reservoirs required to store the water, but at Glen Canyon we must have a large capacity for the storage of silt. The Colorado River is a muddy river.

One writer has stated it belches mud all the way down into Mead Lake. It carries a great deal of sediment. It has been estimated that the Glen Canyon construction alone, with the amount allowed for silt control, will extend the life of Hoover Dam 200 years. An extension of 200 years is almost like providing a new dam without cost.

Not one dime is allowed in this measure for the great benefit to be contributed to the lower basin States, particularly the States that get waterpower at the Hoover Dam.

(3) Hoover Dam provided the necessary holdover storage to entirely regulate the river below Hoover Dam.

(4) It will require 9 storage dams to do an equivalent job in the upper basin; of these 9 only 2 are large. The bulk of the storage load must be carried by the Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs and they must be built first.

9. What are the capacities of these two reservoirs and why must they be built first?

I have partly covered that point, but I will give a summary of it:

(1) Echo Park, 6½ million acre-feet; Glen Canyon, 26 million acre-feet.

(2) The lower basin is well along with its development, both consumptive uses and power. The filling of the upper-basin reservoirs must be done without interferring with those rights.

(3) The consumptive uses in the upper basin are now only about 2½ million acre-feet. This leaves 5 million acre-feet per year available for filling upper-basin storage reservoirs without interferring with lower-bason uses.

(4) As consumptive uses upstream increase the water available for filling the reservoirs decreases. If built now, before full consumptive use of water is made in lower basin, additional water would be available for filling, because that water, along with the upper basin's water that is not being used, is going into the sea. It is wasted forever.

10. The annual evaporation losses from Echo Park and Glen Canyon reservoirs are reported to be 613,000 acre-feet. Can this huge loss be justified?

Some Members of the Senate, in discussing that point, have stated that it is a waste of water to store the water behind those dams, because, they have stated, the only reason we are building those dams is for the production of power; therefore, it is a wasting of water to store it for power production, because a great deal of the water is lost by evaporation. Furthermore, it is claimed that the power could be as easily developed by the use of coal, oil, oil shale, or uranium. That is why, they claim, we are wasting all that water. In answer to the question about the evaporation losses, I should like to give this answer:

(1) It is estimated that 12 percent of the water apportioned to the upper basin will be lost through evaporation. This is the price the upper basin has to pay for the opportunity of utilizing the remaining 88 percent of its water resource. No one objects to burning coal or oil because they cannot get 100 percent efficiency out of it.

I do not know of any electric power production plants using oil or coal which have a 100 percent efficiency in the use of their fuels.

(2) No one objected to Lake Mead because it loses 600,00 acre-feet annually by evaporation or because another 600,000 acre-feet annually is lost below Lake Mead in the reservoirs downstream and in the stream itself.

11. What are the power generating capacities at the proposed storage reservoirs?

	Kilowatts
1. Glen Canyon	800,000
2. Echo Park	200,000
3. Juniper	25,000
4. Curricanti	40,000
5. Flaming Gorge	72,000

6. All are small except Echo Park and Glen Canyon.

12. Do the Echo Park and Glen Canyon Reservoirs have to be filled before they can produce power?

(1) No. The greater portion of the power head will be available before a third of the storage capacity is filled.

(2) Building these storage reservoirs now will provide early power revenues and make possible an orderly filling of the storage reservoirs without damage to lower users.

13. Why Echo Park Dam? Why is it so important to the project?

Mr. President, I am going to summarize this case tomorrow. I expect to answer the contention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] that the building of the Echo Park Dam will constitute an invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument and will create a dangerous precedent. I might remark, for the benefit of those who will read the RECORD that on March 28 I presented a fully documented case on the Dinosaur National Monument showing who tried to invade and did invade to a limited extent the water reservations and power reservations made many years before. As the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said in the debate with the Senator from Oregon, the invasion came from the other direction. An effort was made to accomplish an invasion which the President of the United States would not permit when he extended the area from 80 acres to 203,000 acres. Mr. Ickes went along with an agreement with the Federal Power Commission and with the people of the States involved and said there would be no interference with the water program in the areas included in the monument enlargement area. They got together long ago. If Mr. Ickes and Mr. Roosevelt were alive today I am sure they would testify that that was the program.

Now, when the proposals are presented to make effective those water reservations, objection is raised and we are told we are invading the monument. Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Ickes, and the others involved at that time knew exactly what was happening, and there has not been one single piece of evidence presented to meet the challenge which I laid down before the Members of the Congress. There has not been any evidence brought to this body or to the people of the country showing that I was wrong in any way. They did not impeach that record, and they cannot do so.

Mr. President, here is the summary on the Echo Park Dam:

13. Why Echo Park Dam? Why is it so important to the project?

WHY ECHO PARK DAM SITE WAS SELECTED FOR DEVELOPMENT

Here are the principal advantages of including the Echo Park Dam and Reservoir in the Colorado River Storage project plan:

(1) With respect to storage capacity and power generation, Echo Park would be second in size to Glen Canyon in the reservoir system planned for the upper basin.

(2) Evaporation losses per acre-foot of water stored at Echo Park would be less than at any other major storage site in the upper basin.

(3) Construction of Echo Park Reservoir in place of Dewey Reservoir, the best alternative outside of a national monument, would save an estimated 120,000 acre-feet in evaporation losses annually—a significant quantity of water in the arid West.

(4) Echo Park Reservoir, located just below the junction of the Green and Yampa Rivers, would be integrated with the upstream Flaming Gorge and Cross Mountain Reservoirs in regulating flows of the rivers. In addition, it would contribute materially to the feasibility of reservoirs at the Split Mountain and Gray Canyon sites downstream on the Green River.

(5) Use of the Echo Park site is the key to the economic development of the upper end of the upper Colorado River Basin. The site is strategically located with respect to the upstream power market, the proposed system of dams and powerplants, and the basin's many resources awaiting development, such as phosphate rock for fertilizer and chemicals, oil shale, coal, natural sodium carbonate, and many important minerals.

The opponents of Echo Park Dam claim two objections. First, development of the dam would invade the Dinosaur National Monument. Secondly, it would destroy scenery and rapids. Let's review the facts.

Documents show that the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded in 1938 with the understanding that dams could be built in the area. In fact, the Presidential proclamation states that it shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, and that the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904.

Echo Park Reservoir would partially inundate 2 or 3 scenic areas, but in so doing it would make possible boating through the beautiful Lodore and Yampa Canyons by many people—not just the adventurous few who now dare to ride the river. The rapids here would be gone, but there would be plenty left for the daredevil river rider on other stretches of the Colorado River and its tributaries.

Mr. President, there are other questions to which I have prepared the answers. I shall not read them into the RECORD tonight, but I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

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

14. Under article IIIa of the Colorado River compact, 7½ million acre feet annual beneficial consumptive use were apportioned to the upper and lower basins, respectively, with a further provision in IIId that the upper basin States could not deplete the river at Lee Ferry more than 75 million acre-feet each consecutive 10-year period. Based on current streamflow records is there enough water in the river to satisfy article IIId and leave 7½ million acre-feet annually for the upper basin?

Answer. (1) The Colorado River compact, apportioning the beneficial consumptive use of the water between the two basins, is predicated upon regulation and control of the river flow by means of holdover storage reservoirs.

(2) The records of streamflow made by the USGS show an average virgin flow at Lee Ferry of slightly above 15 million acre-feet.

(3) Holdover storage capacity provided in the nine proposed reservoirs (ultimate phase) would be adequate to deliver annually at Lee Ferry not less than 7½ million acre-feet and

leave in the upper basin for beneficial consumptive use 7½ million acre-feet.

(4) 7½ milion acre-feet annually equals 75 million acre-feet every 10 years as per article IIId of the compact.

15. What is the current consumptive use of water in the upper basin?

Answer. (1) Approximately 2½ million acre-feet annually.

(2) Five million acre-feet annually remain to be put to use before full development of compact apportionment is realized in the upper basin.

16. What will the total consumptive use in the upper basin be after the proposed project is built? Will this use interfere with lower basin rights under the compact no matter what the interpretation of the compact by the Supreme Court?

Answer. (1) The total consumptive use after full development of the proposed project will not exceed 4.3 million acre-feet annually. It will take at least 30 years to put this water to use.

(2) The total use leaves 3.2 million acre-feet annually before the full apportionment to the upper basin is used.

(3) Therefore, the construction of the proposed project can in no way jeopardize the rights in the lower basin no matter how the Supreme Court interprets the compact.

17. Will the proposed project make the quality of water unsuitable for use in the lower basin?

Answer. (1) No.

(2) Transmountain diversions take both salt and water out of the basin.

(3) Storage of water precipitates salt with silt and thus reduces the salt content of water in storage about 12 percent.

(4) Based on studies on the Rio Grande River below Elephant Butte Dam and Lake Mead by the Salinity Laboratory (USDA) and studies on Lake Mead recently completed by the USBR and others, the maximum salt content at Lee Ferry cannot exceed 1 ton per acre-foot. Such water is classified by salinity effects as good and equal to or better than that available at the heading of the Alamo Canal diverting water to the Imperial Valley before the construction of Lake Mead.

(5) Julian Hinds, formerly chief engineer of the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, says "Exhaustive studies show that the mineral content under the most unfavorable future conditions will be lower than the average for waters diverted and successfully used in the Yuma and Imperial Valleys prior to the construction of the Hoover Dam.

18. Senator DOUGLAS has said there is a current water shortage at Lake Mead and that, therefore, the upper basin project should not be built. Is this a true statement?

Answer. (1) No. There is no water shortage at Lake Mead.

(2) The level of water in the lake is at the lowest point since the dam was completed. This, however, is not due to a water shortage. It is due to the fact that more water has been taken out of the reservoir to make power than has come in.

(3) At Hoover Dam an acre-foot of water is about equal to a barrel of oil for purposes of power generation. Falling water costs nothing. Oil costs money. Therefore there is an incentive to use water to make power rather than oil. This incentive has overcome judgment and the power head at Hoover Dam has been reduced resulting in a further reduction of power. A depleted reservoir indicates a water shortage. Perhaps this depletion at this time has been deliberate in order to indicate a water shortage.

19. Does the presence of reservoirs in the upper basin jeopardize the water rights in the lower basin?

Answer. (1) No. The Colorado River compact governs the water uses, and the pending legislation provides for integrated administration of the works in the best interests of the parties and the public and the remedies provided for each State in case of controversy.

20. What will be the impact of the proposed project on the agricultural surplus?

Answer. (1) The current agricultural surplus is limited to wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, corn and rice.

(2) Of these, only wheat and corn are grown in the upper-basin States and to a very limited degree. Most of the wheat in these States is grown on dry land, so is not involved; and only a very little corn is produced.

(3) Forage for livestock, some small grains, fruit, vegetables, and sugar beets are the principal crops. These are not in surplus. They are necessary for a balanced diet. They come on the market off season to other parts of the country, and more and more the local market will absorb the entire production.

(4) USDA reports that by 1962, at the present rate of consumption, the production of surplus crops will be in balance with consumption and the surplus will have disappeared.

(5) USDA forecasts a need by 1975 of an additional 115 million equivalent acres of land in production to meet minimum needs.

(6) 70 million of these equivalent acres will come from increased efficiencies of production. 45 million of these acres will have to come from new lands.

(7) The maximum that can be reclaimed from cutover and swamplands is about 21 million acres.

(8) A maximum of 6 million acres of irrigated land can be developed.

(9) It appears that by 1975 there will be a shortage of food supplies.

21. How does cost of installed power capacity at hydro and steam plants compare?

Answer. (1) They are not really comparable. Steam power plants use expendable fuel. The first cost of the boilers and steam turbines are much less expensive than the hydraulic turbines, penstocks, pipelines, and storage or equalizing reservoirs required in hydroelectric plants. Furthermore, dams and storage reservoirs are usually multipupose but the cost is allocated to power alone.

(2) Steam plants use fuel which is expendable. The costs of operation are very much higher. The advantage of lower cost installation is more than offset by the higher operation costs.

(3) The real criteria to compare the cost of steam and electric plants is the cost per kilowatt-hour produced and delivered to the load centers.

(4) Federal Power Commission and private power companies in addition to the USBR state that steam power cannot compete with hydropower from proposed plants on the upper Colorado.

(5) USBR figure for cost of steam power in the upper-basin area is 7.3 mills per kilowatt-hour. Equivalent costs of power at Echo Park and Glen Canyon computed by Federal Power Commission is 5.6 and 4.7 mills per kilowatt-hour.

22. How does the cost of hydroplants on the Columbia, Tennessee, St. Lawrence, and the lower Colorado compare with the projects in the upper basin?

Answer. (1) They are not comparable.

(2) In some cases the reported costs include the transmission lines, substations, transformer, and all other appurtenant works. In other cases they do not.

(3) At Hoover Dam you are comparing costs as of 1930 with costs as of 1954. The cost of materials and labor has increased several times, and, at the same time, the value of the dollar has decreased. Therefore you can't compare the cost of two plants built 20 years apart. Improved design and increased efficiency have also increased cost.

(4) The cost of power per kilowatt-hour depends partially on the point at which it is delivered. Some cost reports give cost at bus bar, some for falling water, and some at load centers. It is misleading and unfair to compare costs that are not comparable.

(5) The 6-mill rate proposed for power from project plants is a competitive rate and not the cost of generating and delivery at load centers. The net profits from power revenues will be used to help pay costs of irrigation.

23. The proposed project is claimed to be a reclamation project. The cost figures show that the cost of power and municipal installations greatly exceed the cost of irrigation. How do you justify this project as a reclamation project?

Answer (1) S. 500 shows a total cost of $1,092,999,800.

(2) Nonreimbursable costs $8,238,000.

(3) Cost allocations for 5 dams and 12 participating projects:

(a) Power, $655,651,000.

(b) Municipal, $45,500,000.

(c) Irrigation, $378,109,900; water users will pay $82,921,500, power will pay $295,278,400.

(4) Cost of additional participating projects which are subject to further approval and authorization by Congress—21 projects:

(a) Total, $558,173,300.

(b) Nonreimbursable, $470,000.

(c) Power, $953,000.

(d) Municipal, $26,775,000.

(e) Irrigation, $529,975,300; water users will pay $103,365,700, power will pay $426,609,600.

(5) Total cost of storage and the two groups of participating projects, $1,658,460,100.

(6) The total cost is large. Power and municipal features represent 44 percent of the total cost. Irrigation 56 percent.

(7) Water for consumptive use in irrigation is the first objective. Power is incidental thereto but a valuable byproduct, the use of which makes the reclamation project economically feasible. The energy of the falling water costs nothing. The cost of facilities necessary to develop it is repaid to Government with interest.

24. How can the per-acre costs of irrigation be justified?

Answer (1) The irrigation costs per acre are high but not as high as have been reported by the opponents.

(2) It is dishonest arithmetic when per-acre costs are computed by dividing the total cost of the project, including power and municipal features, by the number of acres served. Costs as high as $5,000 per acre have been reported. Such figures are just not true.

(3) The following tabulation shows typical costs per acre and average costs for the 12 participating projects proposed for authorization.

Project	Land to be served (acres)			Total	Irrigation allocation	Cost per acre
	New	Supplemental	Indian			
Central Utah	28,540	131,840	42,630	203,010	$127,354,000	$627
Emery County	3,630	20,450		24,080	9,865,500	400
Gooseberry		16,400		16,400	5,727,500	349
12 participating projects	132,360	250,330	42,630	425,320	205,476,900	483

(4) These costs are not excessive:

(a) It is true they exceed the market value of the land today. The true measure is the present worth of this joined land and water resource 50 years from today.

(b) Joining good land and good water makes good management, creates renewable wealth.

(c) This new wealth provides homes and jobs and other general public benefits.

(d) The record shows that farms are bought and paid for once each generation. In 100 years this means a given farm would be bought and paid for, out of its earnings, four times. If the land and water were to become nonproductive at the end of 100 years, the present value would be worth at least $1,000 per acre.

(5) Any project which will join good land and good water under management which will keep these resources producing in perpetuity and return annually sufficient income to pay the operation, maintenance and replacement costs and enough in addition to build up a reasonable equity is fully justified.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, in addition, I have statements with respect to various questions which have been raised before this body, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

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

A. PAYMENT OF COSTS ALLOCATED TO IRRIGATION: THREE UTAH PARTICIPATING PROJECTS

The central Utah project will provide a full water supply for 28,540 acres of new land and a supplemental supply for 131,840 acres of land which is now partially irrigated. The estimated total cost of the project as of 1953 is $231 million dollars, of which 6 million is nonreimbursable. For this total, power will repay $47 million, municipal water will repay $45 million, $127 million will be charged to irrigation. Of this, the water users will repay $15 million, and the balance will come from power revenues from the local projects and Echo and Glen Canyon power plants. Consumptive water users will pay 35 percent, revenues from project plants will pay 27 percent, and revenues from main stream power plants will pay 35 percent. The power, municipal, and irrigation allocations will be paid out within 50 years.

STATEMENT ON CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT—UTAH INITIAL PHASE OF PROJECT

The initial phase of the project would provide for the irrigation of 28,540 acres of new land and 131,800 acres now irrigated but in need of more water. Full seasonal regulation would be provided for 42,600 acres of land in the Duchesne River area, more than half of which is owned by Indians or has been acquired from them; 48,800 acre-feet of water would be provided annually for municipal, industrial, and other miscellaneous uses. Power plants with an installed capacity of 61,000 kilowatts would generate approximately 373 million kilowatt-hours of electric energy annually. Approximately 2.2 million kilowatt-hours of energy would be required by the project for irrigation and drainage pumping. Central Utah project powerplants would be interconnected with plants of the Colorado River storage project.

Preliminary land classification surveys of the project lands indicate that they would be suitable for sustained crop production under irrigation farming.

Summary data, central Utah project initial phase, Utah irrigated acreage

New land	28,540
Supplemental	131,840
Total	160,380

Principal agricultural production: Alfalfa, grain, fruit, vegetables, sugar beets, tomatoes; dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

The Gooseberry project located in central Utah consists of a storage reservoir on the Price River, a tributary to the Colorado, and a transmountain diversion tunnel to the San Pitch River, a tributary to the Sevier River in the Bonneville Basin. The Sanpete Valley, which is supplied with water from the San Pitch River, is an established agricultural area. Its agricultural production, however, is limited to subsistence by annual water shortages. These annual water shortages will be practically eliminated on 16,400 acres of land by the construction of this project which will provide supplemental water for this area and stabilize its agriculture. It will cost $5,760,500, of which $33,000 is nonreimbursable. Of the reimbursable costs, $3,352,000 will come from power revenues.

Gooseberry project, Utah: The potential Gooseberry project would divert water from a headwater tributary in the Colorado River Basin to improve the irrigation water supply and thus the agricultural production, of 16,400 acres of arable lands in the Bonneville Basin in Sanpete County, central Utah.

The general type of farming now practiced in the area would be continued with project development. Agriculture would continue to center around the livestock industry with more than 95 percent of the irrigated area producing alfalfa, pasture, and small grains for livestock feed. Principal livestock would include dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

A preliminary land classification survey indicates that the project lands would be suitable for sustained production of crops under irrigation farming. Detailed land classification would be required to confirm the suitability of all the lands.

Summary data, Gooseberry project, Utah, irrigated acreage

New land	None
Supplemental	16,400
Total	16,400

Principal agricultural production: Alfalfa, pasture, grain, dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

The Emery County project consists of a storage reservoir, a diversion dam, and a main canal to distribute the storage water to the existing irrigation companies. The Emery County project will provide a supplemental water supply for 20,450 acres of land and a full supply for 3,630 acres. This additional water will expand the agriculture of the area through the introduction of late-season crops and stabilize both the production of forage and the livestock industry which is dependent upon it.

The Emery County project will cost $9,865,500, of which $229,000 is nonreimbursable. Of this reimbursable cost, the water users will pay $3,715,000, and the balance of $5,921,500 will come from power reserves.

Statement on Emery County project, Utah: The potential Emery County project is planned primarily to improve the irrigation water supply and thus better the agricultural production of 24,080 acres of land in Emery County in east central Utah near the towns of Huntington, Castle Dale, and Orangeville. The project is in the Green River Basin, a part of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The general type of farming now practiced in the area would be continued with project development. Agriculture would continue to center around the livestock industry with more than 90 percent of the irrigated area producing hay and grains. The increased production in livestock feed would permit increased production on the farm of beef, sheep, pork, and dairy products.

Summary data, Emery County project, Utah, irrigated acreage

New land	3,630
Supplemental	20,450
Total	24,080

Alfalfa, grain, peaches, vegetables; dairy cows, beef cattle, and sheep.

B. RECLAMATION PROJECTS AND THE SMALL FARMER: UTAH A TYPICAL CASE

There are two major weaknesses which confront farmers in Utah. The most important impact of these weaknesses is upon farm income, which I shall comment upon in detail in a moment.

The first of these weaknesses or handicaps is the small size of the average farming unit. In a country such as the United States where 9 percent of our farms produce 51 percent of the total value of all farm produce sold (and 22 percent produced 74 percent), it is evident that the most basic problem confronting American agriculture is not price support but the great number—over 80 percent—of our farms which are just too small to yield their operators satisfactory levels of living. Utah agriculture is a typical case in point, and it comprises part of this basic national agricultural problem.

Twelve and four-tenths percent of Utah's population in 1950 was engaged in agriculture. These people received in 1952 only 7.4 percent of the State's total income payments which went to Utahans. These people lived by and large on irrigated farms which averaged only 23 acres. But 23-acre farms, cultivated intensively as they are in Utah, are small family-sized farms, with a large number being classified, from the economic point of view, as marginal. As a result, an abnormally high percentage of Utah farmers are part-time farmers.

This problem has its roots in pioneer history. The size of farms has always been small; partly because irrigation made it a necessity, partly because of the philosophy of the early pioneers, which held that a family shouldn't own more land than its members could work. The small farm from the beginning was also an economic necessity because of the difficulty of physically developing an irrigation system. Modern canal and ditch digging tools were unknown. The task was so great that even with group action the canals could not be made of sufficient size to irrigate a large land acreage for each family. Nor was it possible to develop adequate water storage facilities for the same reasons. At present, therefore, the primary economic need of Utah agriculture is to expand the opportunity for full-time employment of its farming population.

How can this be done? Dr. W. Preston Thomas, former head of the Agricultural Economics Department at the Utah State Agricultural College, in a recent Utah Agricultural Experiment Station publication concludes that:

This can be done by expanding acreage of upland per farm or by using existing levels more intensively. In most areas of the State neither is possible because of a lack of irrigation water. (Farm and Home Service, March 1955).

The second weakness of Utah agriculture, however, is that the State lacks an adequate supply of water. This, in addition to making for irrigated farms which average only 23 acres in size, has also been responsible for the inability of Utah farmers to adjust the type of farming which prevails to meet the present day market demands which Utah farms are geographically best situated to supply. The result: Smaller markets and low potential farm income. As Dr. Thomas of the Utah State Agricultural College has so aptly put it:

"The home market and the California market normally need, for example: more dairy

products, more slaughter beef, more pork, and pork products, more chicken meat, more potatoes and similar products. Because they cannot be produced here, it is necessary to pay transportation costs."

C. How Reclamation Projects Can Stabilize Agriculture on a Regional Basis: the Colorado-Big Thompson Project

The 17 Western States, with 61 percent of the land area, have 48.5 percent of the cropland, but only 25 percent of the Nation's water supply. Yet, as of 1950, 94 percent of all the irrigated farmland in the United States, was located in these 17 States. As the President's Water Resources Policy Commission so ably phrased it in 1950: "Crop production in the Colorado River basin is dependent almost wholly on irrigation" (vol. 2, Ten Rivers in America's Future, No. 5, the Colorado, p. 11).

It is the shortage of water which has and will continue to limit land development in the western United States. Reservoirs of all sizes have been built to serve two major purposes:

1. To impound the early run-off waters; and

2. To control the flow for use as needed.

From a practical standpoint, as Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, director, farm and land management research, Agricultural Research Service of the Department of Agriculture told the National Association of County Agricultural Agents last October, "The land in the valley may be almost valueless without a right to use some of the water stored in a mountain reservoir."

The part played by the reclamation project known as the Colorado-Big Thompson in alleviating the effect of the 1954 drought in Colorado is standing proof of the validity of Dr. Johnson's observation. Almost simultaneously with the completion of the major project works in the spring of 1954 came the worst drought in Colorado history. In this respect, the Bureau of Reclamation in its publication, The Colorado-Big Thompson Project and the Drought of 1954, stated:

"The basic water supply for the irrigated lands was, in most respects, the worst on record. Soil moisture content had shrunk to approximately 15 percent of normal, precipitation averaged about 50 to 60 percent of normal, and natural runoff dwindled to less than 40 percent of normal" (p. 6).

The Big Thompson's storage reservoirs, however, made possible the delivery of 300,352 acre-feet of supplemental water, which, when added to the natural runoff supply, though way below normal, and nonproject storage, brought up to normal the farmers' total water supply for the 1954 crop year.

What did this mean to Colorado agriculture? Namely, that the normal crop production level was nearly attained. Specifically the economists of the Bureau of Reclamation put it:

"Had the project water not been available, less than half a crop could have been harvested. Translated into terms of dollars, the difference amounted to $22 million. The worst year on record was licked. Widespread financial distress, delinquent payments, foreclosures, and all the other painful spawnings of drouth were prevented.

"Throughout the area which normally provides about one-fifth of Colorado's agricultural production, and also purchases about one-fifth of the products needed by all the State's farmers, business activity remained strong and healthy, some 75,000 nonfarm residents had a better income as a direct result of the project's victory over drought."

(The Colorado-Big Thompson Project and the Drought of 1954, p. 6.)

The stabilizing effect of reclamation projects in general is not limited to the Colorado-Big Thompson project. This observation is the essence of a letter dated February 8, 1955, which I received from W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. In part this letter pointed out that:

"There is a striking parallel between this story of success and the contributions other reclamation projects are making to the local, regional, and national economics. What the Colorado-Big Thompson project contributed in 1954, and will continue to contribute in the future, to the economic well-being of Colorado and the Nation in a large measure was being duplicated on other reclamation projects throughout the 17 western States.

"This record of accomplishment, moreover, leads to the inescapable conclusion that similar substantial gains to the local, regional, and national economics can be expected from construction of other projects."

In this respect the Colorado River storage project with its dozen participating projects is no exception. There projects will provide supplemental water for 250,333 acres of irrigated land, and in addition will also provide water for 152,360 acres of new irrigated land.

D. Payment of Costs Allocated to Irrigation: Entire Project

The President's Water Resources Policy Commission was created on January 3, 1950, by Executive Order 10045 for the purpose of recommending to the President "policies which should be followed by the Federal Government in fulfilling its proper responsibilities for the development, conservation, and use of the Nation's water resources." One of the major problems which had to be resolved involved the extent and character of the Federal Government's participation in major water resources programs.

With respect to multiple-purpose dams, such as those contemplated by the Colorado River storage project, the Commission concluded that:

"When multiple-purpose dams are built with Federal funds, the Federal Government enters the field of economic enterprise. The justification for this is beyond question: No other agency can command sufficient capital resources or provide the coordination necessary for the construction of these great projects. But Government enterprise does not in any way supplant private enterprise. Rather, its purpose is to provide the opportunity for the further expansion and healthy functioning of a free, competitive economy" (p. 8).

This conclusion has particular significance for financing the irrigation construction costs associated with the Colorado River project, since all lands easily irrigated have been developed primarily by local and private sources.

Dr. W. P. Thomas, former head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, Utah State Agricultural College, writing in the Farm and Home Science magazine for March 1955, published by the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station, has summarized this problem as it affects Utah as follows:

"Utah is an arid region. Irrigation was born of necessity, and Utah settlers were forced to be pioneers in irrigation development. * * * The building of homes, the growth of communities, and the entire culture of the area have been closely interwoven with the progress and development of irrigation. From the beginning, the construction and rise of irrigation facilities were considered community problems, and now, after more than a century of development, the irrigation enterprises are dominantly small, cooperative, mutual companies. With the exception of a few Federal projects, irrigation development has been by community groups. It is quite natural that under such conditions and in a pioneer economy, the development should include only the lands and water facilities that could be most economically developed. A program for development of all the land and water resources is a vital need for Utah.

"As a result of this type of development, some irrigated lands have an inadequate water supply and some of the better lands have no water at all—yet in some places water remains unused. The financial requirements for developing these resources, however, are beyond the capacity of community groups alone."

The great effort which generally has been made by private sources to develop the water potential of this area has been described by Rainer Schickle, head of the Department of Agricultural Economics, North Dakota Agricultural College, in his excellent book, Agricultural Policy, as follows:

"In 1948, an estimated 22 million acres of land were under irrigation on about 300,000 farms, most of it in the 17 western States. The water for approximately 70 percent of this land was supplied by private individuals or cooperative enterprises, 20 percent by irrigation districts, and 10 percent by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and other public agencies. Most of the land that can be irrigated at low cost is now so used, development and water cost per acre of additional irrigated land is rising sharply. This rise in per acre cost is only partly tempered by technological progress in construction methods and by the fact that the new water supply often comes from reservoirs which are not primarily built for irrigation purposes. This means that most of the land to be brought under irrigation in the future will depend upon public projects for water supply" (p. 125).

Repayment of all irrigation costs by farmers is not possible. On most of the projects now contemplated, irrigators will be unable to repay all such costs. The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, in cognizance of this fact, recommended that:

"The primary beneficiaries of reclamation activities should repay without interest an amount assessed according to their ability to pay, based upon annual net income which the farmers derive from the project, under a formula adjusting repayment to production and marketing conditions, this amount to include the full costs of operation and maintenance of facilities. An agreed portion of the remaining investment cost allocated to reclamation should be assumed by the local communities, conservancy districts, or interests receiving secondary benefits from the project under arrangements with the State or States in which the projects are located.

"The remaining cost should be borne by the Federal Government as a measure of national interest." (A Water Policy for the American People, vol. 1, pp. 84–85.)

Dr. Schickle, head of the department of agricultural economics, North Dakota Agricultural College, and an outstanding student of the economics of the irrigation aspect of multiple-purpose dams is of a similar opinion. He concludes that:

"The rate of repayment of irrigation development costs by farmers should be geared to what they are able to pay, under average management and prevailing prices after farm operating expenses and minimum adequate family living requirements have been met. This can perhaps be done by allocating to irrigation only those original investments which otherwise would not have been made and by extending the repayment period over a sufficiently long period of time to keep the annual payment rates within farmer's ability to pay. Any residual cost not covered by repayments would then be mainly for the multi-purpose structures, such as major dams, and should be borne by society as a whole." (Agricultural Policy, p. 125.)

The ability or inability of irrigation users to pay the costs of multiple-purpose dams, however, is not the controlling factor in determining the economic justification of irrigation projects which will result in a net gain to society as a whole. Dr. George D. Clyde, commissioner of Interstate Streams

for Utah gave an excellent analysis of benefits compared to costs before the House of Representative's Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on March 14 of this year. Dr. Clyde said:

"The Bureau of Reclamation benefit-cost analysis recognizes three main types of tangible benefits:

"Direct benefits: Benefits derived from increased production of farm products (from detailed farm budget analysis); increased production of electric power; reduction of damage from floods; pollution, and sedimentation; recreation and conservation of fish and wildlife; provision for domestic, municipal, and industrial water and other directly beneficial effects.

"Indirect benefits: Benefits derived from the increase in profits of all business enterprises handling, processing, and marketing products from the project and profits of all enterprises supplying goods and services to the project farmers.

"Public benefits: Represent the increase or improvement in settlement, job, investment opportunities, community facilities and services, and the stabilization of the local and regional economy.

"The construction of a reclamation project which brings together land, water, and people creates new wealth. New wealth is a benefit in any language. A good index of the value of the benefits is the broadened tax base and rise in income taxes which have followed the construction of every reclamation project in the United States.

"The cost side of the benefit-cost comparison includes all costs: Construction, interest on all unpaid balances, and costs of operation, maintenance, and replacement.

"All recommended units of the Colorado storage project and participating projects, collectively and individually, have tangible benefits greater than costs. For the projects in my State the benefit-cost ratios are as follows:

"Central Utah, 1.23 to 1.

"Gooseberry, 1.2 to 1.

"Emery County, 1.38 to 1."

The bill, S. 500, contemplates the use of electric-power revenues from project powerplants in order to keep the repayment schedules for irrigation farmers within their ability to pay, rather than relying entirely upon the Federal Government to meet this expense or as recommended by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission. The use of power revenues from the project to pay off a portion of the irrigation costs is not a subsidy to irrigation, since, as Dr. George D. Clyde, commissioner on interstate streams for Utah, told the Senate Interior Committee:

"There are many indirect benefits to citizens in both the local, and State, and the national areas. Property values increase where agriculture is stabilized. Business improves when the farmers are making money. The tax base is broadened and industries and services are established in prosperous agricultural communities. It is the accepted national policy that reclamation projects be supported with interest-free money for construction because of the indirect benefits accruing to the general public at all levels. The water users and the indirect beneficiaries from an irrigation project are the same people. Therefore, the use of power revenues to pay indirect benefits is not a subsidy but an equitable method of assessing indirect beneficiaries for their share of the cost of the irrigation works. Interest-free money for irrigation works is no more a subsidy than the use of Federal funds for flood control or river and harbor improvement, none of which costs are ever repaid. The use of power revenues to pay costs of irrigation works above the ability of the water users to pay is not a subsidy and this money does not come out of the taxpayers' pockets. It is compensation for the use of the water belonging to the upper basin States for the purpose of producing power. The upper basin States are the owners of the right to use the water allocated to them by the Colorado River compact for all beneficial purposes, including power. It, therefore, follows that if these waters are used to make hydropower, the upper basin States are entitled to compensation for such use. The upper basin States are not asking for all the revenues from this use, but only sufficient to pay a portion of the irrigation costs. The power revenues from this project will be sufficient to pay the cost of power facilities with interest and the cost of irrigation facilities, without interest, over and above the ability of the irrigators to pay in a period of 50 years. After that time the recurring water will produce power revenues in addition to the annual cost of operation, maintenance, and replacement of $15 to $20 million a year which will pour into the public treasury." (Hearings on S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, p. 142.)

All units: Storage and participating

Construction costs:	
Total	$1,092,999,800
Nonreimbursable	8,238,900
Reimbursable	1,084,760,900
Irrigation	378,109,900
Repayment: Water users	82,921,500
Repayment: Power revenues	996,339,400

E. Agricultural Economic Studies Indicate Need for Project

In order to appraise the impact of the Colorado River storage project upon the agriculture of the upper basin States, or that of any other like project upon the agriculture of a given area, basic economic projection studies are needed. Such studies in advance of construction, and followup studies, have been made for other projects in the upper Colorado Basin area either by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the State agricultural experiment stations of the States concerned.

For example, the justification of one such project in Utah, the Weber Basin project, from an agricultural standpoint, was the subject of such a study by three agricultural economists of the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station in cooperation with the USDA. Headed by Dr. G. T. Blanch, presently the chairman of the Department of Agricultural Economics of Utah State Agricultural College, these economists concluded with respect to the Weber Basin project that:

"Based on the results of their own work and their confidence in the conclusions reached by others * * * working on the project, the economic investigators believe that lands proposed for irrigation within the Weber Basin project could be developed into satisfactory farms through the proposed development of irrigation and drainage facilities; that it is highly probable that an economically and socially satisfactory system of agriculture would result; and that, in addition to supporting the farm families and community institutions at a reasonable level, agriculture can contribute substantial amounts toward the cost of operating and construction of the project and the repayment of construction costs." (Fuhriman, Blanch & Stewart, Weber Basin Reclamation project, Utah (Logan: Agricultural Experiment Station, USAC, Special Rept. No. 7, Dec. 1952, p. 32).)

Prior to the authorization of the Weber Basin project, the Echo and Pine View Reclamation projects were constructed making possible the delivery of a full supplemental supply of water to farmland located in the area served. Have the results confirmed the findings of the USDA agricultural economists referred to above? Have they justified the cost involved? During the 1954 hearings of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on the Colorado River project, I asked these questions of Mr. E. O. Larson, regional director, region 4, Bureau of Reclamation, which encompasses the upper basin States. The colloquy was as follows:

"Senator Watkins. Do you have in mind any project, for instance, in the State of Utah where you could illustrate the benefits that come to the United States, or anywhere else for that matter? It does not matter to me which one you use. I could direct your attention to the Echo project in Utah, which I think is a very good example.

"Mr. Larson. The Weber River project, or Echo project as it is sometimes called, is not to be confused with Echo Park. It is a very good illustration. On that project, in the early days of the pioneers, about 65 percent of the land was used for the growing of grain, and most of the remainder for alfalfa. Today, the area totals about 75,000 acres. Out of that 75,000 acres only about 8 or 10 percent is used for the growing of grain. There are now many very important crops, such as truck crops, and vegetable and fruit crops for canning. For instance, the tomato crop is very large and is canned there. I might say, too, that the total gross crop value of that project, before the construction of the Echo Reservoir, never exceeded about $1¼ million and most of the time less than that. Since the construction of Echo Reservoir and a full supplemental supply of water made available, the gross crop value of that project has been as high as $14 million in 1 year, and $10 million in many years.

"Senator Watkins. Of course, that means increased income taxes paid to the United States.

"Mr. Larson. Several canning factories have been brought in, and there are new businesses of all kinds, and I daresay that increased income tax to the United States as a result of that water is many times the construction payment by the water users.

"Senator Watkins. It has provided for employment of additional men and women? That is a general result, is it not, on a project of that kind?

"Mr. Larson. Yes." (Hearings on S. 1555, Colorado River storage project, p. 82.)

It is significant to point out that Mr. Larson's reply indicated not only that agricultural income of the farmers concerned had been increased nearly 10 times, but also that the supplemental water provided had been instrumental in changing the type of crops produced. A few short years ago 65 percent of the 75,000 acres were used for drain production. Today only 9 percent are used for that purpose. What is significant about this trend? Namely, that reclamation projects such as this do not result in the production of commodities which are in surplus supply today. Most of this land—over 90 percent—is used for the production of forage for livestock, truck and canning vegetable and fruit crops—crops which are not even subject to price support by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The agricultural economists of the Utah State Agricultural Experiment Station in 1949 made just such an economic appraisal of the potential effects of the Colorado River project upon Utah's agriculture. And in March 1954 their salient conclusions were contained in abbreviated form in the periodical Farm and Home Science, published by the State Agricultural Experiment Station. These studies revealed that:

1. Only 40 percent or 408,000 acres of irrigated land has an adequate water supply.

2. Only 2,875,000 acre-feet of water is now available annually for irrigation.

3. But 5,039,000 acre-feet of water will be available annually for irrigation if the water resources are developed.

They likewise revealed, if the water resources of the State are developed in a manner anticipated and provided for in S. 500, that—

1. Ninety percent of the irrigated lands within the area served after development would have an adequate water supply. This would represent an increase of 125 percent of land having an adequate supply.

2. Seventy percent increase in crop production after development.

In summarizing the import of Colorado River project upon Utah's agriculture, Dr. W. Preston Thomas, head of the department of agricultural economics at Utah State Agricultural College, at the time of the basic study referred to, which was completed in 1949, stated:

"At the present time 80 percent of labor utilized in agriculture is employed on irrigated farms. Of the total agricultural income for Utah, 75 percent is derived from irrigated farming, 20 percent comes from range livestock, and only 5 percent from dry farming. According to range conservationists the number of livestock that can be grazed on Utah ranges is limited and the small amount of rainfall in most areas restricts the expansion of dry farming.

"It therefore follows that Utah's opportunity for agricultural expansion and development and the addition of new agricultural wealth lies in the further development and more efficient use of irrigation water within the State including its transfer from the Colorado River to the Bonneville Basin."

This problem is not peculiar to Utah's agriculture but is common to that of every upper basin State in particular, as concerns the Colorado River project, and all the western agricultural States in general. The significance of this situation was ably depicted by Dr. Sherman E. Johnson, director of farm and management research, Agricultural Research Service, USDA. In a talk last October before the National Association of County Agricultural Agents in Salt Lake City, he dramatically told the assembled delegates that—

"Today the 17 Western States, with 61 percent of the land area, have 48.5 percent of the cropland * * *, they have (however) only about one-fourth of the Nation's water supply.

"About 94 percent of all of the irrigated land in farms in 1950 was found in the 17 Western States—77 percent of it in the 11 Mountain and Pacific States. In these 11 States, about a third of the cropland is irrigated. * * * Reservoirs of all sizes are built to impound the floodwaters and to control the flow for use as needed by crops and pasture, and by the cities and towns. * * * The land in the valley may be almost valueless without a right to use some of the water stored in a mountain reservoir.

"Looking ahead, the shortage of water will limit land development in the West. At the present time over 90 percent of the water that is consumptively used in the West is for irrigation. With rapid growth of population in the Far Western States, some of this water will have to be shared with cities and towns for industrial and municipal uses. Some new irrigation projects are under consideration, and taking the 17 Western States as a whole, perhaps some 5 million acres of additional land might be irrigated by 1975" (pp. 5, 6, and 9).

F. Reclamation Projects and Surplus Agricultural Commodities

One issue which has been raised with respect to the Colorado River storage project and the participating projects involves the use of reclamation to bring in new land, when, as the opponents say, we are plagued with the problem of agricultural surpluses. Why, they ask, should large sums of money be invested in projects which bring new lands into production through irrigation when large amounts of Federal funds are now being spent to support farm prices.

Here is the answer, which I shall try and condense, although it has many aspects which must be considered:

1. The crops grown in the four upper basin States are not in surplus nor are they crops now under price support. In addition, however, the new water supply made possible by the project will not be used in their production.

In Utah, only 7 percent of the cash receipts of farmers are from basic commodities, notably wheat. In Wyoming, farmers receive only 8 percent of their cash from receipts from the sale of basic commodities. Colorado farmers received 18 percent of their income from basic commodities, of which 17.6 percent is derived from wheat. This wheat, however, is grown in eastern Colorado on lands which will never utilize water from the Colorado River. New Mexico farmers received 38 percent of their income from the role of basic commodities of which cotton, grown in southern New Mexico, constitutes 37 percent. No water from participating projects authorized by S. 500 will find its way into the agricultural production of this area. As President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission reported in 1950:

"Livestock raising is the basin's principal agricultural pursuit, particularly in the northern region. * * * Moreover, 30 percent of the basin's irrigated land is used to grow alfalfa as winter feed for the many kinds of sheep and cattle that graze the range."

2. Agricultural production due to the increased supply of water from the participating projects will not be a fact for many years to come if this bill were passed by the Congress and signed by the President today.

It will require 25 to 30 years to construct the initial phase of the project, over 20 years to fill the reservoirs in the project, and 100 years to develop complete utilization of the upper basin's share of the water. So it is evident that even if the crops which are produced in the upper basin States did constitute a surplus problem, which they do not, it would be impossible for added production due to project water to make a material contribution for at least 10 years.

3. By the time when the initial phases of the upper Colorado River project are completed—25 years from now—the American people will need all of the agricultural production our farm economy can produce.

President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission estimated in 1950 in the light of future food requirements that not only are the present food surpluses temporary, but also that 100 million additional cropland acres will be needed by 1975.

This estimated need of 100 million additional acres of cropland takes into account the reduced need for feed for horses and that export acreage would remain constant. The Commission estimated the potential sources of meeting this additional need as follows:

Source	*Acres*
1. Acre equivalent of ordinary farm land reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection	21,000,000
2. Newly irrigated land (equivalent)	9,000,000
3. Increased productivity on present lands under cultivation (assuming that productivity would increase 18 percent by 1975 over the base period 1945–49)	46,000,000
Total	76,000,000

This potential of 76 million leaves a need for an additional 24 million acres of crop land.

On the basis of its analysis and conclusions, the Commission concluded that:

"Reclamation of new land through irrigation, flood control, drainage, and clearing, and improvement in the use of existing farm lands, must move forward together if the future needs of the Nation are to be met. It tends to controvert the contention that reclamation of new lands should be curtailed because of surpluses in certain agricultural commodities."

It is evident that the rate at which the land can be brought into production is much less than the demand for increased production can possibly be. It is for this reason that the United States Department of Agriculture estimated that by 1962 our present agricultural surpluses will have disappeared.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have a further statement on the many problems connected with the project, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

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

Statement by Senator Arthur V. Watkins Relative to S. 500, Colorado River Storage Project Bill

Many people, essentially uninformed conservationists who should know better, have been challenging the engineering studies of the Colorado River storage project, questioning data as to dam structure foundations, and even charging that possible alternatives to the recommended project units have not been given adequate consideration.

At the risk of dignifying these unreasonable and wholly unfounded charges, I wish to take a few moments to review some of the historical background of the extensive and detailed engineering investigation that went into the Department of the Interior report which was the basis for S. 500, now before the Senate. As a serious student of reclamation policy and practitioner of reclamation law for 17 years before coming to Congress, and as a member of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs since 1947, I can assure the Senate that no other water resources development project to my knowledge has come before this body with the thorough and competent engineering study which constitutes the foundation of this measure. Furthermore, S. 500 represents the type of well-planned, basinwide, multiple-purpose water-resource project that some Members of this body have been demanding for years, and it reflects the type of comprehensive engineering, economic, and resource planning that, in my estimation, should become compulsory for proposed water-resource developments in the future.

In making that statement, I do not wish to throw discredit on any other area that is obliged to bring individual water-resource projects before the Congress in advance of basinwide planning. Such basinwide planning takes time and demands that States agree on their basic needs and objectives. In our case, we were forced into a basinwide approach. Downstream delivery commitments agreed to by the four upper basin States in the Colorado River compact of 1922, forced us to regard holdover water storage as a first consideration in plans to utilize water from the Colorado River. The costs and complexities of fulfilling this requirement necessitated that we work together and cooperate with the Government agencies that undertook to work out a plan for solving the engineering and economic problems involved.

We also were fortunate in having the funds to finance such costly planning and engineering investigation. Roughly $10 million, derived from funds accruing to the upper basin States from Hoover Dam power, and contributions from States involved, has been allocated for these basinwide investigations conducted over 25 years.

Engineering investigations in the upper Colorado River Basin actually began as early

as 1904, over half a century ago. At that time, a reconnaissance survey of the Green River, covering portions of the stream now considered for some of the controversial units of the Colorado River storage project, was made by the Bureau of Reclamation. I hereby introduce at the end of my remarks, as exhibit 1, an extract from the seventh annual report of the Reclamation Service, 1907–8, which refers to this survey.

(See exhibit 1.)

You will note from this extract that by 1908, Flaming Gorge, 1 of the 9 storage-dam sites in the Colorado River project, had already been under engineering study as a reservoir site. Borings also had been made at the Browns Park Dam site, covered in the 1904 reclamation withdrawal exempted in the Dinosaur Monument proclamation of 1938.

Island Park also was under active consideration as a potential reservoir site at that time, but it subsequently was dropped in favor of two better adjoining sites, Echo Park and Split Mountain. Island Park, like its better known neighbor, Echo Park, also is not a National or State park in any sense of the word. Both are just wide spots on the Green River.

I will not bother to make similar citations from other annual reports of the Bureau of Reclamation or from similar reports of the United States Corps of Engineers, which also made river control studies of the Colorado at various times during the past half century.

Water studies on the Colorado River were summarized in the Department of the Interior's Water Supply Paper 395, published in 1916. It is significant that by this time, five more dam sites on the Green and Yampa Rivers, within the present boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument had been under active consideration. At that time, however, Dinosaur Monument was confined to its original quarry section of 80 acres, which had been set aside by Presidential proclamation in 1915.

Extracts from this study are interesting in that they point out that engineering studies already were well advanced by that date. I introduced these excerpts at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 2.

(See exhibit 2.)

In 1920 another Federal agency came into the picture—the Federal Power Commission. This independent agency was established by the Congress pursuant to the Federal Water Power Act of 1920, in order to effect the systematic development of the country's hydropower resources. The FPC also assumed jurisdiction of existing Federal lands reserved for power development, and was given authority to make additional reservations, or withdrawals as they are also known, to protect the public's interest in other potential power sources located in the public domain.

Under authority of this 1920 act, the Utah Power & Light Co., a private power utility interested in developing the power resources of the upper Colorado River, was authorized to participate in a cooperative survey of large sections of the Colorado River and its upper tributaries. This survey resulted in the maps and river profiles published by the Department of the Interior in 1922.

The results of these cooperative studies and other engineering investigations were summarized in a 456-page volume published in 1930, Water Supply Paper 618 of the Department of the Interior. This volume was entitled "The Green River and Its Utilization," and it was written by the late Ralf R. Woolley, one of the all-time great field engineers of the United States Geological Survey and who was incidentally a member of one of the first scientific river-running parties to negotiate the Green River by boat.

I have made a few extracts from this publication to show how extensive were the engineering studies of the Green River by 1930, and I insert these excerpts as exhibit 3, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 3.)

Included in this exhibit are two plates which cannot be reproduced in the RECORD. These are profile maps of both the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, as then proposed.

At that time, the investigations authorized in the Boulder Canyon Project Act of December 21, 1928, had just been initiated. These investigations authorized by Congress were to be made by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of producing a comprehensive program for the development of the water resources of the Colorado River, including irrigation, power, and other multiple uses.

Authorization of this large-scale, multiple-purpose investigation in 1928 by the Congress indicates why both reclamation and power withdrawals within the area proposed for inclusion within an expanded Dinosaur National Monument in the mid-1930's would be of concern to the Bureau of Reclamation and to the four upper-basin States interested in development of their allocated share of the river.

Up to 1930, the major interest in the reservoir sites on the Green River in the Green and Yampa Canyon sections, was primarily for power development. This interest is expressed in Mr. Woolley's report. It also is reflected by the fact that there are 10 power site withdrawals valid and in effect within the Dinosaur National Monument extension, and only 1 reclamation withdrawal.

However, both types of withdrawals were clearly of interest to Government engineers engaged in the past quarter century of upper Colorado River water-development investigations. This is emphasized in a letter written on December 13, 1934, by FPC Chairman Frank R. McNinch, in answer to a request from the National Park Service that power withdrawals on the Green and Yampa Rivers be vacated to permit the proposed expansion of the Dinosaur Monument. I hereby introduce, as exhibit 4, the McNinch letter of December 13, 1934, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 4.)

You will note that Chairman McNinch enclosed a copy of Water Supply Paper No. 618 with his letter, along with Yampa and Green River profile maps, so there is no reason to believe that the National Parks Service was unaware of the tremendous importance of those power resources prior to the Dinosaur Monument expansion.

Now these reports to which I have been referring do not in and of themselves comprise the total field notes and engineering data assembled in that quarter century of earnest study. They represent only the distillation of many hundreds upon hundreds of pages of field notes and project studies.

These multi-agency studies had been extensive up to that time, but on July 19, 1940, investigations of the Colorado River received a tremendous financial shot in the arm. At that time, President F. D. Roosevelt signed the Boulder Canyon Project Adjustment Act, which created the Colorado River Development Fund and authorized allocation to it of $500,000 per year from power revenues. All of the fund revenues from 1940 to 1955 were to be utilized in the investigation of projects under consideration for the comprehensive basinwide water resource development program.

Never before, to my knowledge, has such a large engineering investigation fund been authorized for a river basin study in advance of congressional consideration of the overall project. We residents of the four upper basin States are indebted to President Roosevelt and the 76th Congress for permitting us to utilize our power revenues to supplement contributions by the States for such a thorough and competent basin-wide investigation.

These expanded Colorado River Basin investigations were culminated by the March 1946 publication of The Colorado River—A Comprehensive Report on the Development of the Water Resources of the Colorado River Basin for Irrigation, Power Production, and Other Beneficial Uses in Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. This was a 293-page book, amply supplemented with well illustrated charts and maps.

This monumental document presented an inventory of 134 potential projects or units of projects, mostly multiple purpose, for the consideration of the Congress and the States involved in arriving at a final comprehensive development plan. One hundred of these projects were included within the upper basin area.

The 1946 report makes this point: "A great amount of engineering and economic investigational work has been required to assemble and evaluate this information from which has been prepared this inventory of potential projects. Detailed information is available for a substantial number of potential developments and only data of a reconnaissance nature for others, but from all the information available it should be possible, prior to a final settlement of water rights, to select a group of projects which are urgently needed, or which will be key units of the comprehensive plan for construction as the next stage of this development."

To indicate the nature of this report and the extensive engineering information assembled by 1946, I hereby introduce these excerpts from that 293-page document as exhibit 5, at the conclusion of my remarks.

(See exhibit 5.)

Information assembled in these very extensive reports and investigations was made available to the four States involved. Each of the States conducted independent studies on its own and made recommendations on projects to the Bureau of Reclamation. The Department of Interior reported that "important contributions" and substantiating materials were provided by the States and by the upper Colorado River Compact Commission.

On December 15, 1950, the Secretary of the Interior submitted his formal report to the Congress on the Colorado River storage project, outlining a comprehensive program for development of the upper basin of the Colorado River. This report followed action by the 4 States involved which resulted in the upper basin compact of 1949, allocating among the 4 States the water apportioned to the upper basin by the Colorado River compact of 1922.

This detailed upper basin study comprising several hundred pages represents the last formal report issued on the proposed comprehensive development of the Colorado River. However, engineering studies have gone forward in the States involved and in the Bureau of Reclamation since 1950. Furthermore, investigations are still going on and will be continued on individual projects, including some special economic studies called for in this bill, right up to the start of construction.

All of this material, together with the concrete exhibit of a relatively small number of reports and field studies assembled as a floor display, suggests the tremendous scope of the engineering and economic investigations that have been made into this great comprehensive project for development of the water resources of the Colorado River.

All potential reservoir and dam sites on the river have been studied and catalogued. This includes all the so-called "alternatives" to Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams.

Projects recommended to the Congress are covered by detailed engineering reports, and represent the most efficient and most economical of those that are possible within the basin.

It is a sound project, planned to function for hundreds of years, but designed to pay back the construction costs, including

interest on power and municipal features, in 50 years.

Much of the planning was done under a Democratic administration, and the project is now backed wholeheartedly by the present Republican administration, so it is a true product of bipartisan planning and will stand as a monument to both our great political parties, each of which is solidly on record as favoring projects of this nature.

The Colorado River storage project was endorsed in the Senate hearings by Administrator Val Peterson of the Civil Defense Administration. In fact, it is my profound conviction, after hearing Governor Peterson's testimony that the development of this water and power in the mountain area is so important to national defense, that Congress would be justified in going ahead with its authorization and construction, even if the residents of the respective States opposed it, which they most assuredly do not.

From my years of experience with irrigation and reclamation projects, I can wholeheartedly endorse the Colorado River storage project and recommend that the Senate speedily pass Senate 500 so that the desert area involved, and the rest of the Nation, can start receiving its benefits in the shortest time possible.

EXHIBIT 1

EXTRACT FROM SEVENTH ANNUAL REPORT OF THE RECLAMATION SERVICE, 1907–1908 (P. 57)

The Colorado River projects consist of a number of possible irrigation developments on the lower Colorado River in Arizona and California, the principal of which are the Blythe, Parker, and Needles. Descriptions of the Colorado River projects will be found in the 1st and 2d annual reports. The lands of these projects are to be irrigated with water from the Colorado River, but there is an insufficient normal water supply in the river for the purpose of their proper irrigation. The success of the projects therefore depends on the storage of water in the drainage waters of the Grand and the Green River systems, forming the Colorado River.

A description of the storage reservoirs investigated on the Grand River and its tributaries will be found in the fourth annual report. During 1904 investigations were carried on in connection with certain possible reservoirs on the Green River. A reconnaissance survey of Green River between Green River, Wyo., and Ouray, Utah, was made for the purpose of determining the most feasible location for a storage reservoir that would control the entire flow of the river, and special investigations were made in connection with the Flaming Gorge Reservoir site, Wyoming and Utah; the Browns Park Reservoir site, Utah and Colorado; the Island Park Reservoir site, Utah; the Narrows Reservoir site, Utah; the Ouray Reservoir site, Utah. No feasible dam sites were found in connection with the last two of these reservoir sites.

FLAMING GORGE AND ISLAND PARK RESERVOIR SITES

The Flaming Gorge Reservoir site is located about 40 miles south of Green River, Wyo. The fall of the river above Henrys Fork is quite uniform and light and there are no rapids in the river between Henrys Fork and Green River. The capacity of the reservoir with a 100-foot dam is between 300,000 and 350,00 acre-feet. This capacity is not sufficient to control the flow of the river at the dam. The dam site is located in Flaming Gorge, about 1½ miles below Henrys Fork. The length of the dam at the crest would be about 800 feet and at the present low-water surface about 380 feet. The rock at the dam site consists of hard Uinta seamy sandstone. The stratification is irregular, especially on the right bank, which is a perfect anticlinal flexure. The land covered by the reservoir site is chiefly unimproved.

The Island Park Reservoir site is located in Utah, about 22 miles northeast of Vernal. The capacity of the reservoir with a 100-foot dam is between 130,000 and 15,000 acre-feet. The dam site is located in Split Mountain Canyon and a dam 100 feet high would be 700 feet long at the crest and about 350 feet long at the present low-water surface. The rock at the dams site consists of hard, seamy sandstone with irregular stratification. This reservoir might be utilized for storing the flow of Bear River, thus serving as an auxiliary storage to the Browns Park Reservoir in caring for the flow from this source coming into Green River below Browns Park.

BROWNS PARK RESERVOIR SITE

Browns Park Reservoir site is located in Utah and Colorado, about 55 miles south of Rock Springs, Wyo. The dam site is located in the upper end of Ladon Canyon. The rock at the dam site consists of hard Uinta sandstone and is uniformly bedded. The reservoir would control the flow of the entire river except in the wettest years, and the site is the most feasible of those investigated by the Reclamation Service on Green River. The land covered by the reservoir site consists of winter pasture lands.

During the past season borings at the dam site have been in progress for the purpose of determining the distance to bedrock.

EXHIBIT 2

EXCERPTS FROM WATER SUPPLY PAPER NO. 395, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, 1916

What is to be the future of this immense region? Doubtless its forests will be utilized, its mineral wealth will be exploited, its wonderful scenic beauties will be unfolded. Its greatest development must come, however, from its water resources, on which the development of its other resources must largely depend. Without the water afforded by Colorado River and its tributaries this basin would remain forever a barren desert. These rivers make possible not only the construction of large irrigation systems and the growth of towns, cities, and prosperous agricultural communities but also the generation of hydroelectric power for lighting, heating, industrial uses, and the transportation of freight and passengers.

The United States Geological Survey began the study of the water resources of the basin by establishing gaging stations on Gila River at Buttes, Ariz., in 1889. Since that time records of river discharge have been collected at 180 points in the basin. In the collection of these records and in the study of water resources the United States Reclamation Service, the Indian Office, the Forest Service, and the Weather Bureau have cooperated. Each of these Federal bureaus has also made independent investigations of certain questions pertaining to the water resources. The Reclamation Service has investigated the available water supply for particular projects and the feasibility of proposed works that have been more or less definitely outlined. That service has also studied the possibilities of storage on the Gila, San Juan, Grand, and Green rivers, and on the Colorado below the junction of the Grand and Green. The Indian Office has investigated the available water, and its possible uses on the Indian reservations in the basin. The Forest Service has studied the water supply and possible water powers of the national forests. The Weather Bureau has collected records of precipitation, temperature, and evaporation at many points. In addition, the State officials who have had the responsibility of distributing the water among a great number of users and of recording, examining, and approving water filings, have collected a mass of information as to the present and proposed use of the streams in the basin. Much exploratory work has been done by private parties and corporations, irrigation and power projects have been examined, railroad routes have been surveyed, and the Grand Canyon has been traversed by several persons and parties since Major Powell made the pioneer trip. The diversion of water outside the basin to irrigate nearly half a million acres in the Salton Basin, the breach in the river banks and the diversion of the whole flow of the river to the Salton Sink with the resulting danger to and loss of valuable property in Imperial Valley, the spectacular struggle and final success of the Southern Pacific Co. in closing the breach and restoring the flow of the river to the Gulf of California, and the international questions involved in the joint use of the river by the United States and the Republic of Mexico have brought to the attention of the people of the country, as well as to State and Federal officials, first one and then another phase of the many problems involved in the utilization of Colorado River.

The information relating to the water resources that has been collected by many agencies has never been brought together so that a broad view of the possible utilization of the whole river could be obtained. Mr. La Rue has attempted the pioneer work of assembling the principal facts relating to the subject, and especially of studying the possibility of controlling the flow of the whole river by means of storage reservoirs in order to avoid further danger of overflow to the Salton Sink and to render available for profitable use the enormous quantity of water which now flows unused and largely unusable to the Gulf of California in the form of floods.

In discussing the broader problems of the basin, hundreds, yes, thousands, of the minor possibilities and even plans for expansion have necessarily been unmentioned, though future minor developments will have great local importance and in the aggregate considerable national significance. In general such projects do not preclude the larger use of the river but must be undertaken as part of that larger use.

This report does not, of course, contain the last word on the uitilization of Colorado River. Additional facts will become known that may modify the conclusions here recorded. It is hoped, however, that a foundation has been laid for future comprehensive discussion and treatment that will not ignore the effects produced on the present or future utilization of the river by developments in other parts of the basin. The importance of Colorado River to the prosperity of an area extending over seven States warrants broad consideration and perhaps Federal assistance not only in the construction of large irrigation systems and incidental storage works, but also in the important phases of river control.

* * * * *

UNDEVELOPED POWER SITES

Green River Basin

Flaming Gorge Reservoir power site (1): The Flaming Gorge power site is at the dam site for the Flaming Gorge Reservoir in northeastern Utah (pp. 199–201). The elevation of the low-water level of Green River at the dam site in Horseshoe Canyon is 5,825 feet. By constructing a dam to elevation 6,050 for storing to elevation 6,040 feet, the reservoir capacity would be 3,130,000 acre-feet. The storage capacity between the 6,000- and 6,040-foot contour would be 1,210,000 acre-feet, or sufficient to equalize the flow of the river at this point and insure a minimum flow of 2,700 second-feet. By constructing a 3-mile tunnel at elevation 6,000 feet, an effective head of about 290 feet could be obtained. With a head of 290 feet and a flow of 2,700 second-feet, 71,000 brake horsepower could be developed.

Swallow Canyon power site (2): Swallow Canyon is near the upper end of Browns Park, in northeastern Utah. This canyon is about 2 miles long. At its upper end, in sec. 31, T. 2 N., R. 25 E., Salt Lake meridian, an outcrop of solid rock extending across the channel of Green River indicates that

it would be practicable to construct a high dam. The water level could be raised about 150 feet without interfering with the development of the Flaming Gorge site. By utilizing the Flaming Gorge Reservoir site, a uniform flow of 2,700 second-feet could be maintained, which, with a head of 150 feet, would make possible the development of 36,800 brake horsepower.

EXHIBIT 3

EXCERPTS FOR WATER SUPPLY PAPER NO. 618, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, 1930

(Preface by Nathan C. Grover)

The Green River and its drainage basin are interesting economically, historically, and scenically. The river constitutes one of the great natural resources of Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah. It has had an influence on the exploration, settlement, and development of the West and is woven into the history of the white man's progress throughout a broad region. Its canyons are grand and beautiful but unfortunately are so difficult to traverse that they have been seen by relatively few people.

The Green River is the largest tributary of the Colorado and brings to that river nearly one-half of the water flowing in the stretch just below the junction. The mean annual runoff of the Green from a drainage area of nearly 45,000 square miles is about 5,700,000 acre-feet; the mean annual runoff from a drainage area of 26,500 square miles of the Colorado above the Green is about 6,800,000 acre-feet. Although its drainage basin is more than 70 percent greater than that of the Colorado above the junction, the runoff of the Green is somewhat smaller because of the relatively low precipitation on much of the basin. It is far larger than any other tributary of the Colorado, the next in size being the San Juan, which has a mean annual runoff of somewhat more than 2,500,000 acre-feet.

The drainage basin of the Green, situated in Wyoming, Colorado, and Utah, ranges in altitude from more than 15,000 feet in the summits of the mountains to about 3,900 feet in the valley at its mouth. The average annual precipitation on the basin ranges from perhaps 50 inches or more near the summits of the high mountains to 6 inches or less in the southern valleys. The runoff from tributaries ranges from perhaps 30 inches or more in depth in the high mountain areas to a small fraction of an inch in the driest valleys.

Within the basin of the Green are mountain valleys that have excellent stands of timber, broad fertile valleys that are irrigated in part, excellent rangelands for stock, and vast areas of mountains and valleys that are essentially of desert character. Within it also are large deposits of phosphate rock, extensive coalfields which yield valuable bituminous coals, and vast areas of oil shales. Oilfields that may have considable future importance may yet be discovered here. The population in 1920 was largely engaged in agriculture and devoted principally to producing forage crops and raising stock.

The basin is traversed by two transcontinental railroads—the Union Pacific-Oregon Short Line system and the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railroad. It is penetrated also from the east by the Denver & Salt Lake Railroad (Moffat line). Two transcontital highway routes also cross the basin, one by way of Green River, Wyo., and the other by way of Green River, Utah. Many highways of lesser importance make a large part of the basin reasonably accessible.

Because of resources in agricultural lands, in water for their irrigation, and for the development of power, and in the possibilities of producing electric power from coal and oil, the future growth of the region will doubtless be largely rural but in part urban, based on agriculture and industry. Water will be needed in large quantities as an important if not a controlling factor in such growth, in agriculture for irrigation; in the production of electric energy, for use through the turbines of water-power plants and through the condensers of steam-power plants; in manufacturing, for many industrial processes; and in the present and future towns and cities for domestic and municipal uses.

The ultimate area of land that may be irrigated in the basin of the Green River is estimated at 1,782,800 acres. There are four principal irrigable sections. The basin of the upper Green River in Wyoming, in which there is an estimated irrigable area of 755,000 acres, is all above 5,800 feet in altitude. Its agricultural possibilities are, therefore, limited to the forage crops needed for winter feeding to the great herds of stock that graze within the mountain valleys of the upper basin. The Yampa and White River Basins, in Colorado, have irrigable areas estimated at 467,400 acres, ranging in altitude from 5,000 to 8,000 feet and, therefore, utilized largely for producing forage crops. The Uinta basin in Utah, having an estimated irrigable area of 295,000 acres, lies at 5,000 to 6,000 feet above sea level, and forage crops predominate there. The lower Green River Basin, including the valleys of the Price and San Rafael Rivers, contains an estimated irrigable area of 265,400 acres. These lands, which are situated farther south and at lower altitudes, have a greater range in agricultural products than the other three irrigable sections.

Only 1,850 horsepower of water power is now developed in the basin of the Green River. The total of undeveloped water power, 760,000 horsepower, is more impressive. In general the undeveloped power sites are situated wholly or in part on public lands, and permits or licenses for their use may be obtained from the Federal Power Commission under the terms of the Federal Water Power Act, approved June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063).

The probable future uses of water within the basin of the Green River will not exhaust the supply. With the irrigable areas of the basin fully developed a large quantity of water will still be discharged by the Green into the Colorado and will be available for producing power in the long stretch of canyons below the mouth of the Green and for irrigating agricultural lands in the great valleys situated in Arizona, California, and New Mexico below the Grand Canyon.

Many excellent sites for constructing storage reservoirs are situated on the Green River and its tributaries. These sites will have great value both for local utilization and for equalizing the flow of the Colorado River below the mouth of the Green. Thereby the importance of the Green River is greatly increased, and its future large utilization for agriculture and industry is made probable.

The broad aspects of the Green River have been known by white men for nearly a century. Hunters and trappers penetrated into its basin in the early part of the last century, but until the migration and settlement in Utah of Mormons in 1847 and subsequent years, and the discovery of gold in California in 1848, followed by the overland rush of gold hunters to that State in 1849–50, relatively few white men had seen the river in any part of its course. Two great overland trails used in the migrations to California and Utah crossed the Green River—one in Wyoming near the site of the present town of Green River, Wyo., and one near the site of the present town of Green River, Utah. As would be expected, a few adventurers who came to the river at these crossings attempted navigation, but the canyons and rapids in the Green River between these two places and in the Colorado River below the mouth of the Green were so dangerous that transportation by boats was found to be impracticable.

A few men have succeeded in putting boats through or around all the rapids of the Green River. Powell started his bold trip through the canyons of the Colorado at Green River, Wyo., in 1869 and so traversed all the canyons of the Green as well as those of the Colorado. A few other adventurers, explorers, or scientists have followed him, as outlined in this report. The canyons were accurately mapped in 1922, when a party of topographers, geologists, and hydraulic engineers of the United States Geological Survey carried instrumental surveys from Green River, Wyo., to Green River, Utah. Mr. Woolley, the author of this report, was attached to that party as hydraulic engineer.

Mr. Woolley is a resident of Utah who has spent his engineering life on problems related to the development of the resources of the region. In studying projects for developing waterpower and irrigation within the Green River Basin, he has visited all the principal power sites and agricultural valleys. He has traversed the river by boat from Green River, Wyo., to Green River, Utah, through the beautiful and dangerous canyons that are rarely seen by man. He has, of course, made use of all available pertinent information collected by the personnel of the Geological Survey and others over a period of many years. His basis of information is therefore the best that could be obtained at this time. He speaks with authority and from first-hand knowledge, and his report has a value that could be obtained only by thorough familiarity with the river and its possibilities of utilization.

In this report, Mr. Woolley has presented the available physical facts that are related to the present and future utilization of the Green River and his estimates of the probable ultimate development and waterpower sites and irrigable lands. His conclusions are given without bias for particular schemes or projects. The facts will serve to guide stable growth in industry and agriculture; the estimates represent a probable measure of ultimate regional development. Similar facts and estimates for the Colorado above the mouth of the Green are contained in Water-Supply Paper 617, Upper Colorado River and its Utilization, by Robert Follansbee, and for the Colorado below the mouth of the Green in Water-Supply Paper 556, Water Power and Flood Control of Colorado River below Green River, Utah, by E. C. LaRue. These three reports are supplementary to Water-Supply Paper 395, Colorado River and its Utilization, by E. C. LaRue, which contained the facts related to the whole basin that were available at the time of its publication, in 1916. In the intervening years much of the river has been accurately surveyed, and additional records of discharge have been made. Because of the more complete information on which they are based, the three recent reports, Water-Supply Papers 556, 617, and 618, are more satisfactory in presentation and conclusions than the earlier report. The fundamental data presented in them are essential to stable regional development, and their compilation and publication in usable form will serve to promote proper utilization of the rivers and other natural resources contained within the drainage basin.

Mr. Woolley has not attempted to carry his study to such a degree of detail as to show to what extent a comprehensive plan of development of the Colorado River as a whole may involve correlation of development on the Green River, but he has presented basic information whereby this question may be considered by others.

The determinations of undeveloped power for this report are based somewhat arbitrarily on two time elements: (1) The ca-

pacity available 90 percent of the time, or that available during ordinary low stages and for so great a part of the time that comparatively little pondage will render it thoroughly reliable; (2) the capacity available 50 percent of the time, or that available when conditions of flow are such that, although development is ordinarily warranted, substantial storage regulation or auxiliary steam power must be provided to render the capacity thoroughly reliable. The power sites included in this report are treated only as physical possibilities, without strict regard to economic feasibility. Some of the sites that are physically possible are obviously unattractive in the economic sense, but those that are included in the report are believed to be the most attractive ones in the different basins. Accordingly they form a basis of comparison which shows the relative value of the power resources.

The 50 sites that were investigated are estimated to be capable of furnishing with the existing streamflow about 51,780 horsepower for 90 percent of the time or 88,565 horsepower for 50 percent of the time. With regulated flow the total would be about 759,600 horsepower. The Green River and Yampa River sites are considered only with regulated flow.

RELATIVE VALUE OF STREAMS FOR POWER AND IRRIGATION

The accepted principle in the States in which the Green River Basin lies is that the different uses to which the water of the streams may be put are classified in order of their importance as (1) domestic, (2) irrigation, and (3) power and other industrial uses. Economic conditions play an important part in the development of the water resources of the West, and it is recognized by many that more flexible rules should be applied to the use of the streams. It is conceded, of course, that domestic use should always come first, but power and irrigation uses are likely to be of coordinate importance, and both should be encouraged wherever possible. If conditions are such that the power value of a stream is greater economically than its irrigation value, development of its power should be encouraged by removal of all restrictions that would tend to preclude such development.

GREEN RIVER CANYONS—GENERAL FEATURES

The Green River in its course through the Uinta Mountains and the high plateaus to the south flows in alternate stretches of narrow canyons and small valleys called parks. The stream attracted little attention as a great natural resource until recent years. It first became a subject of careful study only as it might affect the regimen of the lower Colorado River.

Water was first diverted from the Colorado River into the Imperial Valley for irrigation in 1901, and the use for this purpose grew rapidly thereafter. It was immediately realized, however, that some protection against floods on the lower river should be provided if this irrigation development were to be preserved. Accordingly searches were instituted for storage sites to control the river, and in 1904 a preliminary report was made to the United States Bureau of Reclamation calling attention to Browns Park, on the Green River, as a possible reservoir site. Immediately after this report was submitted a plane-table survey was made of the park area and its capacity as a reservoir determined. The dam site was located in the head of the canyon of Lodore, and during 1907–08 more than $43,000 was spent by the Bureau of Reclamation in drilling explorations at two proposed dam sites. The results of these operations were not encouraging, and further investigations were made for other reservoir sites. A survey was made of the Flaming Gorge site in 1914. Soon afterward diamond drilling was done at the proposed dam sites in Horseshoe Canyon. Two sites were drilled, one about 4,000 feet above the mouth of the canyon and the other about 500 feet farther up. At the upper site 15 holes were drilled, at the lower site 6, and on the saddle above the Horseshoe Canyon 4. Further work was done here by the Utah Power & Light Co. in 1923–26 and is described in detail in the section on the Flaming Gorge power site.

After the survey of the Flaming Gorge reservoir site an attempt was made in 1916 to find a suitable dam site in the upper part of Desolation Canyon that could be used to create a huge reservoir of the Green River Valley in Uinta Basin. Several of the most promising cross sections in the canyon were surveyed. A topographic survey of the reservoir itself had already been made for private persons by Guy Sterling, an engineer. About this time the stream began to attract so much interest as a source of power as to induce the Utah Power & Light Co. to spend considerable money in making a topographic survey of a stretch of the river extending through part of Desolation and Gray Canyons and reconnaissance investigations of the power possibilities of the canyon stretches between Flaming Gorge and Uinta Basin. In this way there became available several maps of different stretches of the river. They were all independent of one another, and there was no complete map of the river as a whole. Accordingly in 1922 the Geological Survey, in cooperation with the Utah Power & Light Co., made a complete map, correlating the surveys that were available and filling in the stretches for which there were no surveys. The results of this survey are published by the Geological Survey under the title, "Plan and profile of Green River, Green River, Utah, to Green River, Wyo.," consisting of 16 sheets—10 plans and 6 profiles. These may be obtained from the Director of the Geological Survey at $1.60 for the set.

When survey data became available for the Colorado River through its lower canyons storage possibilities were found large enough to afford complete regulation of the flow of the river into its lower valley, and the sites on the Green River were abandoned, except the one at Flaming Gorge, which has now been completely investigated as a power site under premilinary permit 165 of the Federal Power Commission.

In discussing the power sites in this report it is not intended to advocate the development of the river as here outlined, but merely to suggest a plan that seems to fit into the general topographic conditions without undue disturbance to agricultural developments along the stream. Obviously, it is impossible to say that suitable foundation conditions for dams will be found at any of these suggested sites where no drilling has been done. Accordingly some of them may prove infeasible after careful investigation, or some others not here suggested may prove to be better fitted into market and economic conditions.

CONDITIONS SUGGESTING PLAN OF DEVELOPMENT

With a dam in Horseshoe Canyon complete regulation of the flow of the river at that place is possible. This is, of course, a very desirable result, because the regulated flow would then be available at all the power sites down the river.

To develop the fall through Red Canyon a dam is suggested near mile 285 of the river survey, because of the narrow cross section there and the fact that a dam of moderate height could be used to develop the entire fall between that locality and the Flaming Gorge site in Horseshoe Canyon.

The Swallow Canyon site is suggested in place of one near the upper end of the Canyon of Lodore, because the drillings made by the Bureau of Reclamation at the latter site disclose unattractive foundation conditions, which add materially to the engineering difficulties of the project, because the dam site is from 1 to 3 miles down the canyon, a narrow rock gorge with almost vertical walls nearly half a mile high. Furthermore, the reservoir that would be created would not be needed after the Flaming Gorge project is built and would only add to depletion of the streamflow by evaporation as well as inundate additional ranch lands in Browns Park.

With a dam at the head of Whirlpool Canyon, which is here suggested as the Echo Park site, advantage would be gained of the combined flow of the Green and Yampa Rivers, and it is believed that with the streams already regulated at developments above sufficient additional regulation would be created by this dam to take care of the inflow below the other points of regulation. The Canyon of Lodore would be the reservoir, and no serious inundation of lands in Browns Park would result. Evaporation losses would be a minimum, because of the narrowness of the canyon, the average width of the proposed reservoir surface being only about 600 feet. However, it would be about 30 miles long and have an estimated capacity of 200,000 acre-feet, about half of which could be used for stream regulation with a drawdown of 50 feet at the dam.

The Split Mountain site is at the lower end of the Green River Canyon through the Uinta Mountains. It contemplates by creating storage in Island Park the use of the total regulated flow of the Green River at this point. Here the river enters the open valley of the Uinta Basin, and for a distance of more than 80 miles it meanders through the valley with an average fall of less than 2 feet to the mile.

It is this valley that would be inundated by the proposed Ouray Reservoir, for which dam-site surveys were made at several sections in the upper end of Desolation Canyon. The building of this reservoir would completely control the Green River at this place, but it would inundate considerable improved agricultural land and serve no material benefit other than contribute to regulation of the lower Colorado River. No suitable dam site was found.

The fall in Desolation and Gray Canyons below Uinta Basin and the topography of the canyon suggest two developments, and these are selected with the view of utilizing the power of the stream with due regard to the agricultural possibilities along it in the Uinta Basin. They are described below.

FLAMING GORGE POWER SITE

Location: The Flaming Gorge power site is on the Green River just south of the Wyoming-Utah line. The dam site is in the upper end of Horseshoe Canyon, in the SW. ¼ sec. 31, T. 3 N., R. 21 E., Salt Lake base and meridian.

Physical characteristics: Hoseshoe Canyon is a narrow gorge with massive sandstone walls, in many places almost vertical. (See pl. 31, A.) In August 1923, a preliminary permit was issued to the Utah Power & Light Co. by the Federal Power Commission for the development of this site. Under this permit more than 20 drill holes were sunk in Horseshoe Canyon and 10 in Flaming Gorge. Bedrock was found in Flaming Gorge at depths of 40 to 45 feet and in Horseshoe Canyon at depths ranging from 50 feet at the upper end of the canyon to 73 feet at the lower end. As a result of these investigations and studies of cross sections at many places the dam site above indicated was chosen as best suited for the proposed development. At this section the average altitude of low water is 5,839 feet above sea level and a dam with its crest at 6,065 feet would have a crest length of 875 feet.

ECHO PARK POWER SITE

Location: The Echo Park Dam site is at the head of Whirlpool Canyon, just where the river leaves Echo Park. It is about 3 miles down the river from the mouth of the Yampa River.

Physical characteristics: At this site the river is in a narrow box canyon in the Uinta quartzite. The distance between the walls at the water surface is 150 feet, and a dam to raise the water 300 feet would be 600 feet long on the top.

Plan of development: A development such as that proposed at the Flaming Gorge site is also suggested at this site.

Water supply: At this site the flow of the Green River is augmented by that of the Yampa River, and it is estimated that with each of the streams regulated above a flow of 4,950 second-feet would be available here. The Canyon of Ladore and the Blue Mountain Canyon on the Yampa River would form a reservoir. The backwater would extend up each of the streams about 29½ miles and create storage capacity of about 575,000 acre-feet. The Sand Draw and Johnson Draw dam sites, on the Yampa River, would both be flooded.

Power capacity: The static head at the Echo Park site would probably fluctuate from 280 to 300 feet, allowing the top 20 feet of the reservoir to be used for regulation of the inflow into it below other points of regulation. With an average static head of 290 feet and a stream flow of 4,950 second-feet the power capacity of the site is 114,800 horsepower (86,100 kilowatts). All future irrigation use of the streams above this site will probably never reduce this capacity as much as 15 percent.

Right of way: No valuable agricultural lands would be flooded by this project.

Accessibility: The scite is accessible with difficulty. It is remote from any railroad transportation and would require expensive road construction to connect it with any present highway.

SPLIT MOUNTAIN POWER SITE

Location: The Split Mountain power site is about 1 mile above the lower end of Split Mountain Canyon, about 9 miles northeast of Jensen, Utah, just below mile 201 of the Green River survey.

Physical characteristics: The river at this dam site has cut its channel into the Weber sandstone. This rock is hard and dense and is considered satisfactory for the foundation and abutment walls of a dam.

Plan of development: The same type of development as that proposed at the Flaming Gorge site is adaptable for this site. The dam here would have a length of 150 feet at the water surface (altitude 4,800 feet) and a crest length of 1,000 feet at a height of 250 feet (altitude 5,050 feet). Another plan has been suggested, however, as a combination irrigation and power development. This plan contemplates a tunnel from a point immediately above the proposed dam extending almost due south to Red Wash. This tunnel, if taken out at an altitude of 4,900 feet, would be about 1 mile long, and a penstock from its outlet to the river near the mouth of Red Wash would be 1½ miles long. This would cut off about 12 miles of the river course and gain an additional head of 65 feet, adding about 25,500 horsepower to the capacity of the site after due allowance is made for irrigating about 12,000 acres of land to the west and south of the tunnel outlet. The large tunnel and pressure pipe necessary to handle 5,100 second-feet of water would add considerably to the cost of the development, but the irrigation feature may add to the attractiveness of the project when further irrigation development is needed in that locality. A small tunnel for the irrigation project might be more feasible. It has also been proposed that water be diverted from the Green River here to supply the Deadmans Bench irrigation project, which lies on both sides of the Colorado-Utah line to the southeast. This plan, however, was investigated by the Bureau of Reclamation and determined to be economically infeasible.

Water supply: From an analysis of the stream-flow records on the Green River at Little Valley, Ouray, Jensen, and Bridgeport, it is estimted that an equalized flow at the Split Mountain power site of about 5,100 second-feet is possible with the regulation provided by the other developments above and the storage that would be created behind this dam.

Power capacity: If the top 50 feet of the storage behind the dam is allowed for regulation the average static head would be 225 feet. With a flow of 5,100 second-feet the power capacity would be 91,800 horsepower (68,850 kilowatts). Ultimate irrigation use of the streams above this site will probably not decrease this capacity in excess of 15 percent.

Right of way: Development as here suggested would inundate Island Park, a part of which is used for ranching.

Accessibility: The dam site is not difficultly accessible from towns in the Uinta Basin, but it is remote from railroad transportation.

Waterpower sites on Green River between Green River, Wyo., and Green River, Utah [1]

Name of power site	Static head (feet)	Estimated regulated streamflow (second-feet)	Power capacity (horsepower)
Flaming Gorge	[2] 196	2,620	41,000
Red Canyon	266	2,720	57,900
Swallow Canyon	195	2,740	34,700
Echo Park [3]	[2] 290	4,950	114,800
Split Mountain	[2] 225	5,100	91,800
Rock Creek	[2] 180	7,000	100,000
Rattlesnake	275	7,000	154,000
Total			594,200

[1] Backwater from either the Dark Canyon or the junction power developments as described in Water Supply Paper 556, pp. 47–49, would extend to the town of Green River, Utah. For this reason the utilization of that stretch of the river below the town is not considered in detail in this report.

[2] Average head.

[3] Development of the Echo Park site would flood the Sand Draw and Johnson Draw Dam sites on the Yampa River.

Water powers of Green River Basin

RECAPITULATION

Minor drainage basin	Number of power sites	Horsepower			
		With existing flow		With regulated flow	
		0.08H×Q90	0.08H×Q50	0.08H×Q90	0.08H×Q50
Upper Green River Basin	9	1,530	1,933	11,100	
Yampa and White River Basins	9	[1] 7,150	[1] 17,460	[2] 86,500	
Uinta Basin exclusive of Green River	16	37,170	59,088	49,622	78,334
Lower Green River Basin	9	5,930	10,084	18,190	
Green River canyons	7			594,200	
Total	50	51,780	88,565	759,612	78,344

[1] Includes Cross Mountain site and sites on small streams. Other sites on main stream considered only with stream regulation.

[2] Does not include Sand Draw and Johnson Draw sites, as these would be flooded by development of Echo Park site on Green River.

RELATIVE VALUE OF STREAMS FOR POWER AND IRRIGATION

In the arid region the question how the streams may be used to best advantage is one that becomes more serious as the use of the water increases. One of the fundamental conditions involved in the question is the accepted principle that the different uses to which the water may be put are classified in order of their importance as (1) domestic, (2) irrigation, and (3) power and other industrial uses. In the early stages of development along the streams there is usually plenty of water and no difficulty attendant upon its use, but as the number of users increases and communities become dependent upon the streams for their water supply the problem becomes more and more complicated.

It is, of course, obvious that domestic use should have a preferred right, and it is also obvious that in communities where local irrigation is of primary importance in the production of the community's food supplies that, too, should have a preferred right. But there are few communities now that are solely dependent upon their own products for food. Only a little more than half of the food supply for the farms in the intermontane region is now produced on the farms, and in many places it is even cheaper to obtain foodstuffs by parcel post or freight than it is to produce them there. This condition has greatly changed the economic aspect of farming in the arid region where irrigation is necessary, and it has likewise affected, in some localities at least, the economic value of water rights for irrigation.

Throughout the arid region the cheaply constructed irrigation projects in climates adapted for general farming are all built, and the time when the more expensive ones will become economically feasible has been pushed farther into the future by increased transportation facilities and more efficient farming methods. Agriculture, including irrigation, was the basis upon which practically all the permanent communities of the arid West have been built, and some of these are still solely dependent upon this industry for their existence, but others have added different forms of industry such as mining and manufacturing.

The communities supported by irrigated lands are beyond doubt more stable than those subject to the ups and downs of prosperity that are not uncommon to other industries, and for this reason public opinion in the West places irrigation use of the streams superior to all other uses except domestic.

It is a somewhat common practice to measure the future growth of the arid West in terms of the total runoff of the streams and the area of undeveloped land, without any regard to the economic factor involved in the problem. However, the fallacy of such a criterion is very rapidly becoming apparent. The fact is now recognized that new problems must be solved in irrigation development to meet the profound changes that are reshaping our economic and social structure. Further irrigation development should be made only as economic needs demand, if it is to become permanently successful. This fact, however, seems to be entirely overlooked by those who wish to see every arable acre developed, and the result is that other uses of streams, such as power, are regarded as subject for all time to any proposed future demands for irrigation development, regardless of economic feasibili-

ty and without consideration of the relative economic value of the two uses. This attitude may preclude the use of a stream for power, as it may involve the water rights for that use in so much uncertainty as to make the power capacity too small to be attractive and also add to the difficulties of financing the project. In view of these conditions, each stream should be considered as an individual problem, and its utilization might properly be worked out according to the most comprehensive plan, based upon the weighted economic values of the various uses. Power now has a place in modern agriculture. Electricity has become the servant of the farmer and is the means by which he is enabled to do several times the work that he could do a few years ago.

EXHIBIT 4

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
December 13, 1934.

The DIRECTOR,
National Park Service.

DEAR DIRECTOR CAEMMERER: Reference is made to Acting Director Demaray's letter of August 9, 1934, in which the Commission was advised that you were studying the possibility of establishing a national monument along the Green and Yampa Rivers, in northwestern Colorado, which would embrace lands withdrawn for the proposed Echo Park and Blue Mountain power developments included in the application for preliminary permit of the Utah Power & Light Co., designated as project No. 279.

Assurance was given in the letter that the Presidential proclamation establishing such a monument would exempt all existing rights, including power withdrawals, but a statement was added that if it were possible to release the power withdrawals the "monument would be placed in a much better position from the standpoint of administration." This implied request for a vacation of the power withdrawal has called for careful consideration because of the magnitude of the power resources involved and the fact that the permit application is still in suspended status pending conclusion of the comprehensive investigation of irrigation and power possibilities on the Upper Colorado River and its tributaries by the Bureau of Reclamation, and a more definite determination of water allocations between the States of the upper basin. The power resources in this area are also covered by Power Site Reserves Nos. 121 and 721 and Power Site Classifications Nos. 87 and 93 of the Interior Department.

In the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. the primary power capacity of the Echo Park site is estimated at 130,000 horsepower. This is based on the development of a head of 310 feet at the dam and a regulated flow of 5,000 cubic feet per second obtained by storage in the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir on Green River and Juniper Mountain Reservoir on Yampa River. At Blue Mountain the primary capacity is estimated at 19,000 horsepower based on the development of 210 feet of head and a regulated flow of 1,100 cubic feet per second.

Ralf R. Woolley in his report on Green River and its utilization (Water Supply Paper No. 618, U. S. Geological Survey), proposes the development of 114,800 horsepower, primary capacity, at the Echo Park site, based on an average head of 290 feet and a streamflow of 4,950 cubic feet per second. At Johnson's Draw, which is his designation for the Blue Mountain site, Mr. Woolley proposes a primary capacity of 43,200 horsepower based on a regulated flow of 1,800 cubic feet per second and a head of 300 feet. Either of these estimates would justify installations of something like 300,000 horsepower at Echo Park and at least 50,000 horsepower at Blue Mountain.

It is generally recognized that the Green and Yampa Rivers present one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale. Power possibilities on Green River between the proposed Flaming Gorge Reservoir and Green River, Utah, and on the Yampa River below the proposed Juniper Mountain Reservoir are estimated at more than 700,000 primary horsepower, which would normally correspond to 1.5 million to 2 million horsepower installed capacity. Excellent dam sites are available, and as the greater part of the lands remain in the public domain, a very small outlay would be required for flowage rights. The sites we are considering are important links in any general plan of development of these streams.

Regardless of the disposition which may be made of the Utah Power & Light Co.'s application, and giving due consideration to the prospect that some time may elapse before this power is needed, the Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource is too great to permit its impairment by voluntary relinquishment of two units in the center of the scheme. The Commission will not object, however, to the creation of the monument if the proclamation contains a specific provision that power development under the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act will be permitted.

I enclose a copy of the portion of the application of the Utah Power & Light Co. which describes the proposed development, and blueprints of exhibits H (a), H (b), and H (c) showing the location of the various units of the plan, river profiles, and cross sections of the dam sites. The Commission has no special reports on the area under consideration, but if you are not already familiar with them, it is suggested that you obtain the following publications of the Geological Survey:

Water supply paper No. 618 (previously referred to).

Plan and profile of Yampa River, Colo., from Green River to Morgan Gulch (5 sheets showing river profile and topography and 1 sheet of special dam-site surveys).

Plan and profile of Green River, Green River, Utah, to Green River, Wyo. (16 sheets, 10 plans, and 6 profiles).

Yours very cordially,

FRANK R. MCNINCH,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT 5

EXCERPTS FROM THE COLORADO RIVER, A DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR REPORT, DATED MARCH 1946

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF WATER RESOURCES

31. Ultimate development of the water resources of the Colorado River will involve the investigation and construction of such projects as will fully utilize for irrigation, power production, flood control, and other beneficial purposes all the water in the Colorado River system available to the United States. Looking toward the formulation of a plan for comprehensive development, this report presents for consideration 134 potential projects or units of projects, mostly multiple purpose, for use of water within the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River. Potential projects for the export of water from the Colorado River Basin to adjacent basins are also discussed. The inventory of potential projects in this report and substantiating material is intended to be of use in the selection of projects which will comprise ultimately the final comprehensive plan. It is not intended that the listing of projects in this report will preclude the consideration of others that additional investigations may show to be desirable. In the formulation of the ultimate plan, however, consideration must also be given the possibilities for expanding projects now existing or authorized. Because of the limited water supply, it is not possible for all the potential projects to be constructed and for all the existing or authorized projects to be expanded to the possible extent of their ultimate potentialities. Each development can deplete the stream flow only insofar as permitted by the Colorado River compact and other legal limitations. The formulation of an ultimate plan of river development, therefore, will require selection from among the possibilities for expanding existing or authorized projects as well as from among the potential new projects. Before such a selection of projects can be made it will be necessary that the seven Colorado River Basin States agree upon their respective rights to deplete the water supply of the Colorado River or that the courts apportion available water among them. Each State also will need to select from the potential projects within its boundaries those it desires to have constructed to consume its allocation of water. The many decisions and selections to be made require a vast background of factual information. To assist the States in the selection of projects the several agencies which have prepared this report stand ready to make available their consultative services and all information presently at hand. A great amount of engineering and economic investigational work has been required to assemble and evaluate the information from which has been prepared this inventory of potential projects. Detailed information is available for a substantial number of potential developments and only data of a reconnaissance nature for others, but from all the information available it should be possible, prior to a final settlement of water rights, to select a group of projects which are urgently needed, or which will be key units of the comprehensive plan for construction as the next stage of the development.

32. Although there would be enough water in the river system to serve all of the 134 within-basin projects or units of projects if no further exportation of water is made, it may be found more economical and the States may elect to forego construction of some irrigation projects within the natural drainage basin in order to make water available for exportation to adjacent watersheds within the basin States. When final allocations of water are made, moreover, some States may be unable to use their full amount unless part is exported. Power projects do not consume water except by evaporation from power reservoirs, but most of these reservoirs serve multiple purposes and are required for full river regulation and control.

33. If all the 134 within-basin potential projects or units of projects were constructed, they would deplete the flow of the Colorado River by more than 6 million acre-feet annually. New possibilities exist for the exportation of an additional 3 million acre-feet annually to areas outside the natural drainage basin but within the boundaries of the Colorado River Basin States, as permitted by the Colorado River compact. If all existing or authorized projects were constructed to the possible extent of their ultimate potentialities, they would increase present depletion by approximately 4 million acre-feet. With present uses depleting the stream by about 7 million acre-feet, the total depletions would aggregate more than 20 million acre-feet, or about 25 percent more than the estimated amount of water available. Predominant among existing or

authorized projects which could be further developed are those in the lower basin made possible by the construction of Boulder Dam. Possible future development of these enterprises would increase present river depletions by about 3,600,000 acre-feet annually, of which 2,800,000 acre-feet would be used in California outside the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River and the remainder would be consumed in Arizona or California or lost by reservoir evaporation. In the upper basin completion of existing or authorized transmountain diversion projects would further deplete the river by 474,000 acre-feet annually and expansion of within-basin projects would cause a depletion of 82,000 acre-feet.

34. The depletory effect on stream flow of all within-basin and export diversion projects, including existing or authorized projects and potential projects, is shown in table 1. The depletion shown under existing or authorized projects include present depletions resulting from projects in operation and possible depletions which would result from the extension of existing projects or the construction of authorized projects. Depletions are shown for the 134 potential within-basin projects and for the new export diversion possibilities.

TABLE I.—*Present and potential stream depletions in the Colorado River Basin*

Basin and State	Estimated average annual depletion (acre-feet) [1]			
	Existing or authorized projects		Potential projects	Total ultimate depletion
	Present depletion	Possible increase		
Upper basin:				
Arizona	10,200		39,000	49,200
Colorado	1,231,300	507,000	2,522,000	4,260,300
New Mexico	68,400		450,000	518,400
Utah	515,900	32,000	1,462,700	2,010,600
Wyoming	374,000	17,000	576,000	967,000
Main stem reservoir losses			831,000	831,000
Pasture irrigation	(2)	(2)	500,000	500,000
Subtotal	2,199,800	556,000	6,380,700	9,136,500
Lower basin:				
Arizona	1,407,200	571,000	2,015,400	3,993,600
California	2,680,000	2,946,000	176,000	5,802,000
Nevada	43,800		213,000	256,800
New Mexico	29,000		8,000	37,000
Utah	45,000		56,300	101,300
Main stem reservoir losses	713,000	66,000	91,000	870,000
Subtotal	4,918,000	3,583,000	2,559,700	11,060,700
Total	7,117,800	4,139,000	8,940,400	20,197,200

NOTE.—Average flow available for depletion in the United States, 16,220,000 acre-feet.

[1] Includes both uses within the natural basin and export diversions to adjacent watersheds.
[2] Included in depletions shown by States.

POTENTIAL PROJECTS

35. The 134 projects or units of projects included in the inventory of potential projects for development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin are all located within the natural drainage basin of the Colorado River, 100 in the upper basin and 34 in the lower basin. These within-basin potential projects considered as a group indicate in general the ultimate potentialities of future development. For that reason these projects are summarized in the following paragraphs. If similar basin reports for adjoining basins or individual project reports indicate the need and desirability for exporting water from the natural drainage basin for use within the Colorado Basin States, as permitted by the Colorado River Compact, this would result in a corresponding reduction of within-basin uses. New possibilities for exportation of water to adjoining watersheds, such as the Blue River-South Platte and Gunnison-Arkansas projects in Colorado and the central Utah project in Utah, are mentioned in the substantiating material but are not tabulated and summarized in the inventory of potential projects presented in this report.

36. If all of these 134 projects or units of projects should be constructed they would benefit 2,656,230 acres of land, 1,734,980 acres in the upper basin and 921,250 acres in the lower basin. Of this total 1,533,960 acres would be new land brought into cultivation, 1,230,810 acres in the upper basin and 303,150 acres in the lower basin, and 1,122,270 acres of inadequately irrigated land would be furnished a supplemental supply, 504,170 acres in the upper basin and 618,100 acres in the lower basin. (See par. 41, table III.) In addition to these lands vast areas of natural pasture lands in the upper basin would produce more abundantly under irrigation. These pasture lands, located mostly on gentle mountain slopes, have not been surveyed and consequently specific projects have not been planned to bring water to them, but in summarizing potentialities for new developments an ultimate river depletion of 500,000 acre-feet annually has been allowed for pasture irrigation.

37. These potential projects include 38 hydroelectric power plants with a total installed capacity of more than 3,500,000 kilowatts. (See par. 41, table IV.) Twenty-nine of the plants would be in the upper basin, mostly on tributary streams. The combined installed capacities of the upper basin plants would total 1,713,000 kilowatts and the annual energy output 9.2 billion kilowatt-hours.

This is more than the anticipated requirement for power in the upper basin and would leave some for transmission to adjacent areas. The 9 new plants outlined for the lower basin would have installed capacities totaling 1,945,400 kilowatts and would produce 10.2 billion kilowatt-hours of additional energy a year. This would satisfy all expected demands in the lower basin and the adjacent west coast power market area until 1960, at which time additional power developments would be required to meet growing demands. The potential power output in both the upper and lower basins could be maintained substantially even with full development of the river system for irrigation and other purposes.

38. Potential power and irrigation reservoirs would make a substantial contribution to flood control in the basin, but the extent of that contribution cannot, of course, be determined until the projects to be constructed have been selected. Some of these reservoirs would permit use of a greater part of Lake Mead's capacity for irrigation storage and power production.

39. Reservoirs provided for irrigation, power production, or flood control would have incidental value for fishing, boating, and other recreational purposes. Reservoirs could be operated to maintain or improve the fishing in mountain streams. Specific projects are described which would furnish municipal supplies to Tucson, Ariz., and the Grand Valley area in Colorado. Future water requirements for growing municipalities and industries could be provided as needs arise. Many of the reservoirs would have storage capacity for retention of silt and mitigate that menace for a great many years to come.

40. Construction of all these potential projects for use of water in the natural drainage basin, including transmission grids, is estimated to cost $2,185,442,000 with expenditures divided $930,142,000 in the upper basin and $1,255,300,000 in the lower basin. These preliminary estimates are based on costs as of January 1940.

41. These 134 potential projects or units of projects, together with their locations, sources of water supply, purposes to be served, and estimated construction costs are listed in table II. Potential irrigation and power developments that would result from the construction of these projects are summarized in tables III and IV, respectively.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

54. There is need for proceeding at an early date with the construction of certain of the potential projects. In areas such as would be served by the Animas-LaPlata, Hurricane, and Snowflake projects, existing distress resulting from the lack of opportunities in irrigated agriculture should be relieved as promptly as practicable. The power markets of southern California and southern Arizona will shortly require the construction of a major hydroelectric development on the lower river; similarly, the load growth in Utah and western Colorado will require construction of power developments in the upper basin. An existing economy in the Salt and Gila River Valleys in central Arizona is threatened with serious losses through overdraft of its water supply from underground sources. Key developments necessary in many instances before lesser developments can proceed, should be constructed at an early date in order that those dependent projects may follow in logical order and basinwide development be undertaken in stages.

55. To activate a construction program, it is suggested that the affected States decide from among the known potentialities which projects they desire to have the Bureau of Reclamation consider for construction and that such projects as are selected for construction comprise the next stage of development. The economic feasibility of the group of projects included in this next stage of development would be comprehended in the finding of feasibility for the overall ultimate development of the basin. The group of projects should include those for which there is an immediate need and for which adequate water rights consistent with the Colorado River Compact and its associated and dependent documents are assured. As has been stated, the agencies which have prepared this report stand ready with their consultative services to assist the States in this selective process. When the next stage of development has been decided upon, it may be presented to the Congress as a program for authorization of construction.

TABLE II.—*Potential projects in the Colorado River Basin*

Project and unit	Location of project	Source of water supply	Purpose to be served [1]	Estimated construction cost [2]
UPPER BASIN				
Sublette	Wyoming	Green River	I, F, P	$36,500,000
West Side	do	do	I, F	
Daniel	do	do	I, F	
Elkhorn	do	do	I, F, P	
Paradise	do	New Fork River	I	
Eden	do	Big Sandy Creek	I	
Lower Big Sandy	do	do	I	
LaBarge	do	LaBarge Creek	I, F	
Fontenelle	do	Fontenelle Creek	I, F	
Seedskadee	do	Green River	I	
Opal	do	Hams Fork	I, F	3,600,000
Lyman	do	Blacks Fork, Smiths Fork	I, F	4,330,000
Henrys Fork	Wyoming, Utah	Henrys Fork	I, F	1,470,000
Flaming Gorge	do	Green River	P, F, H, S	10,000,000
Red Canyon	Utah	do	P, F	4,100,000
Little Snake River	Wyoming, Colorado	Little Snake River tributaries	I, P, F	21,500,000
Upper Yampa	Colorado	Yampa River	I, F	2,300,000
Wessels	do	do	I, F	1,100,000
Mount Harris	do	Tributaries of Yampa River	I, F	3,300,000
Great Northern	do	Elkhead Creek and Elk River	I, F	2,700,000
Yellow Jacket	do	White River and Milk Creek	I, F	4,700,000
Deadman Bench	Colorado, Utah	Yampa River	I, P, F, H, S	23,800,000
Maybell	Colorado	do	I	700,000
Cross Mountain	do	do	P	5,000,000
Lily Park	do	do	P, F	1,900,000
Josephine Basin	do	do	I	300,000
Piceance	do	Piceance Creek	I, F	800,000
Moon Lake Extension	Utah	Duchesne River and tributary	I, F	7,900,000
Fruitland	do	Red Creek	I, F	400,000
Castle Peak	do	Duchesne River	I, F	5,300,000
Mosby	do	Deep Creek, Whiterocks River	I, F	1,100,000
Vernal	do	Ashley Creek	I, F	1,500,000
Jensen	do	Brush Creek	I, F	300,000
Minnie Maud	do	Minnie Maud Creek	I, F	100,000
Green River Pumping	do	Green River	I	400,000
Echo Park	Colorado	do	P, F, H, S	43,000,000
Split Mountain	Utah	do	P, F, H, S	23,000,000
Emery County	do	Cottonwood Creek	I, F	2,500,000
Buckhorn	do	Huntington Creek	I, F	1,200,000
Gunnison Valley	do	Green River	I	1,100,000
Desolation Canyon	do	do	P, F, H	21,000,000
Rattlesnake Power	do	do	P, F, H	23,000,000
Troublesome	Colorado	Troublesome Creek	I, F	2,210,000
Muddy Creek	do	Muddy Creek	I, F	500,000
Gore Canyon	do	Colorado River	P	3,800,000
Fourmile	do	Fourmile Creek	I, F	600,000
Cattle Creek	do	Cattle Creek	I, F	430,000
Capitol Creek	do	Snowmass Creek	I	130,000
Woody Creek	do	Roaring Fork	I	170,000
Silt	do	Rifle Creek	I, F	1,320,000
West Divide	do	Middle Willow Creek	I, F	1,300,000
Hunter Mesa	do	Buzzard Creek	I, F	1,500,000
Roan Creek	do	Carr Creek	I, F	610,000
Collbran	do	Plateau Creek	I, F, M	1,940,000
Grand Valley Extension	do	Colorado River	I	415,000
Cisco-Thompson	Colorado, Utah	do.[3]	P, I, F, H, S	34,240,000
Tomichi Creek	Colorado	Tomichi Creek	I, F	1,860,000
Cochetopa Creek	do	Cochetopa Creek	I, F	1,150,000
Ohio Creek	do	Anthracite and Castle Creeks	I, F	1,080,000
Lake Fork	do	Lake Fork	P, F	1,300,000
Sapinero	do	Gunnison River	P, F	7,800,000
Fruitland Mesa	do	Curecante and Sapinero Creeks	I, F	3,500,000
Smith Fork	do	Smith Fork	I, F	2,200,000
Paonia	do	East Muddy Creek and North Fork	I, F	1,400,000
Minnesota	do	Minnesota Creek	I, F	820,000
Leroux Creek	do	Leroux Creek	I, F	2,800,000
Grand Mesa	do	Currant, Surface, and Tongue Creeks	I, F	1,920,000
Ouray	do	Uncompahgre River	P, I, F	4,100,000
Redlands	do	Gunnison River	I, F	367,000
Saucer Valley	do	Disappointment Creek	I, F	940,000
Nucla	do	Horsefly and Cottonwood Creeks	I, F	1,500,000
San Miguel	do	Anderson, Naturita, Dry Creeks, and San Miguel River	I, F	6,590,000
West Paradox	do	West Paradox, Deep, and Geyser Creeks	I, F	640,000
Dewey	Utah	Colorado River	P, F, H, S	38,000,000
Moab	do	do	P, F, H, S	9,900,000
Pack Creek	Utah	Mill Creek	I, F	775,000
Hatch Creek	do	Hatch Creek	I, F	400,000
Dulce-Chama-Navaho	Colorado	Navaho River	I, F	1,627,000
South San Juan	New Mexico	San Juan River	I, F	35,000,000
Carracas	Colorado	do	I	36,000
O'Neal Park	do	Piedra River	I	880,000
Hammond	New Mexico	San Juan River	I	725,000
Shiprock	do	do	I, F	21,141,000
Emerald Lake	Colorado	Pine River	P, F	6,200,000
Pine River Extension	Colorado, New Mexico	do	I	1,835,000
Florida	Colorado	Florida River	I, F	2,290,000
Animas-La Plata	Colorado, New Mexico	Animas and La Plata Rivers	I, P, F, S	63,534,000
McElmo	Colorado	McElmo Creek	I, F	390,000
Montezuma Valley Extension	do	Dolores River	I, F	1,300,000
Dolores	Colorado, Utah	do	I, F, S	12,200,000
Blanding	Utah	Recapture Creek	I, F	567,000
Navaho Indian Project	Colorado	San Juan River	I, F, S	2,910,000
Bluff	Utah	do	P, F	19,000,000
Goosenecks	do	do	P, S, F, H	5,200,000
Slick Horn Canyon	do	do	P, S, F, H	6,300,000
Great Bend	do	do	P, S, F, H	10,000,000
Fremont	do	Fremont River	I, F	800,000
Torrey	do	do	I, F	200,000
Escalante	do	Escalante River	I, F	900,000
Dark Canyon	do	Colorado River	P, F, S, H	105,000,000
Glen Canyon	Arizona	do	P, F, S, H	64,000,000
Transmission Grid				170,000,000
Subtotal, upper basin				930,142,000

[1] Symbols used: I=irrigation; F=flood control; P=power; H=hold-over storage for river regulation; S=silt retention; M=municipal; U=underground water recharge; C=channel improvement. In addition many potential reservoirs would have value for recreation and fish and wildlife conservation.

[2] Preliminary estimates based on construction costs Jan. 1, 1940.

[3] Half the water required for this project would be diverted from the Gunnison River by exchange.

TABLE II.—*Potential projects in the Colorado River Basin*—Continued

Project and unit	Location of project	Source of water supply	Purpose to be served	Estimated construction cost
LOWER BASIN				
Snowflake	Arizona	Showlow and Silver Creeks	I, F, S	$2,600,000
Black Creek	do	Black Creek	I, F, S	1,800,000
Holbrook	do	Little Colorado River	I, F, S, C	1,300,000
Winslow	do	Clear and Chevelon Creeks	I, F, S	19,000,000
Kanab Creek	do	Kanab Creek	I	200,000
Hurricane	Utah, Arizona	Virgin River	I, P, S, F	9,200,000
Santa Clara	Utah	Santa Clara River	I, F, S	1,700,000
Panaca Valley	Nevada	Meadow Valley Wash	I, F	1,300,000
Moapa Valley	do	Muddy River	I, F, S	700,000
Moapa Valley Pumping	do	Lake Mead	I	2,800,000
Marble Canyon-Kanab Creek	Arizona	Colorado River	P, F, S, H	382,000,000
Coconino	do	Little Colorado River	F, S, H	4,000,000
Bridge Canyon	do	Colorado	P, I, F, S, H	146,500,000
Virgin Bay Pumping	Nevada	Lake Mead	I	1,300,000
Las Vegas Pumping	do	do	I, M	8,400,000
Davis Reservoir Pumping	do	Davis Reservoir	I	500,000
Big Bend Pumping	do	Colorado River	I	700,000
Fort Mojave	do	do	I	800,000
Mojave Valley	Arizona	do	I	1,900,000
Alamo	do	Bill Williams River	F, P, H	3,200,000
Palo Verde Mesa	California	Colorado River	I	3,100,000
Wellton-Mohawk	Arizona	do	I	10,600,000
Sentinel	do	Gila River	F, H	15,000,000
River rectification and control	California-Arizona	Colorado River	F	5,000,000
Central Arizona	Arizona	do	I, F, P, M, U	432,800,000
Salt River.				
Paradise Valley.				
San Carlos.				
Charleston.				
Safford Valley.				
San Francisco.				
Duncan-Virden Valley.				
New Mexico.				
Chino Valley	do	Granite and Willow Creeks	I	150,000
Hassayampa	do	Hassayampa River	I, F	6,650,000
Transmission Grid				192,100,000
Subtotal, lower basin				1,255,300,000
Total, Colorado River Basin				2,185,442,000

RELATED INVESTIGATIONS

56. Various Federal agencies having an interest in development of resources in the basin have collaborated in the preparation of this report. These agencies have cooperated to the extent of funds and personnel available, and their specific comments are found in chapter VIII of the substantiating material attached.

57. The Geological Survey has furnished basic data on streamflow, ground-water supplies, quality of water, water utilization, minerals, and mapping. In order to obtain additional basic facts related to both surface water and ground water of the Colorado River Basin, the Geological Survey has outlined a 3-year investigational program estimated to cost about $650,000 a year. The basic water facts obtained by the Geological Survey are needed for use not only in the design, construction, and operation of potential projects but also in the planning, construction, operation, and administration of other structures, present and future, involving the use of water in the basin. Surveys and investigations should be prosecuted actively so that data secured will be continuous and representative.

58. The National Park Service has surveyed the recreational possibilities of the potential projects and has made a number of specific recommendations which will enhance their recreational value. The Bureau of Reclamation concurs in the objectives of these proposals. The National Park Service, however, questions the advisability of the Moab power project on the ground that it "would inundate the lower slopes and bottom of an unusually scenic canyon and eliminate the existing road which runs through the canyon between Moab and Dewey, Utah." A road could be constructed along the edge of the reservoir, and in all probability this would add to the scenic attractions of the canyon. Such differences do not represent conflicts between the purposes of these agencies both of which desire to secure maximum overall benefits for the people of the basin.

59. The Fish and Wildlife Service has made preliminary studies of the potential projects reported herein and has made a number of specific recommendations which will assure the restoration and conservation of fish and wildlife resources. The Bureau of Reclamation concurs in principle with these recommendations. Owing to very limited streamflows which prevail during dry years, however, it would be impracticable to maintain the minimum releases of water which are desired. As detailed project plans are prepared, the interest of the Fish and Wildlife Service can be correlated into a unified program. In order to provide the increased fish stocking required for the new reservoirs the Fish and Wildlife Service should develop and expand its present facilities at Springville, Utah, construct a new combination trout-bass fisheries station near Page Springs in Oak Creek Canyon, about 40 miles south of Flagstaff, Ariz., and supplement the facilities of this new hatchery by further developing the Williams Station for necessary incubation of trout eggs, as recommended in its report.

60. The Grazing Service has outlined the objectives of its range-improvement program and the benefits that will result from potential projects in stabilization of the livestock industry and conservation of natural resources. Results of the proposed reclamation program in the Colorado River Basin will be favorable from a Grazing Service viewpoint.

61. The Bureau of Mines has probed the minerals of the basin to discover how they might best be mined, processed, and utilized to support the metallurgical and industrial economy that is envisioned. "The mineral industries in the Colorado River Basin constitute one of the most obvious outlets for power generated at multiple-purpose dams."

62. The Office of Indian Affairs has outlined projects that will benefit the Indians of the basin.

63. The General Land Office, which administers about 6 million acres of public land in the Colorado River Basin, has outlined a program to obtain optimum use of these public lands and to coordinate their utilization with the development of water resources.

64. The Forest Service has emphasized the need for careful management of water on the national forest lands to insure adequate safeguarding of the water yields.

65. The Federal Power Commission has furnished data upon which power utilization and market trends are based and has commented generally on the power resources of the basin.

66. The interest and cooperation of State and local groups, as well as other Federal agencies in the basin, are reflected throughout the report.

CONCLUSIONS

67. Future development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin is needed to relieve economic distress in local areas, to stabilize highly developed agricultural areas, and to create opportunities for agricultural and industrial growth and expansion throughout the Colorado River Basin. Such development should be comprehended in a basinwide plan for ultimate development of all water resources of the basin. The potential projects outlined in this report will form the basis for future detailed investigations and the selection and construction of sound projects. Considered as a group, these projects are an index of the overall results and benefits to be expected from the development and utilization of all the available waters of the Colorado River system. They indicate also the engineering feasibility and economic justification of an overall plan for basin development. Planning has progressed sufficiently to make possible a selection from among the potentialities of a group of projects to comprise a construction program for the next stage of basin development. These projects should be key features of or should fit into the final comprehensive plan to be developed through continued investigations and planning.

68. There is not enough water available in the Colorado River system for full ex-

pansion of existing and authorized projects and for all potential projects outlined in the report, including the new possibilities for exporting water to adjacent watersheds. The need for a determination of the rights of the respective States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact and its associated documents therefore is most pressing.

69. It is concluded that future development of the water resources of the Colorado River Basin would benefit the national and local economies and a plan for development of all the water resources of the basin should therefore be effectuated, that the selection of a group of projects comprising the next stage of development would represent a logical step in effecting that plan, and that detailed investigations to develop the succeeding stages should be continued.

RECOMMENDATIONS

70. The following recommendations are made in view of the fact that there is not enough water available in the Colorado River system to permit construction of all the potential projects outlined in the report and for a full expansion of existing and authorized projects, and that there has not been a final determination of the respective rights of the Colorado River Basin States to deplete the flow of the Colorado River:

(1) That the States of the Colorado River Basin, acting separately or jointly, recommend for construction, as the next stage of development, a group of projects, the streamflow depletions of which will assuredly fall within ultimate allocations of Colorado River water which may be made to the individual States.

(2) That the States of the Colorado River Basin determine their respective rights to deplete the flow of the Colorado River consistent with the Colorado River compact.

(3) That additional investigations, summarized below, and appropriations to the Department of the Interior for use by the various agencies within that Department for these investigations, be approved.

(a) The Bureau of Reclamation to continue and expand its detailed investigations of potential projects within the States of the Colorado River basin to obtain adequate information by which the Department of the Interior in cooperation with the basin States can formulate a comprehensive plan for use of all the water resources of the basin and select and recommend projects for successive stages of development.

(b) The Geological Survey, National Park Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, Grazing Service, Bureau of Mines, Office of Indian Affairs, and General Land Office to initiate or continue to conduct such investigations and studies as required by the Secretary of the Interior to formulate and carry out the comprehensive plan.

E. A. MORITZ,
Regional Director, Region III.
E. O. LARSON,
Regional Director, Region IV.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I have statements of many prominent people in the United States, many of whom are officials, which I desire to place in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD at this point. They include a statement made by President Eisenhower in his message on the state of the Union, one from Vice President NIXON, one from the Secretary of the Interior, and others.

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

President Dwight D. Eisenhower, state of the Union message, January 6, 1955:

"Now, of course, the Federal Government must shoulder its own partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle, I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, as quoted in the Deseret News and Salt Lake Telegram, October 25, 1954:

"President Eisenhower is for development of the upper Colorado. The administration is committed to it. So am I."

Department of the Interior, report to Congress on S. 500:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, D. C., February 25, 1955.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Chairman, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: A report has been requested from this Department on S. 500, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project and participating projects, and for other purposes.

In his address to the Congress on the state of the Union, President Eisenhower said (H. Doc. No. 1, 84th Cong., p. 8):

"* * * the Federal Government must shoulder its * * * partnership obligations by undertaking projects of such complexity and size that their success requires Federal development. In keeping with this principle I again urge the Congress to approve the development of the upper Colorado River Basin to conserve and assure better use of precious water essential to the future of the West."

Likewise in his budget message (H. Doc. No. 16, 84th Cong., p. M65) the President said:

"I also recommend enactment of legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake construction of two comprehensive river-basin improvements which are beyond the capacity of local initiative, public or private, but which are needed for irrigation, power, flood control, and municipal and industrial water supply. These are the upper Colorado River Basin development in the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, and New Mexico, and the Fryingpan-Arkansas development in Colorado. The Colorado River development will enable the upper basin States to conserve floodwaters and to assure the availability of water and power necessary for the economic growth of the region. * * * Sale of power generated at these developments will repay the power investment within 50 years and will make a contribution toward repayment of other investments."

In the budget itself it was pointed out (p. 830) that the administration proposes to initiate construction of the Colorado River storage project during the next fiscal year if it is authorized and that the budget includes an item for funds to be requested for this purpose.

The substance of our views on the proper contents of a bill to implement the President's recommendation and particularly on those projects and units which should be covered in the initial legislation is contained in the draft of bill which was developed by the Bureau of the Budget in collaboration with this Department and submitted to your committee on April 1, 1954, in connection with S. 1555, 83d Congress, a predecessor of the present S. 500.

We recommend that S. 500 be examined in the light of the proposal there made and in the light of the two letters dated March 18, 1954, from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to your committee and to this Department which are reprinted in Senate Report No. 1983, 83d Congress, and that, with suitable amendments, S. 500 be enacted.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the submission of this report to your committee.

Sincerely yours,
FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Michael W. Straus, former commissioner, United States Bureau of Reclamation, as reported in the Salt Lake Telegram, August 7, 1952:

"He [Mr. Straus] described the upper Colorado Basin program as the greatest multiple purpose water conservation plan ever proposed for this continent."

Congress of Industrial Organizations:

"CIO VOICES SUPPORT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ECHO PARK DAM IN COLORADO

"DENVER, COLO., March 22, 1955.—CIO support for the construction of the Echo Park Dam in Echo Park, Colo., as part of the upper Colorado River storage project, has been voted by the CIO committee on power, atomic energy, and resources development, it was announced today by Chairman O. A. Knight.

"Mr. Knight, who heads the CIO Oil, Chemical, and Atomic Workers Internatinal Union, said the decision followed an extensive meeting of the committee in Denver late last month.

"In reversing its previous stand of opposition to the dam, Mr. Knight said the committee now supports the dam project as a means of securing maximum benefits of water for irrigation and municipal purposes, as well as the development of electric power for expansion of the upper Colorado Basin area.

"Mr. Knight's statement:

" 'From a careful study of the facts which have been presented to me and my committee, I am persuaded that the maximum benefit to mankind will result from the earliest possible completion of the upper Colorado storage project including Echo Park Dam. The engineering prospects provide facilities for recreation for those now interested in the scenery and wildlife aspects of this area, as well as substantial regulation of the waterflow in the river and a head of water for the production of electric power. This power is needed for the expanding population and industrial growth in the Mountain States. Salt Lake City, Utah, and Denver, Colo., and the total area between these two growing cities will greatly benefit from the earliest possible development of the total upper Colorado storage project.' "

Indian Rights Association:

INDIAN RIGHTS ASSOCIATION,
Philadelphia, March 3, 1955.

Hon. CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Irrigation, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: At its regular meeting, held yesterday, the board of directors of the Indian Rights Association went on record in support of the Navaho project of the Colorado River storage project. The association urges that the Navaho project be definitely included in any legislation authorizing the development of the water resources of the upper Colorado River Basin.

The need of the Navaho Indians for resources to enable a larger number of members of the tribe to earn a living on their reservation is fully recognized. Many thousands of Navahos should be enabled to support themselves from the use of their land to be irrigated through the Navaho project. The Navahos are entitled to first consideration in the use of the waters of the upper Colorado River Basin.

We urge the inclusion of the full Navaho project in any provisions for the upper Colorado development.

Sincerely,
LAWRENCE E. LINDLEY,
General Secretary.

National Farmers Union:

"STATEMENT OF ANGUS M'DONALD, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT, NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS, IN SUPPORT OF THE UPPER COLORADO DEVELOPMENT

"Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am here to present the position of our organization in regard to S. 500 which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado storage project and participating projects. We fully endorse this legislation and feel that it is entirely consistent with the policies of the National Farmers Union adopted by delegates of the biennial convention at Denver, Colo., March 15–19, 1954. Furthermore, endorsement of upper Colorado development is entirely consistent with policies adopted by previous Farmers Union conventions—local, country, State, and National."

The Christian Science Monitor, January 27, 1955:

"The water resources of the Colorado River's upper basin must be developed. Here is an objective against which there is no open opposition of which we have knowledge.

"These resources must be developed even if it should prove necessary to build dams at Echo Park and Split Mountain, both of which lie within the boundaries of Dinosaur National Monument. Those who would argue seriously against that postulate are also few. But as to whether it is necessary to invade a long-established national preserve is a question being hotly disputed."

Ralph A. Tudor, former Undersecretary of the Interior, as quoted in the Saturday Evening Post, November 27, 1954:

"In connection with the proposed billion-dollar program for development of the upper Colorado River basin, the Bureau of Reclamation had made plans for a dam at Echo Park within the Dinosaur National Monument, a spectacularly beautiful area in eastern Utah. Conservationists and lovers of natural beauty were up in arms over this proposal—not to mention archaeologists who had the misapprehension that the waters impounded by the dam might cover lands containing the bones of dinosaurs which once roamed this territory. Actually the bone quarry is miles from the proposed reservoir.

"Secretary McKay dispatched me to the scene. For days, I flew over the area, looking at alternate dam sites. Then I spent 3 days in Echo Park itself, climbing around the mountains. It is a delightful spot, a beautiful natural resource and, other things being equal, I certainly would say that no dam should be built in there. But other things are not equal. This is a section of the country in which water is very precious. And I had to conclude that a dam built elsewhere that would be otherwise effective would lose enough water by evaporation every year to supply a city the size of Denver. And in this semiarid country, where the whole economic development is limited by water, and where scenery is abundant, the choice was pretty clear but nonetheless hard.

"I therefore recommended to the Secretary, and to Congress, that the dam in Echo Park be built, even though it would alter—I do not concede that it would destroy—a great natural beauty spot. It was a case of balancing one natural resource against another and of using my best judgment as to which decision would serve the greater public good. I do not imagine, however, that my popularity is any too high among nature lovers. Yet had I decided against the Echo Park Dam, I would have been just as big a villain in the eyes of the upper Colorado Basin water users."

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.—Charles J. Fain, legislative assistant, NRECA, in a statement before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, March 2, 1955:

"In summary, I would like to say that the rural-electric systems nationally, and especially those in the power-marketing area to be served by the proposed upper Colorado storage project, wholeheartedly support and urge its authorization provided the power is marketed in accordance with traditional principles of reclamation law, and provided that authorization for an electric transmission network capable of fully integrating the individual units of the project with each other, and the project as a whole with the existing transmission network of the Bureau of Reclamation, and capable of delivering power to the load centers of preference customers, is included."

Individuals and organizations

The following individuals and organizations also are included among the millions of Americans who have expressed approval, either individually or through their organizations, of the Echo Park and Glen Canyon units or of the entire Colorado River storage project:

Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay.

Former Secretary of the Interior Oscar Chapman.

The entire congressional delegations of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming.

Bureau of the Budget.

Federal Power Commission.

United States Corps of Engineers.

Val Peterson, Administrator, Civil Defense Administration.

CONSERVATIONISTS AND CONSERVATION GROUPS

Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners.

Seth Gordon, one of the foremost conservation experts in United States.

Herbert F. Smart, former president of the Utah Wildlife Federation, finance commissioner of the State of Utah and member of land policy committee of National Wildlife Federation.

Thomas L. Kimball, director of Colorado Game and Fish Department.

Lester Bagley, game and fish director of the State of Wyoming.

J. Parry Egan, director of Utah's Fish and Game Department.

Leo Young, editor, Wild Life Notes (West Virginia).

Roy Despain, veteran professional Colorado River runner.

Harry Aleson, Colorado River boatman.

G. E. Untermann, ranger-naturalist at Dinosaur National Monument for many years, and at present, director of the Utah Field House of Natural History at Vernal, Utah.

Finis Mitchell, explorer and photographer.

George Harris, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

William E. Scheele, naturalist, Cleveland, Ohio.

J. Leroy Kay, Pittsburgh, curator, Carnegie Museum.

Loveland, Colo., Wildlife Association.

Hugh B. Woodward, Albuquerque, N. Mex., western director, National Wildlife Federation.

LETTERS

Letters to United States Department of Interior, tabulated April 21, 1954: 2,625 for Echo Park Dam, 2,602 against the dam (Salt Lake Tribune, April 22, 1954).

INDIAN GROUPS

Indian Rights Association.

Association of American Indian Affairs, Inc.

New Mexico Association on Indian Affairs.

Sam Akhea, chairman, Navaho Tribal Council.

Jack Clime, Indian trader, Fruitland, N. Mex.

PRIVATE UTILITIES

Arizona Public Service Co.

Public Service Co. of Colorado.

Public Service Co. of New Mexico.

Southern Colorado Power Co.

Southern Utah Power Co.

Southern Wyoming Utilities Co.

Telluride Power Co.

Western Colorado Power Co.

Uintah Power & Light Co.

Utah Power & Light Co.

MISCELLANEOUS

LaPlata Electric Association, Inc.

Montezuma County, Colorado Planning Association.

Colorado River Water Conservation District.

Farmington, N. Mex., Chamber of Commerce.

Yampa Valley, Colorado Development Association, Inc.

The Water Development Association of Southeastern Colorado.

Gooseberry Project Water Users, Mt. Pleasant, Utah.

Salt Lake Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Utah State Agricultural College, Logan, Utah.

Uintah Basin Water Users, Vernal, Utah.

Federated Women's Clubs, Provo, Utah.

Utah Canning Crops Association, Logan, Utah.

Emery County Project Water Users, Orangeville, Utah.

Orem Chamber of Commerce, Orem, Utah.

Utah County Civil Defense, Provo, Utah.

Pacific States Cast Iron Pipe Co., Provo, Utah.

Sterling Price—National Wild Life Association, Provo, Utah.

Ashley Farmers Union Cooperative, Vernal, Utah.

W. R. Wallace, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Henry Roberts, chairman, Central Utah Projects Committee.

Provo Electric Power Co., Provo, Utah.

J. A. Howell, Ogden, Utah.

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Sevier County Groups, Richfield, Utah.

County commissioners of Salt Lake, Sanpete, Utah, Sevier, Garfield, Tooele, Carbon, Washington, Uintah, Duchesne, Juab, Iron, Kane, Emery, Millard, Wayne, Grand, Wasatch, and San Juan, Utah.

Utah Association of County Officials.

State and county water users associations in Wayne County, Iron County, Garfield County, Beaver County, Sanpete County, Uintah County, Wasatch County, Piute County, Salt Lake County, and Juab County, Utah.

Utah Water Users Association.

Colorado River Development Association (21 counties).

Springville Irrigation District and Springville Drainage District.

Weber County Water Users Association.

District No. 2—Utah Water Users Association.

Cache County Water Users Association.

Pleasant Grove Irrigation Co.

Utah County Water Users Association.

Salt Lake County Water Users Association.

Uintah County Water Users Association.

Washington County Democratic Central Committee.

Washington County Republican Central Committee.

Kane County Republican Central Committee.

Uintah County Republican Central Committee.

Utah County Republican Central Committee.

Garfield County Republican Central Committee.

Committee for Young Men in Government (Grant S. Thorn, Springville, Utah).

Utah Mining Association, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Associated General Contractors, Salt Lake City, Utah.
Greater Utah Valley, Provo, Utah.
Park City Consolidated Mines, Park City, Utah.
Springville Banking Co., Springville, Utah.
Cities and towns (Utah): Payson, Springville, Orem, Nephi, Vernal, Roosevelt, Duchesne, Price, Milford, Meadow, Eureka, Scipio, Ephraim, Salt Lake City, Grantsville, Murray, Richfield, Fillmore, Fairview, Salina, Marysville, Mount Pleasant, Pleasant Grove, Provo.
Utah Municipal League.
Chambers of commerce: Salt Lake City, Richfield, Roosevelt, Wasatch, Vernal, South Salt Lake, Price, Cedar City, North Sevier, Nephi, Springville, and Ogden.
Junior chambers of commerce: Vernal, Utah State, Nephi, Delta, Gunnison Valley, Pleasant Grove, and Provo.

EDUCATIONAL GROUPS

Central Utah Vocational School.
Associated Students, Brigham Young University.
Students of the Uintah High School.
Associated Students, Utah State Agricultural College.

WOMEN'S CLUBS

Utah Federation of Women's Clubs (member).
Federated Women's Clubs of Nephi.
Women's Safety Council (Salt Lake County).
East Millard Fine Arts Guild.
Murray Women's Club.
Panguitch Women's Club.
Progressive Arts Club.
Price Federated Women's Clubs.
Richfield Study Club.
Richfield Culture Club.
Athenian Club of Lehi.
Utah Federation of Women's Clubs (Sanpete-Sevier).
Utah Federated Women's Club (State).
Roosevelt Culture Club.
Current Topic Club of Vernal.
Uintah Basin District, Federated Women's Clubs.
Mothers Study Club, Pleasant Grove, Utah.
Executive committee, Utah Federated Women's Clubs.
Junior Ladies Literary Club, American Fork, Utah.
Federated Clubs of Utah (Alpha Beta Club).
Ogden District Federation of Women's Clubs.
Provo Council PTA.
Timpanogos First District Federated Women's Clubs.

CIVIC CLUBS

Kiwanis Club of Nephi.
Kiwanis Club of Provo.
Kiwanis Club of Roosevelt.
Lions Club of Beaver.
Lions Club of Union.
Lions Club of Marysvale.
Lions Club of Park City.
Lions Club of Fairview.
Lions Club of Vernal.
Lions Club of Grantsville.
Lions Club of Panguitch.
Lions Club of Milford.
Lions Club of Salina.
Lions Club of Roosevelt.
Lions Club of Bingham Canyon.
Lions Club of Wayne County.
Lions Club of Moab.
Lions Club of Duchesne.
Lions Club of Mount Pleasant.
Lions Club of Pleasant Grove.
Associated Civic Clubs of Southern and Eastern Utah.
Kiwanis Club of Eureka.
Associated Civic Clubs of Northern Utah.
Cadmus Club of Pleasant Grove.
American Legion, Springville, Utah.
Central Utah Association of Engineers, Provo, Utah.
Utah Wildlife Federation.
Vernal Rod and Gun Club.
Mount Nebo Wildlife Association.
Utah Cattle & Horse Growers' Association.
Uintah Basin Soil Conservation District.
Utah County Central Labor Council, Provo, Utah.
Provo Real Estate Board, Provo, Utah.

Mr. WATKINS. This is only a partial list of supporters which have come to my personal attention. It does not begin to be a complete list of groups and prominent individuals in favor of the bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Utah Wild Life Federation; an article appearing in the Christian Science Monitor of April 11, 1955; a copy of a letter I have written to Representatives and Senators who have changed their position of hostility to that of open support; and an editorial from the Denver Post of April 14, 1955.

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

UTAH WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Salt Lake City, Utah, March 1955.

DEAR FRIEND OF CONSERVATION: You will, I am sure, be interested in the following analysis of wildlife resources in the area to be affected by Echo Park Dam. The analysis is by Thomas Kimball, director, game and fish department, State of Colorado. Mr. Kimball was formerly director of the Arizona Game and Fish Department, and is particularly qualified because of his studies and investigations of resources management at Lake Mead:

"FISH AND GAME ASPECTS—ECHO PARK RESERVOIR

"(By Thomas L. Kimball, director, game and fish department, State of Colorado)

"The Echo Park Dam is planned as a concrete arch type structure 525 feet in height above the river bed elevation of approximately 5,050 feet mean sea level. The maximum water surface elevation is 5,570 feet. The water surface area at this elevation will be approximately 43,000 acres. The reservoir will be of the narrow canyon-type and, when full, will back water 63 miles up the Green River and 44 miles up the Yampa River.

"The permanent outlet elevation (penstock height) is at elevation 5,325. This elevation represents the maximum drawn-down point of the reservoir and will leave a permanent water depth of 275 feet at the dam.

"The outlet works consist of an intake tower of the type constructed at Hoover Dam supplying the power penstock. The maximum discharge capacity will be 20,000 second-feet.

"In 1951 the Fish Research Division of the Colorado Game and Fish Department stationed two men in this area to gather physical data and make fish population inventories on the lower Yampa River and its tributaries. The findings showed the lower limits of trout and whitefish habitat to be in the vicinity of Craig, Colo. Siltation and high water temperatures evidently preclude the presence of cold water species in the lower sections of the Yampa River.

"The fish species which were inventoried in the portion of the Yampa to be inundated by Echo Park Reservoir are as follows: Channel catfish, Colorado River squawfish, bonytail chub, Northern Creek chub, flannelmouth sucker, bullhead catfish, roundtail chub, carp, Colorado speckled dace, and northern bluehead mountain sucker.

"This list is undoubtedly incomplete, but represents the major species now inhabiting this water. The same species are present in the Green River portion of the reservoir area although no collections were made in the Green River.

"It will be noted that the only game fish of consequence abiding there at present is the channel catfish. The Colorado River squawfish is occasionally sought by anglers for its large size.

"The fishing pressure in this area as it is now is quite low, possibly no more than 200 fisherman days per year for the entire reservoir area.

"Using United States Fish and Wildlife Service River Basin Manual evaluations, this usage amounts to a preproject monetary fishing evaluation of approximately $1,500 per year.

"A series of water and air temperatures were taken daily at various points along the lower Yampa River in 1951. The significant temperature stations with relation to Echo Park Reservoir were at Lily Park and Pat's Hole. The highest air temperature recorded was 91° F. and the highest water temperature was 79° F. These occurred in the last week in July 1951. Water temperature stayed below 60° F. until early in July.

"Water temperatures above 70° F. lasted from mid-July to the second week in August at which time they slowly began to cool to 65° in early September.

"This temperature data points up the fact that it would not take an excessive drop in temperature to make these waters within temperature tolerance ranges of cold water game fish species such as trout and whitefish.

"It is felt that the construction of Echo Park Reservoir would drop water temperatures at least in the lower and central strata to well within trout temperature tolerances.

"In all probability other game fish with greater temperature tolerance ranges such as walleyed pike and largemouth black bass would create a significant fishery in the upper strata of the lake.

"Utilization of a fishery in this area would not be as great when compared to reservoirs near larger centers of population; however, the eventual quality and quantity of the fishery would play a large part in its popularity and usage.

"Using the very minimum figure of one pound of fish to the creel per surface acre per year on the basis of a partially drawn-down reservoir of 20,000 acres (43,000 acres full) the reservoir would yield an annual monetary evaluation of $81,600 for a trout fishery or $54,400 for a bass and walleye fishery (River Basin Manual evaluation figures).

"This evaluation is considered for the reservoir fishery only. The stream fishery below the dam would develop into an excellent trout fishery if the water is drawn from underneath the surface of the lake as is planned in the schedule of operations. The Colorado River below Hoover Dam is a case in point here.

"There is no attempt made to evaluate the stream fishery as only a short portion is in Colorado; however, it should be a valuable adjunct to the State of Utah.

"This water suitability for trout should extend downstream as far as Jensen, Utah, due to the canyon terrain and absence of silt-carrying tributaries.

"There can be no other conclusion drawn than the fact that the construction of Echo Park Dam would provide significant enhancement to the region from the fisheries standpoint.

"The following is a summary by specie as to the effect the construction of the Echo Park and Flaming Gorge Dams will have on

wildlife. This portion of the report has been made by Gilbert N. Hunter, game manager for the Colorado Game and Fish Department.

"1. Deer: Generally, from studying the water levels, as well as the vegetative type, and deer populations within this area, I do not feel there will be a great amount of loss in the available deer range, because in the upper Green, namely around Smith Ferry, the depth of the water is not great, and the bottom lands that will be covered in this particular area have been severely overgrazed by domestic stock. The same condition applies in Little Brown's Park and Big Brown's Park. Furthermore, in these areas observations would indicate that the deer are inclined to hold more to the slopes rather than the bottoms. The general type is pinion juniper and sage, and outside of sage there is a very small amount of palatable browse. In the main canyons, that is from Ladore on the Green River, down to Echo Park Dam site, and the Yampa from Cross Mountain to Pat's Hole, the canyons are very steep and narrow, and inaccessible to large numbers of deer. The big wintering concentration on the Yampa will not be materially affected, due to the fact that deer generally winter well above the proposed high-water line.

"2. Mountain sheep: The area in Ladore Canyon is the only location where at present mountain sheep exist. Naturally they are on the slopes far above the water level and will not be affected. This is the area where a transplant should be made, and has been recommended.

"3. Migratory birds: The Green and Yampa Rivers have a very good population of the greater Canadian geese. At the present time the heavy nesting areas are confined in Big Brown's Park, and along the little shelves immediately adjacent to both the Yampa and the Green Rivers. Ducks are generally common throughout the area. It was observed that in the Yampa Canyon from Lilly Park down, the concentration of geese was not as heavy as that of the Green. This can be attributed to the fact that again the canyon walls rise abruptly from the water, and there is little or no area suitable for nesting. It is felt that by flooding the Brown's Park area that other swampy areas will be created, which should, unless the water level varies too much at the time of the nesting period, greatly increase the number of geese and ducks within this area.

"4. Beaver: In the upper portions of the Green River, that is above Ladore Canyon, beaver are quite common. They are bank beaver, and a great deal of their habitat will be destroyed; however, on the other hand, it may be that they will adapt themselves to the situation by moving to higher elevation, which in all probability will in time be reseeded by willows. If the water level does not vary too much this should not cause any great loss as pertaining to the beaver. (End of Kimball's statement.)

"Because of the great benefits to our western wildlife resources, the Directors of the Game, Fish, and Conservation Departments of the 11 Western States, at their annual meeting in May 1954, endorsed and approved the construction of Echo Park Dam. Why shouldn't all conservationists?"

Yours for better fishing and hunting,
D. KEITH BARNES,
President, Utah Wildlife Federation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of April 11, 1955]

COLORADO BASIN WATER DISPUTE SWIRLS IN WEST

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—People of the States where the Colorado River originates regard the big dams and powerplants proposed in the Upper Colorado Basin Storage Project Act, favored by the Eisenhower administration and recently approved 11 to 1 by the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, as absolutely vital to their continued growth and prosperity.

Therefore, they grow more bitter over California's strong and continued opposition to the authorizing legislation. They feel the project will only carry out, a third of a century later, the longtime arrangements made by the seven Colorado Basin States under the Colorado River compact of 1922.

Much of the river's flow still runs unused into the Gulf of California, an intolerable waste in an arid land. Upper basin residents and officials feel that the project development, providing storage for this wasted water, would insure southern California's future water supply as well as their own.

POLITICAL TONES

They say California got more than half of all the money authorized by the 83d Congress for all reclamation projects in all 17 Western States, and that California now has pending before the Congress, requests for projects totaling hundreds of millions of dollars more.

Their attitude, right or wrong, was well put by United States Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, chairman of the Senate committee, when he declared that if California succeeds in defeating the upper basin project, "no new projects will be approved for California as long as I am chairman."

The water war might also have a bearing on national politics, particularly if Mr. Eisenhower should retire and a Californian aspire in 1956 to the presidency on the Republican ticket.

One angle that politicians notice, whether the public does or not, is that while giant California has 30 House Members against only 12 for all the other Colorado Basin States put together, the upper basin States—those which consider themselves peculiarly aggrieved by the California stand—have 10 United States Senators to California's 2. Nevada has traditionally been neutral.

Regardless of party, those 10 Senators are, by the pressure of back-home opinion, welded into a solid bloc in this matter. It would be political oblivion for any of the 10 to vote with California.

Two key dams

In what was regarded as a trial run for the fate of the big project in the 83d Congress, the House last year defeated by a very small margin the bill to authorize Colorado's proposed Fryingpan project which would divert about 80,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water over the mountains. The California delegation voted 23 to 7 against it. Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN (Republican), of Massachusetts, then Speaker of the House, therefore decided not even to bring up the upper basin project act.

Crux of the dispute over the project centers about the two enormous key dams planned. The Glen Canyon Dam on the Arizona-Utah border would cost about $450 million, would store about 26 million acre-feet of water, and would provide a huge power supply.

The Echo Park Dam on the Colorado-Utah border, within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, would cost about $175 million, would store about 6 million acre-feet, and would provide a power supply second only to Glen Canyon.

Californians are less opposed to Glen Canyon, for the reason that there is no place for either its water or power benefits to go, save downriver to them.

The big fight has been on the Echo Park Dam, as an allegedly precedent-setting invasion of a national monument. Conservation and wildlife societies all over the Nation have lined up to oppose this dam. Proponents say that it is so efficient, both for water storage and power, that no other suggested site will do.

In a recent speech in the Senate documented with maps and citations of Government records, Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah, sought to demolish the invasion contention, and in the eyes of upper basin people, at least, did very well.

He pointed out not only that President Roosevelt's original proclamation of 1938 enlarging the monument to its present proportions reserved a power site in the area, but that 11 successive reservations of power sites had been made in the canyons between 1904 and 1925. He said that all of them retain precedence over the dedication of the area for monument purposes, and that none have ever been withdrawn.

He cited correspondence dating back to 1934, when the National Park Service was working to establish the monument, in which the Park Service asked the Federal Power Commission to cancel its power reservations in favor of the monument, and was refused. The power commission could not do anything else under the law, he said.

Letter cited

He further cited a recent letter from Jerome Kuykendall, Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, that in the opinion of the Commission these power reservations are still valid.

In other words, said Mr. WATKINS, the monument is the interloper, and the victory of those who would leave it untouched would establish a precedent that valid and prior Government commitments can illegally be set aside at will.

He added that the advocates of the monument were perfectly willing in 1938 to have it established subject to the prior powersite withdrawals, once they had failed to get those canceled.

Reports of the Park Service show that in 1954 about 2,000 persons visited the disputed canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers by road, and about 900 made the perilous downriver run (which requires guides) by boat.

Senator WATKINS has also pointed out that the Bureau of Reclamation plan includes an elaborate recreational development with access roads permitting many thousand Americans to see the big dam and the canyons, in place of the less than 3,000 who were able to visit the canyons in 1954.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
April 14, 1955.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It may have escaped your attention, but the sportsmen in your State affiliated with the National Wildlife Federation recently reconsidered their previous opposition to Echo Park Dam and voted against a 1955 resolution of the National organization, which opposes this unit, of the proposed Colorado River storage project.

This was disclosed by Charles S. Callison, conservation director of the National Wildlife Federation, in an appearance before the House Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee on March 28. The federation's resolution, opposed by 11 States which had favored a similar resolution in 1954, actually was approved by only 30 States represented at the organization's annual convention in Montreal, Canada, March 11 to 13. It is my conviction that many of these remaining States also would change their position if they had access to all the facts.

I felt obligated to bring this matter before you, because the House hearing record has not yet been printed, and because I feel assured that the propagandists of the National Wildlife Federation will not direct your attention to such a reversal of position by so many of their State affiliates.

Wildlife groups in these 11 States—Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Illinois, Kentucky, New Mexico, Oregon, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wyoming—now have joined the national Congress of Industrial Organizations

in taking a public stand in favor of Echo Park Dam, after examining all the facts. The Utah Wildlife Federation has always supported Echo Park Dam.

Some of the facts on Echo Dam are set forth in the enclosed reprint of my recent floor speech on this subject.

With all best wishes.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR V. WATKINS.

[From the Denver Post of April 14, 1955]

THE WHOLE TRUTH ON ECHO PARK DAM

On March 28, in a speech on the floor of the United States Senate, ARTHUR V. WATKINS, of Utah, demolished the objection to the Echo Park Dam on grounds that it would invade the Dinosaur Monument and thereby establish precedent that would threaten the National Park System.

WATKINS introduced records and correspondence which—

1. Established incontrovertibly that the Echo Park site was only one of several sites in the canyons of the Yampa and Green Rivers that had been withdrawn for power purposes by the Federal Power Commission several years before the monument was expanded in 1938.

2. Proved that the Department of the Interior, including both Secretary Ickes and the National Park Service, were aware not only of the withdrawals, but of their lawful effect upon the nature and administration of the Dinosaur Monument before it was expanded by presidential proclamation.

3. Revealed that the Department of the Interior had been advised in 1939, through an opinion of its own solicitor, Nathan R. Margold, that a monument could be created "subject to the reclamation withdrawals and power site classifications and thereby preserve and continue the effectiveness of the withdrawals and classifications."

4. Affirmed that the "reservation" in President Roosevelt's monument proclamation was not (in Roosevelt's own words) to "affect the operation of the Federal waterpower act of June 10, 1920 * * *." That is precisely the act under which the Echo Park and other sites were withdrawn by the FPC and described in 1934 by Chairman McNinch as * * * "one of the most attractive fields remaining open for comprehensive and economical power development on a large scale."

5. Supported his (WATKINS') contention that if "invasion" is taking place, the aggressors are those who are trying to set aside lawful power withdrawals and override the Federal Waterpower Act to superimpose a national monument on an area that had been staked out for other purposes many years before 1938.

Before Roosevelt expanded the monument from its original 80 acres (1915) to 203,885 acres, the matter of "vacating" the power withdrawals was taken up with the FPC twice. The issue was raised first in 1934 by A. E. Demaray, acting director of the National Park Service. It was brought to the attention of the FPC again in 1935 by Secretary Ickes, who asked about the "possibility of releasing the power withdrawals" * * * thus to place the "proposed monument * * * in a much better position from the standpoint of administration."

The power withdrawals were never vacated. The conservation groups opposed to the Echo Park Dam have not, to our knowledge, claimed that they were.

Apparently those opposing this dam are asking us to believe that the President himself, in his proclamation creating the monument, personally vacated the power withdrawals by failing to include them, specifically, in the exemptions of his statement. But if that were so, why did Roosevelt specifically refer to "affect operation of the Waterpower Act of 1920," under which the withdrawals were made and sustained by the decision of the FPC in 1934 and 1935?

The proponents of the upper Colorado River project are not invading this national monument. The conservationists, in an emotional and unreasoning mood, are trying, in effect, to rewrite both the record and the law by misleading the friends and champions of our natural playgrounds.

Listen to this: "Construction of Echo Park Dam * * * would set a fatal precedent for other inroads on our national recreational reserves. Once the inviolability of the park system is breached in Dinosaur Monument, it will be imperiled everywhere. Echo Park Dam is the beachhead from which a coordinated onslaught could be made by private interests against the boundaries of national parks."

What about the "inviolability" of the Water Power Act or, for that matter, of the President's proclamation which cited it? Since when has a program of the United States Bureau of Reclamation, proceeding upon the clear authority of public law, become an onslaught similar to that of private enterprise imperiling the National Park System?

Senator WATKINS' thorough, documented chronology of events up to and immediately following the act expanding the Dinosaur Monument exposes the error, presumably innocent, of those who believe the dam would set a fatal precedent.

If the power priorities on the Yampa and the Green may be thus arbitrarily ignored or set aside, then the Water Power Act of 1920 is without meaning, and the purposes and authority of the Federal Power Commission are canceled by implication. That we doubt will be accepted by Congress or was intended by Roosevelt in 1938. And it is a public disservice for the conservationists—with whom we have pleasurably joined in many worthy programs for the defense of natural values in this country—to proceed further down the wrong path they have taken.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, because of the limitation on debate which I understand we shall have tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks which I had prepared on certain aspects of the bill which is before the Senate printed as a statement in the RECORD.

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

In the index to a book on The National Parks: What They Mean to You and Me, by Freeman Tilden, there is an entry that reads as follows: "Hetch Hetchy, classic example of needless spoliation of park scenery, page 173." On page 173 Mr. Tilden says, "I recall the outburst of infatuation that led to the creation of a stupid Hetch Hetchy reservoir in what was once a treasured part of the wild beauty of Yosemite."

I should like to review with you this "classic example of needless spoliation of park scenery." Like millions of other Americans I am opposed to the Echo Park Dam, because it is proposed for construction within our national park system. And I am amazed, and also deeply shocked, to realize how closely we here seem to be repeating history.

I am shocked because the history that we are in danger of repeating is hardly creditable to us. It is history that rather should teach us a lesson of never-again.

It is history that shows that those who were defending a national park against a dam proposal a half century ago were right. Their opponents won out, but nevertheless they were wrong. We lost a marvelously beautiful valley in one of our greatest national parks.

Where once there was the beautiful Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park, there is now the stark drab reservoir of the O'Shaughnessy Dam. In a display of photographs entitled "Hetch Hetchy: Before and After" in The Living Wilderness magazine for winter 1953–54 (p. 36), there is a photograph of the tragic scene that confronts the few visitors who now seek out this valley, a photograph that I wish could be enlarged and seen clearly by all of us who share the responsibility for protecting the national park system. This photograph shows this reservoir, with the characteristic scar along its edge that comes with the "drawdown"—the great lowering of water levels that promoters of dams for playgrounds always neglect to describe in their visions of the future for which they strive. In the foreground of this scene is a stone wall. In the far background is a beautiful waterfall. But in the foreground is a stone wall and a bare gravel road. Standing ominously in this deserted scene is a large road sign: "One way, do not enter."

Once already we have proved that this is a way which we in America do not enter without a drastic disregard of the signs by which we are seeking to govern our national welfare.

And once is too often, as Robert K. Cutter puts it in an impressive article published by the Sierra Club. In this pamphlet, Hetch Hetchy—Once Is Too Often, the tragic case of the once-beautiful Hetch Hetchy Valley is strikingly presented. I am sure other Senators also have received copies of this booklet. The photographs of the noble valley of Hetch Hetchy before "alteration," with all of its loveliness, inspire reverence and awe. It is plain that were the valley still in existence today, there would be thousands of Americans enjoying it in the same way that they are enjoying Yosemite Valley. Hetch Hetchy's trees, its mountains, its tumbling streams, its majestic waterfalls were like a benediction. They would have provided for ages to come rest and relaxation for the mind and spirit of countless Americans.

But Hetch Hetchy had a good dam site; and all that might have been was lost because Senators in 1913 believed the statements that a dam would not destroy the valley, but would instead enhance its beauty and create a great and attractive natural object.

Did these predictions come true? No. You have only to look, a little further on, at the picture of Hetch Hetchy today, to see how wrong were the prophets of 1913. Or, Mr. President, open once the folder called What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur? and see, above, the beautiful scenes of Hetch Hetchy half a century ago and then see the picture, below, of the reservoir today. That picture points to the fallaciousness of the reasoning that Echo Park will be improved by a dam. The photograph of Hetch Hetchy today shows a bleak expanse of dead water, made particularly ugly by the fluctuating water levels which expose stumps of dead trees and the muddy, rock-strewn shores.

Before Hetch Hetchy was inundated there might perhaps have seemed to be some possibilities in the reasoning that a dam would not destroy the beauty and wonders of Dinosaur National Monument. We did not then have concrete evidence that "alteration" really means ruin for such an area; that inundation of a natural area such as Hetch Hetchy and Dinosaur means its destruction.

What of the prediction that crowds of people would flock to the altered Hetch Hetchy? We have only to ask, Who hears of Hetch Hetchy today or who knows of it, except those who knew it once and who mourn its destruction, or those who see it and hear of it as a sad example? The crowds stay away

in droves. For every million people who delight in the beauty, the natural beauty, of Yosemite and spend vacations there, there are a thousand who drive up to Hetch Hetchy, turn around, and leave. The prediction that Hetch Hetchy Reservoir would become a playground for millions has evaporated under the bright sun of reality.

Today, we are being told that Echo Park, when flooded, will become the "playground for millions," and we are seeing the wide distribution of a brochure with artistic conceptions of Echo Park as such a playground. Thus history threatens to repeat itself—a threat that is indeed frightening.

In the Hetch Hetchy case, too, there was wide distribution of similarly pretty conceptions of the inundated Hetch Hetchy Valley as seen by an artist who was hired to make the drawings. One such drawing was distributed to the desk of every Member of the United States Senate the day of the final vote on the bill that, like this one we face, was supposed to create this beautiful lake. The drawing conjured up beauties which are not there. When we look at Hetch Hetchy today we know the answer to the question that was printed at the head of the drawing distributed to the Members of the Senate in 1913 when Hetch Hetchy was at stake. The question read: "Does this beautiful lake ruin this beautiful valley?" The answer as we look at Hetch Hetchy today is a resounding "Yes." It has ruined it. And it is not beautiful after all.

The irony of the story of Hetch Hetchy is that history has proved that it was not necessary to ruin the valley in order for San Francisco to get the water that it needed. There were alternatives which were ignored, which would have provided San Francisco with its water and at the same time would have kept for the Nation an incomparable recreation area of which it could be mighty proud.

There are alternatives to the Echo Park Dam, just as there were for Hetch Hetchy. We need not be the destroyers of our park heritage in order to provide the upper Colorado Basin States with the water and power they require. We can have both, if we make the necessary effort. I strongly urge that we do so. For once destroyed, the scenic splendor of the Dinosaur National Monument cannot be recreated.

So, let us look with some care at this once-is-too-often bit of history that is now threatening to repeat itself.

What was Hetch Hetchy?

In the final chaper of his great, now classic work on The Mountains of California, John Muir called Hetch Hetchy "a wonderfully exact counterpart" of Yosemite—the Yosemite that in the summertime now is crowded with thousands and thousands of visitors—in 1954. Yosemite, that great U-shaped valley with its magnificent cliff walls rising in grandeur and enlivened with waterfalls. The resemblance to Yosemite that John Muir noted in the Hetch Hetchy Valley, he found, as he said, "not only in its sublime rocks and waterfalls but in the gardens, groves, and meadows of its flower-park-like floor." Describing the valley's beauty and particularly a great waterfall that excelled even Yosemite's Bridal Veil falls "both in height and airy-fairy beauty and behavior," John Muir wrote as follows:

"Imagine yourself in Hetch Hetchy on a sunny day in June, standing waist-deep in grass and flowers, while the great pines sway dreamily with scarcely perceptible motion. Looking northward across the valley you see a plain, gray granite cliff rising abruptly out of the gardens and groves to a height of 1,800 feet, and in front of it the waterfall called Tueeulala's silvery scarf burning with irised sun-fire. In the first white outburst at the head there is abundance of visible energy, but it is speedily hushed and concealed in divine repose, and its tranquil progress to the base of the cliff is like that of a downy feather in a still room. Now observe the fineness and marvelous distinctness of the various sun-illumined fabrics into which the water is woven; they sift and float from form to form down the face of that grand gray rock in so leisurely and unconfused a manner that you can examine their texture, and patterns and tones of color as you would a piece of embroidery held in hand. Toward the top of the fall you see groups of booming, comet-like masses, their solid white heads separate, their tails like combed silk interlacing among delicate gray and purple shadows, ever forming and dissolving, worn out by friction in their rush through the air."

I am trying to suggest the value of this Hetch Hetchy Valley as part of a national park, to suggest how through the eyes of a great naturalist and explorer we all still can have some understanding of its splendor.

John Muir went on to describe the other magnificent waterfalls of Hetch Hetchy and the many smaller streams that come over the walls which he described as leaping from ledge to ledge with birdlike song and watering many a hidden cliff garden and fernery.

"The correspondence between the Hetch Hetchy walls in their trends, sculpture, physical structure, and general arrangement of the main rock masses and those of the Yosemite Valley," John Muir said, "has excited the wondering admiration of every observer."

With a sublimity of words appropriate to the scene of which he wrote, this great son of the wilderness called Hetch Hetchy a grand landscape garden, one of Nature's rarest and most precious mountain temples, and he said:

"As in Yosemite, the sublime rocks of its walls seem to glow with life, whether leaning back in repose or standing erect in thoughtful attitudes, giving welcome to storms and calms alike, their brows in the sky, their feet set in the groves and gay flowery meadows, while birds, bees, and butterflies help the river and waterfalls to stir all the air into music—things frail and fleeting and types of permanence meeting here and blending, just as they do in Yosemite, to draw her lovers into close and confiding communion with her."

"Sad to say," however, John Muir had also to record that "this most precious and sublime feature of the Yosemite National Park, one of the greatest of all our natural resources for the uplifting joy and peace and health of the people" was "in danger of being dammed and made into a reservoir to help supply San Francisco with water and light, thus flooding it from wall to wall and burying its gardens and groves one or two hundred feet deep."

It is our great national misfortune that Hetch Hetchy was thus dammed and is today thus flooded. It is our perplexity today that this same misfortune is now threatened for the scenic wild canyons of the Green and the Yampa Rivers in Dinosaur National Monument.

Listen to what John Muir wrote about the threat to Hetch Hetchy. Does it not sound shockingly familiar to us who have been hearing so persistently the arguments of those who now want to dam Echo Park?

"This grossly destructive commercial scheme," wrote John Muir, "has long been planned and urged (though water as pure and abundant can be got from sources outside of the people's park, in a dozen different places), because of the comparative cheapness of the dam and of the territory which it is sought to divert from the great uses to which it was dedicated.

"The proponents of the dam scheme"—and I am quoting John Muir writing about the Hetch Hetchy Dam—"the proponents of the dam scheme bring forward a lot of bad arguments to prove that the only righteous thing to do with the people's parks is to destroy them bit by bit as they are able.

"Their arguments"—and I am still quoting John Muir—"their arguments are curiously alike those of the devil, devised for the destruction of the first garden—so much of the very best Eden fruit going to waste; so much of the best Tuolumne water and Tuolumne scenery going to waste."

I interrupt myself to point out that John Muir was the organizer and first president, and for a great many years the president, of the Sierra Club. He was not opposing the Hetch Hetchy Dam because of a hidden sympathy for California water interests. He was opposing California water interests. Today the Sierra Club suffers the inferences of insinuating opponents who suspect these devoted preservers of national parks of opposition to another dam in another national park for unworthy secondary reasons, because the supposed beneficiaries of this Echo Park Dam are in a rival State. The executive director of the Sierra Club today when he testifies before our Senate committee is subject to the duress of such inferences and of questioning that is diligently pursued with these insinuations, yet the club which he represents—and I hold it to be one of the outstanding forces for conservation in America—that club under its first great leader fought earnestly against a dam supposed to be for the benefit of the club's own headquarters city, and fought as earnestly as the Sierra Club leaders of our day now contend against the proponents of the Echo Park Dam. They do this for the same reason—because they are devoted to the preservation of our national parks unimpaired by such structures.

John Muir was not confronted with arguments about the waters of the Colorado but about those of his own California—"so much of the best Tuolumne water," he was told, "and Tuolumne scenery going to waste."

Of his opponents John Muir said:

"Few of their statements are even partly true, and all are misleading."

This is strong language—not ours of our opponents, I hasten again to emphasize, but John Muir's comments half a century ago.

As an example of what he meant, John Muir cited his opponents' claim that the national park feature that he was defending was "like thousands of others." John Muir answered: "On the contrary it is a very uncommon feature; after Yosemite, the rarest and in many ways the most important in this national park."

I call special attention to another example of the arguments that John Muir heard from the people who insisted on building the Hetch Hetchy Dam, in Yosemite National Park—the people who insisted on and succeeded in building this dam in a national park. These arguments thus are especially interesting in this case because we can now see how true they were.

John Muir's opponents said this about the Hetch Hetchy Dam, which they were determined to build, and I quote:

"Damming and submerging it 175 feet deep would enhance its beauty by forming a crystal-clear lake."

Does not this sound familiar?

To this argument a half century ago John Muir replied, and again I quote:

"Landscape gardens, places of recreation and worship, are never made beautiful by destroying and burying them. The beautiful sham lake, forsooth, would be only an eyesore, a dismal blot on the landscape, like many others to be seen in the Sierra. For instead of keeping it at the same level all year, allowing Nature centuries of time to make new shore, it would, of course be full only a month or two in the spring, when the snow is melting fast; then it would be gradually drained, exposing the slimy sides of the basin and shallower parts of the bottom, with the gathered drift and waste,

death and decay of the upper basins, caught here instead of being swept on to decent natural burial along the banks of the river or in the sea. Thus the Hetch Hetchy Damlake," John Muir warned, "would be only a rough imitation of a natural lake for a few spring months, an open sepulchre for the others."

To see how right John Muir was, all we have to do is to go to Hetch Hetchy and see there, behind that O'Shaughnessy Dam, the reservoir that now inundates this valley. Or here today we need only see the photographs to which I referred in the magazine The Living Wilderness, or the photographs on the back cover of the pamphlet to which I referred called Hetch Hetchy—Once Is Too Often. Or open once the folder called What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur? Thus in photographs and drawings we can see the original beauty of Hetch Hetchy, the fantasy of the would-be dam builders in their promises for recreation, and finally the actual result of the successful dam project.

Robert K. Cutter today, asking the question, "What is Hetch Hetchy now?" calls it "just another dammed artificial lake," and comments, as follows:

"Those of you who have only seen it since it was flooded will refuse to believe that it ever approached Kings River Canyon in beauty, let alone Yosemite. Hetch Hetchy now isn't worth a 35-millimeter Kodachrome film. So much for beauty."

"Now, what about it as an area for recreation?" Mr. Cotter goes on to ask, and he answers:

"Of the three canyons, Hetch Hetchy, Yosemite, and Kings Canyon, Hetch Hetchy is the nearest to the central California center of population, and there is a beautiful paved road leading right to it. If it were of equal recreational value there would be 10 visitors to every 1 at Kings River Canyon, which is the most distant. But are there?"

"No," he answers, "it's just the opposite. Why should anyone want to go to Hetch Hetchy now?"

Mr. Cutter concludes:

"Thus, we do not have to guess or debate. Hetch Hetchy teaches us that former Under Secretary of the Interior Ralph Tudor was right in 1954 when he advised that in flooding Dinosaur's Echo Park 'the alteration will be substantial,' and wrong when he advised that 'the beauty of the park will by no means be destroyed and it will remain an area of great attraction.' "

Here is how this "case in history" is summed up by our own conservationists of today who are defending again with zeal and determination the natural beauty of one of our superb dedicated areas. They write in this folder, What Is Your Stake in Dinosaur, as follows:

"Hetch Hetchy was not quite so beautiful as its neighbor, Yosemite Valley, but it had much of Yosemite's charm and living—great oaks, verdant meadows, tree-framed waterfalls, and one of the finest streams in all the Sierra Nevada. Here hundreds of thousands might have camped in these days of overcrowding in our parks. But Hetch Hetchy had a good dam site. True, others existed downstream—and still exist today—and the water would flow down to them for diversion to a distant, growing city. Hetch Hetchy, though, could add a little more to hydroelectric power production, for which alternative sources were then available—and more and more alternatives are becoming available.

"A great battle waged. * * * San Francisco's mayor, urging the dam, said of the valley in 1911: '* * * its beauty will be enhanced, making the valley more sightly and accessible. * * * There can be no question but that the beauty of the scene, with a dam easily concealed by grasses and vines, will be enhanced by the effect of the lake reflecting all above it and about it and will be in itself a great and attractive natural object.'

"The dam was built. The valley is buried forever. It is more accessible. But for every million people who come to Yosemite Valley to stay, a mere thousand come to Hetch Hetchy's fluctuating reservoir to turn around and leave."

Mr. President, Patrick Henry in his famous speech entitled "The Alternative," delivered in the Virginia convention, in 1775, and best known for its eloquent conclusion, "Give me liberty, or give me death," said to his colleagues:

"I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided; and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past."

In the light of experience, judging the future by the past, we most certainly should insist on an alternative to this proposed Echo Park Dam that threatens again to violate an area of superb natural beauty and wonder—an area that rather than be dammed should be forever preserved in our national park system. For, indeed, there are alternatives to this Echo Park Dam, just as there were to the Hetch Hetchy Dam. And it is with regard to this possibility of an alternative that history gives us our final admonition on this page with the running head "Hetch Hetchy."

Perhaps this page of history is most briefly read from Linnie Marsh Wolfe's great biography Son of the Wilderness: The Life of John Muir, published in 1945 by Alfred A. Knopf, and in that year honored with the Pulitzer prize for biography. Here is how Linnie Marsh Wolfe concludes her account of John Muir's—and our—defeat in the Hetch Hetchy controversy. She writes:

"Muir felt no bitterness against the people of San Francisco over the Hetch Hetchy. He placed the blame at the door of 3 or 4 ambitious traders and politicians calling themselves the city of San Francisco.

"As the years went on, the citizens suffered for the acts of these leaders, but were obligated to make the best of a bad bargain. They had been told that the project would cost not more than $50 million; but engineering difficulties brought the total up to the neighborhood of $100 million.

"Long before the system was completed, the adjacent East Bay communities, worn out with waiting to share in the promised benefits had combined to develop their own project.

"In the midtwenties they chose the Mokelumne River as a source, purchased the rights, and built the system within 4 years at a cost of about $36 million.

"Before San Francisco had finished her Herculean task, in a year of great shortage (1931), the Mokelumne River was helping to supply that city with pure mountain water at the rate of 25 million gallons per day.

"One of the ironies of the situation was that the Mokelumne source had been rejected by the San Francisco officials in favor of the Hetch Hetchy."

Thus, not only do we see in this case demonstrated the destruction of an area of a great national park but also the demonstration of the value of an alternative.

In the light of this experience, so dramatically parallel to that through which we are again passing, let us earnestly resist the temptation to exploit the Dinosaur National Monument for the supposed advantages of the proposed Echo Park Dam. Let us rather insist that an alternative be selected from the many possibilities that have so far been considered or that may yet be developed with careful sincere effort.

By all means let us have the advantages of water storage and hydroelectric power production, but let us at the same time preserve our parks.

The one hopeful outcome of the Hetch Hetchy controversy was the determination on the part of the people of this country that in the future the national park areas should be firmly protected.

When Hetch Hetchy was in jeopardy there was no recognized National Park System. There was no National Park Service.

As William Frederick Bade, John Muir's early biographer, said, "the compensating good" which John Muir felt sure would arise out of the "tragic sacrifice" of Hetch Hetchy would have to be in "the consolidation of public sentiment against any possible repetition of such a raid."

That "consolidation of public sentiment," Mr. President, resulted in the establishment by Congress of a National Park Service and a National Park System, and it has today resulted in thousands of protests against this Echo Park Dam proposal.

On August 25, 1916, 3 years after the act that permitted the sacrifice of Hetch Hetchy, President Woodrow Wilson approved an act (39 Stat. 535) that set up the National Park Service, provided for the administration and protection of national parks and monuments, and defined their purpose.

This purpose, according to this act of Congress, is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Never since this declaration of national policy by Congress, never since the National Park System was thus established, never since we learned our Hetch Hetchy lesson has there ever been permitted the construction of a dam in our National Park System.

Let it not ever be said that the 84th Congress turned its back on this experience and, permitting itself to be misled, countenanced the invasion of the Dinosaur National Monument for this Echo Park Dam.

Let us rather heed the lesson of Hetch Hetchy and by reaffirming make still stronger our national determination to preserve a National Park System "unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the body of the RECORD a statement from Howard Zahniser, executive secretary of the Wilderness Society and editor of the Living Wilderness, regarding the upper Colorado River storage project and its relation to wilderness preservation.

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

SHALL WE DAM OUR NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM?

The aim of the Wilderness Society is to represent the public interest in preserving and protecting our national park system and our other areas of wilderness and park lands that have been set aside for preservation.

So long as any project includes a proposal to use an area of the national park system in a way that is inconsistent with its purpose as defined by Congress, "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wildlife therein, and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations," so long would the recommendation of the Wilderness Society be against its approval. Yet I do not wish to be considered an opponent of the upper Colorado River storage project, except as it does threaten areas dedicated for preservation. It is rather my purpose to urge that any bill approved by Congress be one from which all such threats have been carefully excluded and in which provision is made for the protection of national parks and monuments. It is my belief that such a bill can be prepared that will adequately

meet the needs for a sound upper Colorado River storage project, and after 5 years of deep concern with the problems now being discussed, I can assure you that I should welcome such a bill with great eagerness.

Summer before last, on a trip through Colorado and Utah, my wife and I, with our then 15- and 7-year-old sons and our 12- and 10-year-old daughters, camped at the mouth of Split Mountain Canyon, in the Dinosaur National Monument, motored and hiked out to Harpers Corner, and then returned and motored on down into Echo Park.

A beautiful park it is, too, so named by Maj. John Wesley Powell, who camped there on his now historic expedition in 1869, and described Echo Park itself as "the size of a good farm."

There, along the Green River, in that lovely grassy park, with its beautiful cottonwood trees, across from Steamboat Rock, my wife cooked hamburgers and made a meal for us, while the children climbed on the rock slopes of the canyon wall and I wandered about, exhilarated, and overawed—and perplexed, as I tried to understand the dam-building proposal that has focused so much controversial attention on this area of our national park system.

Then, as I stood there along the Green River, a ways away from the others, I shouted across the river:

"Should we build a dam here?"

The echo came back with my question still in it:

"Dam here?"

That question is still echoing, in the corridors of the Department of the Interior, in the White House, in the Halls of Congress, and indeed throughout the country.

That is the question that we face here today in our concern for the preservation of our national park system. It is one of the great questions that face us all in our efforts to cherish and use wisely the natural resources on which our own, our children's, and our children's children's welfare depends.

Again and again we conservationists who have been compelled to oppose so earnestly the proposed Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams have insisted and have sought to emphasize that we do not object to dams, or to reclamation, or to water storage or hydroelectric power production, but to the proposal to use a particular site, or sites, in the Dinosaur National Monument for the Echo Park and/or the Split Mountain Dams.

This Echo Park question that conservationists all over the United States are asking, and answering so earnestly, is a question that challenges the very principle on which our national park protection policy is based. That is the principle that once an area has been set aside for preservation it should be held inviolate and used for commodity purposes only in the case of extreme national need.

Secretary of the Interior Julius A. Krug once stated this principle, in its application to dams, as follows:

"Large power and flood-control projects should not be recommended for construction in national parks, unless the need for such projects is so pressing that the economic stability of our country, or its existence, would be endangered without them."

It is with this principle of the integrity of the National Park System that we conservationists are most deeply concerned as we face this Echo Park question. The proponents of the Echo Park (and Split Mountain) Dam construction seem also to be deeply conscious that the controversy is in large measure over this principle, for it is hard indeed to escape the conclusion that the persistent advocacy of the Echo Park Dam is intended to modify this principle, reverse the national policy for park preservation, and secure for those who are responsible for impoundment projects the freedom to use any National Park System site that seems advantageous.

It is not the building of a dam or dams that is at issue but rather the choice of a site or sites. The Echo Park question is not whether to build a dam but "Shall we build a dam here?"

And my deep conviction, my most earnest persuasion is that this is indeed no place for a dam.

This is one of the great places of the world, a place of so great natural grandeur that it should most assuredly be protected with great respect.

I wish I could somehow express here something of its grandeur and wonder.

If we could raise the venetian blinds at those windows over there, Mr. Chairman, and look across the mall of this beautiful Capital City we would have in view the Washington Monument and in its nobleness we might find a measure of a sort of the magnificence with which we are here concerned—the magnificence of the natural features which we cherish in the Dinosaur National Monument.

Think of standing at the base of the Washington Monument and looking up at its grandeur. Imagine again the respect and admiration, the aspiration and noble inspiration which we feel as we place ourselves before its 555-foot thrust into the sky.

Think then again of a solid natural rock a hundred feet and more still higher than the Washington Monument, towering above you like the prow of a great boat a mile long, its hidden mast a thousand feet high—a monolith of natural rock, golden and brown. Steamboat Rock. Imagine the awe and wonder you feel as you place yourself before its massive stand against time and the elements.

Think, too, of the river flowing against the side, winding around the prow of this great rock—the Green River that has come through the canyon of Lodore and at Steamboat Rock has found its confluence with the Yampa, waters which have flowed through canyons which surpass, in the scenic superlatives of those who have known them, even this marvel of Steamboat Rock.

Then realize again that you and this high rock more than a mile long, with the river moving around it, and the park where you stand—all are deep in a wild canyon, and behind you as you turn are sheer walls of rock that sweep even higher than Steamboat Rock.

Climb out of these canyons onto the great plateau land in which they are cut. Walk out along the edges of the chasm, on Harpers Corner. Stand on this tongue of solid rock that holds you 2,000 feet above the river. And see the abyss to the right and left and straight ahead of you.

Turn right and see far below you Steamboat Rock that awed you in its presence. See the river flowing around it. Trace its course on up the stream, and the course of the Yampa River's canyon as it winds to its confluence with the Green there in Echo Park.

Turn to your left. Find yourself looking straight downstream between the narrow walls of Whirlpool Canyon, and the rough river, deep in the chasm, so apparently quiet from your height.

Try to tell yourself that there before you, deep below you, the United States Bureau of Reclamation—our Bureau of Reclamation—wants to build a dam 525 feet high above that river. The Echo Park Dam. And up to its concrete foot would come the reservoir waters eventually of another dam—Split Mountain—inundating those whirlpool rapids.

Turn again to your right and imagine the reservoir waters impounded by that dam. Imagine Echo Park inundated. See nothing of Steamboat Rock but a stone island in a storage basin deep almost as the Washington Monument is high.

Think of the rivers and the canyon-bottom riverside camp spots above Echo Park, buried in the waters of that basin—along the Green's marvelous Canyon of Lodore, and along the deep meanders of the Yampa—that great gorge twisting through colored rock around its sequence of bends, loops, and curves. Think of the unique, wild, river-running recreation in these canyons, the like of which is nowhere else, flooded out forever by miles and miles of a storage reservoir.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that you thus have as good an idea as I can give you here of what I believe is the essential reason why the Congress should not authorize this proposed dam building at Echo Park.

It would destroy one of the unique, irreplaceable, scenic, wild wonders of the world.

This great beautiful area that you view from Harpers Corner and wherein you stood at Echo Park—this marvelous wild scenic area in our national park system is what the Bureau of Reclamation's Director for this region calls, with an admiration of his own, "the remarkable storage vessel at Echo Park."

As you turn then in imagination from Harpers Corner and make the hike back to your parking place, and the long wild-road drive back to the transcontinental highway (U. S. 40), you realize that you are within the Dinosaur National Monument—part of America's national park system, a system of a few superlative parts of America dedicated for preservation while all the rest is free for all man's purposes. You begin to feel a profanity in this dam proposal, a threat posed to all such areas you hold sacred, a challenge to the very idea of holding sacred any part of the natural earth.

Driving through the plateau land within the national park area that surrounds these canyon chasms, and sensing the violence that would be done to all this wilderness by the very construction itself—$200 million of sand and gravel and concrete, roads and trucks, men and materials, steel, and the noise of drills and dynamite, man's mighty power in bulldozer and all his great tools—you begin to realize that you are in the midst of a great debate over the very idea of preserving natural parks.

Will you dam the scenic wild canyons of the national park system?

That is the question.

The proponents of the dam tell you that it was understood when the area was established that such a dam could be built, but you look at the proclamation establishing the monument and read that "the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Browns Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." You find that the Browns Park site is far up the Green River near the northern edge of the monument, many miles up the river from the now proposed Echo Park site. You understand why the possible construction of this Browns Park Dam could have been allowed, and you understand, too, that this proclamation can never be distorted into a true justification for constructing the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams in the heart of the monument, creating reservoirs along practically all of the area's scenic canyons which it was set aside to preserve. You recognize this new proposal as clearly an encroachment on a duly designated national park area.

You hear the proponents of these dams in the monument claim that the reservoirs will themselves provide recreation and attract many people, but you know that such recreation will anyhow be afforded by other reservoirs outside the monument, while the wild-canyon experiences of the unspoiled wilderness cannot be duplicated.

For, finally (I trust), you realize that these national park sites are not needed for reser-

voirs. The reservoirs can be built elsewhere, with all their advantages to the people of the Colorado River Basin and indeed to the people of the Nation, which we all appreciate. You hear an alternative program outlined, see its feasibility, hear its various features debated.

You see the proponents of the Dinosaur dams, nevertheless, build pretexts into arguments, and you realize after all that not necessity but supposed advantage tempts these would-be dam builders into the national park system.

Evaporation differences at various sites are pointed to in the 83d Congress as a compulsion to build dams in the Dinosaur National Monument, a compulsion that is yielded to reluctantly because it would do damage to an area that would preferably be preserved in its natural condition but for these evaporation-loss differences.

Then as the evaporation-loss differences appear in some cases at least to be much less than estimated earlier, the evaporation-loss argument seems itself to have been dissipated in thin air. Yet a new argument arises to prominence, and the reservoir anticipated by the proponents of the Echo Park Dam is urged not reluctantly because it would do damage to this marvelous area but because (and I am quoting from the brochure Tomorrow's Playground for Millions of Americans published by the Upper Colorado River Commission):

"Only by storing and putting to beneficial use the river waters which run through it, by approval of a combined reclamation-power project like the one proposed, can Echo Park and surrounding country truly become a park."

Thus the very nature of our preservation effort in the National Park System is threatened. Those with contrary concepts that better suit their other purposes are urging upon us a policy that would not leave our National Park System unimpaired as envisioned by Congress when this system was established but would rather develop and improve and adapt these areas to purposes that Congress after Congress and administration after administration have considered inconsistent with national-park principles.

The challenge is a challenge to the concept and integrity of the national park system.

I do wish to be understood as being interested in the welfare and prosperity of this great upper Colorado region of our country and its people. Just as I have come to value the privilege of visiting this region and breathing a little deeper in its outdoors, so also I have valued the privilege of knowing the people who live there. I value highly their hospitality and friendship. I share their aspirations, and wish accordingly to be understood as approaching this controversy with hope and confidence that it will be so resolved as not only to preserve the areas which have been set aside for preservation but also to provide for the wise development of the region.

I have been particularly sensitive to the claim that we who oppose the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam proposals are in danger of breaking faith with the people of this region.

I have read with deep interest David H. Madsen's March 27, 1950, affidavit regarding the June 11, 1936, and June 13, 1936, public meetings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., at which, he testified, he then authoritatively stated as a representative of the National Park Service "that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power or irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Colorado and Utah, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development."

I have read also with deep interest the March 27, 1950, affidavits by J. A. Chaney, Joseph Haslem, Leo Calder, H. E. Seeley, and B. H. Stringham regarding one or both of these meetings, at which they said, each with the same words, that "the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes."

It has been pointed out by others that such assurance could not have been given responsibly and authoritatively, because the letter of instructions from the Secretary of the Interior of June 8, 1936, expressly prohibited the National Park Service from making commitments on the subject of water development at the hearings. Nevertheless, I have still been disposed, personally, to have a regard for these discussions testified to by Mr. Madsen and these other residents of Utah, to try to look at this situation from the viewpoint of these people's own understanding, and to feel a moral responsibility to respect such agreements as were understood.

Yet I am without any belief whatever that any such agreements justify approval of the Echo Park or Split Mountain Dams.

The outcome of the discussions and considerations of which these meetings and so-called agreements were a part was the proclamation establishing the Dinosaur National Monument as we know it today.

We have in this country what I believe is an excellent democratic process of discussing extensively (and intensively) all aspects of any proposed public action. Then we resolve our various points of view in some definite action. We adopt a constitution. We enact a law. We have a presidential proclamation. And then we pass on to future discussions of other problems with our past discussions and agreements made formal and finally resolved in writing—for our clear understanding not only at the time but in the future.

Such was the Presidential Proclamation of 1938. Some 2 years after the 1936 public hearings and following various governmental considerations, this proclamation enlarged the monument and at the same time included and defined the public understanding regarding reservoir projects, as follows:

"This reservation * * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended, and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project."

There is no evidence of any dissatisfaction with this statement—no evidence at all that provision for the Brown's Park Reservoir site was not an adequate recognition of such assurances as were understood. The proclamation's reservation is specific. It applies to a site and an area many miles up the river from the sites now being argued. And Congress by appropriating for and providing for the administration of the monument has in effect, repeatedly endorsed this proclamation. I can only conclude that we have in this respect no obligation to the people of this region other than our obligation to respect this proclamation's provision that the administration of the area is subject to a prior withdrawal for the Brown's Park Reservoir site. As Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay himself said, in my hearing, tapping the edge of his desk with his index finger, "Just because I give somebody permission to do something at this desk, it doesn't mean that he can do it anywhere in the room." Wrong as Secretary McKay is, in my opinion, in supporting the Echo Park Dam proposal, he does recognize that it is not authorized in the proclamation that establishes the national monument.

I also have been deeply interested in the implications of the proclamation's provision that "this reservation * * * shall not affect the operation of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended."

I am aware that in a memorandum published on page 719 and the following pages of the hearings before the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 83d Congress, 2d session, on H. R. 4449, H. R. 4443, and H. R. 4463, Mr. George W. Abbott, counsel for the committee, concluded that the Federal Power Commission, in accordance with this provision of the proclamation, has the authority to license the construction of a dam in the canyons of the Dinosaur National Monument. Yet after a careful study of this contention I am persuaded that, on the contrary, only Congress has the authority to authorize such a dam and furthermore that such an authorization by Congress would be a departure from a policy in protection of national parks and monuments which Congress set in 1921, renewed and strengthened in 1935, and has ever since respected.

Here are the facts and my understanding of them that lead me to this conclusion:

The Dinosaur National Monument, in eastern Utah and northwestern Colorado, established on October 4, 1915, by proclamation of President Woodrow Wilson for the protection of the dinosaur quarry, was originally only 80 acres in size and did not include the canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers until the monument was enlarged by 203,885 acres on July 14, 1938, by proclamation of President Franklin D. Roosevelt, for the protection of these canyons.

The Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920, in section 4 (d) authorized the Federal Power Commission "to issue licenses * * * for the purpose of constructing * * * dams * * * upon any part of the public lands and reservations of the United States * * *" and in section 3 defined "reservations" to include "national monuments" and "national parks."

By an act of March 3, 1921, however, Congress amended the Federal Power Commission's authority under this Federal Water Power Act of 1920 to the effect "that hereafter no permit, license, lease, or authorization for dams, conduits, reservoirs, powerhouses, transmission lines, or other works for storage or carriage of water, or for the development, transmission, or utilization of power, within the limits as now constituted of any national park or national monument shall be granted or made without specific authority of Congress, and so much of the act of June 10, 1920 * * * as authorizes licensing such uses of existing national parks and national monuments by the Federal Power Commission is hereby repealed."

By this 1921 amendment Congress established a fundamental national policy from which it has never departed—providing an immunity for national parks and national monuments from the construction of dams.

The legislative history leaves no doubt as to the purpose of the 1921 amendment. In Senate debate on the amendment, Mr. Walsh of Montana said, "I understand that (the bill) was introduced by the Senator from Washington (Mr. Jones) for the purpose of eliminating national parks from the jurisdiction of the Water Power Commission." Mr. Jones of Washington replied "that is correct."

It is true, as Mr. Abbott points out, that the 1921 amendment was confined to "existing" national parks and monuments, and to the areas "as now constituted." A reasonable interpretation was that the Federal Power Commission's authority would extend to any national parks or monuments enlarged or created in the future—unless Congress decided otherwise at the time.

The proponents of the 1921 amendment reluctantly made this concession to the Federal Power Commission in order to assure passage of the bill. They recognized that it was more important to assure the establishment of the national policy as to the parks and monuments as then constituted, and fight out the issue again, when new parks were created or present ones enlarged, than to risk delay in amending the 1920 act.

In House debate, Mr. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, said:

"As the bill passed the Senate and as it was reported to the House, it limited its effect to existing national parks only, so that hereafter, if more national parks shall be created, or those already in existence shall be enlarged, we must fight out on every individual bill creating a new national park or enlarging one already in existence the question whether the water power in the national park shall be used. It was my thought that we ought to make this provision apply to all parks that exist now as well as those that may be created in the future; but if the House feels that such an amendment would endanger the passage of this bill and thinks it is better to get what we can under this bill than to try to get more, I have no disposition to offer an amendment. I do desire, however, to register my objection to the provision that limits it to existing national parks instead of including all that may hereafter be created."

Mr. BARKLEY proved to be farsighted; the policy established by the 1921 amendment has never been abandoned.

By an act of August 20, 1935, the Federal Power Commission's authority to license the construction of dams on "public lands and reservations of the United States" was significantly amended once again. This time the definition of "reservations" was changed, to provide specifically that the term "shall not include national monuments or national parks."

This unequivocal language restricting the Federal Power Commission's fundamental authority would seem to leave no room for interpretation. Its purpose was made doubly clear in Senate Report 1318, 74th Congress, 1st session, which stated at page 22:

"The definition of the former term ('reservations') has been amended to exclude national parks and national monuments. Under the amendment of the act passed in 1921, the Commission has no authority to issue licenses in national parks or national monuments. The purpose of this change in the definition of 'reservations' is to remove from the act all suggestion of authority for the granting of such licenses."

It may be emphasized that the only "suggestion of authority" to be removed was in the phrase "as now constituted' and the word "existing" of the 1921 amendment.

As clear as the 1935 amendment is in language and purpose, Mr. Abbott argues in his memorandum that the new definition of "reservations" does not mean what it says. He argues that the language "shall not include national monuments or national parks" really means "shall not include the parks in existence on March 3, 1921, as then constituted." This conclusion is reached by a strained interpretation of a further provision in the 1935 act which provided:

"Nothing in the Federal Water Power Act, as amended, shall be construed to repeal or amend the provisions of the amendment to the Federal Water Power Act approved March 3, 1921 (41 Stat. 1353), or the provisions of any other act relating to national parks and national monuments."

The purpose of this provision in the 1935 act was stated as follows by its author, Mr. Crosser, of Ohio, who said in the House debate:

"The national parks organization wants to make sure that the bill does not infringe upon their preserves, so to speak. We are offering this at their request."

The provision, offered at the request of the national parks organization, is construed by Mr. Abbott is a way that nullifies the plain meaning of the language that redefined reservations so as to exclude national parks and monuments. The purpose of the provision submitted by Mr. Crosser of Ohio certainly was not to preserve any authority of the Federal Power Commission to license the building of dams in parks or monuments, past or present. On the contrary, its purpose was to make it doubly clear that Congress subscribed to the policy of protecting national parks and monuments from invasion by dams.

Mr. Abbott contends that the purpose of the Crosser provision was to continue the effect of the language as now constituted and existing, which actually was eliminated by the 1935 act. It is inconceivable that this was the purpose of the Crosser provision. To construe it so against the interests and purposes of its sponsor, the national parks organization, would be ironical indeed. The redefinition of reservations removed any suggestion of Federal Power Commission authority over national parks or monuments. To argue that the Crosser provision was designed to reinsert such a suggestion is surely a distortion of legislative intent.

Thus the provisions in the Presidential proclamation of July 14, 1938, that "this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 (41 Stat. 1063), as amended," could not possibly give the Federal Power Commission authority to license construction of a dam in the enlarged area of Dinosaur National Monument. Any such authority of the Federal Power Commission may be conferred only by Congress, and Congress determined in 1935 that the Commission could not license the construction of dams in any national monument. To deviate from this well established national policy would set a dangerous precedent.

I am confident, therefore, both with regard to reclamation and power withdrawals, we are in no sense breaking faith with the people of Utah and Colorado and the other States of the upper Colorado region in urging that the preservation of this area be continued by Congress, and strengthened.

In emphasizing this I should like also, in as friendly a fashion as possible, to remind the people of Utah and Colorado, that all of us from all parts of the country share with them the public ownership of this unit in our National Park System. I would appeal to them to recognize that they share also a responsibility to all of us for its protection.

I recognize that our national welfare depends on the welfare of this region, and I feel that my own personal welfare is related to the personal welfare of fellow citizens in Utah and Colorado. I am interested in the national importance of the upper Colorado River program for the benefit of this region and its people. At the same time, I would urge all of them to keep faith with all of us throughout the Nation, and with those of future generations, by cherishing these scenic wild canyons and helping to preserve them unimpaired.

It is important, I believe, in discussing these so-called agreements and our various obligations, regional and national, to recognize that the Dinosaur National Monument was created out of lands that already belonged to the Nation, public domain that belonged to all of us. In some parts of our country private lands have been purchased for, and State lands have been turned over to the Federal Government for the creation of national parks. Those who have lived near these areas have given such parks to the Nation. Here, the Nation, already in ownership of this public domain, merely dedicated it for a special use of all the Nation—including the people of Utah and Colorado who indeed are in a preferred location—as one of the superbly beautiful parts of the land to become a part of the National Park System.

The purpose of the enlarged Dinosaur National Monument, it is clear, is to preserve the marvelous wild canyons of the Green and Yampa Rivers. The shape of the monument, as readily seen on the map, shows that this is the purpose, its size being that which is necessary to preserve and protect properly these canyons. Only so much as was needed for this purpose was thus reserved, out of our own public domain, and set aside from the normal commodity uses that are made by local residents of other parts of the public domain or of the private lands which they own or rent.

During the public debate that followed the Bureau of Reclamation's proposal of this Echo Park Dam some 5 years ago, it has been clearly shown, I believe, not only that (1) the scenic wild canyons of the Dinosaur National Monument are superb and unique, a wilderness resource irreplaceable, invaluable, and increasingly popular, but also (2) that it is not necessary to destroy this national monument in order to realize the purposes of the upper Colorado River project. Others have spoken, and will yet speak, in greater detail and with better understanding of alternative programs. All of us conservationists have shown real interest in them. Far from wishing to enforce any denial of water storage or power potential on the people of the region, we have extended ourselves to demonstrate that there can be a program that will serve all public purposes, including national park preservation. Neither evaporation loss, which was once officially described as the fundamental issue, nor any other supposed sacrifice, I am sincerely convinced, will ever become any severe penalty on the people of Utah and Colorado for the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument. I am confident that in no way will they eventually regret joining with all of us in its preservation.

In the Living Wilderness, the quarterly magazine which I edit for the Wilderness Society, we have devoted earnest attention during the past 5 years to the presentation of information about the Dinosaur National Monument and its preservation within a successful program for the upper Colorado River storage project. In addition to numerous news items with maps and photographs we have published a number of articles of feature length. In our autumn 1950 magazine we published General Grant's definitive discussion with the title "The Dinosaur Dam Sites Are Not Needed." In this same magazine we published Margaret E. Murie's appreciation of the national monument entitled "A Matter of Choice," which concluded: "Water, yes, for those dry States. By all means. But, what if it can be had in some other way than by damming up the beautiful canyons of the Green and the Yampa in this particular 'convenient' spot." Mrs. Murie quoted Robert Browning:

"Oh, if we draw a circle premature
Heedless of far gain,
Greedy for quick returns of profit, sure
Bad is our bargain."

In the autumn 1950 magazine we also included Mildred E. Baker's "Lifelong Inspiration," recalling her 1940 trip on the Green River. These Autumn 1950 articles were combined later in a special reprint entitled "The Dinosaur Dam Case," a copy of which is herewith submitted for the committee's files, and additional copies of which will be gladly supplied. There similarly is submitted a reprint of Philip Hyde's article "Nature's Climax at Dinosaur" which we were privileged to publish with a selection of Mr. Hyde's brilliant photographs and

a special map by W. Frederick Freund in the Living Wilderness for Autumn 1952.

We have sought to emphasize, not only that the upper Colorado River program can be realized along with the preservation of the Dinosaur National Monument, but also that our only way of preserving any such areas throughout our land is by dedicating them and not allowing any destruction.

Our whole American policy for preserving some of our wilderness is, in fact, based on two understandings that are here involved.

On the one hand is the understanding that our land and water resources are great enough and varied enough to make possible the preservation of a system of wilderness areas without sacrificing the commodity production and other uses that make it necessary to develop most of our areas.

On the other hand, our wilderness preservation program is based on the understanding that our civilization is such that no lands will persist unexploited except those that are deliberately set aside and faithfully protected.

For this policy to prevail we must be faithful in respecting our dedications, for otherwise the dedicated areas will inevitably disappear one by one as it seems profitable to exploit them. We cannot merely set aside an area until we get to it with some kind of exploitation project without defrauding both our own and future generations.

To permit the would-be exploiters of Dinosaur National Monument to build the Echo Park and Split Mountains dams would certainly jeopardize this public policy of national park preservation. Rather than place this great and brilliant policy of the American people in such jeopardy let us instead strengthen it by reasserting our adherence to it and our determination that it must be respected. If we turn back now this threatened invasion, by reaffirming the sanctity of the areas which the Nation has dedicated for preservation, we can be sure that the whole national system of parks, monuments, wildlife refuges, wilderness, wild, primitive, and roadless areas will, indeed, be safeguarded more surely than ever.

We cannot avoid setting precedents. We can only do our best to see that the precedents which we do set are sound.

I would, therefore, recommend:

(1) That the Echo Park Dam be deleted from any of the bills now under consideration which the subcommittee may consider for approval and that the Echo Park Dam be omitted from any authorization recommended for approval;

(2) That any bill recommended for passage by Congress include a provision that the Glen Canyon project be so constructed that it shall not impair the Rainbow Bridge National Monument, a protection that we are assured by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Department of the Interior can be provided but one that should be specified by Congress as a requirement; and

(3) That any bill authorizing an upper Colorado project should include a provision that no project constructed under the authorization of this act shall be built within, or impair any of the natural features within, any area within the national park system.

Thus, not only does it seem possible to see authorized a sound project for the development and conservation of the water resources of the upper Colorado River region, but also, by reaffirming here in Congress the sanctity of the areas that the Nation has dedicated for preservation, we can resolve this long controversy in such a manner as to make more secure than ever our great American policy for preserving some areas of our land forever wild and unspoiled in their natural beauty and grandeur.

It will be an achievement that I am sure will bring us the gratitude of American citizens during a long, long future, an accomplishment that all of us, I am sure, will be well satisfied to share. As I said before, we cannot avoid setting precedents. We can only do our best to see that the precedents which we do set are sound.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, stripped of all its complexity, the upper Colorado River storage project is designed to put water on the parched lands and into the water-hungry economy of Utah and the other upper Colorado Basin States—Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico. It is water which rightfully belongs to us under the Colorado River compact of 1922, which apportioned the waters of the Colorado River and which was approved by the Congress.

It is a project of immense importance to the Nation, as shown by the strong support given by President Eisenhower and his administration. He recognizes that we cannot postpose development of our water resources in the arid Western States. His keen understanding was shown in a letter which he sent to be in September of 1954, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

DENVER, COLO., *September 8, 1954.*

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BENNETT: I appreciated your August 5 letter respecting an affirmative reclamation program which is so important to the Western States and the Nation generally.

I regret that some should feel that this administration has not sought to further a sound reclamation program. Recently a Cabinet Committee on Water Resources was appointed to make a complete review and submit recommendations on all major problems in this important field. The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch, established in the first session of the 83d Congress, also has included water resources in its studies. These efforts should lead to the formulation of a comprehensive and progressive water policy acceptable to the Congress.

The need for such reviews is evident, but we cannot afford to suspend all resources development until they are completed. The Colorado River storage project is a case in point. It is well conceived as proposed in the administration plan, which takes into full account the interests of the areas affected, both upstream and downstream. I consider the plan in this form to be essential to the proper development of the great intermountain region. I have so expressed my views publicly; the Secretary of the Interior also has urged the project on many occasions and in many places. Very unfortunately, action on it was not completed by the 83d Congress, but it is now much better understood as a result of legislative work already done, and I am confident that the 84th Congress will approve it.

In the future, I shall continue to support Secretary McKay's administration of a sound, progressive reclamation program and will count on your continued vigorous sponsorship of legislative proposals essential to the success of our recommendations.

With warm regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the project, however, is a nonpartisan development enjoying the support of both parties in Utah and the upper basin.

Former President Herbert Hoover has shown also an acute perception concerning the foregoing problems, as well he might, for he served as Chairman of the Colorado River Commission. He portrayed the problems in a letter written in 1945 to former Senator Albert Hawkes, of New Jersey.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from this letter may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

As you know, I had the honor to be Chairman of the Colorado River Commission which settled the Colorado River compact in 1922 and other matters relating to the development of the river. During the following years I had many duties involving these questions. * * * In 1922 there was general agreement that the allocation of 7,500,000 acre-feet per annum to the upper basin would be more than ample to meet their requirements. * * * It is now realized that the allocation will fall far short of ultimate needs of the upper basin. * * * In 1922 the compact requirement that the upper States never deplete the flow of the river to less than 75 million acre-feet in any 10-year period was not considered burdensome. Studies now available show that to meet this obligation the upper States will have to provide at least 20 million acre-feet of holdover storage to be used during low-flow periods, comparable to 1931–40, or lacking storage, will have to limit their use to about 64 percent of their allocation, in order to make available 75 million acre-feet at Lee Ferry.

WATER: OUR PARAMOUNT RESOURCE—THE COLORADO RIVER: UTAH'S LAST WATER SOURCE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, to us in the semiarid upper Colorado River Basin and in all of my own State of Utah, water is our paramount resource. Our water problem is all too serious to us in Utah, particularly as we contemplate the forbidding fact that virtually all of our available water has been, or will be, put to use in the near future. This, in general, is the plight of the whole upper basin.

The progress of our entire region, with our immense minerals and industrial potential, an expanding agriculture, and the growth of our cities, all hinges directly on the future availability of more water. Without water, our growth will be stunted; with water, a great new era of development lies before us—an era of benefit to the entire Nation.

The same recognition of the relative importance of water in the scheme of things in the West was realized by the pioneers who first entered Utah. Irrigation was begun almost immediately while the colonizers were instructed by Brigham Young to forego mineral development, even during the height of the 1849 gold rush. The purpose was obvious—the settlers must first have a solid economic base. As we all know, mining was to come into its own, but water and farming came first.

UTAH AND THE PROJECT

In agricultural development, to evaluate properly the upper Colorado River project, it is necessary to view the tremendous potential of the area. Because

I am best acquainted with Utah, I shall confine my remarks largely to my State.

At the present time, less than 2.2 percent of the land in the State of Utah is irrigated. Of the 1 million acres currently under irrigation, fully 60 percent, or 600,000 acres, has only a periodic supply of water and undergoes severe shortages annually. Utah's farmers, most of whom run small farms, need the water with its invigorating impact, which can come alone from ultimate development of the central Utah, Gooseberry, and Emery projects.

Mr. President, I have prepared a table showing the number of acres which may be irrigated, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Projects	Acres of new land irrigated	Supplemental acres irrigated	Total acreage
Central Utah	28,500	132,000	160,500
Emery County	3,630	20,450	24,080
Gooseberry		16,400	16,400
Total	32,130	168,850	200,980

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is hoped that with ultimate development of Utah's share of the Colorado waters, the total of new irrigated land will be about 210,000 acres, and that furnished supplemental water, 250,000 acres. This will still leave nearly one-half million acres in the Colorado and Bonneville basins needing either a full or partial supply of water.

The crops produced in Utah are not in competition with the major crops of the Nation, so the development would not contribute to the present surpluses. Except for fruits, vegetables, sugarbeets, and canning crops, our agricultural production is harvested through livestock. Moreover, it will take from 10 to 20 years to get the projects into operation. It is likely that any increase in production will be consumed locally by Utah's rapidly increasing population.

I have received from the Honorable Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, a letter which points out that, on the basis of findings by the Agricultural Research Service, by 1975 we will be approximately 167 million acres short of land to produce enough food and forage to supply the population expected at that time.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the letter from Secretary Benson may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 28, 1955.

Hon. WALLACE F. BENNETT,
United States Senate.

DEAR WALLACE: This is in response to a telephone request from a member of your staff indicating that you would like some information concerning the estimated increase in farm production necessary to provide food and fiber for the expected population increase by 1975.

Dr. B. T. Shaw, Administrator of our Agricultural Research Service, recently discussed this matter before the House Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee. His estimates are as follows:

Based on population estimates made by the Bureau of the Census, Dr. Shaw believes that by 1975 we will need production from 167 million acres more land than we are now using. He assumes that 45 million acres can be brought into production through irrigation, drainage, land clearing, and the release of land from growing horse and mule feed. This would leave a deficit of 122 million acres that would have to be made up through improved technology (increased output per acre). Our research figures indicate that improvements in crop yields per acre have been slowing down in recent years.

Thus it would appear safe to assume that by 1975 we will need for agricultural production in the United States all of the new land that can be safely and efficiently brought into production. In addition to that, our research will have to keep pace to provide the increased output per acre.

I hope that this information will be of some benefit to you.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

EZRA T. BENSON,
Secretary.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the statement by the Secretary of Agriculture has been further substantiated by an article entitled "Food and Fiber Outlook for the Future versus Current Farm Surpluses," written by Dr. Jewell J. Rasmussen, and published in the Utah Economic and Business Review for March, 1955. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

FOOD AND FIBER OUTLOOK FOR THE FUTURE VERSUS CURRENT FARM SURPLUSES

(By Dr. Jewell J. Rasmussen)

One of the most important issues with respect to the Colorado River storage project and participating projects concerns the use of reclamation to bring in new farmland while the Nation is plagued with the problem of surpluses under the farm price support program. Specifically, the question is: Why invest large amounts of Federal money in projects which bring new lands into production by irrigation or other reclamation means at the same time that the Federal Government is spending large sums to support farm prices under seemingly overproduction on existing lands?

Standing alone, this argument overlooks the multipurpose aspects of water resources development and ignores the importance of controlling and regulating such mighty streams as the Colorado River. Apart from this aspect of the problem, however, the basic question posed above should and can be answered from the narrower standpoint of agricultural production.

In attempting to answer this question, it is necessary to consider such factors as (1) changes in the productivity of land, (2) population trends as an indication of future requirements, (3) the relation of improved diets to changes in food consumption, (4) future feed requirements for horses and mules, and (5) export possibilities. Careful analysis of these factors was made by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950 with illuminating results for the Colorado River and similar projects.[1]

CHANGES IN PRODUCTIVITY

The Commission found that from 1910 until the late thirties, there were no substantial changes in per acre yields on American farms. Then, as a result of a combination of factors, including the greater use of fertilizer and lime, improved varieties of plants, control of insects and disease, shifting high-producing crops to better lands, improved soil building and conservation practices, and further mechanization of farms, crop yields increased sharply. Average wheat yields during 1945–49 were one-fourth higher than in 1920–39; corn yields were up about one-third; and hay yields increased 10 percent. In addition, improvements in the food value of hay contributed to an increase of 15 to 20 percent in production per animal unit.

Further improvements in farm technology will undoubtedly result in a continuation of the upward trend in per acre production. Of course, there are also limiting factors on the full benefits of improved technology such as the lag between the development and use of improved production techniques and the absence of proper soil management. The Commission concluded that:

"In view of all these considerations it seems probable that average per acre yields will continue to increase over at least the next quarter century although the rate of increase may be somewhat less rapid than during the past decade."

POPULATION TRENDS

An important aspect of the decision to reclaim more agricultural land through irrigation is the size and location of the population. Since 1940 there has been a significant reversal of the previous decline in the rate of population increase. On the basis of a medium projection, the Bureau of the Census has forecast a population of about 170 million in 1960 and 190 million in 1975.[2] With an estimated population of 163.9 million on January 1, 1955, the above forecast for 1960 will undoubtedly be exceeded by perhaps seven to eight million.

Of special significance to the Colorado River Storage project and the participating projects is the rapid growth of population in the West. Between 1940 and 1950 the population of the 11 Western States increased 40.4 percent, while the Nation increased only 14.4 percent. The estimated population of the 11 Western States in 1960 (medium projection) will be some 78–80 percent greater than it was in 1940, while the Nation will gain only about 28–30 percent. The gain of the Mountain States alone between 1940 and 1960 will be at least 44 percent, and individually all Western States except three will have gains considerably in excess of the national average.

The significance of these population trends was very carefully considered by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950. With reference to the Western States, the Commission stated:

"The existence of these large populations in relatively undeveloped areas will require new farm production, as well as industrial production in nearby locations. The new production can be developed smoothly, if plans for it are formulated promptly. Such

[1] The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, A Water Policy for the American People, vol. I (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1950).

[2] Margaret J. Hagood and Jacob S. Siegel, Projections of the Regional Distribution of the Population of the United States to 1975, Agricultural Economics Research, III (April 1951), p. 43.

plans should be carried out under the basin development planning which the Commission is recommending."

With reference to the Nation as a whole, the Commission took the position that the real agricultural problem is how to assure sufficient production to meet the requirements of an expanding population. * * *

CHANGES IN THE AMERICAN DIET

Per capita food consumption remained fairly stable during the 25 years prior to the late 1930's. But the increased output of food in the following decade permitted an increase in per capita consumption of about 15 percent above 1935–39. In addition, changes in what Americans eat will also affect cropland requirements for the future. The proportion of grain products and potatoes has declined by about one-third since 1909–14, the proportion of livestock products has increased about 10 percent, and the proportion of fruit, vegetables, and other foods has gone up nearly 50 percent.

These dietary trends are a shift to a more adequate and more palatable diet and are very likely to continue inasmuch as diet improvement is due more to rising income than to any other factor, and real per capita income in the United States is steadily rising. On this point, the following statement of the Commission is pertinent:

"In spite of the bumper crops of recent years, there are still large numbers of the population whose diets are not adequate in nutrition or palatability. Some of the deficiency is due to lack of knowledge and some to habit. But most of it can be attributed to inadequate income."

The shift in diet toward the proportionate consumption of more livestock products and fruits and vegetables is also a shift to higher per capita land requirements. When crops go into livestock production rather than directly into human consumption, relatively more land is required because the calorie production per acre is decreased, although other nutritive factors are increased. The shift to fruits and vegetables also increases the cropland requirement, but not as much as does the shift to livestock products. It is especially important to note, however, that the shift to fruits and vegetables increases the demand for irrigated land.

EXPORT POSSIBILITIES

The amount of land needed for future agricultural exports is very uncertain. In the past, the acreage was varied from 55 million acres in 1920–24 to as low as 15 million acres in 1941, with an average of 48 million acres for the period of 1945–49. The Commission estimated in 1950 that the acreage needed for export production may drop from the present 50 million acres, leveling off at about 40 million.

CROPLAND NEEDED FOR WORKSTOCK

Acreage needed to produce feed for horses and mules declined from 90 million in 1910 to 30 million cropland acres in 1949. Studies by the United States Department of Agriculture indicates that by 1975 there will be only half as many horses and mules in use as there were in 1950. This reduction will release additional acreage for human use.

REMOTE CROPLAND REQUIREMENTS

On the basis of the preceding analysis and certain assumptions, it is possible to project the national cropland requirements for future years. The Commission made such projections for 1960 and 1975, assuming the average diet and production per acre remained about the same as in the 1945–45 period. Table 1 shows these projections.

From the table it is seen that the estimated cropland requirements will be some 99 million acres greater in 1975 than in 1945–49. If an adequate diet were made available to the whole population, it might require up to a 15-percent increase in cropland requirements, which would be about 96 million acres in 1975. An increase in per-acre yields would, of course, correspondingly reduce the acreage requirements.

TABLE 1.—*Projected acreage requirements for 1960 and 1975 (assuming 1945–49 consumption levels and acre yields)*

	1945–49	1960	1975
Population (millions)	144	169	190
Cropland requirements (millions of acres):			
For human consumption:			
From cropland [1]	297	348	391
From pasture (cropland equivalent) [2]	127	149	167
Total	424	497	558
For export	48	40	40
For horse and mule feed:			
From cropland	30	18	12
From pasture (cropland equivalent)	15	9	6
Idle cropland	25	25	25
Total cropland acreage or equivalent	542	589	641

[1] Requirements for domestic consumption of food, fiber, tobacco, and feed for livestock produces. Excludes double cropping; includes 25 million acres for fallow and crop failure. Per capita acreage equals 297 divided by 144 equals 2.06. Requirements for 1960 and 1975 calculated by applying this figure to population projections.

[2] Total cropland equivalent of pasture, 142 million acres minus cropland equivalent of pasture for horses and mules equals 127 million acres. Per capita requirements equals 127 divided by 144 equals 0.88. Requirements for 1960 and 1975 calculated by applying this figure to population projections.

Source: The President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 159.

MEETING INCREASED REQUIREMENTS

If the above estimates of future requirements are realistic and defensible, then the present food surpluses are transitory, and about 100 million additional cropland acres will be needed by 1975. This increased agricultural production can come only from four major sources: (1) increasing production from existing farmlands, (2) bringing new lands into production through all forms of reclamation, (3) importing more from other countries, and (4) reduced future feed requirements for workstock. A possible additional source is "hydroponic" farming or nutriculture. Hydroponic gardens are shallow, gravel-lined beds through which chemical plant-feeding solutions are circulated. This method of vegetable production has been practiced to a very limited extent in Puerto Rico and Florida, and by the United States Army in Japan and other Pacific islands. The future of this source of supply depends on relative cost which is very uncertain.

Continuation or acceleration of the soil conservation program logically can be expected to result in increased farm output in the years ahead. However, the results of the program will not be all gain. It has been estimated by the Department of Agriculture that about half of the present cropland is subject to erosion. Some of this land, perhaps as much as 50 million acres, might well be retired to grass and trees in the next 20 to 25 years. The major gains from soil conservation are expected in hay and grazing which will result primarily in increased livestock production. In summarizing the net gains from soil conservation, the Commission concluded:

"It is probable, therefore, that the soil conservation program, if effectively carried out during the next 25 years, can be depended upon to do no more than take care of the increased demands due to the correlative improvement in diet, insofar as that involves increased consumption of livestock products. The correlative increased demand for fruits and vegetables will have to be taken care of by other means, including reclamation. In other words, the 1975 requirements for an additional 100 million cropland acres is still to be provided for."

Of the projected requirements of 100 million additional cropland acres by 1975, it has been estimated that about 30 million equivalent acres could come from reclamation projects—about 6 million acres of newly irrigated land, which are the equivalent of 9 million of nonirrigated land, plus the equivalent of 21 million acres of ordinary farmland reclaimed through clearing, drainage, and flood protection. The ultimate acreage suitable for development for agricultural use through flood control, drainage, and clearing has been estimated at 75 million acres, which is the equivalent of about 43 million acres of new cropland of average yields. In addition, it has been estimated that ultimately about 25 million equivalent cropland acres could be developed by irrigation.[3] (Much more irrigable land exists, of course, than can be irrigated with available water supplies.) Total equivalent cropland acreage considered susceptible of development through reclamation was thus estimated by the President's Water Resources Policy Commission to be about 68 million acres. Table 2 summarizes these estimates.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural production potentials*

Type of potential	Considered susceptible of development [1]	
	By 1975	Ultimate
Irrigation	9.0	25.0
Flood protection	3.5	4.3
Flood protection, drainage, and land clearing	3.8	14.6
Drainage and land clearing	[2] 11.2	14.4
Land clearing	2.0	8.0
Subtotal	29.5	68.3
Improved technology: [3]		
Moderate increase	46.0	----------
Substantial increase	77.0	----------

[1] Expressed in millions of acres of average cropland equivalent.

[2] Based on the assumption that the present rate of drainage and land clearing development would be expanded as a result of Federal activity.

[3] Based on a cropland equivalent acreage of 542 million less 40 million acres for land to be removed permanently from the cropland base, and productivity indexes of 110 and 118 compared to acreage production for the 5-year period 1945 to 1949. The index of 118 is equivalent to 150 for the 5-year period 1935 to 1939. Ultimate improvement in technology is not estimated.

Source: President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 165.

The provision of about 30 million equivalent cropland acres through reclamation by 1975 would still leave about 70 million equivalent acres to be provided through other means. The estimate of the needed additional acreage in 1975 (100 million cropland acres) takes into account the reduced need for feed for horses and mules (see table 1). The net export acreage is assumed to remain about constant. Hence, the equivalent of an additional 70 million acres can be secured only through an accelerated reclamation program or through a substantial increase in the productivity of existing farmlands.

---

[3] This estimate is based upon the following factors: "Yields from irrigated lands are, on the average, about 50 percent higher than from nonirrigated land. Delivery of additional water to already irrigated lands increases the yields by about one-third of the yield of irrigated lands. Pasture is also reckoned as about a third as productive as irrigated cropland." President's Water Resources Policy Commission, op. cit., p. 160.

The Commission projected future land requirements on the basis of two assumptions with respect to yield increases: A moderate increase assumed that in 1960 and 1975 yields would be 5 and 10 percent, respectively, above the average for the period 1945–49—increases equal to a 33- and a 40-percent increase above the average for the prewar period of 1935–39. A substantial increase assumed that in 1960 and 1975 yields would be 10 and 18 percent above the average for the period 1945–49, or 40 and 50 percent above the period 1935–39. The results of these projections of technology improvements in terms of cropland acreage are shown in table 2. It is seen that the moderate-increase projection—46 million acres—falls considerably short of the additional needed acreage of 70 million, and that the substantial-increase projection exceeds the estimated land requirements only by 10 percent.

As a result of the above analysis and projections, the President's Water Resources Policy Commission reached the following conclusions:

"On the basis of these estimates, it appears that the increased productivity of existing agricultural acreage, if added to the production available from new lands brought in by irrigation, drainage, flood control, and clearing, is likely to meet the Nation's expanding requirements over the next 25 years by a rather narrow margin. Obviously, the program for meeting those requirements must include the combined efforts of those responsible for reclamation in its various forms and those responsible for improved farming practices."

In general, this analysis has shown that reclamation of new land through irrigation, flood control, drainage, and clearing, and improvement in the use of existing farmlands, must move forward together if the future needs of the Nation are to be met. It tends to controvert the contention that reclamation of new lands should be curtailed because of surpluses in certain agricultural commodities.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, it is evident from Secretary Benson's letter that even with the reclaiming of lands, drainage of swamps, and the expansion of research, by 1975 we will still need many more thousands of acres just to feed our population. It would be most unwise not to proceed with the development of lands to meet this eventuality.

Many of Utah's towns and cities are in critical need of culinary and industrial water, particularly in central Utah. The sobering part of this picture is that virtually all of the water in these areas even now is tapped and in use.

Utah's population has increased 27 percent in the years 1940 through 1953, a growth well above the national average, and exceeded by only 10 States. Utah leads the Nation with its vital index—that is, a high birthrate and low death rate. If proportionate growth continues, the State's population will be well over a million by 1965, compared with 750,000 today, 1965 being the earliest date by which the initial phase of the central Utah project would be completed. The strain on our water resources can well be imagined if additional water is not forthcoming.

For years, one of Utah's major exports has been the trained intelligence of our young people who emigrate because of lack of job opportunities. They have enriched the Nation but it is a lamentable circumstance that they should feel obliged to leave the place of their birth, especially when it is possessed of a treasure trove of wealth and opportunity, given the vital elements of water and power. It has been estimated that Utah can support a population twice its present size if our share of Colorado River waters is made available through the full development of the central Utah, Emery County, and Gooseberry projects.

Water and power are needed for our industrial potential. It may be said without exaggeration, I believe, that Utah is the mineral storehouse of the Nation. By enlarging this statement to include the upper basin, there can be no contradiction advanced whatever. Utah is one of the most important world sources of such radioactive ores as uranium, vanadium, carnotite, and pitchblende. Together with western Colorado, the area provides the greatest domestic source for uranium. This is an area where we have a dependable supply not subject to the vagaries of political machinations abroad. Water and power are, of course, needed in the processing of these ores.

In terms of the variety of minerals from which new wealth was and is created, Utah is excelled by no other State. As processes for developing synthetic liquid fuel are perfected, the fact that Utah has 200 billion tons of coal, and that there are 800 billion tons within 350 miles of Salt Lake City, will be increasingly important. This comprises one-seventh of the world's known coal reserves.

Virtually all of the materials necessary for the development of a chemical industry are to be found in Utah, but the existing water and power supplies are not now sufficient to fully develop the great possibilities of such an industry.

Utah is one of the main producers of nonferrous metals and ranks at the top or near the top of the Nation in production of copper, zinc, lead, silver, and gold. There are great deposits of magnesium in the Great Salt Lake and in southeastern Utah, but again large amounts of water are required to obtain this metallic element.

Utah is now in the iron and steel business, with ever-increasing opportunities for satellite industries; 50,000 acre-feet of water per year is consumed at the Geneva mill, while at the same time circulating 146,000 acre-feet.

Phosphate fertilizer is critically short, and it is significant that the largest known deposits of phosphate rock are in the upper basin States. Power and water again are required.

Utah is at a critical juncture in its history with much of its future possibilities contingent directly upon water and power made available by this project. It is impossible to overdramatize our need, for it means either progress or stagnation.

CALIFORNIA HAS HAD FIRST TURN ON THE COLORADO RIVER WATERS

The Colorado River compact was signed in 1922 to divide equally the waters of the Colorado between the upper and lower basin in advance of their actual use. This was done so that southern California could commence the development of her share of the Colorado waters. The upper basin States were willing to step aside and allow southern California to develop first, providing it was agreed that the upper States could at a later date develop their half of the water. It was recognized by the people of Utah that at that time California was then climatically, geographically, and economically in a better position to proceed with irrigation and storage projects than was the upper basin. Moreover, we too were greatly concerned about the recurring floods which were then constantly menacing southern California, particularly the Imperial Valley. Consequently, we were willing to defer to southern California and give her first turn on the river.

UTAH BARGAINED IN GOOD FAITH

Had we in the upper basin States wished to be selfish in 1922, we could have effectively blocked any additional development in southern California including the Hoover Dam. However, the upper basin, in the interest of interstate comity and reasonableness, agreed to the 1922 compact. Utah and the upper basin States intend to abide by the compact. We in Utah have demonstrated our good faith by signing the compact and we have scrupulously adhered to its provisions, in the bill before the Senate. Southern California can now show her good faith by refusing to engage in further dilatory tactics and allow the project to proceed. Surely, their 33 year head start has not blunted their sense of fairness.

FIRST TURN OF INCALCULABLE VALUE TO SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

For a variety of reasons, the lower basin has been developed more rapidly than the upper basin, as is evidenced by such monumental works as the Hoover Dam, Parker Dam, Davis Dam, and the All-American Canal among others. A comparison of the relative development of the two basins is most illuminating, particularly in the light of the approximate equality of development contemplated by the 1922 compact.

I have prepared a schedule showing the comparative use of water and power developed along the Colorado, as between the two basins. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

Colorado River water put to use:

(2.2 to 1 ratio)	*Acre-feet annually*
Lower basin	5,500,000
Upper basin	2,000,000

Total storage capacity of projects constructed or authorized for construction:

(23 to 1 ratio)	*Acre-feet annually*
Lower basin	38,600,000
Upper basin	1,700,000

Development of power by projects constructed or authorized for construction by Congress in generating capacity:

(53 to 1 ratio)	*Kilowatts*
Lower basin	1,700,900
Upper basin	32,000

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the overwhelming bulk of this development

has been for the benefit of Southern California. Thus the lower basin has developed 53 times more generating capacity, 23 times more storage capacity, has put 2.2 more water to use, and is using more daily. In addition, millions of dollars are saved by halting the floods which previously devastated the lower Colorado, and particularly the Imperial Valley.

I wonder if our downstream neighbors really realize just what this first turn to the Colorado water and resulting power has meant to them? On the lower Colorado alone, under national reclamation law, approximately $450 million have been invested for the development of water and power for Arizona, California, and Nevada; and when there is added to that the fact that there has been an investment in reclamation of equal magnitude on other rivers in those States, one gets the very impressive total of $894 million.

SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA HAS SAVED $1 BILLION BY HAVING FIRST TURN

But this is only half, or less than half, of the story. If these same projects were built today, at current prices, they would cost $1,825,000,000. In other words, the privilege of having first turn has saved our downstream neighbors a billion dollars—a billion which they will not have to pay back or pay interest on.

If the upper Colorado development project is authorized and built, we in the upper basin will have to pay back twice as much as they must for equal value. There are three ways in which our friends down river might look at this with us. First, if the development of both ends of the river had begun in the twenties, the cost to each would have been approximately equal, as our share of the water is. Second, at the prices of the twenties there would be no question of "economic feasibility." And third, even at today's prices, we can build the initial phase of the program on the upper river for the billion saved by the lower basin because they had first turn.

We in Utah have watched with pleasure the great progress made in the lower basin. We have witnessed the extensive agricultural developments, the growth of industrial developments, the population influx, and the overall increase in wealth made possible to a great extent by the utilization of the Colorado waters and the very important byproduct power.

The entire Nation has been inestimably benefited by the development of the lower basin, and there is every reason to believe a similar boon will be conferred by a corresponding development of the upper basin's share of the Colorado water. We believe that it is now our "water turn."

CONGRESS THE WATERMASTER

Out of the pioneer experiences with water there emerged a unique feature, the "watermaster," whose job it was to see that every man along the stream had his turn and his share. The Colorado River Compact of 1922 established our share, and we are now asking Congress as the watermaster to see that we get our turn.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER VERSUS ATOMIC POWER

It has been suggested by opponents of the upper Colorado River storage project that nuclear fuel will shortly displace hydroelectric and steam power. It is urged, therefore, that the Glen Canyon and Echo Park Dams would be obsolete before they are paid for.

While I was looking forward with great hope to rapid development of atomic power, I think that it would be imprudent and most unwise to summarily halt further hydropower and steam development.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to present to the Senate committee, while it was holding hearings on the bill, a letter signed by W. F. Libby, Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, expressing the view that there would never be a time when power development by atomic energy would completely replace power developed by conventional powerplants. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., March 9, 1955.

Hon. FRED G. AANDAHL,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior, United States Department of the Interior, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AANDAHL: This has reference to your letter of February 17 wherein you ask for an expression from the Atomic Energy Commission as to how soon we estimate that the goal of producing electrical energy, utilizing atomic energy, might be competitive in costs to other fuels; also our views as to the time period which might be involved before electric energy could be produced directly from atomic energy; and whether or not we feel that hydroelectric, or even conventional, fuel plants will soon become obsolete.

Generation of electricity from nuclear fuel should first become competitive with conventional fuels in areas of high cost electricity. We feel this could happen during the 1960's. However, regardless of this fact, it is our feeling that hydroelectric plants which can be economically justified at this time probably will not become obsolete during their useful life.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

ECHO PARK DAM NOT AN INVASION OF DINOSAUR MONUMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Echo Park Dam has been the object of considerable and often loose and inaccurate discussion. It has been urged by some conservationists that the dam is an invasion of a national monument, and that it will lead to the destruction of the National Park System. In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 28, 1955, my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. WATKINS] completely refuted this contention, and demonstrated that the Dinosaur Monument expansion in 1938 was itself an invasion of valid reclamation and power withdrawals dating back to 1904.

It was only after repeated assurances from the Federal Government that the reclamation and power withdrawals would be honored, that the people of Utah and Colorado consented to the expansion of the monument from 80 acres to 209,000 acres in 1938. Mr. David H. Madsen conducted the meetings for the Federal Government in Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., in 1936, which secured local approval. I ask unanimous consent that a sworn statement by Mr. Madsen concerning these meetings be put in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, together with five affidavits of men who attended the meetings.

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

EXCERPT, TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, IN THE MATTER OF DINOSAUR NATIONAL MONUMENT, ECHO PARK, AND SPLIT MOUNTAIN DAMS, APRIL 3, 1950

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

David H. Madsen, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says: That he is over the age of 21 years and a citizen of the United States, and a resident of Utah County, Utah. That at the time the area of the Dinosaur National Monument was expanded to include the canyon unit I was employed by the National Park Service under the title of supervisor of wild life resources for the national parks. Among my other duties I was acting superintendent of the Dinosaur National Monument and in that capacity was ordered by the National Park Service to arrange for hearings at Vernal, Utah, and Craig, Colo., for the purpose of securing the approval of the citizens of that area for the expansion of the Dinosaur National Monument to include the canyon unit. Meetings were accordingly held at Vernal, Utah, June 11, 1936, and Craig, Colo., June 13, 1936. A large representation of the citizens of the area were present at these two meetings.

Among other questions which arose was the question of grazing and the question of power and/or irrigation development which might be deemed essential to the proper development of the area at some future time. I was authorized to state, and did state as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development.

The first part of this agreement with reference to grazing has been carried out and the residents of the area involved are entitled to the same consideration with reference to the development of power and irrigation at the Echo Park and Split Mountain Dam sites, and any other development that may not unduly interfere for the purpose of the establishment of the monument and which is necessary for the proper development of the area.

DAVID H. MADSEN.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March A. D. 1950.

KARL H. BENNETT,
Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

Leo Calder, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah;

That he attended a meeting called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional

acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meeting was held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at this meeting, and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of this meeting the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of the future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

LEO CALDER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March, 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE, *Notary Public.*

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

Joseph Haslam, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Jensen, Uintah County, State of Utah, for the past 35 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meetings was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

JOSEPH HARLEM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE, *Notary Public.*

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

B. H. Stringham, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah, for the past 40 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

B. H. STRINGHAM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE, *Notary Public.*

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

H. E. Seeley, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he has been a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah, for 30 years;

That he attended two meetings called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meetings were held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936, and at Craig, Colo., on June 13, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at both of these meetings, and that a record of the proceedings of the meetings was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of these meetings, and at both meetings, the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

H. E. SEELEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE, Notary Public.

STATE OF UTAH,
County of Uintah, ss:

J. A. Cheney, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of Vernal, Uintah County, State of Utah;

That he attended a meeting called by the National Park Service for the purpose of obtaining public reaction relative to the withdrawal of public lands to provide additional acreage to be added to the Dinosaur National Monument;

That said meeting was held at Vernal, Utah, on June 11, 1936;

That a stenographer was present at this meeting and that a record of the proceedings of the meeting was kept on a stenotype machine;

That during the course of this meeting the National Park Service representative assured the residents of these areas that if the Dinosaur National Monument were enlarged, that the National Park Service would not prevent or stand in the way of future reclamation projects or water development projects on the Green River or the Yampa River within the boundaries of the Dinosaur National Monument, for irrigation or power purposes.

J. A. CHENEY.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 27th day of March, 1950.

[SEAL] RUTH ASTLE, *Notary Public.*

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have prepared additional material, which includes quotations from newspaper reports of the period, setting forth very clearly the impressions which the people of Utah gained from those promises. I ask unanimous consent to have that material printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

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

Mr. Madsen states that "I was authorized to state and did state, as a representative of the National Park Service, that grazing on the area would not be discontinued and that in the event it became necessary to construct a project or projects for power and irrigation in order to develop that part of the States of Utah and Colorado, that the establishment of the monument would not interfere with such development."

Quite clearly, future power and irrigation projects were contemplated and the people of the area were promised that they would not be jeopardized by the monument expansion. Secretary of the Interior Harold Ickes states in a policy directive governing the negotiations to create the Dinosaur National Monument that "The future development of mineral, water, and power resources, if and when it should become economically feasible, would be determined by the Congress."

The promises made were an outgrowth of concern expressed by local people, including Governor Blood, of Utah, who wrote Senator King, of Utah, requesting that reservations for the development of power, water, and minerals in the proposed monument be made. In May of 1938, Congressman Taylor and Senator Johnson of Colorado were notified by the Park Service that the Secretary of the Interior had approved the enlargement, subject to the reclamation and power withdrawals.

In response to a request from Secretary Ickes on June 6, 1935, asking that the Federal Power Commission release its power withdrawals in the affected area, Chairman Frank R. McNinch replied, "The Federal Power Commission believes that the public interest in this major power resource in the proposed monument area is too great to permit voluntary relinquishment, but the Commission will not object to the creation of a monument if the proclamation setting aside the area contains a specific provision that the development will be permitted."

EXECUTIVE ORDER ALLOWS DAMS IN MONUMENT

As a result of these negotiations and promises, President Roosevelt provided in his 1938 Executive order expanding the monument that "the Director of the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall have the supervision, management, and control of this monument * * * except that this reservation shall not affect the operation of the Federal Water Power Act of June 10, 1920 * * * as amended and the administration of the monument shall be subject to the reclamation withdrawal of October 17, 1904, for the Brown's Park Reservoir site in connection with the Green River project." Significantly, the power reservations cover the Echo Park dam site as well as that of Split Mountain.

UTAH RELIED ON FEDERAL PROMISES

The Utah papers carried a series of stories on the President's proclamation. The Vernal Express for July 21, 1938, stated: "In bringing the 318 square miles into the national monument, which heretofore covered only 80 acres, the Park Service agreed to permit the Division of Grazing to continue operation on the land and recognized power and reclamation rights."

The Salt Lake Tribune dated July 29, 1930, in a front-page article entitled "United States Enlarges Dinosaur Area in Utah" chronicled the following: "Under the order enlarging the monument, grazing will continue in areas which previously have been used by stockmen, and power and irrigation rights will be recognized."

The Vernal Express carried two further articles, the first on July 28, 1938, saying,

"J. A. Cheney, cashier of the Uintah State Bank, has worked on the enlargement and the development of the Dinosaur National Monument for a number of years, representing the Vernal Lions. It was through the efforts of Mr. Cheney that the power and grazing rights were protected in the opening of the new scenic region." Then, on August 4, 1938, the Express said: "Under the order enlarging the monument, grazing will continue in areas which previously have been used by stockmen, and power and irrigation rights will be recognized."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the people of Utah bargained with the Federal Government in good faith, and took the promises of its agents and the Executive order of President Roosevelt to be reliable. It is only natural, therefore, that we are nonplussed to discover that some misguided national conservationist leaders charge that the Echo Park Dam is an invasion. They have spent many thousands of dollars attacking the Echo Dam, saying that it would destroy the national park system. They could have used their money to aid the park system and build it up. Instead, they have chosen the weakest link in the monument system upon which to base a highly emotional stand, the only monument containing both power and reclamation withdrawals far antedating the creation of the monument.

The Echo Park Dam is patently not a precedent or an invasion to destroy national parks. Therefore, it should be judged on its merits. It is the second most efficient dam in the project in terms of storage, conserving water, and power production. It has a low rate of evaporation loss, so important in the arid West. Compared to feasible alternates, the Echo Park Dam will save 120,000 acre-feet of water annually in evaporation losses, enough to supply a city with a population over 400,000. The total population of the State of Utah is only 750,000. It is strategically located for the potential power market, located between Denver and Salt Lake City. Further, it is in the center of other lesser reservoirs, improving their efficiency.

Mr. President, in conclusion, the upper Colorado storage project culminates several decades of engineering study designed to put water on the dry lands of the upper basin States and still meet the commitments to the lower basin under the Colorado River compact of 1922.

Utah negotiated the 1922 compact with southern California in good faith, so that it could proceed with its development. It is now our turn to develop our half of the water apportioned by the compact. I hope that Congress will recognize the good faith evidenced by Utah and the upper basin in honoring the compact, and that southern California will now show her good faith by also honoring it and allow the upper basin to develop its water.

Similarly, Utah relied on the promises and assurances made by the Federal Government when the Dinosaur Monument was expanded to include the Echo Park Dam site. We were promised by United States officials that the expansion would not preclude later irrigation and power development. I hope that the Congress will not countenance the proposal that the United States back out of its agreements with the people of Utah and Colorado.

We in Utah are in dire need of the water, which is rightfully ours, from the Colorado River. Our entire future is dependent on obtaining more water for our agricultural, municipal, and industrial expansion. I think that our water turn is long overdue, and I am confident that this body will recognize the wisdom and value of the project to the entire Nation as well as to Utah and the upper basin.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement I have prepared relating to the upper Colorado River storage projects.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Before discussing the many and varied merits of the upper Colorado River storage projects, I want first to thank and congratulate the members of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for its full and complete hearings on this bill, S. 500. I was especially impressed with the vast and detailed knowledge of the subcommittee's chairman on every facet of the interstate compacts governing the use of water flowing in this great artery, the Colorado River. I would be pleased for the subcommittee chairman, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Senator CLINTON ANDERSON, to accept my compliments.

The bill, S. 500, was sponsored by Mr. ANDERSON and nine other Senators through whose States the mighty Colorado courses. All members of the Senate are familiar and acquainted with the huge dams built in the canyons of this river to generate electricity, the tremendous man-made lakes which serve as storage for irrigation and reclamation of barren but highly productive lands once they are touched by water. In this respect, the complete report on S. 500 speaks for itself.

The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain six specified initial units of the Colorado River storage project, consisting of dams, reservoirs, powerplants, transmission facilities, and appurtenant works.

After reexamination of the economic justification of each participating project including a reappraisal of the prospective direct agricultural benefits after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, such participating projects will be constructed as economic conditions permit. It would declare the intent of the Congress to authorize additional units of the Colorado River Storage Project and additional participating projects. It also would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, construct, operate, and maintain public recreational facilities on lands withdrawn or acquired for Colorado River storage project units and participating projects.

It is also very interesting to note on page 279 of the hearings the testimony of Hon. Val Peterson, administrator of the Civil Defense Administration. He said, in part, while endorsing this bill:

"My interest today is in the features of the project that lend themselves to the survival of the United States in time of war. I am, of course, familiar with the President's desire that the development go forward in the national interest.

"In this nuclear age, if an attack is made on the United States, it will be necessary, first, to get our people away from our critical target areas, our great centers of population and industry, and if a city is hit by a hydrogen bomb, we will not be able to reenter for some time, and possibly never.

"Second, the time is here for us to think about constructing or developing locations where vital or sensitive industries and facilities will be more secure.

"I will call your attention to the work that Russia is reported to have done in developing a second line of industry behind the Ural Mountains.

"Too, I have had the privilege of visiting many of the underground defense plants and military installations in Scandinavia. I refer to such installations as the great Bofors Armament Works, to the SKF plant, as well as to air hangars and destroyer bases created in the rock.

"While I am not proposing that our industries as such be relocated, I do urge that in expanding and extending our industries we should look to areas where they would be more difficult to attack.

"The upper Colorado development by providing water and power would pave the way for taking care of those who, by necessity, may be forced to evacuate our west coast cities."

In discussing the upper Colorado River storage project, it is well to remember two facts about the general region it affects: First, the area is subject to erratic and unpredictable periods of drought and floods, and second, it is undergoing a period of rapid industrialization and accelerated development of natural resources.

These two facts help explain some of the most urgent needs for the construction of the project. Foremost is the need to store water so that the excess water during years of plentiful flow can be saved for use during years of low flow. The future economy of Colorado and four other Western States is dependent on the conservation and use of its available water resources.

This project is also vitally needed to supply municipalities and for industrial growth. In fact, present demand for municipal water in the project area is increasing rapidly. I think it should be made clear that the proposed upper basin development is the last of the water resources available in many parts of the area to supply additional water for municipal and industrial purposes.

Not only is there a great need for water. There is also a tremendously increasing demand for electric energy. The power demands of the region are expected to exceed the output of all the power installations now scheduled, including those of the Colorado River project, for years to come. So the generation of hydroelectric energy by the project should be considered an important contribution to the future of the region and of the United States.

Still another contribution of the project should be mentioned. At present, the Colorado River system is committing larceny on a grand scale. I am told that it annually carries away more than 131 million tons of good soil—enough to build a 4- by 5-foot wall around the earth at the equator. This soil is deposited for the most part in Lake Mead, where it is being piled to heights threatening the useful life of the lake. The silt retention benefits of the project will greatly minimize the deposit and the attrition upon the benefits of the Hoover Dam.

At this time, I want to clarify a misconception about this bill which opponents are prone to amplify. The opponents' lobbyist who would want all water in the Colorado River for unrestricted use in their particular State and the misinformed conservation and wildlife groups contend that the Echo Park project would be an invasion of a national park and would set a precedent which would endanger our national-park system. These opponents are confused people; they are well-meaning people who have been led astray

because they are not fully informed of the facts.

This issue has been debated on this Senate floor before. The most accurate record and explanation of facts was given by Senator WATKINS, of Utah, on March 28. He attempted to clear away some misconceptions by explaining the words "Echo Park" are themselves misleading.

In the West it has long been a custom to designate an open area or a valley, canyon, and similar spots as parks. These small areas are found along streams and rivers flowing through our great forests. To my knowledge there is North Park, South Park, East Park, and West Park, to name just a few. Only through misconception and usage of the word park, have people come to think of them as being national parks.

It is through this practice of naming such areas has the mistaken belief arisen among people that "Echo Park" is really a national park.

In order to set the record straight so that all may understand, I want to explain the circumstances and review developments chronologically regarding the origin of Echo Park.

As the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] explained, in 1915 President Woodrow Wilson under the Antiquities Act set aside an 80-acre tract of land in northeastern Utah, where some skeletons of dinosaurs had been discovered, as a national monument. This area was called Dinosaur National Monument, and that monument probably has received more publicity in the past few years than any other monument in the United States.

This 80-acre tract was a part of the public domain. Later, on July 14, 1938—to be exact—President Franklin D. Roosevelt, by formal proclamation, added 203,885 acres of public land, which included parts of northwestern Colorado, to the original 80 acres and declared it, subject to some significant exemptions, to be a part of the Dinosaur National Monument.

The new area extends roughly 40 miles upstream on the Colorado River tributaries. The monument extension embraced lands on both sides of the Green and Yampa Rivers, and the area named "Echo Park" by the pioneers is included within its boundaries.

The opponents of Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams contend that this 1938 proclamation made all the area along those streams, including the Echo and Split Mountain Dam sites, a part of a national monument, and they challenge not only the propriety but also the legal right of public use of these reservoir and dam sites for water, power, and reclamation purposes.

This claim is challenged by the sponsors of the Colorado River because documentary evidence shows conclusively that a tremendous acreage within the present monument boundaries was reserved for water and power development from 13 to 34 years before the extension of Dinosaur Monument in 1938.

These facts which I have just related are based on the documentary evidence from the files of the Department of Interior and the Federal Power Commission. The conclusions stated here have not been refuted in the 734 pages of hearings on this bill. The majority of the Interior Committee, composed of Senators from all sections of the country, after hearing testimony on both sides of the question, voted that there is no invasion of national parks or monument areas in the construction of Echo Park Dam.

These, in brief, are some of the more important reasons why we, in Congress, should vote the passage of this legislation. It must be borne in mind by the Nation at large that the developments of these benefits cannot be made available for our use in a few months. This project will not be completed until the next century—after the year 2,000, if we are to plan and develop our Nation's resources for the forseeable future, they must be commenced now.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles on the Colorado River storage project, published in the Denver Post on March 2 and 5, entitled, respectively, "Upper River Called Defense Bastion" and "Water Hogging Try Hit."

The articles were written by Mr. Barnet Nover, chief of the Denver Post Washington bureau and a writer of wide experience and reputation, who has done outstanding work in covering the progress of the Colorado River storage legislation.

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

[From the Denver Post of March 2, 1955]

UPPER RIVER CALLED DEFENSE BASTION—CD CHIEF TELLS OF WAR NEEDS

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON, March 2.—The upper Colorado River basin area could be a defense stronghold in event of war, Val Peterson, Administrator of the Federal Civil Defense Administration told a Senate subcommittee Wednesday.

The subcommittee is holding hearings on a bill authorizing the billion-dollar river storage project.

In response to a query by Senator WATKINS (Republican), of Utah, a member of the subcommittee, Peterson said he was voicing not only his own view but that of the Eisenhower administration, which has strongly endorsed the storage project.

CITES NORWAY, SWEDEN

Peterson said the mountainous region served by the upper Colorado was peculiarly suited to participate in a dispersal program.

He pointed out that such dispersal to mountain hideaways already is being carried out in Norway and Sweden where such installations as the great Bofors armaments works and the SKF ball-bearing plant have been built underground.

"The time is here for us to think about constructing or developing locations where vital or sensitive industries and facilities will be more secure," Peterson said.

IDEALLY SUITED AREA

"The upper Colorado development, by providing water and power would pave the way for taking care of those who by necessity may be forced to evacuate our west coast cities. It would be fortunate if we had areas, with adequate water and power facilities, far removed from our vulnerable and heavily populated urban centers to which these people (those forced to evacuate from west coast areas) could go. The area in the upper Colorado Basin would be ideally suited for such development.

The civil defense administration chief cited the fact that the Nation's expanding economy requires new sites for industry.

"If uranium is a coming source of power," Peterson said, "it might be profitable for industry to locate near its source. If the oil shale developments prove out, new industries should be located near the source of this fuel. The entire basin has great coal reserves as well as other minerals and raw materials. Water and power will be sorely needed for such developments."

Citing a report on industrial concentration in the United States made by a group of universities for the Government, Peterson said that of the 96 million urban residents in the United States, 33 million live in the central cities of our 32 largest metropolitan areas which together occupy an area equivalent to a square only 55 miles to a side.

[From the Denver Post of March 5, 1955]

WATER HOGGING TRY HIT—UPPER STATE AIDES BLAST CALIFORNIAN

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON, March 5.—Senators from the upper Colorado Basin, after listening to opposition voiced by representatives of southern California to the storage project vehemently denounced the Pacific-coast State for trying to hog all Colorado River water for its own purposes.

"I haven't the slightest doubt," Senator EUGENE D. MILLIKIN said, "that the representatives of California are sincere in their desire to get all the Colorado River water, although that State does not contribute one drop.

"It's been their course of action from the beginning."

Supporting this view, Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, Democrat, of New Mexico, told a witness appearing before the Senate Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, now in its fifth day of hearings, that the fundamental issue is whether California "gets all the water or whether the upper basin States get a spoonful from time to time."

Similar views were expressed by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming, and Senator ARTHUR V. WATKINS, Republican, of Utah.

RIGHT TO VIEWS

The California witnesses were defended by Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California. He said that they had a right to state their views and "ought to be run out of town" if they failed to speak up.

ANDERSON is chairman of the Senate Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee which is looking into the storage plan whose purpose is to enable the upper basin States to put to beneficial use the share of Colorado River water to which they are entitled under the compact of 1922.

Earlier, Ben P. Griffith, president, board of water and power commissioners, city of Los Angeles, like the other witnesses from southern California, had expressed strong opposition to the bill authorizing the upper Colorado storage project.

Griffith contended, as previous California witnesses had before him, that the bill "constitutes a reinterpretation of the Colorado River compact which is indefensible," since he alleged it would nullify contracts entered into by Los Angeles with the Government for the purchase of power from the Hoover Dam.

CITES HOOVER REPORT

Griffith also argued that in any case the report of the Hoover Commission task force on reclamation and water, which is headed by former Gov. A. L. Miller, of Wyoming, should be awaited before any action is taken on the bill.

This led Anderson to say:

"We couldn't put our case before a more unfriendly jury than the Hoover Commission task force on water."

He cited the fact that Miller already was on record as hostile to the storage plan and other large-scale multiple-use irrigation, reclamation, and power projects.

Another argument made by Griffith and repeated by other California witnesses at the hearing, as well as by Senator KUCHEL, was that since there was such a sharp divergence in the interpretations of the Colorado compact by California and the other signatories, the upper basin States should agree to join in the Arizona-California suit now before the Supreme Court. This the upper basin States have resisted.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States the

enrolled bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

RETIREMENT OF SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the recent retirement of Prime Minister Winston Churchhill ended the public career of one of the greatest men in history. We Texans have a deep appreciation for his tremendous contribution to the cause of freedom in the world.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by the Senate of the State of Texas.

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

Senate Resolution 203

Whereas on April 5, 1955, one of the great men of our time, the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill, Prime Minister of the British Empire, retired from a lifelong career of active public service; and

Whereas the cloth from which men of the caliber of Churchill is cut is seldom loomed, as expressed in the immortal prose of another Englishman of 3 centuries ago, Shakespeare—

"He was a man, take him for all in all,
We shall not look upon his like again"; and

Whereas the empire of Texas, mother of many patriots herself, wishes to congratulate the British Empire for her good fortune in having had available the services of this patriot; and

Whereas the empire of Texas wishes to pay tribute and honor to Winston Churchill for his superb leadership and innumerable contributions to the freedom-loving people of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Texas, That we here and now pay our respects to a beloved world citizen, Winston Churchill, and congratulate the British Empire upon the outstanding services which it has received; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread on the pages of the senate journal, and that copies be forwarded to the Right Honorable Sir Winston Churchill and to the British Museum with the request that it be suitably displayed.

(Lock, Hardeman, Phillips, Ashley, Weinert, Aikin, Bracewell, Colson, Corbin, Fly, Fuller, Hazlewood, Kazen, Kelley, Lane, Latimer, Martin, McDonald, Moffett, Moore, Owen, Parkhouse, Ratliff, Roberts, Rogers of Childress, Rogers of Travis, Secrest, Shireman, Strauss, Wagonseller, Willis, Ramsey, Lieutenant Governor.)

BEN RAMSEY,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was adopted by the senate on April 6, 1955.

[SEAL] LOYCE M. BELL,
Secretary of the Senate.

RECESS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to be transacted, I move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge for the fifth circuit.

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Hon. Gerald R. Corbett, of Hawaii, to be sixth judge of the first circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 19 (legislative day of April 18), 1955:

POSTMASTER

Jesse T. Smathers to be postmaster at Canton in the State of North Carolina.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 19, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Alec Gerald Nichols, First Methodist Church, Santa Ana, Calif., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Heavenly Father, we come to Thee in adoration and praise, thanking Thee for life, liberty, and the glorious rights guaranteed to us as citizens of this Nation.

Grant that we may not be so concerned with the enjoyment of these rights as to forget the attendant responsibilities. May we ever be aware that in Thy sight we are the trustees—the stewards of these priceless privileges.

We pause for a moment to honor the memory of Dr. Einstein. Grant, O Father, that his great discoveries shall be ultimately used for the blessings of mankind.

We commend to Thee, O Lord, our President and all who are engaged in government; grant to them integrity of purpose and unfailing devotion to righteousness.

May Thy special blessing rest upon the Members of the House as they labor for Thee and their fellow men. May Thy guiding presence be with their families, wherever they may be.

Give them a sincere concern for freedom. Let it not become license but may each Member of this session love it so passionately as to preserve it for yet unborn generations.

Give to each Representative, O Lord, a discriminating sense of truth and the courage to be governed by it.

We thank Thee for their devotion to our country. May they represent their constituency with honor, sincerity, and pride. Give them courage, vision, and, at the end of the day, the inner approval of their heart and conscience.

May Thy grace rest upon our Nation. Guide her in the days ahead that she may become an instrument in Thy hand to relieve the oppressed, succor the poor, create social justice, and bring peace to all mankind.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday were read and approved.

DR. ALBERT EINSTEIN

Mr. MOLLOHAN. 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 West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation today mourns the loss of one of its outstanding citizens, Dr. Albert Einstein, whose tremendous contributions to the world and to this Nation have literally changed the course of this century in which we live.

Many honors have been showered upon Dr. Einstein during the course of his life and many more will be dedicated to his memory. But I can think of no greater tribute which this Congress could pay to him—and certainly none that would be more fitting—than that the House reexamine the immigration laws of our country in order that future "Dr. Einsteins," whether potential or recognized, shall not be barred from our shores because of our preoccupation with unworthy fears, mistrust, and discrimination against the stranger who knocks at our gates.

Surely no finer monument could be erected to the great heart and great mind of Dr. Einstein than for this House to put life and meaning into the Refugee Relief Act. Need I remind any Member of the House that this act was passed by the 83d Congress for the humanitarian purpose of admitting to this country 214,000 of those who seek escape from tyranny and oppression, from hardship and suffering in their mother lands to reach America, where liberty was cradled and independence nurtured. Yet, today, this legislation stands a bar instead of a door to freedom.

In memory of Dr. Einstein, then let us engrave upon our hearts as well as upon stone those famous words of the poet, Emma Lazarus:

Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,
The wretched refuse of your teeming shore.
Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost, to me.
I lift my lamp beside the golden door.

TREASURY AND POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS, 1956

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4876) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments for the fiscal year 1956 and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair

hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. GARY, PASSMAN, SIEMINSKI, MURRAY of Illinois, CANNON, CANFIELD, WILSON of Indiana, JAMES, and TABER.

PAY OF POSTAL WORKERS

Mr. PRICE. 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. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, now that the time is approaching for a showdown on the pay of our postal workers, the key question should be, What do they deserve? The facts say that a 10-percent raise for these hard-working and dependable public servants is no more than they deserve.

We have been told, while this question dangled, that the state of the Government's budget would not allow more than a pay rise of 6.5 percent or 7.6 percent. The budget matter has been presented as if the United States would go broke if it paid its postal employees fairly.

All of us are equally interested in a stable financial situation and in the faith and credit of the Treasury of the United States. There are differences, however, about how to balance the budget and what sacrifices should be called for from underpaid postal workers as a means to that end.

I refuse to acknowledge that the Government has to balance its budget by keeping the pay of its faithful employees hammered down below equitable levels.

We have been warned, almost too broadly, that if we dare to vote a 10-percent increase for postal workers the bill will run into a White House veto.

Well, it is the constitutional authority of the Chief Executive to veto any bill of which he does not approve. But it is our authority and responsibility to act as we honestly think wise and fair—not to be frightened from our duty by the menace of executive disapproval.

The constitutional system awards to this House the initiative in such matters. Let us exercise this right of initiative. Whatever may happen elsewhere, we should express our convictions clearly, in the belief that our expression has merit of its own, and may even prove persuasive in another coordinate branch of the Government.

The postal workers' claim to a 10-percent raise is based to a large degree on the hard fact of the rise in living costs. This is not something postal workers can control; they merely have to try to make ends meet, for themselves and their families, on what the Government is willing to pay them.

Our Government should not set a niggardly pattern for private employers. It should deal decently with postal workers whose only recourse is here. The proposed 10-percent raise would not break the Treasury and it will give the employees of our Post Office Department the pay to which they are entitled.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD today at the conclusion of all other business, on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE MURDER OF THREE UNITED STATES ARMY OFFICERS IN PASSAU, GERMANY

Mr. DODD. 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 Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, early this year, Mr. Charles D. Hanlon, a resident of the State of Connecticut, brought to my attention certain information concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany, on the morning of January 7, 1946.

Mr. Charles D. Hanlon is the brother-in-law of one of the murdered officers.

I have tried since January to obtain information and to get some action on this matter, but thus far, I have been unable to do so.

I make this public statement today before my colleagues in the hope that the State Department, the High Commissioner of Germany, and the United States Army authorities will bring to justice the individual charged with these murders.

All of the information which I have been able to obtain convinces me that there has been incredible neglect with respect to this case.

Why the Government has failed to prosecute is beyond my power to understand.

Any prosecutor worth his salt in the United States of America would have presented this case promptly in the courts.

I will go further and say that any prosecutor in the United States of America who failed to present the facts as they are known in this case should and would be removed from office.

The following facts concerning this case have been presented to me by Mr. William D. Canfield, of Springfield, Mass., a former trial attorney with the United States High Commissioner in Germany.

Mr. Canfield investigated this case and he has assured me that all of these facts, which I shall relate to you, are true and that the official records will support every one of them.

Let me also point out that the United States High Commissioner for Germany has requested the extradition of the person accused of these crimes and that a warrant for his arrest has been issued, but nothing has happened.

At approximately 2:30 in the morning of January 7, 1946, 3 United States military government officers were murdered in the Koller Villa at Passau, Germany.

The victims, Maj. Everett S. Cofran, of Washington, D. C.; Capt. Adrian L. Wessler, of New Rochelle, N. Y.; and 1st Lt. Stanley Mac A. Rosewater, of Omaha, Nebr., were killed by being struck on the head with an ax and by being burned with gasoline which had been poured on them and then set afire.

Major Cofran, in civilian life an architect, was the military governor of Passau although he had only been in the area a few weeks. He was not in contact with the local population and only knew a few German officials and employees. Captain Wessler and Lieutenant Rosewater were both lawyers and stationed at Regensburg about 75 miles away. They had no prior connection with each other except that one had been assigned as the prosecutor and the other as the defense counsel of a court-martial. The offense had occurred in Vienna and both officers were en route to that city to take the depositions of witnesses. Originally they had planned to leave Regensburg on January 7 but, inasmuch as Rosewater desired to view some blooded stallions at Poching, Bavaria, he persuaded Wessler to leave with him a day earlier. At 3:30 in the afternoon of January 6, the two were driving through Passau en route to Poching when Rosewater, remembering that his friend Cofran was stationed in the city, drove to Koller Villa for a few minutes visit. Cofran welcomed both officers, and after a short conversation, induced them to stay overnight as his guests. Thus without the prior knowledge of anyone including themselves Wessler and Rosewater arranged to stay the night in what was later known throughout Germany as the Horror House.

The Koller Villa itself was located on the bank of the Danube River and surrounded by a cement wall 9 feet high. Because the property pitched sharply down to the river there was a 20-foot drop from the top of the wall to the yard. Major Cofran lived in two bedrooms on the second floor of the villa. In one he slept and in the other, which was separated from the first by a hall, he kept his clothing. Maj. Hugo J. Hesson and a Miss Gerda Inez Weiss lived on the first floor.

Major Hesson was not a member of Cofran's unit but temporarily attached as an agricultural expert. He had received orders transferring him to a city 150 miles away. His bags were packed and he planned to leave on the morning of January 7. He and Major Cofran were on terms of the utmost cordiality and he and Miss Weiss were invited by the major to have a drink with him and his two guests after the trio had returned from a movie.

At about a quarter to 12, Cofran, Wessler, and Rosewater went upstairs to sleep while Hesson and Miss Weiss retired on the ground floor. The latter two locked their bedroom doors but, since an unlocked french door connected the rooms to a veranda which in turn was connected by another french door to the

dining room, any person within the villa could easily have entered their rooms.

Although the gates of the compound itself were locked at night, the house door of the Koller Villa was never locked and it was Cofran's custom to leave his bedroom door open whenever he had officers as overnight guests.

Adjacent to the Koller Villa and enclosed within the same walled compound was the Botschafter Villa which was occupied by Capt. George E. Peterson and James M. Leech, both members of Cofran's command. Botschafter Villa itself contained three overnight guests of Captain Peterson. They were Mr. and Mrs. Willy Kuchar, a German couple who were occupying a second-story bedroom, and a Mrs. Rosa Schicks.

At about 3:30 a. m. Hesson was awakened by what he believed to be an explosion, and, on going into the hall, he discovered the staircase to be in flames.

After unsuccessfully attempting to reach the second floor, he dispatched Miss Weiss to the Botschafter Villa to arouse the occupants. On gaining admittance to Botschafter Villa, Miss Weiss knocked on Captain Leech's door to have it opened immediately by Captain Leech who was dressed and had a flashlight in his hand. It was suggested that the fire department be phoned but Captain Leech vetoed that and left in his car to personally contact them although he later admitted that he did not know where the station was located. He did contact the Army unit which called the fire department. Captain Leech returned to the Villa after an absence of 30 minutes. During this trip the crankcase of his car was damaged to the extent that it had a large, gaping hole. He denied having had an accident.

Leech was deputy military governor and as such it was his duty to assume command of the situation. Instead he went to bed shortly after his return. He declined to view the bodies in the morning but went instead to the military government building where he moved into Cofran's office and directed that signs and stamps indicating that he was the military governor be made.

The fire itself was extinguished at 6 a. m., and German police entered the Villa and began taking photographs and searching for evidence. However, shortly thereafter a Lieutenant Spitzell of CIC arrived and ordered the German police to desist and leave because the matter would be handled by the occupation authorities. Lieutenant Spitzell directed that a guard be placed about the Villa with orders that no one was to be admitted. For 24 hours this guard was maintained and nothing was done. During this period a dispute raged as to whether the CIC which was responsible for subversive activities or the CID which handled criminal matters should conduct the investigation.

In any event, on the morning of January 8, CID agents entered Koller Villa and began their inquiry, an inquiry which I am told was later used by the military school at Camp Gordon, Ga., as an example of how not to conduct a criminal investigation.

The investigators learned that Major Cofran, who was the senior officer and known to be especially insistent upon the prerogatives of his rank had surrendered his quarters to the visiting officers and had slept on a cot in an unused attic room.

The body of Lieutenant Rosewater was found face down in Cofran's bed. Rosewater had been struck six times on the head with what pathologists described as an ax or meat ax or meat cleaver. Death had come almost instantaneously. Major Cofran's body lay on the attic cot. He too had received similar blows which caused injuries that immediately rendered him unconscious although he might have lived had he received prompt and competent medical attention.

Both officers had suffered well directed blows which because of the darkness of the night could only have been delivered with the assistance of some artificial illumination such as a flashlight.

Captain Wessler's body was found on the floor of his bedroom near the door. His unfired pistol was lying near the body. He had been struck by an ax, meat ax, or meat cleaver, on the head, face, neck, and thigh. These blows were insufficient to have caused death. Smoke and soot were in his lungs establishing that he had been alive at the time of the fire and had perished therefrom. The faucet on a washstand was turned on and the water still running, indicating that the murderer may have washed blood off himself after his struggle with Wessler. Wessler was well known as a man who was extremely security conscious. He never went to sleep without locking his bedroom door and placing a loaded pistol within easy reach, and never opened the door without ascertaining the identity of those seeking admittance.

About a week prior to the murders, Major Cofran had stored seven 5-gallon cans of gasoline in the attic. The murderer had taken these and poured the fluid over the victims and about the rooms, hallways, and stairs, igniting the fire from below. In each of the murder rooms a full can of gasoline was left which accounted for the explosion heard by Hesson.

It became quite clear to the investigators that the murderer was a person who was very familiar with Koller Villa and the habits of Major Cofran, who obviously had been the intended victim. The investigators believed that the murderer went directly to Cofran's room and killed Rosewater who was sleeping on his stomach. Discovering his mistake, the killer had gone to the only other place where Cofran could reasonably be expected to be sleeping and, finding the room locked, was compelled to knock, which caused Wessler to come to the door, pistol in hand. Even then Wessler would only have opened up after proper inquiry. Someone spoke to him in English and when he unlocked the door, with his pistol not in a firing position, immediately struck him down. After making two ghastly errors without accomplishing his mission, the murderer then knew that the only place where Cofran could be sleeping was in the attic and he went there forthwith and dispatched the major, then utilizing the gasoline, the existence of which was known to him.

The Botschafter Villa had been locked on the night of the murders, and, although no evidence of a forcible entry existed, an ax which had the name of its owner burned into the handle, and which had been seen in the cellar of Botschafter Villa at 8 p. m. on January 6 was missing on the morning of January 7. The investigators did not search for the missing weapon in the adjacent Danube River until 10 days after they had started to work on the case. They had been informed by a German neighbor who lived on a hill overlooking the Villas that she had been awakened shortly before 3 a. m. and had looked out to see the upper part of Koller Villa in flames. She then saw the form of a man leave Koller Villa and proceed to a point halfway to Botschafter Villa at which time he stopped and hurled an object into the river. He then entered Botschafter Villa. The neighbor had not left her house after this despite the fire because all persons not members of the Occupation Forces or accredited thereto without special passes were subject to arrest and imprisonment if found on the streets after 11 p. m. When the CID finally decided to look for the weapon in the river, they had an agent stand in the spot from where the German neighbor said the man hurled his object. This agent threw a stone of the approximate weight of the missing axe and a boat put a diver down into 12 feet of water at the place where the stone struck water. Thirty seconds later he came up with the identical ax missing from Botschafter Villa.

A housemaid reported to the CID that Captain Leech had been observed washing his Army uniform in a bathtub the day after the murders.

His explanation for this was that, although he had never washed his own clothing before, he nonetheless decided to do so the day after the murders because he felt that the maid was tired and had to much work as it was. No blood was found on his clothing.

The investigation disclosed the following additional facts:

First. Rosa Schicks had awakened at exactly 3 a. m. and heard someone walking around in Leech's room for a period of at least 10 minutes. When originally questioned, Leech stated that he had gone to bed at 9 p. m. and had slept soundly until awakened by Miss Weiss at 3:30. When confronted with the Schicks statement he said he had forgotten that he had actually arisen at about 3 o'clock to go to the bathroom and had also shaken down his fire. Mrs. Schicks was positive that the only noise was that of a person walking back and forth. Experiments disclosed that the flushing of the toilet and the shaking of a grate made noises louder than that of a person walking in the room.

Second. Leech was seen coming from the cellar of Botschafter Villa at 8 p. m. on January 6.

Third. Leech disliked Cofran, wanted his job, and had made attempts to have Cofran transferred from Passau.

Fourth. Captain Leech had ordered the city of Passau to finance his secretary's father in a peat business. On January 5 Cofran learned of this, countermanded the order, and discharged the secretary over Leech's strenuous objections. Thirty-six hours later Cofran was dead.

Fifth. After the secretary was dismissed, Captain Leech inspected Koller Villa on January 5. He entered the attic, observed 7 cans of gas, and lifted each one ascertaining that it was full.

Sixth. Captain Leech had applied for appointment as a Regular Army officer. On December 31, 1945, he returned from an Army hospital where he had been treated. The hospital report was on Cofran's desk together with the officer's efficiency ratings which the major was about to fill out and forward. Major Cofran had indicated his displeasure with Leech and his intention of lowering the latter's rating. This was action which would adversely affect Leech's hope of a Regular Army commission. After the murders the hospital report and the efficiency form could not be found.

Seventh. Leech was given five polygraph examinations, commonly known as lie detector tests, including two by Orland Keeler, inventor of the machine. In all of these the graph showed he lied when he denied killing the officers.

Eighth. All other occupants of Botschafter Villa from which the ax originated except Leech had an alibi. It had been Captain Leech's habit to have his secretary come to the villa almost every evening.

Ninth. On the night of January 6, he telephoned her from Botschafter Villa, telling her not to come to the villa, because he had certain files in his possession which he had to study. It was later established that the files in question were not in the possession of Leech that night.

Although the German police were not permitted to conduct an investigation of the crimes in the first instance, the matter was turned over to them after 3 months went by with the murders still unsolved. The German authorities provided a special team of experienced prosecutors and policemen who conducted their own investigation. Although they were not permitted to question Americans, they were given full access to the CIO file. Their report, along with that of CID, was sent to the judge advocate for evaluation. Curiously it was referred for decision to a captain, whose entire Army legal career had been in the claims section and who had not had any experience in criminal matters. He rendered the opinion that, only if Leech confessed, could he be brought to trial.

With this opinion, the case became practically dormant until 1948. It was again reviewed in 1950. Leech left the Army. Major Hesson was killed in an automobile accident.

In early 1954, Lt. Col. J. B. Manley, Jr., a new CID chief in Europe, digested the old file and, as he stated, "immediately felt that someone should have been court-martialed because Leech was not court-martialed."

He then transmitted the file to Lt. Col. Morton S. Jaffe, Military Justice Branch, Office of The Judge Advocate, who studied the case. Colonel Jaffe, a competent Army lawyer with plenty of experience in the trial of criminal cases, wrote as follows:

> I have studied the documents and reports available in the Passau murder case. I am surprised that the case against Captain Leech was not brought to trial in 1946.

With that the colonel pointed out that Leech was no longer subject to court-martial jurisdiction and could only be tried before a United States High Commission Court. He recommended that the file be forwarded to High Commission prosecutors. This was done on May 7, 1954.

On May 21, 1954, charges against Leech, then a resident of Lima, Ohio, were filed with the United States High Commission Court at Frankfort. Warrants for his arrest for murder, intentional manslaughter, and arson were issued by the court.

It is interesting to note that on May 30, 1954, the German state's attorney at Passau announced that he would have long ago brought charges except that he felt he lacked jurisdiction.

Title 18 of the United States Criminal Code provides that when a person in the United States had been charged with certain offenses including murder within a foreign territory occupied by the United States Army, said person shall on the request of the highest United States executive authority within the area, be arrested and brought before the nearest United States court.

If the court makes a finding of probable cause then such person shall be delivered up to the foreign territory for trial. So far the law has been ignored in this case. The High Commissioner forwarded the case to the State Department in Washington which sent it to the Justice Department, which sent it back to State Department which sent it back to the High Commissioner. Each one of these offices denied possession of the file when queried by relatives of one of the murdered officers. Finally, on October 26, 1954, the High Commissioner forwarded the file back to Washington and at the same time notified Wessler's relatives of this action although the relatives were informed that the High Commissioner's recommendations could not be revealed.

I am writing to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee in both the House and the Senate, and sending all of the information which I have reported here today.

All of the information which I have reported to the House today, I have also given to the Department of State.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of Americans in our armed services in distant places throughout the world. The least that we can do for them is to make certain that crimes committed against them will be promptly punished.

Nine years have elapsed since these three brutal murders were committed. If this is an example of how the Government handles such cases, then there is need for immediate reform.

This is a classic example of red tape, buckpassing, great inefficiency, and failure and refusal to accept responsibility.

I have hesitated about making these facts public because I have no desire to prejudice any individual, but after careful deliberation and considerable reflection, I have decided that these dead men, who cannot speak for themselves, and their relatives and friends, are entitled to some answer and some explanation.

I shall continue to press this matter and to probe it with such means as are at my disposal.

At this point, I insert copies of correspondence which I have had with the State Department, which is in itself interesting:

> JANUARY 17, 1955.
>
> Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
> *Assistant Secretary of State,*
> *Department of State,*
> *Washington, D. C.*
>
> DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Enclosed you will find a letter and enclosure concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Bavaria, which has been received from one of my constituents.
>
> Will you be good enough to advise me what the Department's records may show regarding this matter, particularly with regard to its current status.
>
> Your courtesy is appreciated.
>
> Sincerely yours,
> THOMAS J. DODD, *Member of Congress.*

> DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
> *January 27, 1955.*
>
> DEAR MR. DODD: I have received your letter dated January 17, 1955, with which you enclosed a letter and its enclosure addressed to you on January 9, 1955, by Mr. Charles D. Hanlon, concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.
>
> The case was brought to the attention of this Department by a despatch dated June 24, 1954, from the Office of the United States High Commissioner at Bonn, Germany. The file on the case was enclosed and the request was made that it be referred to the Department of Justice for such further investigation as may be appropriate, and for determination whether sufficient basis exists for instituting proceedings against the accused person under the provisions of 18 U. S. C. 3185. The file, and a copy of the despatch, was forwarded to the Department of Justice, and it was later returned by it with the statement that there appears to be no jurisdiction for the Department of Justice to make an investigation, and that the determination as to whether the return of the accused to Germany should be requested is clearly a matter for the United States High Commissioner.
>
> A copy of the letter from the Department of Justice was sent to the High Commissioner on August 27, 1954, and at the same time the file was returned to him.
>
> The Office of the United States High Commissioner on September 25, 1954, again returned the file to this Department with a formal request from the High Commissioner for the return of the accused to the United States Occupation Zone in Germany for trial. After some further correspondence between this Department and the Office of the United States High Commissioner, the request of the High Commissioner with its supporting documents was forwarded to the Department of Justice for such action under 18 U. S. C. 3185 as might be appropriate.

The Department of Justice has just returned the file again to this Department, and in doing so pointed out that it appears from the files that HICOG has conducted no further investigation in the case, although it indicated that further investigation was required, that a number of witnesses have not been interviewed since 1946, that it is not known whether several of the witnesses will be available for the trial and that HICOG does not assert that sufficient evidence exists to establish probable cause. The file was returned for transmission to the Office of the United States High Commissioner so that the necessary investigation might be determined what witnesses will be available for trial, and whether the evidence in good faith justifies a trial.

Action on the letter from the Department of Justice is being withheld pending a discussion of the matter with the General Counsel of the Office of the United States High Commissioner, who is temporarily in the United States.

Mr. Hanlon's letter and its enclosure are returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

FEBRUARY 2, 1955.

Hon. THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This will acknowledge and thank you for your report of January 27 concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.

In view of the fact that action on the letter from the Department of Justice is being withheld pending a discussion of the matter with the general counsel of HICOG, I would appreciate being advised of the outcome of this discussion.

Thanking you for your courtesy and assistance and awaiting further word, I am

Very truly yours,

THOMAS J. DODD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 3, 1955.

DEAR MR. DODD: I refer to my letter dated January 27, 1955, in reply to your letter of January 17, 1955, concerning the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.

The case has now been discussed with the general counsel to the United States High Commissioner for Germany, and it has been determined to return the papers submitted in support of the High Commissioner's request for the return of the accused person, for such further action as may be deemed appropriate.

Sincerely yours,

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 8, 1955.

DEAR MR. DODD: I have received your letter dated February 2, 1955, in further regard to the murders of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany.

You have not doubt received by this time my letter dated February 3, 1955, informing you that the case has now been discussed with the General Counsel to the United States High Commissioner for Germany, and that it has been determined to return to the High Commissioner for such action as he may deem appropriate, the papers submitted in support of his request for the return to Germany of the person charged with the above-mentioned murders.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
March 11, 1955.

DEAR MR. DODD: I refer to my letter dated February 8, 1955, concerning the case of James M. Leech, who is charged in Germany with the murder of three American Army officers in Passau, Germany, in 1946.

A report has now been received from the Office of the United States High Commissioner at Bonn, in which attention is called to the fact that all witnesses available in Europe (some fifteen) were interviewed by the Chief Attorney's Office of the High Commissioner in May and June 1954, and statements were taken from them and included in the file which was submitted in support of the High Commissioner's request for the return of the accused to Germany for trial. It was further pointed out that since the High Commissioner has no facilities or authority to conduct an investigation in the United States, the file has been forwarded to the United States Army in Europe so that the investigation can be brought up to date and so that it can be determined what witnesses will be available for trial.

Sincerely yours,

THRUSTON B. MORTON,
Assistant Secretary.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works, or a subcommittee thereof, may sit during the session of the House this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

TO AMEND THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. BETTS. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which amends requirements as set forth in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to voting in wheat referenda. Under the law as it now exists, any farmer whose acreage allotment is less than 15 acres is not permitted to vote in a national referendum and is thereby not given any right to express his views concerning the farm program and its problems, which, of course, are vital to him. I have received petitions signed by hundreds of Ohio farmers who are opposed to this restriction. They feel very strongly that they should be given the right to express their views in a referendum, regardless of the acreage allotment which has been allocated to them. I feel this subject matter deserves every consideration at this time and will welcome any support from colleagues who have found the same sentiment in their respective districts.

FATHER HAROLD W. RIGNEY, S. V. D.

Mrs. CHURCH. 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 gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, on this 25th anniversary of the ordination to the priesthood of Father Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., I can best hope that the Congress and the administration will rededicate themselves to obtaining the release of Father Rigney and all other Americans unjustly held imprisoned by Communist China.

Few men have contributed more to their country than Father Rigney.

Father Rigney attended St. Mary's Mission Seminary in Techny, Illinois, where he was ordained in 1929, and later obtained a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Chicago. He was the first American missionary to be appointed to the flying corps in Africa during World War II, and later became chaplain for all Catholic American Air Corps personnel in Africa at that time.

At the time of his arrest on July 25, 1951, Father Rigney was rector of Peiping's Fu Jen University, a Catholic university supported by foreign mission funds. Father Rigney refused to approve Communist teachers on the staff, and he was arrested when he refused to agree to the discontinuance of religious education and the teaching only of dialectical materialism and the promotion of the revolutionary program.

I wish to take this opportunity to assure Father Rigney and his family that he and the other Americans held imprisoned by Communist China are not forgotten. The State Department has taken appropriate steps. Their immediate release must become our dedicated concern.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have permission to file a conference report on the supplement appropriation bill before midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

ATSUKO KIYOTA SZEKERES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1206) to restore United States citizenship to a former citizen, Atsuko Kiyota Szekeres, who has expatriated herself.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PHILIP MACK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1111) for the relief of Philip Mack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) (17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Philip Mack may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after "(9)", insert "and."

Page 1, line 7, after the words "*Provided*, That", strike out "this exemption" and substitute "these exemptions."

Page 1, line 8, after the words "apply only to", strike out "a ground" and substitute "grounds."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E. J. ALBRECHT CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1393) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the E. J. Albrecht Co., an Illinois corporation, the sum of $142,007.75, in full satisfaction of the claim of such corporation against the United States for reimbursement for actual losses sustained by it in performing its contract with the United States for the construction of the outlet works for Sardis Dam on the Little Tallahatchie River, near Sardis, Miss., which losses were occasioned by an innocent misinterpretation of the contract by the corporation and by an extended delay in approving materials by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UTICA BREWING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1747) for the relief of the Utica Brewing Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to the Utica Brewing Co., of Utica, N. Y., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $900, representing the amount paid by said company to the Internal Revenue Bureau for four fermented malt liquor stamps of the 25 barrel denomination at $225 each, which stamps were rendered useless and unfit for the purpose intended, having become lost between the Office of the Collector of Internal Revenue and the office of said brewing company and remain unfound: *Provided*, That the Utica Brewing Co., of Utica, N. Y., shall first file in the Treasury Department a sufficient bond in the penal sum of $900 paid for such stamps, in such form and with such surety or sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury, to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the stamps herein described: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in the act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of the services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be termed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment.

Page 1, line 7, after the word "Revenue" strike out the word "Bureau" and substitute in lieu thereof "Service."

Page 1, line 11, after the second "the" strike out the word "Collector" and substitute in lieu thereof "District Director."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM F. FRIEDMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2068) for the relief of William F. Friedman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to William F. Friedman, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $100,000, in full settlement for all rights in respect of his inventions in connection with military, naval, and air communications facilities which are now or at any time have been placed in secrecy status by the War Department or the Department of Defense, including but not limited to all rights with respect to his inventions covered by Patent Numbered 2,395,863 and by patent application serials 682,096, 107,244, 70,412, 443,320, 478,193, and 549,086 and with respect to all inventions for which patent applications have been withheld by the War Department or Department of Defense in order to preserve secrecy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELIZABETH DOWDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 973) for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

MRS. ELLEN HILLIER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 977) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen Hillier.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Ellen Hillier shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAURICE MUMFORD

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 193) providing that the bill H. R. 2266, and all accompanying papers, shall be referred to the United States Court of Claims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2266) entitled "A bill for the relief of Maurice Mumford," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, 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.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ANNE P. PERCEVAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 874) for the relief of Mrs. Anne P. Perceval.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 619 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to grant national service life insurance to Mrs. Anne P. Perceval, Orange, N. J., under the provisions of section 602 (c) (2) of such act if she applies therefor within 180 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL E. EDWARDS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 947) for the relief of Carl E. Edwards.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of Iowa to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Carl E. Edwards, 3515, 12th Street, Des Moines, Iowa, for compensation for a disability incurred while in the employ of the National Military Establishment, United States Naval Yard, Brooklyn, New York.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 1346 of title 28 of the United States Code.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled 'An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of Carl E. Edwards, 3515 12th Street, Des Moines, Iowa, for compensation for a disability allegedly incurred while in the employ of the National Military Establishment, United States Naval Yard, Brooklyn, New York, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. S. GOEDEKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1002) for the relief of L. S. Goedeke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to L. S. Goedeke, of Roswell, N. Mex., in full settlement of all claims against the United States. Such payment represents the cost of one hangar which was destroyed by the Army Air Force at Fort Sumner, N. Mex., in late 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OSBORNE W. RUTHERFORD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1025) for the relief of Osborne W. Rutherford.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Osborne W. Rutherford, Sunland, Calif., the sum of $1,325.60. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Osborne W. Rutherford against the United States for reimbursement for the loss of household furniture and other personal property when the Government quarters which were furnished him were destroyed on March 2, 1938, as a result of a flood in Big Tujunga Canyon, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,325.60" and insert in lieu thereof "$650."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT H. MERRITT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1202) for the relief of Robert H. Merritt.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of Robert H. Merritt, Los Angeles, Calif., and his claim for compensation for disability resulting from appendicitis occurring in September 1943, with resulting thrombophlebitis, is hereby authorized and directed to be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CABRILLO LAND CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1535) for the relief of Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cabrillo Land Co., of San Diego, Calif., the sum of $2,756, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for payment for petroleum products delivered by said Cabrillo Land Co. to the Bureau of Reclamation, United States Department of the Interior, and as reimbursement of moneys withheld from Cabrillo Land Co. by the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRISCILLA LOUISE DAVIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1751) for the relief of Priscilla Louise Davis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Priscilla Louise Davis, Milwaukee, Wis., the amount which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies to him would have been payable to the said Priscilla Louise Davis under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the period beginning November 14, 1943, and ending March 31, 1946, both dates inclusive, as death compensation benefits arising out of the death of her former husband, John Crockett Ravin (Veterans' Administration claim No. XC–3114411), if she had made application for death compensation within 1 year after the date of the death of the said John Crockett Ravin: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIRLEY W. ROTHRA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1974) for the relief of Shirley W. Rothra.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Shirley W. Rothra (Army Service No. 42109864), Mayville, N. Y., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $150, representing overpayments made to him by the War Department as the result of its failure to make appropriate deductions from his pay

for class E allotments during the period beginning October 1, 1944, and ending December 31, 1945. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED STATES FIDELITY & GUARANTY CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2052) for the relief of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the departure bond of the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co., New York, N. Y., executed May 16, 1949, in favor of the United States in the amount of $500 in the case of Christian Johansen Krogh, Alpharetta, Ga., is hereby declared to be canceled as of the date of its execution. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury rot otherwise appropriated, to the United States Fidelity & Guaranty Co. the sum of $500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for reimbursement in the amount of such bond: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

T. C. ELLIOTT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2470) for the relief of T. C. Elliott.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to T. C. Elliott, of Daytona Beach, Fla., the suit of $15,000, as an extraordinary monetary award for special services rendered to the United States prior to 1944, in addition to his official duties as a Federal employee, in preparing and furnishing rate and transportation information for the use of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate and House of Representatives, and various other officials and agencies of the Government, as a result of which the said T. C. Elliott helped to save to the United States approximately $15 million: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAPHIC ARTS CORPORATION OF OHIO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2893) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the the Claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, of Toledo, Ohio.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Graphic Arts Corporation of Ohio, Toledo, Ohio. Notwithstanding any statute of limitation or lapse of time, suit may be instituted within 1 year after the enactment of this act in accordance with the provisions of section 1491, title 28, United States Code. Proceedings for the determination of such claim and review thereof, and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be had as in cases over which such court has jurisdiction under section 1491 of title 28 of the United States Code. Such claim is for reimbursement of losses sustained as the result of actual expenses incurred under contract No. W33-038ac 2023 with the United States Army Air Force, dated April 17, 1944.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "claim", insert "upon a legal as well as an equitable basis."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID J. DAZÉ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2924) for the relief of David J. Dazé.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to David J. Dazé (Veterans' Administration No. C-4107517), of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of $1,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said David J. Dazé against the United States arising when, in order to preserve his eyesight, it was necessary for him to incur expenses for surgical treatment of a service-incurred disability which could not be provided by the Veterans' Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK MICHAEL WHALEN, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3022) for the relief of Frank Michael Whalen, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding section 2401 (b) of title 28 of the United States Code, no tort claim against the United States arising out of an accident which occurred on January 24, 1947, in the United States naval residential section of the Panama Canal Zone, and in which Frank Michael Whalen, Jr., of Philadelphia, Pa., the minor son of Mary Whalen, of such city, was struck and permanently injured by a United States Navy truck, shall be barred from trial in a United States district court if civil action is begun thereon within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act. This claim is not cognizable under the Federal Tort Claims Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE P. PROVENCAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3036) for the relief of George P. Provencal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George P. Provencal, Auburn, Mass., the sum of $2,500. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George P. Provencal against the United States for loss of use of his taxicab which was impounded by officers of the Department of the Treasury on March 10, 1949, for violation of certain provisions of the internal-revenue laws, while being operated by another person without knowledge on the part of the said George P. Provencal that his taxicab was being operated for such illegal purpose, and was not returned to the said George P. Provencal until approximately April 1, 1950: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAYMON H. MASSEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3152) for the relief of Waymon H. Massey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Waymon H. Massey, Greenville, S. C., the sum of $10,000. Except as provided in section 2, the payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Waymon H. Massey against the United States on account of permanent and disabling personal injuries sustained by him on February 24, 1943, as a result of an

airplane crash at the Auburn-Opelika (Ala.) Airport which was caused by the negligence of a United States naval aviation cadet to whom the said Waymon H. Massey, while in the employ of the Alabama Air Service under an assignment by the Civil Aeronautics Administration, was giving flight instruction: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of section 9 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (5 U. S. C., sec. 759), the injuries sustained by the said Waymon H. Massey on February 24, 1943, shall be held and considered to be injuries "sustained by an employee while in the performance of duty"; and the Secretary of Labor shall furnish to the said Waymon H. Massey adequate medical, surgical, and hospital services, and necessary appliances and supplies, as provided in such section.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 14, strike out section 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM FREDERICK WERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3180) for the relief of William Frederick Werner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William Frederick Werner, Pawtucket, R. I. (Veterans' Administration claim numbered C-3842760), the sum of $1,449.70. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said William Frederick Werner against the United States for reimbursement of the amounts which he paid for hospitalization for a service-connected disability during the period beginning March 1, 1946, and ending May 9, 1947, both dates inclusive, at a Veterans' Administration contract facility: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAYMOND GEORGE PALMER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3359) for the relief of Raymond George Palmer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), and hereby waived in favor of Raymond George Palmer, of 2020 Marshall Street, Little Rock, Ark., for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as a member of the Officers' Reserve Corps at Centaur, Mo., during 1936, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits except medical expenses shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS ELTERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3958) for the relief of Louis Elterman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis Elterman, of Boston, Mass., the sum of $179.17, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incident to the transfer and storage of his personal effects, from Eatontown, N. J., to Boston (West Roxbury), Mass.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. BONIFACE LUCCI, O. S. B.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3975) for the relief of Rev. Boniface Lucci, O. S. B.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,000 to the Reverend Boniface Lucci, O. S. B., of Detroit, Mich., in full settlement of all claims against the United States as a refund for security bonds posted for Rev. Fiorenzo Gregori and Rev. Rolando Conti which were declared forfeited April 27, 1953: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION COMPANY OF OHIO, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4182) for the relief of the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Tax Court of the United States to finally determine the amount, if any, of excessive profits received or accrued by the Highway Construction Company of Ohio, Inc., in an amount either less than, equal to, or greater than that determined by the War Department Price Adjustment Board for the calendar year 1942, under the applicable provisions of the Renegotiation Act, as amended: *Provided*, That the suit authorized hereunder shall be instituted within 90 days after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided further*, That the passage of this act shall not be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the Government of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ORRIN J. BISHOP

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4249) for the relief of Orrin J. Bishop.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Orrin J. Bishop, Presque Isle, Maine, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $761.14. Such sum represents the amount of certain overtime payments which the said Orrin J. Bishop (as postmaster in Presque Isle, Maine) made without legal authority to one of his employees for certain services performed during the June, September, and December quarters, 1951, and for which the said Orrin J. Bishop has been held personally liable.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Orrin J. Bishop, an amount equal to the sum of all amounts which he has repaid to the United States, or which have been withheld by the United States from amounts otherwise due him, by reason of the liability of which he is relieved by the first section of this act: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$761.14" and insert "$868.82."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUF DER HEIDE-ARAGONA, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4418) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and certain of its subcontractors against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same hereby is, conferred upon the United States Court of Claims (a) to hear and determine the claim of Auf der Heide-Aragona, Inc., and through it the claims of its subcontractors, against the United States arising out of the performance of a contract, dated July 25, 1941, which the said contractor had with the Veterans' Administration for the construction of a hospital building at Fort Howard, Md., the work on which contract was completed on or about November 19, 1943, and (b) to enter judgment as provided in section 2 hereof.

SEC. 2. If the said court shall find (a) that after the date of said contract the United States through any of its departments or agencies delayed the issuance of priorities which resulted in subjecting the said contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to additional costs, including overhead expenses, or if the said court shall find (b) that after the date of said contract the United States, through any such departments or agencies, or either of them, including Defense Plant Corporation, sponsored any work program or programs in the general area of Fort Howard, Md., which rendered it impossible for the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to achieve that degree of labor performance which they, respectively, would have achieved if such work program or programs had not existed, or which made it necessary for such contractor or subcontractors, or either of them, to pay higher wages for the labor which was available to them, respectively, than they would otherwise have had to pay, and that the result of such work program or programs was to subject the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, to additional costs, including overhead expenses, then the said court shall in either case, and notwithstanding the bar or defense, if any, of laches, lapse of time, or statute of limitations, enter judgment for the contractor and its subcontractors, or either of them, against the United States in the amount of such additional costs and expenses incurred by them, respectively: *Provided*, That such judgment or judgments shall not include any profit to the said contractor and its said subcontractors, or either of them.

SEC. 3. Suit shall be filed in the Court of Claims by said contractor within 6 months from the approval of this act.

SEC. 4. Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as an inference of liability on the part of the United States.

SEC. 5. Private Law 643, 81st Congress, approved July 6, 1950, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSEZELLA MARIE PRESTON CURRAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4454) for the relief of Rosezella Marie Preston Curran.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Rosezella Marie Preston Curran, the sum of $11,541.96, plus interest up to the date of the enactment of this act, on such sum at the rate of 6 percent per annum for the period beginning on March 19, 1942, the date of her induction into the United States Army on the Philippine Islands, where her services as nurse were so greatly and urgently utilized and where she devoted her time to the care of those wounded in the great struggle on the Philippine Islands during World War II, wherein the records of the armed services to substantiate said claim were lost.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$11,541.96" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000."

Page 2, at the end of line 3, strike out the period and add: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. A. ROSS & CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4506) for the relief of J. A. Ross & Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. A. Ross & Co., of Chicago, Ill., the sum of $34,624.64, in full satisfaction of all claims of such company against the United States for compensation for the twelve thousand six hundred eighty-three and two one-hundredths cubic yards of compacted base-course material which such company actually used in carrying out its obligations under contract entered into between such company and the United States on September 14, 1943, but for which no compensation was received by such company, compensation having been denied by the United States Court of Claims in an opinion rendered on October 6, 1953, on the ground that the base-course material was provided for in such contract and that said company failed to register any protest when required by the United States to use such additional amount of base-course material: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 5 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN J. COWIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4536) for the relief of John J. Cowin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765–770), are hereby waived in favor of John J. Cowin, for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as an employee of the Mare Island Naval Shipyard, Vallejo, Calif., in May 1945, and his claim is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. WILLIAM HENRY DIMENT, MRS. MARY ELLEN DIMENT, AND MRS. GLADYS EVERINGHAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4637) for the relief of Mrs. William Henry Diment, Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, and Mrs. Gladys Everingham.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. William Henry Diment and Mrs. Mary Ellen Diment, 242 Grand Avenue, Ely, Cardiff, England, the sum of $5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of their son, W. H. Diment, as the result of his being shot by a soldier of the United States Army, acting within the scope of his employment as a sentry, at Antwerp, Belgium, on January 22, 1946; and to Mrs. Gladys Everingham, individually and as natural guardian of her 2 minor children, Michael Ronald Everingham and Maureen Everingham, 1 Montrose Avenue, Seymour Street, city of Kingston upon Hull, England, the sum of $12,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of her husband, Sergeant Ronald Everingham of the British Army, as the result of his being shot by a soldier of the United States Army acting outside the scope of his employment, at Antwerp, Belgium, on April 27, 1946: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act shall be paid out of the Treasury until such time as the Government of the United Kingdom has paid to Mrs. Gabrielle Evans, 85 Rue Olivier de Serras, Paris (15) Seine, France, the sum of $12,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United Kingdom on account of the personal injury and

resulting death of her husband, Leroy R. Evans, who was a citizen of the United States and a civilian employee of the United States Army when he was severely injured on January 1, 1949, in an accident involving a British Army vehicle, which occurred at Fontainebleu, France: *And provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, or attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE J. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4714) for the relief of Theodore J. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Theodore J. Harris, Rockville, Md., is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of $257.01. Such sum represents the compensation received by the said Theodore J. Harris for Saturday and Sunday overtime service performed during the period from February to April 1951, at the Rockville, Md., post office. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANLEY RYDZON AND ALEXANDER F. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4865) for the relief of Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson are hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sums of $2,074.50 and $1,550.25, respectively. Such sums represent compensation received by the persons aforesaid as employees of the United States Post Office, San Antonio, Tex., during the periods July 1, 1950, to April 15, 1953, and April 9, 1951, to March 31, 1953, respectively, all dates inclusive, while they were also employed by the General Services Administration and each was receiving dual compensation from the United States at a combined annual rate in excess of $2,000. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amounts for which liability is relieved by the act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Stanley Rydzon and Alexander F. Anderson an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by them, respectively, or withheld from sums otherwise due them, respectively, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claims of the United States for such refunds.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF VICTOR HELFENBEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5078) for the relief of the estate of Victor Helfenbein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Victor Helfenbein, the sum of $6,500, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for fatal injuries sustained by him in a collision involving a United States Army ambulance from Fort Hamilton on August 12, 1944, in Brooklyn, N. Y.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this bill in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or directed to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERSEAS NAVIGATION CORP.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5196) for the relief of the Overseas Navigation Corp.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $12,500 to the Overseas Navigation Corp., of New York, N. Y., in full settlement of all claims against the United States, based on the fact that a deposit of $12,500 made by such corporation in connection with a bid which it submitted to the United States Maritime Commission in 1946 for the purchase of the coastal tanker *Blue Sunoco*, was declared forfeit on March 17, 1947, after such corporation failed to take delivery. Such amount is the decision of the United States Court of Claims in its findings of fact dated March 1, 1955: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL Y. LOONG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 880) for the relief of Paul Y. Loong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Paul Y. Loong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARION JOSEPHINE MONNELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 935) for the relief of Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationaity Act, Mrs. Marion Josephine Monnell shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUZIE BIONDO (LUZIE M. SCHMIDT)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 943) for the relief of Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision in section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luzie Biondo (Luzie M. Schmidt) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRIEDA QUIRING AND TINA QUIRING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 995) for the relief of Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and (205) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor children, Frieda Quiring and Tina Quiring, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Mr. and Mrs. Cornelius N. Neufeld, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRMGARD EMILIE KREPPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 997) for the relief of Irmgard Emilie Krepps.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Irmgard Emilie Krepps may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEIKO SHIKIBU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 998) for the relief of Meiko Shikibu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Meiko Shikibu, the fiancee of Earl A. Beach, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Meiko Shikibu is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Earl A. Beach and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Meiko Shikibu, she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Meiko Shikibu, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Meiko Shikibu as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOLOMON WIESEL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1155) for the relief of Solomon Wiesel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Solomon Wiesel shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARMENOUHI ASSADOUR ARTINIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1047) for the relief of Armenouhi Assadour Artinian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Armenouhi Assadour Artinian shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT SHEN-YEN HOU-MING LIEU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1083) for the relief of Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert Shen-yen Hou-ming Lieu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILAD S. ISAAC

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1157) for the relief of Milad S. Isaac.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Milad S. Isaac shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMANUEL FRANGESKOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1158) for the relief of Emanuel Frangeskos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Emanuel Frangeskos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CYNTHIA JACOB

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1205) for the relief of Cynthia Jacob.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Cynthia Jacob shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAROL BRANDON (VALTRUDE PROBST)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1247) for the relief of Carol Brandon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carol Brandon (Valtrude Probst) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLIVIA MARY ORCIUCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1252) for the relief of Olivia Mary Orciuch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olivia Mary Orciuch shall be held and con-

sidered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MISS TOSHIKO HOZAKA AND HER CHILD, ROGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1299) for the relief of Miss Toshiko Hozaka and her child, Roger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Miss Toshiko Hozaka, the fiancee of Normand Bessette, a citizen of the United States, and her child, shall be eligible for visas as nonimmigrant temporary visitors for a period of 3 months: *Provided*, That the administrative authorities find that the said Toshiko Hozaka is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Normand Bessette and that she is found otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Toshiko Hozaka and her child, they shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event that the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within 3 months after the entry of the said Toshiko Hozaka and her child, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Toshiko Hozaka and her child as of the date of the payment by them of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, strike out the words "she is" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "they are."

On page 2, line 13, strike out the word "fee" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "fees."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUTHER ROSE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1300) for the relief of Luther Rose.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luther Rose shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIN YORK GAY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1357) for the relief of Chin York Gay.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Chin York Gay, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Sam Chin, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STIJEPO BUICH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1467) for the relief of Stijepo Buich.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Stijepo Buich, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Tom and Anfisa Buich, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BARBARA V. TAYLOR

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1468) for the relief of Barbara V. Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Barbara V. Taylor shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, beginning on line 7, after the words "visa fee." strike out the remainder of the bill.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTOR MANUEL SOARES DEMENDONCA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1472) for the relief of Victor Manuel Soares DeMendonca.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Victor Manuel Soares De Mendonca shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSA MARIE PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1487) for the relief of Rosa Marie Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (12) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rosa Marie Phillips (nee Vollmer) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge of prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WOJCIK FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1655) for the relief of the Wojcik family.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Stanislaw, Janina, and Andrzej Wojcik shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. ZDZISLAW ALEKSANDER PESZKOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1684) for the relief of Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Rev. Zdzislaw Aleksander Peszkowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INGRID SAMSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1954) for the relief of Ingrid Samson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ingrid Samson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. BERTA MANSERGH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2933) for the relief of Mrs. Berta Mansergh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Berta Mansergh may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILBRAHAM ACADEMY

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Res. 202) for the relief of Wilbraham Academy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (H. R. 2699) entitled "a bill for the relief of Wilbraham Academy," together with all accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the United States Court of Claims pursuant to sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; and said court shall proceed expeditiously with the same in accordance with the provisions of said sections and report to the House, 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.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWINA L. LINCOLN, WIDOW OF W. IRVING LINCOLN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1296) for the relief of Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edwina L. Lincoln, widow of W. Irving Lincoln, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the loss of the spring-water business owned by the late W. Irving Lincoln situated on Mount Blue in Hingham, Mass., and known as the Mount Blue Spring Water Co., as a result of the construction and operation of the United States naval ammunition depot, Hingham Annex, on land upon which such business was located, compensation having been received by the said W. Irving Lincoln for the loss of such land but not for the loss of such business: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID R. CLICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1400) for the relief of David R. Click.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of David R. Click, Woodville, Ala., and his claim for compensation for disabilities incurred in 1942 and 1943, while in the performance of his duties as an employee of the War Department at Huntsville Arsenal, Huntsville, Ala., shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act if he files such claim with the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, Department of Labor, within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That sections 15 to 20 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act are hereby waived in favor of David R. Click and his claim for compensation for disability caused by an injury alleged to have been sustained while in the performance of his duties on October 23, 1943, as an employee of the War Department at Huntsville, Ala., shall be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act in the same manner as if such claim had been timely filed, if such claim is filed within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to its enactment, except in the case of such medical or hospitalization expenditures which may be deemed reimbursable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVERETT A. ROSS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1922) for the relief of Everett A. Ross.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Everett A. Ross, Stockton, Calif., the sum of $712.61. Such sum represents the amount of the judgment and costs for which the said Everett A. Ross was held liable on February 4, 1952, in a civil action in the justice court of Stockton, Calif., as the result of an accident which occurred at the intersection of Chater Way and Sharps Lane in Stockton, Calif., on November 3, 1950, and which involved a United States mail truck being driven by the said Everett A. Ross, a temporary letter carrier in the United States post office, Stockton, Calif. Such sum shall be paid only on condition that the said Everett A. Ross shall use such sum, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to pay such judgment and costs in full: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. ORIN A. FAYLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2904) for the relief of Maj. Orin A. Fayle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Orin A. Fayle, of 4433 Yuma Street NW., Washington, D. C., the sum of $2,324, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the damages sustained by him on account of damage to and destruction of his household goods which were being shipped from Naples, Italy, where he had been quartered until approximately June 19, 1954, attached to CINCSOUTH, NATO, for which he has not heretofore been compensated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$2,324" and insert "$612.22."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN JORDAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1156) for the relief of John Jordan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Jordan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FERENC BABOTHY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1255) for the relief of Ferenc Babothy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ferenc Babothy shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARLO NONVENUTO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1281) for the relief of Carlo Nonvenuto.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Carlo Nonvenuto shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of his entry into this country, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, after the words "date of," strike out the words "his entry into this country" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLGA JOANNOU GEORGULEA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1283) for the relief of Olga Joannou Georgulea.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Olga Joannou Georgulea, as of the date of enactment of this act, and upon payment of visa fee, and that she shall, for all purposes under the Immigration and Nationality Act, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence as of that date. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall thereupon reduce by one number the immigration quota of the country of her origin, for the current fiscal year.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Olga Joannou Georgulea shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID MORDKA BORENSTAJN ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1287) for the relief of David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, David Mordka Borenstajn, Itta Borenstajn nee Schipper, and Fella Borenstajn Reichlinger, who were admitted to the United States on January 8, 1948, at the port of New York, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of required visa fees. Upon payment of visa fees, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct two numbers from the quota for Poland, and one number from the quota for Germany for the first year such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 5, after the name "Reichlinger", strike out ", who were admitted."

On page 1, strike out all of line 6.

On page 1, strike out "New York", on line 7.

On page 2, line 1, after the words "visa fees.", strike out the remainder of the bill and substitute in lieu thereof the following: "Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VICTORINE MAY DONALDSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1337) for the relief of Victorine May Donaldson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Victorine May Donaldson shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERICH WOLF, ALSO KNOWN AS LADISLOV WOLFENSTEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1338) for the relief of Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Erich Wolf, also known as Ladislov Wolfenstein, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, after the word "fee", in line 8, strike out the balance of line 8 and all of lines 9 and 10; and on page 2, strike out all of lines 1 and 2.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA NIZZIA CONSTANTINO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1339) for the relief of Maria Nizzia Constantino.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Maria Nizzia Constantino shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the

Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 4, strike out "Constantino" and insert "Costantino."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Maria Nizzia Costantino."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANORE HAUSER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1473) for the relief of Eleanore Hauser.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eleanor Hauser shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the apprporiate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN ODABASHIAN, M. D.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2353) for the relief of John Odabashian, M. D.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John Odabashian, doctor of medicine, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MELINA BONTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1028) for the relief of Melina Bonton.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Melina Bonton shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EBOLYA WOLF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1333) for the relief of Ebolya Wolf.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ebolya Wolf shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUISA GEMMA TOFFANI AND ROSA SOMETTI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1879) for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani and Rosa Sometti.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Luisa Gemma Toffani and Rosa Sometti, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for on this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, strike out "Toffani and" and insert "Toffani."

Page 1, line 4, after "Sometti", insert "Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni."

Page 1, line 11, strike out "two" and insert "four."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Luisa Gemma Toffani, Rosa Sometti, Bianca Carpanese, and Margherita Bruni."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PIETRO MURGIA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2358) for the relief of Pietro Murgia.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pietro Murgia may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice have knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "have" and insert "had."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT V. BLEDNYH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3066) for the relief of Robert V. Blednyh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Robert V. Blednyh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the able.

EUFRONIO D. ESPINA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3069) for the relief of Eufronio D. Espina.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eufronio D. Espina shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. LEE TAI HUNG QUAN AND QUAN AH SANG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3070) for the relief of Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Lee Tai Hung Quan and Quan Ah Sang, wife and minor child of Lloyd Quan, deceased citizen of the United States and World War II veteran, shall be held and considered to be nonquota immigrants.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELEANOR RAMOS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3071) for the relief of Eleanor Ramos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eleanor Ramos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEAN-MARIE NEWELL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3074) for the relief of Jean-Marie Newell.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Jean-Marie Newell shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIRGIL WON (ALSO KNOWN AS VIRGILIO JACKSON)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3075) for the relief of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, section 202 (b) shall be held not to apply to the case of Virgil Won (also known as Virgilio Jackson), who was born in Nicaragua.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANGEL MEDINA CARDENAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3852) for the relief of Angel Medina Cardenas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Angel Medina Cardenas may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 3, after the word "the", strike out "provision" and substitute in lieu thereof the word "provisions."

On page 1, line 3, after "212 (a)", insert "(17) and."

On page 1, line 7, after the word "Act", change the period to a colon and add the following: *"Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUADALUPE ZUNIGA (ALSO KNOWN AS BENITA CHAPARRAO-VENEGAS OR GUADALUPE ACOSTA)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3853) for the relief of Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guadalupe Zuniga shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (17) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Guadalupe Zuniga (also known as Benita Chaparrao-Venegas or Guadalupe Acosta) may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ESTHER RODRIGUEZ DE URIBE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4245) for the relief of Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Esther Rodriguez de Uribe may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANTING OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 99) favoring the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my remarks at this point to explain my objection to House Concurrent Resolution 99.

Practically all bills on the Private Calendar are for the benefit of one individual or corporation.

House Concurrent Resolution 99 proposed to grant permanent residence in the United States to certain displaced persons whom the Attorney General has determined to be eligible for such privilege under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948. In as much as the names of 432 persons are listed in the bill and the case histories are not in the committee report, I asked this resolution be passed over without prejudice to permit members to examine the list of beneficiaries in the resolution and to then examine the case histories that are available to them in the custody of the Judiciary Committee if they so desire.

MAX KOZLOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 968) for the relief of Max Kozlowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9) and (19) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Max Kozlowski may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraphs (9), (19), and (28) of section 212 (a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Max Kozlowski may be admitted to the United States for permanent

resident if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES (CARLOS) GERLICZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1417) for the relief of Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (1), (4), and (7) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Charles (Carlos) Gerlicz may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as required by section 213 of that act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROSS SHERMAN TRIGG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1474) for the relief of Ross Sherman Trigg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ross Sherman Trigg shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) and (19) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ross Sherman Trigg may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That these exemptions shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WING CHONG CHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1475) for the relief of Wing Chong Chan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Wing Chong Chan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARDES ALBACETE YANEZ

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1525) for the relief of Ardes Albacete Yanez.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ardes Albacete Yanez shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceeding and to cancel any outstanding order and warrant of deportation, any warrant of arrest and bond which may have been issued in the case of Ardes Albacete Yanez, and the said Ardes Albacete Yanez shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which any such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants of arrest have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the resolution (H. Con. Res. 98) approving the granting of the status of permanent residence to certain aliens.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, my reasons for objecting to this resolution and asking that it be passed over without prejudice are substantially the same as those for House Concurrent Resolution 99.

This bill carries 43 beneficiaries and the case histories are available to Members of the House in the Judiciary Committee if they wish to see them.

I will not object to either resolution at a time they are up for consideration on a succeeding Private Calendar.

MRS. ELIZABETH DOWDS

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 170 the bill H. R. 973.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elizabeth Dowds shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. AYRES. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I did not ask that this bill be passed over without prejudice because I was against the passage of the bill. I merely wanted to point out what I believe to be a most unfair provision of the present immigration law. I refer to the retroactive provision.

In my judgment, aliens who lawfully entered the United States should not be deported for sins committed in the past having once paid their debt to society. To threaten people with deportation on the basis of what they did years ago is awfully cruel. After a person has paid his debt to society, rehabilitated himself, and becomes a respected member of his community, our Government should not harass him or his family for past action.

Since being an objector on the Private Calendar, I have never objected to the passage of any immigration bill; however, I have noticed many of the bills grant permanent residence in our country to those that have sinned a little bit. Are we in the Congress going to set ourselves up as judges and attempt to determine how much sin an alien must participate in before being deported? God has forgiven these people who erred. In like manner, should we not be helping rather than hurting them? This country cannot afford to ignore the spirit of forgiveness. I believe the immigration law should have the retroactive provision removed from it immediately.

I have never been a person to shun my responsibility or duties. When the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] asked me to be an objector, I was pleased. I cannot, however, in clear

conscience participate in an action I believe to be wrong.

Until such a time that the injustices in the present law are corrected, I must cease to be an objector. I am, therefore, submitting my resignation to Mr. MARTIN.

NURSE TRAINEESHIPS

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. 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 gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to authorize the Surgeon General of the United States to provide traineeships for graduate nurses. This is one of a series of measures I am sponsoring in this session in an attempt to break the bottleneck in the severe shortage of nursing services in America.

The purpose of this measure is to expand and improve nurse training and promote the more effective utilization of nursing skills through traineeships for professional nurses to prepare them for teaching in the various fields of nursing and to serve in administrative and supervisory capacities. One of the principal causes of the nurse shortage today stems from the scarcity of qualified teachers, administrators, and supervisors.

This bill is a companion measure to the administration's nursing proposals—title IV of H. R. 3458 and H. R. 3720—except that my bill limits itself to grants for nurses only.

The other nursing legislation I have sponsored this session includes H. R. 2559, which would make qualified men nurses eligible for commissions in the Armed Forces Reserves, and House Joint Resolution 171, which would establish a National Commission on Nursing Services.

House Joint Resolution 171 is receiving outstanding support throughout the country. Just recently a national committee for a Commission on Nursing Services was established to urge passage of this bill. Among members of the committee are:

Mr. Samuel Horwitz, chairman, trustee, Mount Sinai Hospital, Cleveland, Ohio.

David B. Allman, M. D., chairman, committee on legislation, American Medical Association, Atlantic City, N. J.

Miss Gertrude E. Cromwell, supervisor of nursing, Denver Public Schools, Denver, Colo.

Mrs. Howard Egert, president, Cleveland Federation of Women's Clubs, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. Stanley Ferguson, director, University Hospitals, Cleveland, Ohio.

Charles Higley, M. D., past president, Cleveland Academy of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mr. John R. Mannix, director, Cleveland Hospital Service Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. R. Louise McManus, director, division of nursing education, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.

George Sackett, M. D., president, Cleveland Academy of Medicine, Cleveland, Ohio.

Miss Hilda M. Torrop, executive director, National Association for Practical Nurse Education, New York, N. Y.

Mr. Samuel Whitman, director, Cleveland Mental Health Association, Cleveland, Ohio.

Mrs. Robert Woodruff, Atlanta, Ga.

The membership of this committee is being expanded.

Many national organizations, including the American Medical Association, have strongly endorsed the Nurse Commission plan. Most recently this measure received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

I feel certain that with an intelligent legislative and administrative approach, and with wide public understanding, we can make much-needed improvement in the health of the American people.

STRENGTHENING INTER-AMERICAN SOLIDARITY

Mr. McGREGOR. 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 Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, an editorial on Pan-American Day in the New York Times a short time ago makes an excellent point. It is that citizens in all the American Republics who support inter-American solidarity should, in the words of the editorial, "devote themselves to its realization not only today but every day."

For a number of years, in this Congress and elsewhere, I myself have been deeply interested in one of the most important factors in strengthening and perpetuating inter-American solidarity. That is the great Pan-American Highway, a splendid modern thoroughfare to run from Alaska to Argentina. Much of it is completed. Much remains to be done.

One extremely important link for which there is urgent need of completion is that section known as the Inter-American Highway.

On March 31 in letters to Vice President Nixon and to Speaker Rayburn, President Eisenhower recommended early completion of this Inter-American Highway. The President enumerated 4 considerations which lead him to believe that the United States should sponsor an accelerated construction program, as follows:

First. A completed highway will provide a very important contribution to the economic development of the countries through which it passes.

Second. There will be an opportunity for increased trade and improved political relations among these countries and the United States.

Third. The resultant increase in tourist traffic would not only improve cultural relations but also serve as a very important element in the development of their economies through earnings of foreign exchange.

Fourth. The existence of such an all-weather highway would be of substantial security importance, both in providing overland contact and communication as far southward as the Panama Canal, and in bringing an important physical link between these countries in our common defense of the Western Hemisphere against aggression from without and subversion from within.

The President also pointed out forcefully that those 4 stabilizing factors will be a great deterrent to communism, which as we all recall was a real menace in that area very recently in Guatemala. Happily, it was defeated by the will of the people of Guatemala and by the spirit of solidarity of the American Republics. Nevertheless communism, which struck once, will try to strike again. The Inter-American Highway is one realistic means of checking it.

The President's support of early completion of the highway demonstrates once again this administration's continuous interest in our relations with the other American Republics. Too often our policy toward Latin America has been characterized by a great deal of talk but too little action. The President's decision to support a program which will finish the Inter-American Highway in 3 years rather than in an estimated 10 years is solid evidence of the determination of this administration to develop a policy. The Inter-American Highway is important to all the nations of the hemisphere, since it is a regional link, from the United States-Mexican border to the Canal Zone, of the great Pan-American Highway system which when completed will extend from Fairbanks, Alaska, to Buenos Aires.

The important Inter-American Highway link in this system, as the President pointed out in his letters, has been intermittently under construction for the past 21 years. Its speedy completion would help the mid-American area immediately by contributing toward developing it economically, stabilizing it politically, and strengthening it strategically. Obviously, the highway is in consequence of great potential importance in hemisphere solidarity, which is itself of vital importance to the maintenance and defense of the free world. Its completion would benefit every country of the hemisphere, including, most emphatically, the United States.

POSTAL PAY BILL

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include three amendments to be offered to H. R. 4644, the postal pay bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, my statement concerns the amendments to H. R. 4644, as reported, which are in order under the rule on that bill granted by the Committee on Rules.

Under the rule three amendments may be offered. These amendments were presented to the Rules Committee. I am placing them in the RECORD in the form in which presented to and considered by the Rules Committee so that the Members of the House may be informed as to the text of such amendments. The amendments proposed to be offered under the rule are as follows:

Page 81, after line 17, insert the following:

"SEC. 205. (a) The Postmaster General shall transmit to the Congress, on or before January 15, 1956, a comprehensive report of operations under this title. Such report shall include, among other matters, the following—

"(1) information, in summary and in detail, with respect to actions by the Postmaster General taken under section 201, with specific reference to the definitions of positions, the designations of the respective salary levels to which such positions are assigned, and the reasons for such actions;

"(2) a statement showing the number of employees determined to be in each key position under section 203, and the occupational titles of such employees immediately prior to the conversion of such employees under section 304 (b);

"(3) a statement with respect to the operation of the appeals system prescribed by section 202, including the number of such appeals by employees, a general discussion of the reasons for such appeals, the actions taken thereon and the reasons therefor; and

"(4) such other information and evidence as is necessary to enable the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of the Senate and the House of Representatives to carry out the responsibility for supervision and review of the administration of this title, in accordance with section 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (Public Law 601, 79th Cong.)

"(b) The report submitted by the Postmaster General under subsection (a) of this section shall be delivered to the President of the Senate and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the same day, and shall be referred to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service of both Houses. This report shall be printed as a House document after appropriate consideration by the two committees."

Page 82, strike out the entire postal field service schedule occurring after line 2 and before line 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Postal field service schedule

Level	Per annum rates and steps						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	$2,890	$2,990	$3,090	$3,190	$3,290	$3,390	$3,490
2	3,080	3,190	3,300	3,410	3,520	3,630	3,740
3	3,330	3,440	3,550	3,660	3,770	3,880	3,990
4	3,590	3,705	3,820	3,935	4,050	4,165	4,280
5	3,680	3,805	3,930	4,055	4,180	4,305	4,430
6	3,880	4,005	4,130	4,255	4,380	4,505	4,630
7	4,190	4,330	4,470	4,610	4,750	4,890	5,030
8	4,530	4,685	4,840	4,995	5,150	5,305	5,460
9	4,890	5,060	5,230	5,400	5,570	5,740	5,910
10	5,280	5,465	5,650	5,835	6,020	6,205	6,390
11	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	7,000
12	6,380	6,600	6,820	7,040	7,260	7,480	7,700
13	7,020	7,260	7,500	7,740	7,980	8,220	8,460
14	7,730	7,980	8,230	8,480	8,730	8,980	9,230
15	8,500	8,750	9,000	9,250	9,500	9,750	10,000
16	9,350	9,600	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850
17	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800
18	11,400	11,650	11,900	12,150	12,400	12,650	12,900
19	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250	13,500	13,750	14,000
20	13,600	13,850	14,100	14,350	14,600	------	------
21	14,800	------	------	------	------	------	------

Page 89, strike out lines 4 to 19, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"RETROACTIVE BASIC SALARY INCREASES

"SEC. 306. (a) The basic salary in effect immediately prior to the effective date of this section, of each employee paid under the act of July 6, 1945, as amended (39 U. S. C., secs. 858, 859, 861a, 862, 863–866, 868, 869), or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, shall be increased by 6 percent effective March 1, 1955 (rounded to the nearest dollar in the case of per annum rates and to the nearest one-half cent in the case of hourly rates, a half-dollar or one-quarter of a cent being rounded to the next highest dollar or one-half cent, respectively). Such increase shall be applied (1) in the case of each rural carrier to his fixed compensation, his compensation per mile, and any additional compensation allowed him for serving a heavily patronized route, and (2) to the amounts specified in sections 3 (c), 3 (d), 12 (a), 12 (e), 15 (f), and 17 (d) of the act of July 6, 1945 (Public Law 134, 79th Cong.), as amended.

"(b) Retroactive salary shall be paid under this act only in the case of an individual in the service of the United States (including service in the Armed Forces of the United States) or of the municipal government of the District of Columbia on the date of enactment of this act, except that such retroactive salary shall be paid a retired postmaster, officer, or employee for services rendered during the period beginning March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his retirement, or in accordance with the provisions of the act of August 3, 1950, for services rendered by a deceased postmaster, officer, or employee during the period beginning on March 1, 1955, and ending with the date of his death."

Two language changes of a minor nature would clarify the intent as to the administration of these amendments. Accordingly, if the amendments under the rule are adopted by the House, I intend to ask unanimous consent for consideration of two minor changes in the language of such amendments as follows:

First, from the language of the amendment to page 81 of H. R. 4644, as reported, strike out the following last seven words: "after appropriate consideration by the two committees."

Second, from the language of the amendment to page 89 of H. R. 4644, as reported, strike out "or under the Classification Act of 1949, as amended," and on page 110, line 6, of H. R. 4644, as reported, after "as amended," insert "or the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, as the case may be."

The first change eliminates language which might cause a delay in the printing as a House document of the report of the Postmaster General required by the first amendment under the rule.

The second change removes a reference on page 89 of the bill, as reported, to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, and inserts a reference to that act on page 110 of the bill, as reported. The purpose of this second change is to continue the Classification Act of 1949 in effect for payment of salaries of certain employees of the Post Office Department who will be converted from that act to the Postal Field Service Schedule, until the actual conversion is made. This change has been suggested by the Post Office Department and the General Accounting Office.

It should be stressed that these changes in the amendments under the rule in no way change the purpose of those amendments. In my judgment these changes are desirable to clarify the intent of the amendments under the rule.

POSTAL FIELD COMPENSATION ACT OF 1955

Mr. SMITH of Virginia, from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 211, Rept. No. 423) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill, except that it shall be in order for any member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to offer any of the amendments proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, April 19, 1955, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

AMENDING RULES OF THE HOUSE TO INCREASE PAY OF WITNESSES

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 174 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXXV of the Rules of the House of Representatives is amended by striking out "6 dollars" and inserting in lieu thereof "9 dollars."

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely gives the House authority to pay the expenses of witnesses who are called before congressional committees in the amount of $9 a day instead of $6 a day. There has not been any increase in the fee to witnesses before House committees since 1930. This merely brings about a long-delayed increase of $3 a day for witnesses who are brought before House committees. I have no requests for time to speak on this legislation.

There is no opposition to this rule, Mr. Speaker.

I now yield 30 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 174, introduced by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON], chairman of the House Committee on Administration, provides in very simple language for increasing from $6 to $9 a day the expense allowance paid witnesses called before congressional committees.

For a considerable period of time travel pay allowances of Government employees has been $9 a day. Experience has shown that witnesses called before congressional committees are out of pocket when they are given only $6 to cover their actual expenses.

This resolution had the unanimous support, I understand, of both the House Committee on Administration and the Committee on Rules.

I have no requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS ACT

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 200 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill, and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with my remarks, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge the adoption of House Resolution 200, which will make in order the consideration of the bill, H. R. 2225, to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended.

House Resolution 200 provides for an open rule with 1 hour of general debate on the bill itself.

H. R. 2225 would require that permanent certificates of public convenience and necessity be issued to the local service airlines now operating under temporary certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board. These local service lines, Mr. Speaker, provide air service to the small- and medium-size communities of our country and have done a marvelous job since the end of the Second World War in providing rapid transportation to hitherto comparatively inaccessible sections of our country. They provide a linking-up service with the major airlines, and a nationwide network of air transportation has grown up. If these carriers did not perform their vital functions, many important regions and vital links between key cities of the United States would be without scheduled air transportation.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 2225's report disclosed that local service airlines have developed traffic in many areas far in excess of the traffic which the trunk airlines had developed, and this can be explained by the fact that the local service airlines are completely devoted to serving the small- and intermediate-size communities and have adjusted their operations to meet the needs of the smaller communities.

If permanent certificates are issued, a great financial expense will be eliminated for these local service lines, and their whole financial structure will thus be considerably strengthened.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the purpose of this bill is worth while; the rule itself is an open one, and, therefore, the bill is open to amendment on the floor. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I can see no reason for not adopting the rule and thus providing for the full consideration of the bill on its own merits.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Virginia has explained, House Resolution 200 grants a rule for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2225, from the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, and for the consideration of the bill for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The bill H. R. 2225 makes rather simple and direct amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act. It was reported favorably by the unanimous action of the legislative committee, and also by the unanimous action of the Committee on Rules.

I have no requests for time on this side.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2225, with Mr. THOMPSON of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H. R. 2225, introduced by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], and also a companion bill introduced by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW], would have the effect of granting permanent certificates of convenience and necessity to the 13 local service airlines in the country now operating under temporary certificates issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

If you recall, extensive hearings were held on this legislation last year. The committee reported the bill unanimously last year. The House passed the bill, but it was bogged down in the last-minute rush of the legislative jam in the other body, and no final action was had on the legislation. It comes again today to the House with a unanimous vote of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

May I take just a moment, Mr. Chairman, to explain the background of this legislation? Local service air transportation was first begun as an experiment following an extensive investigation completed by the Civil Aeronautics Board in 1944 into the need for extending air service to small and intermediate-sized communities. At first, this service, as you know, was called "feeder" service or feeder airlines. It soon became apparent, however, that the term "feeder" was in a sense too restrictive. The service provided is far more than simply a feeder service, and it became an extensive and more important part of the airline system. It was changed from feeder service to local service airlines. These local service airlines provide service for small communities on a regional basis, and they link these communities to major air terminals. The oldest one of the airlines has been operating now slightly less than 10 years. The youngest one for something more than 4½ years.

If you have a copy of the report, you may turn to page 2, and there you will find listed by States all of the communities served by these particular airlines. The committee feels, and has felt since last year, that this experiment has now proved itself—that it is no longer an experiment and that these local service airlines are, indeed, providing substantial transportation essential to the national welfare and should no longer be regarded as on an experimental basis.

The committee feels also that the time has come to declare that this service is not experimental and to grant these carriers the right of permanent certification in order that some stability, the stability they need to develop, may be achieved. And to do so, we are proposing in this bill some very simple amendments to the Civil Aeronautics Act. You will recall, Mr. Chairman, in 1938, when the Civil Aeronautics Act was enacted, at that time all of the trunklines in the country were given the right of what we call the grandfather clause. They were granted permanent certificates at that time.

The pending legislation simply provides grandfather rights for local service carriers. However, from one standpoint it should be pointed out that H. R. 2225 is less liberal actually than the original

act in 1938, insofar as grandfather clause rights are concerned. Unlike carriers that were granted grandfather rights in 1938, each local service carrier has had to go before the Civil Aeronautics Board and qualify for a certificate under the terms of section 401 of the act. Each of them filed formal application, waited in turn for the Board's docket, for their appearance before the Board under the docket; each one then presented evidence in long, complex hearings, and each one argued its case before the Board. That was to get their first temporary 3-year certificate.

As required by section 401–B, each carrier had to prove it was fit, able, and willing to perform such transportation properly, and conform to the provisions of the act and its rules and regulations, as required by the Board.

In each case before the local service airline could get a certificate, the Board had to determine that the public convenience and necessity required the services. That was not all. In addition to the original full dress proceedings needed to acquire a temporary certificate, each of these carriers every 3 years has had to appear before the Board to ask for a renewal of that temporary certificate. That has been an expensive operation. One airline carrier witness testified it cost his company $80,000 in legal fees and accountant fees, and other expenses, to apply for a renewal of the temporary certificate, which was renewed only on a 3-year basis.

So it has been quite an expensive operation. Some of the carriers paid expenses in excess of $80,000.

Another factor should be brought to the attention of the committee at this time. The local service carriers operate on the basis of temporary certificates and have faced extreme difficulties in financing their operations. It is extremely difficult, if not impossible in many instances, to provide finances, when the lending agencies know that the certificate has life for only 3 years, and at the end of that 3-year period the carrier might be out of business. They have had that difficulty particularly with reference to buying new equipment. Most of them have been using the old, out-moded DC–3 planes for their local service operations. That has been an expensive operation, because the plane has not been manufactured for quite a number of years. Parts are becoming more and more expensive, and yet no airplane manufacturing company will be willing to go into the manufacture of a new plane suitable for this type of air carrier service on the basis of a 3-year certificate. That is just good common financial reasoning, I think, on the part of the manufacturing companies.

So these local service carriers have been unable to buy the equipment they need because they cannot persuade the plane manufacturer to take an order to build a lot of planes when that company does not know whether they will be in business for more than 3 years. The manufacture of aircraft is a risky business. Considerable capital must be committed to the development of the plane.

The local service airlines with temporary certificates are unable to make long-term commitments for the purchase of new equipment, so that the manufacturers have no incentive to take the risk necessary. Besides the problem of long-term commitments to buy needed equipment, the local service air lines frequently find difficulty in obtaining money for needed capital. Higher interest rates are demanded in many instances. One witness said that in 1952, when his company needed additional working capital, it was necessary to go to New York to get the money, and he had to pay 6 percent. Not only that, he had to make a personal guaranty for the repayment of the money.

It is amazing to me that the local service airlines have made the tremendous progress they have made, and have rendered the service to many communities across the country which they have rendered so well, under the difficulties they have faced in their operations.

Mr. PRESTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PRESTON. I wish to state that I plan to support the legislation, but I think the fact should be brought out in this debate that since 1951 the Department of Commerce has issued certificates of convenience and necessity to airlines making it possible to write off on a 5-year basis, on a tax basis, over 600 aircraft, which permits them to depreciate the aircraft in a period of 5 years. I think the life of the average plane may well be 15 years. So this is indeed a terrific windfall for the airlines in the United States.

Mr. PRIEST. May I ask the gentleman if that condition is not primarily confined to the trunk lines?

Mr. PRESTON. I would say that would be true as to the majority of it, but anybody who has a four-engined aircraft is eligible to receive this writeoff. There are, of course, some defense benefits inuring to the Government; there is no question about that; but I think in evaluating the cost of operating airlines this fact should be revealed, that they have this terrific advantage of a 5-year depreciation.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman for bringing that to the attention of the committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that none of these local service carriers have any Boeing or other large aircraft?

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. All of them, I believe, use old World War II DC–3 planes. Is that not true?

Mr. PRIEST. That is true. There were one or two that tried to use some others but were not permitted to do so.

Mr. HARRIS. It proved an unfortunate and expensive experience to them.

Mr. PRIEST. That is quite true.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not a fact that these DC–3's are obsolescent and completely out of date?

Mr. PRIEST. They are.

Mr. HARRIS. In fact it is difficult to find parts in order to keep them maintained. Is that not true?

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. HARRIS. Is it not also true that some of these local air carriers must set up their own machine shops and make their own parts in order to provide necessary machinery for these planes in order that they can continue to fly?

Mr. PRIEST. That was the testimony presented to our committee.

Mr. HARRIS. Consequently for these particular operators the maintenance cost is exceedingly high.

Mr. PRIEST. That is true. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for further developing that point. I had mentioned the maintenance cost earlier in my statement.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. PASSMAN. I think the gentleman from Arkansas cleared up the point I was going to make, that most of the equipment used by the feeder lines is obsolescent or obsolete equipment. Because of that they cannot take advantage of the 5-year depreciation provision.

Mr. PRIEST. That is true.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. With respect to the depreciation figure, Mr. Chan Gurney, the acting Chairman of the CAB, testified to the committee that the Board does depreciate the airplanes, the largest expense item in the whole equipment field, in a period of 7 years; and I believe further in the testimony it was brought out that the youngest airplane now being operated by these local service carriers was 10 years old. Therefore, as far as these local service carriers are concerned, every airplane they have has already been written off long since.

Mr. PRIEST. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one further statement, then I shall not consume more time.

As far as I know the only opposition to this legislation comes from the Civil Aeronautics Board. They feel that the legislation, so they testified, would freeze permanently a lot of these routes. The committee is very definitely of the opinion that the Board has all of the power necessary under existing law to alter local service routes just as they do the trunk lines today, and following the same procedure under 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

The effect of the legislation simply would be to permit these carriers within a 120-day period to file for a permanent certificate; and unless there was something in its record of operation since its last temporary certificate was issued that indicated its unworthiness as a carrier the Board would be required to grant it the same rights they did the primary carriers in 1938 and give to the local service carriers a permanent certificate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRIEST. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman has mentioned the CAB. The opposition of the CAB to this legislation is typical of the obstructionist policy of the CAB, it is typical of the confusion which exists in the CAB. There is not a major community in the United States of America that does not complain about the CAB and, as the gentleman knows, I have pending here a matter which would call for a complete investigation of the civilian air policy in this country. The gentleman is chairman of a great and distinguished committee and I would like for him to state to the House whether or not it is his intention to look into this situation which is causing criticism all over this country?

Mr. PRIEST. May the chairman of the committee state to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana that it is the intention of the committee to look fully into this matter, that a draft of subjects to be investigated already is under way, and that, in effect, we started such investigation several weeks ago. It was interrupted temporarily because we had scheduled hearings on the Natural Gas Act; but it is the intention of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to do what the gentleman has suggested and to do it in as complete form as it is possible for that committee to do.

Mr. BOGGS. The gentleman's statement is very reassuring.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure the chairman of our committee, a very able chairman, has fully explained this entire legislation. I only want to make a few statements because I feel it is rather vital that another particular point be brought to the committee.

I am sure our chairman mentioned the fact that some of these feeder lines now are being forced more or less to cannibalize their planes in order to keep the present lines in operation. I think we should emphasize, furthermore, that the manufacturers of airplanes, those who have appeared before our committee, made it very emphatic that they do not want to bring out new models that would be useful for a shuttle service and for feeder line service until they think there is some permanency to this entire program; until they feel that there is some kind of permanency of certification available to the small lines so that they may be in business for some time to come.

I should like to point out another fact. I believe this should be emphasized, too, Mr. Chairman. The Federal Government is vitally involved and interested in this particular instance. We know they are paying the feeder lines, and all lines, including trunk lines, a certain subsidy depending on their necessity for support. The greater the earnings of these airline companies the smaller amount this subsidy is that will be paid to them by the Federal Government. Consequently, these smaller companies are permitted to enlarge their operations and they will be permitted to enlarge their operations if they know they have a certain degree of permanancy. Then, of course, they are going to be able to make greater earnings and consequently will require smaller subsidy payments from the Federal Government. I think that is very important.

In our particular area we have several of the smaller feeder lines. It is contemplated that it will not be too many years until some type of shuttle service will make it possible for every community in the United States, or nearly every community in the United States, to reach a main trunk line.

To become eligible for a permanent certificate, it is going to be rather simple for each of the smaller feeder lines, as well as the larger lines, to declare themselves and to become eligible to the CAB. I have thought, and I think many other Members have felt, there may have been some opposition expressed but it was very mild opposition on the part of the members of the CAB. Actually, all of the feeder lines and all of the operators of the larger lines were very much in favor of this legislation, which was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Those are 1 or 2 additional points that I thought should be explained on this side of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it was brought out before the committee very plainly that the longtime future planning of these feeder companies is almost impossible with this kind of certification which they are operating under at the present time. Until such time as they do have some permanency and opportunity to finance on a long-scale basis, it is almost impossible for them to give what we would call generally considered here trunk line service, first-class service. Is that not correct?

Mr. BEAMER. I think that is stating it very well. In other words, finance companies do not look with favor upon extension of credit, shall we say, to companies in a semipermanent position.

Mr. SPRINGER. Just like a landlord getting financing for just the length of his lease, and if his lease is not very long, his chances of getting financing in that field is not too great. That is a comparable situation which these feeder lines have been put into. I want to say this, that it was my feeling—and I listened to all of the evidence of the CAB—that there is possibly some merit about keeping these companies under their jurisdiction for a long period of time. I think the committee had to weigh the merits of that against the permanency which a company would have and the better service and the cheaper service and also the question of subsidy, and we had to view those features as being more desirable than some of the issues that were raised in behalf of the CAB. I believe that is about a true statement.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman from Illinois has expressed it very adequately.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I am interested in this bill. We have one of these lines in our city, but I would like to understand a little bit better the objections of the CAB. I do not think that body is simply an obstructionist bunch of bureaucrats. I would like to know a little more of the nature of their objections. This gives these 14 companies grandfather-clause treatment, as it were, but it makes it extremely difficult for any new company to come into this field. Is that not true?

Mr. BEAMER. Yes and no. I would not say it would make it more difficult, because they still would have an opportunity to appear before the Civil Aeronautics Board and apply for regular certification. May I add another point. In case they do appear before the Board—I mean any of these other existing lines—it is necessary for them to continue under the direction of the Civil Aeronautics Board as far as rates and further extension of services are concerned.

Mr. VORYS. Under this bill, H. R. 2225, as I understand it, any line, either one of these local lines or one of the trunk lines, can have its rates suspended or discontinued if there is anything objectionable found about the operation; is that correct?

Mr. BEAMER. I think that is substantially a correct statement. However, it is now up to the Civil Aeronautics Board to prefer such charges. In other words, they are now considered not guilty until they are proven otherwise. That is in conformity with established law.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS. That is part of the present Civil Aeronautics Act, and this bill here does not disturb that authority.

Mr. VORYS. As I understand, these present lines do not have certificates that have no time at all, but they have up to 2, 5, or 7 years under the existing practice. Is that not correct?

Mr. BEAMER. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS. They could be given permanent certificates by the CAB at the present time, is that correct, without this law?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, yes; that is true. Now, I take it there comes a time when any company which has a license or is seeking a license from the Federal Government ought to have a right to know whether it is in business or is not in business. I think these lines have been before the Commission on several occasions. This is not the first time they have been up here. They have presented all their problems and difficulties with which those companies were faced. They are not fly-by-night outfits. They have been in business for years. They are not the kind of firm that is going out of business tomorrow or some time within the next 6 months or even 5 years. In all probability, they are going to be in existence permanently, from now on. They have just as much right, they are just as much entitled to permanency, as a trunkline. The only difference is they are smaller; that is all.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know still what is the basis of the CAB's objection to this bill.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. PRIEST. The CAB's primary objection to the bill, as we gathered it in listening to their testimony before the committee, was that they felt the passage of this bill would have the effect of freezing these routes. Frankly, the committee could not see that. We felt, even though they were well intentioned in presenting that viewpoint, but the facts in the case did not justify their position because section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act remains just as it is and that gives the Civil Aeronautics Board authority to do these things:

> To alter, amend, modify, or suspend such certificate, in whole or in part, if the public convenience and necessity so requires.

There is no amendment whatsoever changing that part of the act. It applies to every certificate of convenience and necessity, whether it be with respect to a trunkline, a local-service line under a temporary certificate, or a permanent certificate. The committee felt that that point was somewhat belabored, and without a great amount of justification, although granting that it was given to the committee in all sincerity by the Board. But we felt it did not carry any weight in view of the study that the committee has made of this problem.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, may I add that on page 9 of the report, in the second and third paragraphs there is given, I believe, an explanation of one of the objections that was presented before the committee a year ago and also the answer that was given, as was stated by the chairman of our committee. It says:

> This legislation does not substantially change the power of the Board to alter and modify the route structures of the local-service carriers. It is believed that section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, which gives the Board power to "alter, amend, modify, or suspend such certificate, in whole or in part" provides all the authority necessary for route development.

I believe that answers the question.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, I think it is well to point out that at the time we received the report from the Civil Aeronautics Board, there were only 4 members; 3 members of the Board stated their opposition to this proposed legislation. They felt that they should retain the authority to make a decision, whether it should be for a 3-year extension or renewal, or what should happen to the route structure. One member of the Board testified before the committee of the other body that he was wholeheartedly in favor of this proposed legislation and felt it to be in the best interests of the service. The fifth member, of course, is presently the Chairman of the Board but had not been confirmed at that time and therefore was not in a position to state how he felt about the legislation. So, in fact, when we refer to the Board, there were only three members of the Board who came to the committee to express opposition.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one other question?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. It has been brought to my attention by one of these local-service lines, which is mentioned here, that the airplane industry could not or would not go ahead and develop a local-service carrier unless some such legislation were passed. With 444 communities to be served, with 14 lines, knowing that either their competitors or their successors will continue this local service, it is inconceivable that there is not sufficient initiative in the aviation industry that they should fail to develop a plane for this type of service, so that they will not have to depend on secondhand, broken-down surplus equipment any longer.

Did the industry attempt to justify that sort of position? I do not understand why they do not develop a carrier of the kind we need for this local service. It seems to me they do not need any Government assurance in order to feel sure of plenty of business if they get the right kind of airplane.

Mr. BEAMER. I think the gentleman from Tennessee answered that question. Would he like to elaborate on it?

Mr. PRIEST. We actually had only one representative of a plane manufacturing concern before the committee. He brought some very favorable news to the committee about a development that is now taking place to supply this type of plane. They have no orders for it and they probably cannot get orders for it until some of these carriers receive permanent certificates, at least. But the developmental stage is well advanced. He brought and presented to our committee a model of a type of plane that would be very well adapted to this sort of air traffic. I believe that is being done. I agree with the gentleman from Ohio that certainly it should be done. They should develop the type and the model and get that ready for production so that if they get orders they can proceed to produce.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HENDERSON. Would the passage of this legislation make it more difficult for an area to be served by a new or different airline?

Mr. BEAMER. The chances are, speaking from a speculative viewpoint, it would probably make it more simple, because the presently existing lines then would want to expand their activities because they would feel a certain degree of permanency. As it has been, they have not felt too much permanency. Consequently they do not go into areas where they feel there might not be sufficient income.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I point out to the gentleman from Ohio that I have exactly that situation in my own area in the Ozark Airlines, where we have been trying to get them to expand to take in new cities within our area. Last year we did get them to go beyond what they had done, to take in one new city. However, in the survey that resulted from this new service, it was pointed out to me what the difficulties of this company are, when you are in this sort of indefinite stage of not knowing whether you are permanently certificated, in making these plans, not for 1955 but for 1957 and 1960 and 1965. I can see that any company might object that with the hazards you face under this indefinite certification it is almost an impossibility to do that.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. This is essentially the same bill that was passed unanimously last year in the House?

Mr. BEAMER. Yes, it is essentially the same bill.

Mr. YOUNGER. Also, this is granting no more to the feeder-line carriers than was granted to the trunk-line carriers under the grandfather clause?

Mr. BEAMER. It treats both of them equally.

Mr. YOUNGER. That is right. It simply gives equal treatment to these feeder-line carriers which are so essential to our economy and to air transportation.

Mr. BEAMER. In fact, the larger lines would support this contention because they like to have the feeder lines supplying them with revenue passengers and revenue freight from their respective communities.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEAMER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JARMAN. I am strongly in favor of the legislation, but there is one question I should like to ask: As I understand, the legislation is limited to carriers in the continental United States. I was wondering if the gentleman would explain why carriers in our Territories, say in Hawaii, where two airlines are operating, are not qualified under the legislation.

Mr. BEAMER. I presume we would have to go back to the act of 1938 for the explanation.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will yield, as I understand, the international airlines are not under regulation by the Civil Aeronautics Board but are regulated and certificates are granted directly by the President. Is that not correct?

Mr. JARMAN. Is it not necessary for these airlines to come in to the Civil Aeronautics Board and get a recertification? That is my understanding. That is the reason I ask the question.

Mr. BEAMER. The gentleman is asking now about international or national carriers?

Mr. JARMAN. I am asking the gentleman about, say, the two airlines in Hawaii that operate between the islands of Hawaii, not on an international basis but interisland.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], the author of the bill.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. HESELTON. Is it not a fact that this bill would not be on the floor today had the CAB been realistic in terms of the operations of the local feeder lines, which are essential to the communities they serve and essential to the trunk lines which serve the country and overseas?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in his analysis of the situation.

In my opinion, the Civil Aeronautics Board has been rather arbitrary in its treatment of the local service airlines problem. As I understand it, there are several other similar problems now before the Board in which the Board is also acting arbitrarily. But this bill deals solely with the question of local service airlines.

It would be repetitious for me, Mr. Chairman, to attempt to add to the statements which have been given to the committee by the distinguished gentlemen from Tennessee and Indiana. Basically, the Civil Aeronautics Board, by acting arbitrarily with respect to the certification of these local service airlines, has made this legislation necessary. The growth of the local service airlines in the United States in the last 10 years has been phenomenal. The Civil Aeronautics Board even in its opposition to this legislation admits through its Chairman, Mr. Chan Gurney, that the local service airlines operation is no longer experimental; that it has passed from the experimental stage and is now, according to him, in the developmental stage, which is the same stage of development that the trunk lines had reached in 1938 when they were granted permanent certification.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I compliment the gentleman for working up and introducing and sponsoring this measure. I am very much in favor of it. I have had some communications from home indicating the need for it. The gentleman, however, is from Mississippi and I am wondering whether there is anything at all in this legislation that would help us in our area to get through service from Louisiana and Mississippi into Washington and New York.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is a matter which is alien to the purposes of this bill. This bill does not deal with that.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. I think that is also a matter that the CAB is very arbitrary about.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. May I say we have an application before the Civil Aeronautics Board now to grant "through" service from Jackson to Washington, and we are trying to get them to act on that application.

I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. If the gentleman would bring in some legislation on that, it might be a good subject also.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I would like to join my colleagues in commending the gentleman from Mississippi for this very worthwhile piece of legislation. I think the chairman and the other members of the committee have made splendid statements in support of this legislation. Its merit should be very apparent, and the need for it from the standpoint of efficiency of these local airlines and the safety of these local airlines through the better equipment which may be obtained should also be apparent. I sincerely hope the bill will pass.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for the bouquets he is throwing my way, but I must confess this really is not my baby. The legislation was originally sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW] in the last Congress; and in the present Congress, as a member of the majority party, I have sponsored it jointly with the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW]. Actually, he is entitled to the credit if and when this legislation is passed.

Mr. Chairman, there are several reasons why this legislation is a must insofar as the future of local air service is concerned.

First, permanent certificates will assist local service carriers to obtain financing by assuring investors and financial institutions of the industry's continuity of operation. It will also reduce the cost of such financing.

As has been stated before, several local service airline officials testified before our committee that they had to give 6 percent interest in order to get financing and that only on a short-term basis. In addition to that, they had to find a member of the board of directors who was personally able to underwrite the loan.

The issuance of permanent certificates will make this unnecessary in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The equipment question has already been covered. Permanent certification will certainly open the door to the possibility that a prototype airplane may be designed specifically for the purpose of carrying out these local service operations. It will permit the local service carriers to make long-range planning for their future operations and effect economies which can only be effected through long-term planning. It will obviate the necessity for each of these carriers coming before the Civil Aeronautics Board every 2 or 3 or 4 years for the purpose of having their certificates renewed, an expense which is no little item in the budget of these airlines.

With respect to the DC-3, which is undoubtedly the greatest airplane that the airlines have ever had to operate, but which is now antiquated, the last DC-3 came off the lines at Douglas in 1945.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has again expired.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER].

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us represents an attempt on the part of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to strengthen the local service airlines in this country. We are charged in the Congress and through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with the duty of trying to develop a domestic air service. A great many people think we have done pretty well in developing intercity air transportation between our great centers of population. We have several very high-grade, first-class air carriers that will get you rapidly from coast to coast or from any two of the very great centers.

But one of the undeveloped segments of our air transportation is that of local service. That has been a very vexing and a very difficult problem for the committee and for the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SCHENCK. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from Iowa, as I remember the discussion in the committee on this bill, one of the great objections to the bill is that by granting a permanent certificate to the local service airlines we grant them an asset of considerable value which they may later want to sell or use in some way. Is it not true that, under the sections read by the distinguished chairman of this committee, the Civil Aeronautics Board still retains all of the necessary authority to review and change and suspend the operations of the local service airlines, so that the objection to which I referred is not a proper objection?

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely correct about that. I might say that that is precisely the situation that the long airlines are in today, because many of them have what amounts to a permanent certification. So what is proposed in this bill for local service airlines is no different treatment than has been accorded to the long lines.

Of course, this whole matter is complicated by the proposition that in order to get an airline system inaugurated and under way, it was necessary for the Congress to provide a subsidy, which was done by means of an air mail pay.

Some of the long lines have gotten to the point where they are paid on a compensatory basis for the service they render in carrying the mails, without subsidy. Not so with numerous of the local service airlines. In order to get the local service airlines to the point where they can be self-sustaining and will receive only compensatory pay for the mail service rather than a subsidy, it seemed to the committee that it was absolutely necessary that they be given a longer tenure of life, that they be given a chance to prove over a longer period of time that they could carry on an economic effective operation. So far they have not been able to do it because of the facts that have already been alluded to in this debate.

One thing that has not been mentioned with respect to the local service airlines is a handicap which we feel would be alleviated were this bill passed and to become law. That is the question of retaining their personnel.

The place where the established airlines go to get pilots to fly their planes and people to run their business is to the local service airlines. As a consequence the local service airlines are confronted with a constant turnover of their good people who do not want to stay when they get a chance to work for a permanent line. This legislation if passed will give the local service airlines a stability similar to the trunk airlines with respect to the employment of personnel.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. The gentleman used the phrase that the trunk lines have what amounts to permanent certification. As I understand, neither the trunk lines nor these local lines get a permanent certificate; they merely get a certificate that does not have a time limit. Is that correct?

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is correct; the gentleman is absolutely right.

Mr. VORYS. If the gentleman will yield further, is that type of certificate for unlimited duration the type of certificate that the Federal Communicaions Commission, for instance, gives for radio and television stations? I am wondering whether there is any difference between the kind of unlimited duration certificate given an airline, both trunk lines and now these local service lines, and the certificate that is granted, say, to a common carrier or by the Federal Communications Commission. Can the gentleman or any member of the committee enlighten me on that?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] to respond.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit, there is a difference. This is a permanent certificate. Under another section of the Civil Aeronautics Act the Board may on its own initiative by making the showing itself alter or change a route; and, as has been said here, completely eliminate it. This bill would not change that authority except that the Board would have to show that its action in changing or altering a route was justified.

Under the operation of the licensing of radio and television stations under the FCC Act, at each 3-year period or some other stated length of time, some cases automatically come in for renewal. The procedure there is for the station itself to file request for renewal, showing the record, the programing, the financing, and so forth; then without having to go through an expensive hearing the renewal is granted. That is the procedure here, but it is a lot more expeditious.

Mr. VORYS. But certainly the radio and television stations make enormous investments based on temporary or limited certificates. Is there so much objection to doing the same thing in the case of the airlines?

Mr. HARRIS. With only one exception. The operation, so far as the television and radio industry is concerned, is more or less automatic. As long as they are doing a good job, as long as there is no protest, then they come in and file their record; consequently, generally as a matter of procedure, the renewal is automatic. If there is some question about it, then, of course, the FCC makes the determination whether or not the renewal should be granted.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I would point out an additional difference in the two fields. The airways which carry the airplanes are not the same ether waves that carry the radio. In addition, there is no subsidy, either implied or in any other way, to the radio stations; whereas, the Government has a definite interest here in improving the stability and the permanence of these local airlines.

May I allude to another matter, which is the question of securing the right kind of airplanes to render this service. That is one of the more difficult problems. It has already been alluded to. It has been said that we had before us a witness who showed there was a model plane for local service which is presently on the drawing board ready to go into production provided they can get orders sufficient to justify setting up a production line. Those orders have not yet come. It did not seem to the committee they would come unless this legislation were passed to give these local airlines some permanence. Then they can get the financing, so that they can order planes which are presently ready for them to use.

Mr. SCHENCK. I should point out the great difference between a radio renewal and the renewal of an airline. That is, the airline has to have very expensive equipment to use; therefore, it is a question of financing, which is the basic reason for the difference in the method of doing business.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely correct. The amount of financing required for an airline is far in excess, relatively, to the amount of financing required for a radio or television station.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BELCHER. Of course, we all realize that the most difficult time that any business has is during the beginning of its operation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BELCHER. In connection with these feeder lines, they are beginning, more or less, their operations, yet they are confronted with a lot of difficulties that do not confront the old established businesses in that line of operation.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. BELCHER. It is to the Government's interest to remove every single difficulty it possibly can, every obstacle they have to overcome, because the sooner these airlines can get on a proper basis the sooner the Government can get out of furnishing them a subsidy to operate.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is one of the basic reasons for the passage of this legislation. In the considered judgment of the committee, this legislation will help the Government sooner to get out of the business of supporting these airlines and get them on a firm foundation.

Mr. BELCHER. May I say that I certainly appreciate the attitude of the committee, and I want to commend them for taking this very progressive step in furthering and helping the operation of these feeder airlines.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I thank the gentleman, and I am sure the committee appreciates his remarks.

Let me conclude by saying again that there is no air service in the world that is better than the service which the American people receive from its domestic airlines. This is absolutely true. Anyone who has traveled in foreign countries by air knows that we have a far superior domestic service to any other nation in the world, either in Europe, in the Far East or anywhere else. Indeed, most of the foreign airlines depend on American operational procedures and upon American engines and planes. So we are leading in this field.

The thing we must do, Mr. Chairman, is to make it possible for the smaller and less populous communities to get the same kind of air service that is being accorded to the large centers of population to the end that all of us may have the advantage of this new and modern type of transportation.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. KLEIN].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Chairman, it is evident that there is very little, if any, opposition to this legislation. The committee was unanimous in approving it. But I wanted to point out one facet of this problem that is not covered by this legislation.

Although this legislation does not apply to helicopters I have noted with great satisfaction the great strides that are being made by the certificated helicopter carriers particularly in the commercial field. It is recognized that this new and radically different type of transportation is being ably developed.

Passenger helicopter service, on a scheduled basis, is now a reality and has been for nearly 2 years, with American aviation leading the way.

New and larger and more economical equipment is already in the air. Greater density of population in our large metropolitan areas means that the helicopter is now a part of our everyday life, both for commercial as well as civilian defense reasons.

In addition, the civilian fleets now in operation have already proved an invaluable training and testing laboratory for our armed services.

We are confident of the continued rapid growth of scheduled helicopter service and I hope that legislation similar to that being considered today be considered for the certificated helicopter lines.

May I say to the chairman of our committee that in the near future we should

consider comparable legislation with regard to helicopter service. These certificated helicopter carriers who are in the field at the present time are up against the same difficulties and uncertainties as the small feeder airlines that we have been discussing here, and I hope that before long we can consider similar legislation with regard to the helicopter service.

Mr. BEAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side, but I would like to make one point, if I may, that no emphasis has been placed on city planning for additional airport development. I think we should touch upon that very briefly, because there are many cities which have been reluctant to improve their airport facilities until they knew with a degree of certainty that there would be service rendered to their communities.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to urge most strongly the favorable consideration of this bill, H. R. 2225, to amend the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 in order to provide for permanent certification of feeder airlines. We have come to a point in time when a decision must be made on the operating future of these local-service airlines. Last year the House gave its unanimous approval to a similar proposal, and I hope to see that same unanimity this year. That this may occur seems likely to me, for this body has as one of its prime functions and outstanding characteristics its knowledge of and effort for the many separate areas, taken either geographically or by economic units, that make up this great Nation.

Most of us here have seen in our time the establishment of our great trunk-airline systems, and have seen them grow from small, faltering companies to great concerns, playing an important part in our economic affairs. We have all come to be proud of our great airline systems, serving not only this Nation but the whole world, as the airplane has brought men closer together by shrinking the distance between points on the earth. We have seen also great advances in aircraft and in aircraft safety. American-built aircraft are in use throughout the world, and this achievement rests solely on the economic performance of these sky giants.

The picture is not perfect, however. We have fallen behind in the development of two types of commercial aircraft, and face presently the new phenomenon of foreign competition in aircraft sales. I speak, of course, of all jet aircraft and also of the turboprop—part jet and part propeller. I am sure, however, that we shall redress this imbalance, for the record of progress in the past in prototype development gives confidence for the future.

The feeder or local service airline is a postwar development and a development which has been of great importance to most areas of our Nation. I can speak with more knowledge of my own area and I would like to tell a part of the story of feeder service development in the Rocky Mountain West. Those of you who have had occasion to see this territory know well that it is rugged country, laced north and south by the great Rocky Mountains. In days gone by, we often spoke of distances out there as so much as the crow flies but we had few opportunities to ever take so straight a line. We have, of course, fine highways and main line rail service and I would not deprecate them one whit. Nonetheless, we have many towns and cities which have neither rail service nor any direct transportation links by surface transportation. We have long been accustomed to taking the long way from point to point as one just does not drive over the mountains. Roads are placed where there are breaks or passes in the mountain chain. In some instances, this makes the actual distance between two points a good deal in excess of the crow line distance between them.

Thus it is that the advent of the feeder service airline was so important to the mountain West. It presented to us the opportunity to go direct from point to point, and on occasion in the winter, almost the only way to go. Even so, the rugged terrain presents its own problems to the airline. It must cross mountain ranges in excess of 14,000 feet and that is quite a climb even if one begins from an airport some 7,000 feet above sea level. I think it is obvious that this great variation in altitude makes for increased cost in aircraft maintenance and in operation costs. I think it is obvious as well that we do not have great cities to be served, yet some of our small cities originate passengers in excess of the population of the city * * * or so to speak, everyone flies at least once and some more than once every year. A similar ratio in our great cities would present impossible numbers.

Do not let this comment on the rugged nature of the country indicate that it makes it impossible for the small airline to operate. Quite the contrary. The Frontier Airline using this particular area has a perfect safety record and completes well in excess of 95 percent of its scheduled flights. It has demonstrated its ability to serve this relatively isolated area; it has won the acceptance of the people as is shown by its steady increase in number of passengers, number of passenger miles, freight loadings and mail and express. It has shown also a steady decrease in the amount of subsidy required and permanency of its certificate would, I am convinced, give it the opportunity to reduce this dependency steadily in the future.

I should like to close by saying that it is my considered opinion that the local service airlines, the feeder lines, have ably vindicated the faith that gave them their start. They have grown enough and progressed enough down the road of service and solvency that they should be accepted as full members of our airline family. They have become important links between our small communities and the rest of this great Nation, and they have earned, by their enterprise and initiative, a right to permanency.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MACK].

Mr. MACK of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to join with my colleagues here today on the permanent certification legislation for local service airlines. I think that the local service airlines have done a remarkable job in rendering service to the small communities, communities under 100,000 population in the country. They have been very successful in their operations, and they are well respected by the various communities that they are operating in.

I am glad that it was suggested that we mention something about the benefits to the cities as far as this legislation is concerned. The cities are very much interested so that they can plan on a long-scale program for the development of airport facilities and for commerce into and out of the cities. It is quite beneficial to the cities to have this air service coming in both for air freight and passenger service, and they have made substantial contributions in assisting in the development of the local service airlines.

An important point to be made is the cost of recertification of your local airlines. The cost of recertification of an airline is great. It costs the individual airline usually in the neighborhood of $100,0000. It costs the Civil Aeronautics Board around $50,000 to $100,000. It costs the communities affected around $25,000 to $50,000. It is expensive. The taxpayers must pay for it. We, the Congress, are rendering a great service in encouraging the enactment of this permanent type of legislation. We will not only reduce the subsidies paid to the local service carriers but will also reduce the cost of operation of our Civil Aeronautics Board. Also we will reduce the cost to the cities receiving this service. I think we have made great progress with our local service airlines and with the airlines, in general. I believe air service is here to stay, and if it is here to stay, we should put it on a permanent basis. We should give a permanent certificate to the local service carriers so that they can plan ahead, so that they can procure equipment, and so they can guarantee their employees jobs for a definite period of time.

In this way the airlines can secure permanent employees and will be in a position to offer them security. They can operate on a sound basis and project their operation over a period of years in procuring new equipment. We do not like to be in a business we think we might be forced to terminate or sell out every 3-year period. That is the proposition the local airlines are faced with today.

The local service airline operating in the part of Illinois that includes my district has brought scheduled air service to several communities which previously did not have the benefit of this type of modern communication with the rest of the country. The improvement in the ability of residents of this area to expedite their mail, their freight, and their personal transportation has resulted in

a substantial increase in commercial activity throughout that region.

As a Member of the Congress I would like to emphasize one further feature of local air service which strikes me as particularly valuable in our overall efforts to increase the practical working of democracy. I refer to the increased ability of a Member of Congress to visit his constituency. We all know of the many demands that are made on the time of Members of Congress in this day and age and we all know of the time schedules under which we operate. We are at the same time equally conscious of the importance of visiting our constituency as frequently as possible so as to be as familiar with the current temper of the people whom we represent in the Congress as we possibly can. Local air service has greatly improved the ability of all of us to perform this service to the Congress and to our constituents better than we ever could before.

I would view with the greatest alarm, and so would my constituents, any suggestion that the local air service in our area is no more than temporary. We believe in my district that the soundness of the concept of local air transportation has been abundantly proved and its permanency demonstrated to be essential. It seems to me that the initial 3-year experimental and temporary certification period should be enough to prove the fitness, willingness, and ability of the individual carriers to perform the service in question in their respective regions. It seems to me also that requiring recurrent temporary certifications is expensive, unnecessary, and inefficient harassment of the carriers and I believe that permanent certification of all of them by legislative action in this session of the Congress is imperative.

So I appeal to the Members of the House to pass this bill so that we may have sound local air service operations and reduce subsidies as well as save the taxpayers money.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 401 (e) (2) of the act of June 23, 1938, as amended (49 U. S. C. 487 (e) (2); 52 Stat. 987), is amended by adding the following:

"(3) If any applicant who makes application for a certificate within 120 days after the enactment of this section shall show that, from the date of enactment of this section until the date of its application, it or its predecessor in interest, was an air carrier furnishing, within the continental limits of the United States, local or feeder service consisting of the carriage of persons, property, and mail, under a temporary certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Civil Aeronautics Board, continuously operating as such (except as to interruptions of service over which the applicant or its predecessors in interest have no control) the Board, upon proof of such fact only, shall, unless the service rendered by such applicant for such period was inadequate and inefficient, issue a certificate or certificates of unlimited duration, authorizing such applicant to engage in air transportation between the terminal and intermediate points within the continental limits of the United States between which it, or its predecessor, so continuously operated between the date of enactment of this section and the date of its application."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "(2) of the act of June 23," and insert in lieu thereof "of the Civil Aeronautics Act of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "(2)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after "adding" insert "at the end thereof."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, insert "date of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "section" and insert "paragraph."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "section" and insert "paragraph."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike out "for such period was" and insert "during the period since its last certification has been."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 17, strike "section" and insert "paragraph."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as has been stated by the members of our committee, we were unanimous in reporting this bill. However, I am not quite as convinced as some of the Members that the Board has adequate powers to regulate these companies.

In the first place, we must remember that we are conferring upon them franchises that will be worth millions of dollars. Of course, they could barter these franchises in the future.

It is true that under section 401 (h) of the act, upon petition or complaint or on its own initiative, after notice of hearing, the Board may alter, amend, modify, or suspend any such certificate in whole or in part if the public convenience or necessity so require, or may revoke any such certificate in whole or in part for intentional failure to comply with the act, the conditions of the certificate, and the rules and regulations of the Board.

With respect to the power of the Board to revoke, I have this fear, that it would be very difficult to prove a case of intentional violation.

With respect to the right to alter or modify in order to guarantee that the public would have adequate and efficient service, there have not been many decisions of the courts. The Board itself in Panagra Terminal Investigation (4 CAB 670) recognized certain definite limitations upon its powers to modify or alter the certificate so as to provide for better service. In the cases of *Western Airlines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board* (196 F. 2d 933) and *United Airlines* v. *Civil Aeronautics Board* (198 F. 2d 100) the courts recognized certain definite limitations.

Therefore, it seems to me there is a serious question as to whether or not the Board has adequate power under existing laws and the interpretations of those laws thus far made to insure that the public will continue to get efficient and adequate service.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PRIEST. I think what the gentleman is saying is certainly well taken, but the gentleman will agree, I believe, that the pending bill makes no change in the law in that respect.

Mr. DIES. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PRIEST. It would have to be done in separate amendments.

Mr. DIES. I agree with the committee that we ought to permanently certificate these companies. They have certainly demonstrated through a long period of time that they are entitled to certification. But the point I am making is that we may have to amend existing law in order to guarantee that these companies will not use their franchises in some areas solely to enrich themselves. I am not charging they will do it. But suppose there is an airline service that has borrowed some money, bought a lot of secondhand equipment, and gone into business. Then you give that company a valuable franchise. If that company's service in the future should not expand and develop to meet the needs of the communities it serves, there ought to be adequate power in the Board to revoke that certificate.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS. I have been listening with great interest to the gentleman's presentation. Does the gentleman mean that Congress has authorized some Board to give a franchise which becomes some sort of vested right that the Board and the Congress cannot then revoke or amend? That would be a serious situation.

Mr. DIES. No. I did not imply that Congress could not do it. What I am saying is that I am not convinced from my limited study of the decisions which have interpreted section 401 that the Board now has adequate power to insure

efficient and adequate service once the certificate is granted.

If I had time to discuss these decisions I think you would reach the same conclusion I have.

(At the request of Mr. HARRIS, and by unanimous consent, Mr. DIES was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I simply want to make it clear, and I know the gentleman intends to do so, that if section 401 (b) needs amending to grant the Board the additional authority, which the gentleman thinks is somewhat questionable, that it will apply to trunklines now operating just the same as it would apply to these lines which we are considering today.

Mr. DIES. That is true, but there is this difference, as I see it, and I do not claim to understand this subject as well as our distinguished chairman and those gentlemen who have served on the committee for many years—but there is this distinction between the trunklines and the feeder lines. The trunklines serve a much more profitable territory and they have every incentive and every reason to improve their service and to give the public the kind of service the public is entitled to. Whereas, in the case of feeder lines, or at least some of them, that are operating on a shoestring, or dependent upon subsidies for survival, I think you have a different situation. In the Panagra Terminal Investigation case decided by the Board, the Board while asserting its power to compel route extensions in appropriate circumstances, concluded that its authority does not include—and I now quote from the Board's decision:

> The addition of new service, which would be so extensive as to amount to a new air transportation route or of such a kind as to substantially change the character of the carriers' system.

Under the facts there presented, the Board concluded that the compulsory extension in issue would transform the essential character of the carrier's operation, that the Board was not and could not be authorized to compel such a change, and, accordingly, dismissed the proceedings.

In the cases that have dealt with certain specific phases of this question, the courts have recognized a very definite limitation, and we ought to be frank with the Congress that the circumscribed jurisdiction granted by section 401 may not afford the flexibility in making route readjustments and realinements which may be required by the public interest and that is offered by a periodic reexamination of a carrier's entire route in a proceeding involving renewal of a temporary certificate.

I merely want to call your attention to the present state of the decisions and the uncertainty with respect to whether or not the Board does have adequate power, because if it develops that some of these feeder lines become inefficient or inadequate, and we are asked by our constituents to do something about it, we may be compelled to amend the existing laws to give the Board adequate power. I believe it is the intention of the committee and of the Congress that these companies who are given these franchises are expected to render an efficient and adequate service and to improve their facilities.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. I yield.

Mr. PRIEST. I am sure the gentleman has properly stated the opinion of the committee and the feeling of the committee toward that particular question. May I state to the gentleman I am sure the very question he has brought up, and I think it is an important one, will be subsequently considered by the committee when we go into a full study of civil aviation policy. I think it should be considered. I think the gentleman has rendered a service in plainly stating those doubts with reference to the authority of the Board to the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. DIES. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think my colleague from Texas has raised an excellent point which deserves full consideration by the committee and the Congress, and I am sure that this discussion of that point has clarified the record of this debate and will be of great value in terms of the interpretation of this law, which I am sure will be passed with unanimous approval. However, I did note that Mr. John Floberg, chairman of the conference of local airlines, seemed to address himself to this matter in part, at least, in a letter which he sent to the committee and which is incorporated in the record, and which I question whether many of us have seen.

I would like to read into the RECORD two short paragraphs which I think bear upon the statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]:

> The argument was advanced at pages 62, 64, 66, and 68 of the printed record of last year's hearings and again in point 2 in Mr. Gurney's statement and frequently throughout the course of his questioning that one of the principal reasons for keeping certificates temporary was the desire of the Board to strengthen the routes of the local service carriers. Aside from the fact that section 401 (h) of the Civil Aeronautics Act adequately answers this point, it may be further pointed out that the history of the Board's actions in this respect inspires little confidence. In the first place you can count on the fingers of one hand—with fingers to spare—the number of route improvements of the local carriers which have been the result of spontaneous inspiration on the part of the Board in the course of a certificate renewal. Nearly all the route improvements have been the result of either a route case as such (e. g. the Fayetteville case as pointed out by Mr. Harris) or have been the result of the proof of public convenience and necessity by the carrier and other interested parties in the course of a renewal proceeding. This proof of public convenience and necessity could have just as well been made in a separate case as in the renewal itself and at considerable economy to all concerned. In any event, the carriers have had to prove to the Board their right to any such route modification.
>
> The Board's argument is also effectively answered both by its recent decision in the North Central Airlines application for a temporary exemption permitting service between Chicago and Duluth-Superior via Milwaukee and Green Bay and also by its decision in the route 106 case in which the Board dismembered a route which the chairman's own statement on page 12 calls a "local service route," divided it between two trunklines, and thereby destroyed the opportunity of either of the two local carriers to strengthen its route with what could have been the strongest segment in its entire system.

I hope that may be helpful in terms of legislative history.

Again I want to make a statement of my own conviction, having some knowledge of one of the local carriers involved that has done an excellent job, the Civil Aeronautics Board having admitted that it should be just about ready to receive permanent certification. I do not believe this legislation would be on this floor today if the Civil Aeronautics Board had done its duty. I think they have been stubborn and unrealistic and have forced us to do something that possibly some of us might have some reservations about in terms of individual carriers. I think the net result is justice and equity in terms of all these local carriers which have done a magnificent job in building up their routes and serving our many communities well.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to carry a little further the discussion presented by our esteemed colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES]. When we had former Senator Gurney, who was acting chairman of the Board at that time, before the committee, he expressed 4 reasons why a majority of the Board, 3 of them, took the position they did on this legislation. I would like to quote those reasons for you:

First. Permanent certification would lessen the incentive which these carriers now have to increase their revenues and hold down their costs;

Second. It would make more difficult the route systems of the several carriers;

Third. It would saddle the Government with an annual subsidy bill of over $20 million for the indefinite future; and

Fourth. The proportion of subsidy to total revenue is still too high, an average of 47 percent for all carriers, to warrant permanent certification of all carriers in the group.

Those are the four basic reasons given by the Board for their position, and in the discussions that followed the committee came to the conclusion that they were not as serious and they were not as justifiable as might seem on the surface.

The Board did not, except under questioning, have any feeling whatsoever about the problem which was brought to the committee here this afternoon by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. The nearest to that issue was "that it would make more difficult the improvement of the route system of the several carriers." But in the development of this point the Board's idea was that the

burden would be on the Board to show the modification or alteration of the route was necessary. The burden as it now stands is on the airline which is operating on the particular route.

I do not have the same apprehension that has been expressed. I do understand that under the act it is entirely possible that the statement made by the gentleman would be true; because, in the first place, we must consider the entire section 401. Section 401 (d) provides for the issuance of the certificate, and "that the Board shall authorize a certificate authorizing the whole or any part of the transportation covered by the application if it finds that the applicant is fit, able, and willing to perform such transportation properly and to conform to the provisions of this act and the rules and regulations and requirements of the Board hereunder, and that such transportation is required by the public convenience and necessity."

Section 401 (f) then provides for the terms and conditions of the certificate. This is why I say it may be that what the gentleman has said could be true, but under the procedure of the Board it is very unlikely that any such situation could arise.

What does this provide?—

Each certificate issued under this section shall specify the terminal points and intermediate points, if any, between which the air carriers authorized to engage in air transportation, and the service to be rendered; and there shall be attached to the exercise of the privileges granted by the certificate or amendment thereto such reasonable terms, conditions, and limitations as the public interest may require.

That is the certificate which is granted to the air carrier under which he must comply with all of its provisions, and so long as those reasonable terms and conditions are required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Chairman, in order that the gentleman may develop his point I ask unanimous consent that he may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Then the application on the action referred to under section 401 (h) of course may be invoked by the Board. It may or may not be the intention of the local air carrier, but he knows what the terms and conditions are; they are included in his certificate, and if he is unable to comply, then, under the terms of section 401 (h) I think the Commission has the authority, as stated here, to make such alterations and modifications of any route as they may find after investigation, as the public interest may require.

Consequently, I do not share the feeling that it is going to be necessary that the committee take this matter up and report additional legislation. But I say generally to my colleague and other members of the committee that if there are conditions, or if there are certificates under which the Board did not make the proper requirements, reasonable requirements to which they must comply, when the certificate was issued, then it may be necessary for the committee to see whether or not they are in the best interests.

I do not know if there are any such existing certificates or not, certainly our attention has not been called to any of them, but what this legislation does is to provide an additional subsection to the paragraph which says that within 120 days from the date of this application if any applicant who has been operating under a certificate has proven himself as operating in the public interest and complying with the provisions and the terms of his certificate, then he may come in and under such application get a permanent certificate in order that he may proceed to develop the route and develop his own company in the interest of the public and certainly the area that he is to serve.

Just one other point which I think is highly important here and about which nothing has been said. I do not believe the hearings reveal any information on it. Presently there have been a number of these renewal certificates under consideration. Public hearings have been held in various places throughout the United States. There are some scheduled to be heard in the future. Some of these hearings have been concluded and the examiner has made his report as to renewal of the certificate for a given airline.

It might be important to note here that should this bill become law, I assume it would make those proceedings unnecessary any further. I assume, and it is important, in order to change or modify any existing route, the Board then, if this becomes law, would have to, under the application of section 401 (h), on its own initiative determine whether or not any particular intermediate point might be suspended from service. There are a lot of them involved right today, there are a lot of them hanging in suspense on a number of these local carrier routes, and I think it might be important here to say that the Congress is relieving that suspense of those particular communities today. Then they would have an opportunity to make response to any contention of the Board that that intermediate point is not being served in the public interest.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. It has been pointed out that these local airlines and some of the communities that they serve have to go to a great deal of expense in going through the procedure of having these certificates renewed. It might also be pointed out that the Federal Government goes to a lot of administrative expense in considering these renewal certificates. I believe it was testified before our committee that on occasion it required some 18 months to 2 years for them to process certain of these applications and consider renewal certificates.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes. And some of them have been undergoing consideration for a longer period of time than that. I just thought this was an important point to be made to emphasize the importance of this legislation and that it should be passed immediately.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not delay the committee but for just a few minutes. First I want to say that in looking over this list of names of cities to be served, I find some 40 cities that are to be served in my native home State of California, and I know how much these permanent certificates will amount to these small airlines that are rendering this service and how much it will stabilize their financial position.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The cities that are listed are cities that are already being served, and I am sure that this list will even be increased.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I know they are served.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I mean, after these permanent certificates are granted.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I realize they are being served, but the granting of the certificates will stabilize that service and put them on a much sounder financial basis.

There are two other problems which I hope this committee will give attention to, which seem to me need attention, and I certainly do not profess to be an expert in this field. One is the amount of subsidy which is, in effect, being paid the major airlines in the field of airmail transportation. If I have been correctly informed, most of these large airlines are now receiving from 45 cents to possibly a little higher than that a pound for the transportation of airmail. I except, of course, some of these recent arrangements where, if space is available, nonairmail stamped envelopes are carried at a cheaper rate. However, I have also been informed that some of the freight lines have submitted bids to the Post Office Department offering to carry this mail at approximately 18 cents a pound.

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HESELTON. I have been very much interested in the elimination of subsidies as far as it is possible to eliminate them for a number of years. I must say that I am surprised at the gentleman's statement, because it is my understanding that the major airlines, for the most part, are off subsidy today, and if they are carrying mail for 45 cents a ton-mile, it is only compensation for the carrier. The committee has given a lot of attention to the matter of subsidy. I think a great deal of improvement has been made, and I am sure a great deal more will be made under the Presidential order known as No. 10 of last year.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am glad to have that information. I had been informed that that matter had been partly corrected, although, as I mentioned the fact, I knew that this Executive order had created a new service at a cheaper price.

There is another point that I would like to bring up, and that is the point of certificating transcontinental lines, competitive lines to those now in existence. If I have been correctly informed, since 1938 there have been no new transcontinental certificates granted; in fact, as I understand, by condensation there has been even a lesser number of operating airlines. I hope the committee will also give some attention to that, because in one case I know of a California company pioneered this air coach transportation which means a difference actually between here and Los Angeles of around $50 to $65 in price on a regular ticket of $165. There is some variance in the price of the nonscheduled lines, and even the scheduled lines have been forced, because of this competition, to give to the people this air coach service. I recently traveled to California on a DC-7, one of the latest and best type plans—I believe it was the American Airlines—for $115, where, if I had taken a regular flight on the same kind of plane, I would have paid $165. So, this air-coach transportation has brought air transportation to millions of people who could not afford the difference in price, and as far as I can see, it is also a great boon to the aircraft industry and the people as well. Certainly, competition in this field should not be curtailed nor should certificates be denied reputable and well-equipped firms to render this type of service. I know this is a complicated question, and I certainly do not have the answer for it, but I do hope that this committee in its future deliberations will give study to this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2225) to amend section 401 (e) (2) of the Civil Aeronautics Act, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 200, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 401 (e) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD on the bill just passed; and that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

ITALIAN IMMIGRATION, RESTRICTED BY LAW, IS BEING SUFFOCATED IN PRACTICE

Mr. LANE. 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. LANE. Mr. Speaker, our one-sided immigration laws, heavily weighted against southern Europeans, are responsible for much dissatisfaction within the United States, and are making us appear intolerant in the eyes of the world.

Under the guise of protecting the national security, they have become so narrow and harsh, both in theory and in application, they are playing right into the hands of the Communist propagandists.

And they are humiliating the very people who want to be our friends and allies.

Are these American principles and American practices?

Is this the way to win people to the cause of freedom?

No one disputes the need of reasonable security measures, but when the immigration laws are so slanted as to discriminate among peoples, the watching world may well question our code of justice and our security.

The quota system, conveniently pegged to immigration ratios that prevailed in the early part of this century, and in order to conform to certain prejudices, is an example of the favored nations treatment that exposes our immigration laws to the charge of hypocrisy.

Furthermore, they reflect the fears and hysteria of our times.

Violating the precept that no law should be retroactive, reaching back to plague and penalize a man for an offense that was committed before the law passed.

Let me cite an actual case.

A constituent of mine, who never became a citizen although he has lived most of his life in the United States, committed a crime over 40 years ago for which he served a term of imprisonment required by law. In the 37 or more years since, he has lived an exemplary life, working hard, raising a family, and investing several thousands of dollars from his modest earnings in United States war bonds.

Last year he made a pleasure trip to the old country, with a reentry permit issued by the United States Government in his pocket.

When he returned, he was detained by the immigration authorities in New York, and put on parole, pending the determination of exclusion proceedings.

All because of an offense that was committed and paid for long, long ago, and one that had no connection with communism or subversion.

Eventually, after much mental anguish prolonged by months of redtape, he was told that he would be allowed to return to his home in Massachusetts.

As he said to me: "I thought that by serving time for my offense, and having been on good behavior ever since, that I would never be placed in double jeopardy, but the immigration laws made me sweat it out for a while—all over again—37 years later."

This overstrict enforcement is putting fear into the hearts of many aliens who are beginning to wonder if the door that opens for them when they want to take a trip overseas will be shut in their faces when they come back.

The searching light of investigation should be turned not on innocent people but into the motives behind, and the operations of, the Immigration Act and the Refugee Relief Act.

When it comes to actual admissions, there is a strange flexibility in the figures.

One report states that out of 190,000 refugees authorized to enter the United States since the President signed the Refugee Relief Act over 18 months ago, less than 2,000 have been cleared for entrance. During the same period, more than 16,000 visas have been issued to relatives of American citizens.

On the other hand, the United States Embassy at Rome is quoted as having issued 16,394 visas under the refugee relief program, but only 289 of these went to persons who had escaped from behind the Iron Curtain.

The program originally called for the issuance of about 60,000 visas in Italy.

It is rumored that the Italian Government has implored our State Department to relieve the inhuman existence these refugees must endure while they are waiting.

The mystery is compounded by the forced departure of the man who was appointed by the United States Government to speed up refugee admissions.

Italy, with whom we share a deep and abiding friendship, is the chief victim of our shortsighted immigration policy and its maladministration.

Suffering from the pressures of overpopulation, and beset by Communist infiltration which thrives on human misery, Italy looks to us for hope and mutual assistance only to be frustrated by a quota blockade that is deceitful, outmoded, and without mercy.

A foreign policy without compassion for liberty-loving people who desperately seek a haven here is stubbornly rejecting its greatest asset.

We realize of course, that we cannot accommodate all of the people who would like to live in the United States, for then we would be overwhelmed by a tidal wave of humanity seeking sanctuary in the new world.

This is no reason, however, for going to the other extreme by drawing the

immigration curtain tight with fear-ridden laws that ill-conceal their racial bias.

Revision of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 rates top priority.

Its ancient quotas and restrictions should be illustrated in a museum where naturalized Americans of the future may pause to wonder why some Americans of 1955 were so distrustful of freedom, and so afraid of themselves.

INDUSTRY: THE MOUNTAIN WEST'S MIRROR OF THE FUTURE

Mr. HOSMER. 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 California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, future prosperity in the intermountain West is dependent not upon the enlargement of agricultural production but upon the development of industry.

This region—the States of Colorado, Utah, Wyoming and parts of New Mexico and Arizona—is essentially a water-short area.

Conversely, this region is unbelievably rich in other natural resources. Within it lie the largest coal deposits in the country, perhaps in the world. There are great reservoirs of oil and natural gas, mountains of oil shale, and deposits of uranium whose size has not yet been determined. There are large amounts of nonferrous metals, and there are gold, silver, copper, lead, zinc, molybdenum, vanadium, phosphate, gilsonite, limestone and many other minerals.

These are the measure of its future potential.[1]

The water resources of this area are of measurable quantity, and their potential benefits to agriculture can be defined. On the other hand, the benefits which these limited water supplies can bring to a program of industrial expansion are immeasurable. It can only be said that they would be of unlimited value.

An unbiased examination of the comparative benefits of agricultural and industrial expansion in the intermountain States leaves no question as to which course should be followed in the interests of both the local and national economy.

Irrigation is a very uneconomic user of water.[2]

The value of crops grown under western irrigation is equal to about 10 cents for each 1,000 gallons of water withdrawn. The value of manufactured products amounts to about $5 for each 1,000 gallons withdrawn.[3]

Manufacturing produces about 50 times as many dollars of products with the same amount of water used by irrigation.

Furthermore, the consumptive use of water by irrigation is 5 or 10 times as great as for manufacturing.

[1] David D. Moffatt, Jr., vice president, Utah Power & Light Co., Senate hearings on S. 500, March 1955.

[2] President's Materials Policy Commission, vol. 5, p. 85.

[3] Ibid.

Suppose, then, that water needs of western cities and industries should become more urgent. In such case, a great part of the crops now irrigated could be produced from lands in the East reclaimed by clearing and drainage in areas of adequate rainfall.[4]

What proponents of more and bigger reclamation projects do not admit is that by using the comparatively small water resources of the intermountain area for costly irrigation projects they are placing an impenetrable ceiling on the development of the area.

There cannot be both agricultural and industrial expansion to any great degree in this arid mountainous part of the United States.

The question to be answered is:

What do the people of the intermountain West want:

(a) A comparatively small and expensive agricultural expansion?

(b) A virtually unlimited industrial expansion?

An obvious disservice is being done the people of the intermountain States by the Reclamation Bureau, which advocates the unlimited use of available water for agricultural development. The Reclamation Bureau's plans do not take into consideration the possibilities of industrial expansion, yet it is upon industrial expansion that the hope of this region rests.

The fact that the Reclamation Bureau is not concerned with creating new industries may be understandable, but there is no justification for a branch of the Federal Government to promote a program within its own field to the detriment and possible destruction of better and more profitable programs in other fields.

If we are to be realistic as well as honest, we must face the fact that the Reclamation Bureau's program is selfish. It would, if followed, serve to perpetuate jobs with the Bureau and create a few new farms at enormous cost, while wiping out the chance to create large-scale employment in industrial developments.

The outstanding example of what the Reclamation Bureau proposes for the intermountain region is found in the plans of the proposed $1.6 billion upper Colorado River project. This project has the support of groups in Wyoming, Colorado, Utah, and New Mexico whose philosophy is based upon getting all possible out of the Federal Treasury now without regard for cost, justification, or long-range benefits. It also has the support of the reclamation-at-any-price school, as well as the national and regional office holders considering political advantages.

The upper Colorado River project as approved recently by the Senate Interior Committee calls for the construction of six immense storage reservoirs. If these reservoirs were built, six great lakes would be created. The evaporation losses of these great lakes would be enormous, conservatively more than 1 million acre-feet of water a year from the Colorado River system.

[4] Ibid.

That is valuable water lost forever. It is not water lost after being used. It is water lost through a wasteful and unnecessary program.

This is the reason. The great reservoirs in the upper Colorado River project are not storage lakes from which water would be drawn for beneficial consumptive use in irrigation. With a single exception, these immense artificial lakes, filling deep canyons for hundreds of miles, would be built to produce hydroelectric power.

The power produced would be sold at a high rate to pay for the participating irrigation projects of the upper Colorado scheme—more than 30 in all.

The Reclamation Bureau has told Congress that the proposed irrigation projects could not pay for themselves and must be subsidized by power revenues.[5] These revenues otherwise would be returned to the Treasury of the United States, thereby helping to decrease the national debt. But under the upper Colorado project proposal they would be spent to pay for totally impractical and infeasible irrigation projects.

As presently planned, the upper Colorado River project would mean a loss to the Nation's taxpayers of more than $4 billion.[6]

This great loss of valuable water and money need not occur. It could be avoided by the use of fossil fuels to produce electric power as required to meet the demands of this area. Steam plants could be built for a small part of the cost of the immense hydropower dams. In most cases, the steam plants could be built immediately upon, or adjacent to, adequate coal fields.

It is difficult to discover any justification for the building of new irrigation projects in the upper basin of the Colorado River. An analysis of the factors involved produces no convincing evidence in defense of the upper Colorado River project plan, unless it be political expediency.

Here are the factors:

First. The subsidy for the irrigation projects would amount to about $5,000 an acre.[7]

Second. With a full water supply the land would be worth $150 to $200 per acre.[8]

Third. More agricultural production, especially at this enormous expense, is not justified in the face of the immense food and fiber surpluses in this country

[5] Hearings, S. 500, Senate Interior Committee, March 1955.

[6] Raymond Moley, What Price Irrigation? American Enterprise Association, Washington, D. C., 1955. Samuel B. Morris, general manager Los Angeles Department of Water and Power, hearings, S. 500, March 1955.

[7] Samuel B. Morris, hearings, H. R. 270, House Interior Committee, March 1955. Raymond Matthew, chief engineer, Colorado River Board, hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, March 1955, Senate and House Interior Committees. Raymond Moley, supra. Oklahoma Expenditures Council, The Last Drop, March 1955.

[8] Hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, supra.

which the taxpayers have already subsidized at great cost.[9]

Fourth. The land to be irrigated lies at high altitudes with an extremely short growing season. Some of it has frost most of the year.[10]

Fifth. The farmers benefiting would be required to repay only a very small percent of the costs allocated to irrigation units of the project.[11]

There is little industry and manufacturing in the States in which the upper Colorado River project would be located. In Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, and New Mexico there are a total of approximately 115,000 persons engaged in manufacturing activities.[12] This amounts to about one twenty-eighth of the total population.

The political leaders of these States who are living only for the present recognize the significance of these figures. Translating them into terms of votes, they understand the value of proposals like the upper Colorado project. Such a project means enormous gifts of money and water; it means some brief boom times for a few towns; it means an influx of craftsmen and laborers; it means some more farms in the desert; it means a temporary era of wild spending; it means a successful raid on the Treasury of the United States.

Considering such a proposition in the light of cold analysis, it must be realized that the final results would be drastically different.

The enormous gifts of money and water would be made at the expense of the taxpayers of all States, and the generosity of these taxpayers is swiftly reaching a breaking point.

In the past, costly and infeasible reclamation projects got through Congress largely because the people of the East did not understand them, were unaware of their immense hidden costs, and did not take the trouble to investigate or study them. That situation no longer prevails, as reclamation-State Members of Congress are finding out.

No economy is improved by boom and bust. The boom that would ensue with the construction work of the proposed upper Colorado project would one day vanish into the clear mountain air. Only ruins built upon false standards would remain.

The craftsmen and laborers, the auxiliary itinerants, the peddlers, poets, and prostitutes, who would pour into the construction areas would suddenly fold their tents and fade away into another desert, leaving nothing good. They would not have been in one place long enough to vote.

The new farms would not be beneficial additions to the national economy. Most of what they would produce would be more surplus for the taxpayers to buy. There would be nobody to eat it. The farmers themselves would be living only at the mercy of the Bureau of Reclamation. The Bureau would be, in turn, eating on the financial structure of the Nation. It would not be a pretty picture of rural prosperity and plentitude, for over it all would hang the depressing cloud of insecurity, and underneath it would be a crumbling foundation of false economy.

The temporary era of wild spending would bring just that and nothing more, except a lingering hangover during which the pain of foolish dreams would throb in the heads of the deluded people.

The raid on the Treasury would be both successful and real, and throughout the country the taxpayers would bend under an increased burden, paying tribute to a fiscal monster they had in their blindness permitted to grow, and paying penance for a crime they did not intend to commit.

The potential thermal power resources of the intermountain area are beyond comprehension. In the heart of such a land, the Bureau of Reclamation—and the States themselves—want to adopt a philosophy and a practice that would undermine their road ahead and cripple, perhaps forever, their opportunities to create an industrial economy that has no foreseeable limit.

The proponents of this misguided philosophy which is based solely on the utilization of water resources and ignores the greater potentialities of other resources, maintain that a point will be reached after which Federal assistance may be reduced. There is no indication now that such a thing will happen, unless it is forced by aroused taxpayers. Federal agencies have spent about $5 billion for interior water projects in the past, contemplate at least 10 times that amount for the future, with about one-half already definitely planned.[13]

For instance, a glance at some projects now before the Congress indicates the enormity of the Bureau of Reclamation's planned program. The proposed upper Colorado River project would cost about $1,600,000,000 to construct; the central Arizona project would cost more than $780 million; and the Missouri River project will cost between five and six billion dollars. In these three projects alone there is an estimated construction cost of at least $7.3 billion, about one and one-half times as much as has been spent on all interior Federal water development in the past century.

No longer is Federal participation only a stimulus for regional development; in many respects, it is also a gigantic relief program in which funds obtained from all citizens directly benefit only a few.[14]

On the very top of the largest coalfields in the world, variously estimated to contain between 400 and 800 billion tons, the advocates of water-power-development-at-any-cost want to build gigantic projects that inflict enormous new loads on the taxpayers of the Nation and rob the United States Treasury of immense amounts of income that by all sound fiscal standards is due it.

On this subject, the Engineers Joint Council states:[15]

> Every diversion of power revenues to amortize part of the cost of other works is in effect a subsidy. Waiver of interest on money expended in the construction of Federal irrigation projects is also a subsidy. It is inevitable that even greater subsidies to irrigation will be required in the future if agricultural production in the western half of the United States is to be increased materially.
>
> As each Federal subsidy must be offset by taxes levied on all the people of the United States, it follows that the benefits to be derived from subsidizing irrigation agriculture should be compared with the benefits which would accrue from the expenditure of like sums to increase agricultural production by any other means or at any other location in the United States.
>
> It is essential to the carrying out of a sound national water policy that each subsidy, regardless of the source of its payment, be recognized and authorized by Congress. "Hidden subsidies for the benefit of particular regions or class of beneficiaries cannot be in the best interest of the Nation."[16]

Steam plants to provide electrical energy in the intermountain States could be built by private capital, with no Federal tax money or subsidy involved. These would create new employment in the coal fields and in the industries that would build to take advantage of the power available. A sound stone would be placed in the foundation of the area's economy by each plant and each new job. And the steam plants, the new industries, and those employed by them all would pay taxes to the local, State and Federal Governments.

But what would the irrigation units proposed as part of the upper Colorado River project, for instance, contribute to the local or national economy? To begin with they would have to be built at Federal expense and subsidized by the taxpayers of all States.

As an example, the comparatively small Seedskadee project in Wyoming may be cited. Here is the Bureau of Reclamation's own report on it:

Acres to be irrigated	60,720
Estimated construction cost	$23,272,000
Repayment by water users	4,785,000
Subsidized by power revenues from upper Colorado River project dams	18,487,000

The irrigated lands in this project would be utilized primarily for the support of livestock enterprises, particularly dairy cows and sheep—grasses for hay and pasture, small grain, alfalfa and some garden crops would be produced.

---

[9] Raymond Moley, supra. Representative JOHN P. SAYLOR, How Can America Best Provide Food and Fiber For Its Future Population? Washington 1955. Leslie A. Miller, member Hoover Commission, hearings H. R. 270, House Interior Committee, March 1955. Evan T. Hewes, president Imperial Irrigation District, hearings S. 500, Senate Interior Committee, March 1955. Samuel B. Morris, supra.

[10] Hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, supra. Bureau of Reclamation reports, hearings S. 500, supra.

[11] Hearings S. 500 and H. R. 270, supra. Bureau of Reclamation testimony, hearings S. 500, supra.

[12] Bureau of the Census, 1953 Annual Survey of Manufacturers, Washington, D. C.

[13] President's Materials Policy Commission, supra, p. 91.

[14] President's Materials Policy Commission, supra, p. 91.

[15] Principals of a Sound National Water Policy, July 1951.

[16] Quotes supplied.

The Bureau says that 9,030 acres would be suitable chiefly for pasture and that of the remaining 51,690 acres only a small proportion is first class land—most of it is third to fifth class land.[17]

The value of the irrigated land would be about $70 per acre.[18]

Increase in the national debt per acre—taxpayers' subsidy—would amount to approximately $2,200.

Total subsidy would be about $133,500,000.

The Seedskadee project is an average participating irrigation unit of the proposed upper Colorado River project. The subsidy for other units would run from a high of $4,700 per acre for the Central Utah project to $1,250 per acre for the LaBarge project.

Thus, it may be seen that the Reclamation Bureau is proposing to build the Seedskadee project, with a subsidy of $133,500,000 to produce more butter, milk, cheese, and garden truck a few months of the year on land that is largely third to fifth class in quality.

On some of the other participating irrigation projects the Bureau frankly admits that the water users can pay nothing, but get the entire project as a gift from the Federal taxpayers. On other units the beneficiaries would repay 1, 2, perhaps 3 percent. On a few they would repay 10 percent.

The Lyman project, with a subsidy of $58 million would be able to produce only hay and pasture because it lies at an altitude of 7,000 feet and suffers from untimely summer frosts.[19]

Pointing out that the intermountain area was extremely rich in fuels and minerals, Miller told Congress:[20]

There are many, and I am one of the group, who believe the ultimate destiny of the region is involved in the development of those minerals. Haste in tying down the water to irrigation of marginal agricultural land could seriously impede industrial development which would depend upon the use of large amounts of water.

It is interesting to consider the difference between industry and irrigation farming in the matter of capital requirements to provide a family with a living. * * * An average investment of $13,300 in an industrial manufacturing plant will provide 1 man with a job. * * * An experiment farm on one of the Missouri Basin irrigation units in Nebraska indicates that a capital investment by the Government and the farmer of $99,200 is required for 160 acres in that area to provide the farm family with a net income of $3,600 per annum.

In the upper Colorado area the required farm investment would average more than double that figure.

Thus, if Federal subsidy is required for the development of the Colorado River Basin, it would appear to be much wiser to consider all types of resource development, and not put all of our money on marginal agriculture.[21]

The United States Geological Survey estimates that coal reserves in the States of Colorado, Wyoming, New Mexico, and Utah amount to 374,641,000,000 tons.[22]

This is a conservative estimate of identifiable reserves. Actual reserves are probably much greater. For instance, with regard to Colorado, the Survey states:[23]

No estimates were made for parts of the State where coal is perhaps present, but specific information was lacking. As more mapping and exploratory drilling is carried on in the coal-bearing areas of Colorado, the estimate of reserves should be substantially increased.

The spread of the coalfields in these States is tremendous. Coal lies beneath 25,400 square miles of Colorado, or 24 percent of the State's area. New Mexico has coal beneath 14,650 square miles, or 12 percent of its area. In Utah there is coal beneath 15,000 square miles, or 18 percent of the State. In Wyoming there is coal under 40,055 square miles, or 41 percent of the State's area.[24]

Another indication as to how conservative is the report of the Geological Survey is found in this statement:[25]

Of the 25,400 square miles of coal-bearing land believed to be present in the State (Colorado), only 5,277 square miles, or 20 percent, was included in the estimate. Although the coal probably almost completely underlies several large basin areas, such as the Denver Basin and the Uinta Basin, the data used to compile the estimates were restricted for the most part to areas within 6 miles or less of the coal outcrops.

At recent hearings before the Senate and House on the proposed upper Colorado River project several witnesses testified to the advantages of supplying needed power in the area with coal steam power instead of waterpower.

Conservationist David R. Brower addressed himself in this regard to Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams, two storage units of the proposed project. He said:[26]

It seems well worth considering, for example, what would happen if power from coal were substituted for Echo Park and Split Mountain Dams' hydropower in the course of the Bureau's proposed payout period. There would be a saving of $147 million over the 44 years, and a market would have been provided for some 35 million tons of upper-basin coal, which could conceivably be pumped to the powerplants through a pipeline.

There might be similar savings in substituting coal and coal mining elsewhere in the Bureau's project. This could be a boon to upper-basin mining economy 2 years from now, not 20 years or so.

Brower further stated:[27]

Senator MILLIKIN. Make it clear to me how burning coal for power will provide any revenue for building participating areas.

Mr. BROWER. What it provides is a differential in the resource of the basin as a whole. You would be using coal, yes, instead of falling water. The coal is there in predictable amounts. It employs people in obtaining it and in transporting it. Even allowing for that in the course of the 44 years of the proposed payout for Echo Park, you would be $149 million better off in the total economy."

Brower also testified:[28]

Steam plants take far less time to build, are not involved in the controversy as to whether the dams could provide power in dry years. Furthermore, they could help the unemployed upper basin coal miners.

Estimates on steam-plant costs are more reliable than dam-cost estimates and the waterpower may actually cost more than estimated.

It appears that Federal hydropower from Echo and Split Mountain Dams would cost both the taxpayers and the power users substantially more than Federal steam power. Private utility steam power would cost the power users a little more than the proposed hydropower, but would cost the taxpayers a great deal less.

The 1.4 mill difference between a 7.4 mill private-utility price and a 6-mill kilowatt-hour Federal hydroplant price would cost the power users an extra $2,320,000 per year, which is hardly enough to cause the users financial distress and is less than private steam plants would pay in income and property taxes. In order to save the upper basin power users this small extra power bill the United States taxpayers as a whole are being asked to provide the following subsidies:

1. Pay $2,565,000 per year of additional income and property taxes otherwise paid by the steam-plant utility companies.

2. Sacrifice one of the most scenic canyon parks in the world to become just another reservoir.

3. Increase the national debt unnecessarily by $282 million minus the cost of the same water storage at other sites.

4. Run the risk of an enormous investment which FPC data indicate may not have enough water to run the turbines.

5. Wait for a 6-year, or longer, construction job when steam plants can be built in less than half the time, and as needed, instead of being based on uncertain long-range predictions.

6. Run the risk that the dams may cost far more than estimated. It was stated in the recent upper basin hearings in the House that the Bureau's past project costs have averaged twice their original estimates. If the cost went up only 30 percent the Bureau's power price would have to go to about 8 mills, or the public would have to increase the subsidy another $80 million.

7. The Bureau's proposed 6-mill price is 0.2 mill below their admitted cost, or about $330,000 per year loss. They plan to offset this with cheaper Glen Canyon Dam power, but it is still an admitted loss for the Split Mountain increment of power generation.

8. Potential relief for unemployed upper basin coal miners is ignored.

Mr. BROWER. This is the table which shows the total saving in 44 years:

(1) Echo Park, Split Mountain hydro, per kilowatt-hour at market (mills)	6 2
(2) Equivalent, steam-generated (mills)	4.9
(3) Saving, with steam alternative, per kilowatt-hour (mills)	1.3
(4) Echo-Split annual generation, billion kilowatt-hours (mills)	1.66
(5) Annual savings in operating and investment costs, steam over hydro	$2,158,000
(6) For 44 years, rounded	95,000,000

[17] Leslie A. Miller, chairman Hoover Task Force on Reclamation, hearings H. R. 270, House Interior Committee, March 1955.

[18] Highest value of general farm land as shown in USBR reports.

[19] Bureau of Reclamation Report.

[20] Leslie A. Miller, supra, March 1955.

[21] Miller is a former Governor of Wyoming.

[22] Circular 293, Coal Resources of United States, October 1953.

[23] Ibid., p. 19.

[24] Ibid, p. 14.

[25] Ibid, p. 19.

[26] Hearings, Senate Interior Committee, S. 500, March 1955, p. 653.

[27] Ibid, p. 654.

[28] Ibid, p. 656.

(7) Interest subsidy saved taxpayers by earlier retirement of irrigation allocation to participating projects, at 2½ percent	$52,000,000
(8) Total savings, 44 years	147,000,000

Former Governor Miller, of Wyoming, spoke to the Wyoming State Legislature in March 1955 on the subject of the proposed upper Colorado River project, and used Echo Park Dam, a key unit of that project, to illustrate the disparity between costs of steam and hydro power.

Pointing out that the plan for the dam called for the production of 200,000 kilowatts of hydroelectric power, Miller said:

This dam is estimated to cost $176,426,000. As it is strictly a power producer, the said cost would be at the rate of $883 per kilowatt.

At Denver, Colo., there is a steam-electric plant at present being enlarged to a capacity of 232,000 kilowatts and the cost is $168 per kilowatt. At Salt Lake City, Utah, there is also a steam-electric plant under enlargement to a total capacity of 241,000 kilowatts at a cost of $166 per kilowatt. By which you will see that to secure hydroelectric power from Echo Park would involve the payment of over $700 per kilowatt more than is necessary.

In the general area of Echo Park, there are hundreds of millions of tons of coal which could readily be mined for around 75 cents per ton by stripping methods and under $3 per ton by underground mining. It is a proven fact that a steam plant located at or near the source of fuel, thus avoiding high transportation costs, and equipped with modern high pressure generating machinery can manufacture energy at very close to the cost of hydroelectric power. In this particular case, you will recognize that the use of coal would provide considerable employment in an industry which is woefully depressed.

* * * * *

Under current procedures, the sale rate on power at a Federal dam must include 3-percent interest on the construction cost. The interest on Echo Park would be then $5,295,000 annually. The interest on the $35 million it would cost to build a steam plant would be $1,050,000 per annum, a difference over 50 years of $212,250,000. A 200,000-kilowatt steam plant would consume 500,000 tons of coal per year—if it cost $2 per ton to mine, average, that would be $50 million over 50 years. Add that cost to the interest, if you wish, and you still have a figure of $110 million in favor of the steam plant.

Testifying on the upper Colorado River project, Samuel B. Morris stated: [29]

It appears most unfortunate that the Congress should be asked to approve a billion and a half dollar project involving hidden costs to the taxpayer of the order of $4 billion, through accumulated interest costs under the Collbran formula. This at a time when Congress is awaiting the recommendations of the Hoover Commission which it, itself, created, and the report of the Cabinet Water Policy Committee named by the President. Both of these are expected to make specific recommendations regarding methods of determining feasibility, financing, and repayment of Federal water projects.

* * * * *

As one directing the management of a large city-owned public power enterprise serving more than 2 million people I cannot refrain from recording my objection to the setting up of these large water storage-power projects on the main stems of the Colorado River, not for the purpose of furnishing power at low rates but for the primary purpose of serving as cash registers for the collection of excessive rates for a hidden subsidy for the so-called participating projects. This is an assortment of irrigation projects in which the irrigators are able to repay little more than 10 percent of their cost in 50 years, without interest.

Morris pointed out to the committee that the Bureau of Reclamation proposed to charge an artificially high rate of 6 mills to consumers for power from the upper Colorado River project, and to continue this charge for decades after the power investment had been returned with interest in order that a subsidy may be provided for at least 100 years to pay for irrigation projects which otherwise could not be built.

He asked the question: Why should power users be called upon to pay this high rate for a century in an area that is one of the greatest sources of thermal energy production to be found anywhere in the world?

Said Morris:

Steam-produced power is being furnished to the Atomic Energy Commission at around four mills. Why should the people in the Mountain States sitting on this enormous potential energy be called upon to pay a 50 percent higher rate for the next 100 years?

In no other section of the United States as in the intermountain area are fuel reserves so large and developments so small.

Obviously the time will come when these fuel reserves must be tapped. When that time arrives, the location of the reserves will be of secondary consideration. Now we look upon them as far removed from the centers of population and industry, but when they are needed, geography will be merely a problem in logistics. It will be swiftly and efficiently solved.

The intermountain States would do well to consider this problem now. When the resources they possess are needed by other sections of the country, then those resources will be transported to the points where they will be consumed. In a very large measure, that need not happen. The intermountain States could very well launch a program of using their full resources at home, and transporting manufactured products to points of consumption.

In such a program lies the hope of these States for an expanding and profitable economy.

[29] Hearings, Senate Interior Committee, S. 500, March 1955. Morris is a former president of American Society of Civil Engineers, former dean of engineering at Stanford University, member of President's Water Resources Policy Commission, and at present general manager and chief engineer of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, on April 1 the Congress received from the President a message urging an increased tempo to speed completion of the Inter-American Highway. Last week's request for supplemental appropriations included an item to put this program into effect. I wish to endorse the President's action wholeheartedly. I think it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of this highway, extending, as it does, from the southern border of the United States to the Panama Canal Zone, linking the nations of Central America.

Last November and December Mrs. Bow and I traveled portions of the Inter-American Highway during our visit to Central America. We visited the Republics of Panama, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Honduras, and El Salvador. In each of these countries we had an opportunity to see the highway firsthand and to discuss with the people of the countries and with United States officials and businessmen in the area what the completion of the highway would mean to them. Everywhere the answer was the same—completion of the highway would open new vistas for political cooperation and economic progress.

For almost 20 years Congress has appropriated funds for this highway. However, the rate of appropriation has meant that the benefits to both the United States and our good partners in Central America have not been fully realized. Under present authorizations many more years will go by before the highway becomes an effective reality. Economic, political, strategic considerations affecting both the United States and Central America tell us plainly that we cannot and should not afford to waste those years. Instead, we should, this session of Congress, take the action which the President has requested and which will mean that within 3 years an all-weather highway will extend, without interruption, from our southern border to the Panama Canal Zone.

I do not have to remind the Members of this Congress of the inroads which international communism was able to make in Central America recently. A good deal of their success resulted from the fact that although the countries of the area are contiguous, they lack easy, inexpensive land communication which would have afforded the people of each of the countries an opportunity to discuss their mutual problems. The highway, whose completion the President is strongly urging, will draw together the peoples of Central America. Through personal contact they will be able to spot more quickly subversive activities taking place. They will also be able to act in concert to defeat that force of evil which is international communism.

In addition to the political benefits which will accrue, the highway also will play an important part in the economic development of the countries of Central America. Increased trade, increased tourism, increased exchange of information—all these will come from the establishment of inexpensive, land transportation facilities. This economic development will contribute to the social betterment of the people of the area and lead to a higher standard of living.

One other factor which I would like to call to the attention of the Members of Congress is the fact that we are not building this highway alone. Thus far, about $90 million has been committed to the construction of the Inter-American Highway. Of this total, $40 million, or almost 50 percent, has been made available by the countries through which the highway will pass. In this connection it is well to recall that the 1,618 miles of highway which extend from our border to the southern border of Mexico have been completed and fully paid for by the Mexican Government alone.

The amount of funds which the President's letter indicates will be necessary to complete this highway in the next 3 years is small in relation to the large sums with which this Congress frequently deals. But the benefits, both to us and to our good partners in Central America, are indeed large. And accordingly I urge that we delay no longer; that we act promptly to permit rapid completion of an all-weather highway which will connect the republics of Central America and our country.

PROPOSED AWARD TO DR. SALK

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the most exciting event of the week—in years, in fact—is the announcement that the polio vaccine developed by Dr. Jonas Salk will be 90 percent effective in protecting against infantile paralysis. This must surely go down in history as ranking with the discoveries of Pasteur, Koch, Lister, Walter Reed, and Curie. The achievement of Dr. Salk is being applauded increasingly every day by prominent people all over the world and millions of parents will be forever grateful to the good doctor for the safety of their children.

President Eisenhower has announced his intention of recommending Dr. Jonas Salk as the first recipient of a proposed new honor to be the highest this country can confer for civilian achievement. The President in his state of the Union message recommended the establishment of such a new system of honoring those who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country. He said:

> In the advancement of the various activities which will make our civilization endure and flourish, the Federal Government should do more to give official recognition to the importance of the arts and other cultural activities. I shall recommend the establishment of a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation. I shall also propose that awards of merit be established whereby we can honor our fellow citizens who make great contributions to the advancement of our civilization and of this country.

On March 1 I introduced a bill carrying out the President's recommendations, and on March 17 I revised it somewhat to include, as well, major recommendations made by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., in a brilliant speech on foreign policy before the National Press Club in Washington on February 28.

Concern is being increasingly expressed these days regarding the role that the Federal Government is playing, or should play, in the Nation's cultural affairs. At the same time there is a growing restiveness being displayed over the cultural status of the Nation's Capital. The question is being asked: Is Washington a hick town or a world capital? An article in the New York Times magazine of April 17, 1955, is a case in point. This article is by Richard H. Rovere, who regularly writes the Letter From Washington for the New Yorker magazine. The title of his article is: "Hick Town or World Capital?—Washington, for This Observer, Is a Mixture of Both, a Global Center, Yet Parochial."

One may wonder, and many people do, Mr. Rovere declares, if much has not been lost as a result of having the Capital of the United States in a community that is exclusively political, or bureaucratic, and therefore by definition, parochial.

> Washington's parochialism bothers some visitors, but it does not upset them half as much as it does the more or less permanent residents. They criticize the city endlessly. It is dull, they say. It lacks culture. It is metropolitan without being cosmopolitan. It is a world capital with very little of the world in it. Anyone will tell you that it is a small town at heart (but don't they say that about every city?) and some describe it as a hick town—

Mr. Rovere says.

The President's recommendations to the Congress in his message on the state of the Union, if implemented, will be a long step forward in giving the Nation's Capital and the Federal Government its proper role in cultural affairs, and it was with this in mind that I introduced my bill, H. R. 5040.

Mr. Rovere goes on to say that—

> Washingtonians grouse about not having enough theater, no opera, no ballet, too little music, too little conversation of an elevating sort. Not much philosophy, they say, is talked there, not much poetry is written or read, there are several museums but hardly any painters of the first order. There are a couple of large universities, but they are not Ivy League or Columbia or Chicago or Berkeley. You don't get in Washington much of the stimulation that a leavening of academics can bring to a city.
>
> The discontent seems endless. Washington people are always running down their own restaurants, grousing about their shops, expatiating on the poor quality of local architecture. Those who acknowledge culture to be more than theater, music, academies, eating places, and the rest even go so far, at times, as to complain about the lack of industry. The point seems to be that industry is an essential element of modernity and an assurance of human diversity.

Mr. Rovere is an accurate observer as well as being a fine reporter and he is right about the main source of the criticism. We find that long-time resident of Washington, W. M. Kiplinger, reporting in his book, Washington Is Like That, published in 1942, for instance:

> Despite the wealth of national tradition attached to Washington, there is very little native culture. The city has never been a notable breeding place for art, or music, or literature. Unlike other great capitals of world thought, such as prewar London and Vienna and Paris, where the native-born leaders of the cities shaped the intellectual patterns which influenced the Nation, Washington as a city has no homegrown culture. Its influence in cultural matters is not by Washington, but rather via Washington. Whatever culture there is here was started elsewhere and brought in and pasted on.

Who is to blame, where does the fault lie, for the present cultural status of the Nation's Capital which is providing such a propaganda bonanza for the U. S. S. R. and the Communist Parties of the world who charge us in their richly financed cultural offensives with being "gumchewing, materialistic barbarians"? Brooks Atkinson, drama critic of the New York Times thinks he has found the villain in the piece. It is the various arms of the Federal Government that are to blame, he declares. He recently wrote:

> The most essential thing that art needs is freedom. Without freedom it is like the art of Soviet Russia or that of Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. It is dead at the core. In the last 10 years the assaults on freedom by various arms of the Government and the public acceptance of this disastrous program have convinced me that in America we cannot expect the Government to leave art unregulated if it pays any of the bills.

I pointed out to Mr. Atkinson that his concern is shared at the highest levels of the Federal Government. Not only have leaders in the House and Senate expressed their concern but President Eisenhower and Chief Justice Warren have spoken out. The President, for instance, recently sent a message to the Museum of Modern Art on its 25th anniversary saying that—

> There is an important principle which we should ever keep in mind—the principle that freedom of the arts is a basic freedom, one of the pillars of liberty in our land.

Others have been specific in assessing the responsibility for the situation in Washington. In an article which appeared in the April issue of the Art News magazine, Charlotte Devree wrote in part as follows:

> Between sculptors (mostly members of the tightly governed and mainly academic group of sculptors who have formed the National Sculpture Society) who regularly get Government commissions, and sculptors who do not, there is a complex mechanism of suave Washington officialdom, with the Commission of Fine Arts its central cog. This is the machinery by which so many monumental sculptural errors are achieved; agencies that choose the architects, who usually serve the Neo-Classic tradition and who chose the sculptors, submit all plans to the Commission of Fine Arts for approval. In effect the Commission has life-or-death jurisdiction over the design of all Federal buildings and their decoration in this country, except those of the Treasury and the armed services; over all monuments in Washington parks and all local Government buildings in Washington;

over private buildings on conspicuous Washington streets; over acceptance of works of art offered as gifts to the Government; over Federal battle monuments, and over anything erected in Georgetown (a section of the Nation's Capital). Though the Capitol architect is technically a free man, he frequently seeks Commission guidance. Since its establishment by Congress in 1910, the Commission has passed upon more than a thousand items, from the Lincoln Memorial to the installation of a market at a Spanish-American War Memorial in Tampa.

The 83d Congress held hearings on some 14 bills which proposed to advance the cultural status of the Federal City and give increased encouragement and recognition to the arts by the Federal Government. So far in the present Congress some 40 related or similar bills have been introduced and hearings have been held on some of them. Among other things, some of these bills would provide for the establishment of a civic and cultural center in Washington. Even on this there is not complete agreement. We find the music critic of the Washington Evening and Sunday Star, Day Thorpe, writing in that paper on March 13, in part, as follows:

In a city like Washington an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center would raise the level of culture no more than a gallon jug would raise the level of the Potomac in flood.

One can only say that the issue of Government and art and the cultural status of the Nation's Capital seems to be provoking a nice clean fight with no holds barred. As the Washington Post and Times Herald comments editorially, "it is both interesting and refreshing to find that so much passion and pother can be aroused over some other subject than war or politics."

The New York Times article by Richard H. Rovere follows:

HICK TOWN OR WORLD CAPITAL?—WASHINGTON, FOR THIS OBSERVER, IS A MIXTURE OF BOTH, A GLOBAL CENTER, YET PAROCHIAL

(By Richard H. Rovere)

Washington as a site on the big, slow bend of the Potomac is more or less an accident. It could have been anywhere, and it very nearly was up on the Delaware River. But Washington as the Federal city was no accident. The founders had that in mind and provided for it in the Constitution—article I, section 8, paragraph 17: a "seat of government" with "needful buildings."

It cannot be said to have turned out badly. It is a handsome city, clean, relatively quiet, with a good deal of dignity, occasional beauty, some but not very much downright ugliness. No one with eyes and ears can visit the Capital of the United States and be unaware of the fact that affairs of state are happening all about. In Paris and London and most other capitals, it is very easy to be thus unaware, and if the Capital were moved to New York, it could be lost in the city, or nearly lost. If it is a good thing to know when you are at the seat of government, Washington is a good idea. Moreover, in periods when State and regional feelings have run high and hot, it has doubtless been advantageous to have the machinery of politics on the neutral ground of the District of Columbia.

Still, one may wonder, and many people do, if much has perhaps been lost as a result of having the Capital of the United States in a community that is exclusively political, or bureaucratic, and therefore by definition, parochial. Washington's parochialism bothers some visitors, but it does not upset them half as much as it does the more or less permanent residents. They criticize the city endlessly. It is dull, they say, it lacks culture. It is metropolitan without being cosmopolitan, it is a world capital with very little of the world in it. Anyone will tell you that it is a small town at heart (but don't they say that about every city?), and some describe it as a hick town.

People grouse about not having enough theater, no opera, no ballet, too little music, too little conversation of an elevating sort. Not much philosophy, they say, is talked there, not much poetry is written or read, there are several museums but hardly any painters of the first order. There are a couple of large universities, but they are not Ivy League or Columbia or Chicago or Berkeley. You don't get in Washington much of the stimulation that a leavening of academics can bring to a city.

The discontent seems endless. Washington people are always running down their own restaurants, grousing about their shops, expatiating on the poor quality of local architecture. Those who acknowledge culture to be more than theater, music, academies, eating places, and the rest even go so far, at times, as to complain about the lack of industry. The point seems to be that industry is an essential element of modernity and an assurance of human diversity. There are some people, one gathers, who would gladly put up with a bit of smog or smaze in order to have the feeling of being truly urban.

In many of the complaints there is something manifestly unfair. Granted that Washington is a one-industry town, that it is specialized to a high degree; but the United States is made up very largely of cities with specialties, cities in which one industry is dominant and sometimes dominating. And though some of them have smog or smaze or something disagreeable in the air, most of them are a good deal less cosmopolitan than Washington.

Vide Detroit, which is a much larger city and equally specialized. Vide Pittsburgh, a bit smaller than Washington but the center of what we nowadays call a "metropolitan area" that is quite a bit larger than Washington's. It could not, I think, be seriously argued that Washington is more parochial than either of these. Of course it can—and must—be argued that neither Detroit nor Pittsburgh represents us before the world, and that this is crucial.

Yet we are faced with the fact that Washington was planned this way. It was intended from the start to be a special kind of community, and it is possible to view it from one perspective and remark on how well it compares with cities that do not have its special problems and handicaps. As a city and as a metropolitan area, Washington is in a class with St. Louis, Cleveland, nearby Baltimore, the Twin Cities, Buffalo, and Cincinnati. Most of these are in some ways better rounded cities than Washington, and some are highly civilized communities.

But I rather think that Washington is at least as much an ornament of our civilization as any of them. How much theater is there in Buffalo? How many poets in Cincinnati? How much philosophy in Cleveland? How many good restaurants in St. Louis? (Quite a few, it may be said, but then it is chiefly the natives who complain of the lack of them in Washington. Visitors manage to find several excellent eating places.)

Measuring culture by the simplest, most obvious standards, Washington, it seems to me, compares very well indeed with many American cities that are its size or larger. I would say that only New York, Boston, and Chicago could support claims for any kind of superiority. Washington has three of the country's finest art museums. Its two legitimate theaters are not always open, but they provide the area with a richer fare than can be found in most comparable areas. Washington has several motion-picture theaters that specialize in films of high quality and, unless I am greatly mistaken, does much better in relative terms than New York does in this field. The National Symphony, under Howard Mitchell, is acknowledged by critics as a distinguished orchestra.

Of the three newspapers in Washington, one, the Evening Star, is principally a community journal, and it fulfills its chosen function with uncommon industry and integrity. Another, the Post and Times Herald, has as fine an editorial page as there is in this country, and that page is graced by a cartoonist, Herbert Block, who is perhaps the most widely admired member of his profession at the present time. The third paper, the Daily News, is part of a chain, but it publishes one local feature, a column by Tom Donnelly, who seems to many critical readers to be as wise and witty and literate an observer of life as any American newspaper can boast.

The broad trend of events has, in recent years, encouraged a considerable growth of culture and urbanity in Washington. There may be a powerful political, economic, and moral case against the Government's invasion of so many fields in which Government once had no part, but one byproduct of this historic development has been a broadening of outlooks in the Federal city.

There was a day when it seemed as if everyone in Washington were a Congressman, a cavalry captain, or some kind of glorified lettercarrier. But no longer. The Government now retains some of the best scientific and engineering brains we have; it sponsors scholarly undertakings of a staggering magnitude; it hires economists the way General Motors hires arc welders; it harbors hundreds of historians and social scientists of every known variety.

Indeed, it is probably safe to assert that there is no socially approved skill or profession which the Government does not have use for. And very often it commands the finest talent in the field. The Policy Planning Staff of the State Department, for example, is generally staffed by experts of a caliber unparalleled anywhere else in the country.

And yet, when one has said everything one can in Washington's behalf, the fact remains that there is an altogether pervasive parochialism about the place. It has a diversity of human types; it has its share and perhaps more than its share of cultural installations; it has become, in recent years, the crossroads of the world. It remains a community dominated by a single concern and governed by a passion for conformity that far antedates this decade—though this decade has seen the passion mount.

It is a world capital and the center of a global operation vaster and more complicated than any the globe has ever known, but only a surface aspect of its life is affected by all of this. New rites and ceremonies have been introduced, but they celebrate no fundamental myths of the community. The kings and emperors, shahs and rajahs, the prime ministers and commissars pass through, but they and all their underlings (there are foreign embassies with as many employees in Washington as the whole Federal Government had in its early days) do not impinge much on the life of the city. The presence of foreigners is most deeply felt when the foreigners have succumbed to the prevailing atmosphere and become, as it were, Washingtonians themselves.

Washington is obsessed with itself, a fact that perhaps measures the fascination of the place. Whatever it may measure, there it is, and there for some time it has been.

Henry James compared Washington with another capital he knew, London, and found a contrast. London, he said, was forever trying to escape herself. The object of all civilized conversation there was to transport the participants from the city. London, according to James, conducted "conversation in an effort * * * to get away from herself. * * * Washington talks about herself and about almost nothing else."

The impeachment is still valid, and the contrast with New York is as sharp as that with London. The virtue of New York, London, or any other truly cosmopolitan city is that in them one gets tidings not only from far-away parts of the earth but from far-away parts of the human mind and spirit. In the great cosmopolitan centers, conversation—the image of the mind, as the Romans said, and the surest register of social character—is wide ranging and various.

Mere shop talk, while of course it is heard, is not encouraged or admired for its own sake. Men and women are judged to be at the top of their form when they are able to move furthest from their day-to-day concerns—furthest either in terms of the distance away or of the penetration beneath.

In Washington, on the other hand, shop talk is everything. It is the stuff of life in office hours, in off hours, in the day, in the evening, on Sundays and holidays. And what is lamentable about this, what is the surest indication of the city's essential parochialism is that the shop talk is of the very narrowest sort.

Politics, broadly construed, can take in a vast amount of territory. Whatever bears on the good of man, according to Aristotle, bears on politics. But Washington is absorbed by politics in its littlest sense.

It cares a great deal about tactics, but is normally indifferent to strategy. It is fascinated by the events of yesterday and today, and breathless about tomorrow's probable doings; it may occupy itself with history to the extent of looking backward as far as the last election, but that is about as far as it cares to go. There are probably about a half dozen cities in the country where the talk of politics is more interesting and more rewarding than what one customarily hears in Washington.

New York, certainly, is one of them. New Yorkers are as stimulated by talk about political ideas as Washington is by political gossip, and the consequence is that New York, generally speaking, is really a more politically sophisticated city than Washington has ever been. The level of political discussion in a Columbia or City College classroom is far higher than anything one is likely to hear at most gatherings of elders in Washington.

A New York hostess could assemble a group of political thinkers and talkers that ought to make Washington hostesses turn green with envy. It would not, though, make the Washington ladies covetous, for what Washigton prizes is the man with today's inside information, however trivial, the guest with the hot poop from the White House, the Hill, the State Department, the Pentagon or Embassy Row.

There are other indexes. Books that treat seriously of politics enjoy far less of a sale, relative to population, in Washington than in many other cities. The best of our political journals are less widely read there than elsewhere. And Washington is not itself the birthplace of political ideas. Those that are translated into political acts are mostly imports.

Does all of this really matter? There are those who maintain that it most certainly does. They complain that our standing in the world is hurt when visitors discover the meagerness of Washington life. They complain that our politics is dehumanized by the cultural poverty of life in Washington and by the lack there of the cross-fertilization that occurs in truly cosmopolitan centers. Their sense of symmetry is offended by the fact that the scene of political action is not also the scene of political cerebration.

Undoubtedly there is merit in some of these contentions. It would seem, however, a meaningless kind of merit, since the separation of functions is here to stay, ordered not only by the Constitution but by irreversible later developments. Nothing much can be done about Washington, and in the circumstances it may be well to consider the advantages.

One that cannot escape the visitor is the real spirit of comity that prevails. There is a singular lack of bitterness in the Federal city. Forced into physical and social proximity, men of varying loyalties and persuations have no choice but to seek out each other's company. Party and faction play a large part in Washington life, but there is notably less political bitterness there than out in the provinces.

It might very well be otherwise if the capital were in a city in which the politicians could bivouac with battalions from the partisan armies, as they could, say, in New York or Chicago or Los Angeles. And it is conceivable, too, that were they to assemble in a city whose life had other facets, they would, all or most of them, be affected by the special character of the community. At the very least, they would be accused of this.

New York has a political character which is anathema to Chicago; Chicago, rightly or wrongly, is regarded by New York as a place where ridiculous and dangerous political ideas circulate. If one of these were the capital, the cry of contamination would be heard in many parts of the land. It is heard now about Washington itself; there are many who think it too easternized, too Europe-minded.

But the fact is that Washington appears to most level-headed observers to be about as representative a city as the mind of man could conceive. In this there are clear advantages. Whether or not they outweigh the disadvantages is surely a matter of opinion, but it is a matter of record that it is the capital of a nation that has held on to democracy longer than any other.

AMENDMENT TO COOPERATIVE HOUSING ACT

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on cooperative housing.

April 20 marks the fifth anniversary of the creation of the section 213 cooperative housing program of the Federal Housing Administration. The legislation establishing such a program was part of the Housing Act of 1950 signed by President Truman on April 20, 1950.

In the 5 years since its creation, the cooperative housing program in FHA has provided homes at lower cost and carrying charges for 32,666 families in 292 cooperatives in both city and small town areas in many States throughout the country.

A report from the FHA showing the status of the cooperative housing program, as of March 31, indicates that there are commitments outstanding for 15 additional cooperatives which will provide housing for 1,255 additional families. There are applications in process, or eligibility statements outstanding for 147 more cooperatives which should bring fine low-cost housing to 17,900 families. Altogether, in these 5 years, the section 213 cooperative housing program in FHA has brought to completion, or has in process, nearly 500 projects providing over 50,000 homes or apartments with an estimated value in excess of $500 million.

This achievement is indeed commendable. There is, however, a serious situation affecting the cooperative housing program at the moment. One change made in the law last year has brought the program to almost a complete standstill. There are several other deficiencies in the act which have shown up in the 5 years of experience which call for perfecting amendments. I am, therefore, today introducing a bill containing a series of amendments aimed at strengthening the cooperative housing program.

Most important of these amendments would restore the earlier provisions which allowed mortgages for cooperative housing projects to be based on replacement cost rather than estimate of value. Frankly, the Congress was stampeded last year when hearings were under way on windfalls and prospective windfalls in the FHA program. The cooperative housing section, which had had no breath of scandal, and which was operated with greater safeguards than any other FHA program, was blanketed into a change which was unnecessary and has now proved to be very unwise.

Cooperative housing is of particular importance because it encourages home ownership in multifamily structures, as opposed to speculative investment in and operation of multifamily rental housing projects. When a group of families get together to build their own homes under the cooperative program, their chief concern is the long-range livability of the dwelling. They have less concern for dollar return on their investment, since the members of cooperatives build these projects to live in themselves. In a rental project the owner can make more money out of small efficiency apartments than he can out of a 3-, 4-, or 5-bedroom apartment or home. To the cooperative member, however, that investment possibly is not important. The member wants a large enough apartment or home to take care of a good size family, and to give his children the space and living room they so richly deserve. Statistics available from the FHA show that cooperatives 213 section dwelling units are uniformly larger in size, with a larger number of bedrooms, and result in greater livability than in the multifamily rental projects.

Since, however, the FHA has determined that all multifamily projects, including cooperatives, must be valued from the strict monetary investment return standpoint, the change from replacement cost to value in calculating the FHA mortgages available for cooperative projects has cut down the amount of available cooperative housing mortgages so sharply that the new projects coming to the FHA require much greater downpayments than the Congress intended in the program. When the law was enacted, it was expected that cooperative members would make approximately 5 percent, and not more than 10 percent downpayments as equity in the projects. The change in method of calculating mortgages has made it necessary for cooperative members to put up 20, 30, and in some cases as high as 35

percent of the cost of the project. As a result, the number of applications for cooperative projects has stopped almost entirely.

The other proposed amendments would strengthen the cooperative-housing program and give it the status which these 5 years of experience indicate is warranted.

First. The restoration of the post of assistant commissioner for cooperative housing, which was cut out by the Appropriations Committee 2 years ago. An effective, hard-hitting program calls for a status within the FHA which would give adequate prestige staff and direct responsibility to the proposed assistant commissioner, which would make it possible to serve many more families than it has in the last 5 years. A steady decline in cooperative housing activity and interest has been noted since the Congress eliminated the position of assistant commissioner. This action was unfortunately interpreted by some within and outside of the FHA as an indication of the Congress' disinterest in the measure.

Second. The Federal National Mortgage Association is already empowered to assist in certain types of important housing programs. This amendment would authorize FNMA to make advance commitments for up to $50 million worth of consumer-sponsored cooperative housing projects at any given time. Not more than $15 million, however, would be available in any one State. This would, in fact, be a revolving fund and would assure readily available financing for any project which might not be able to secure financing in the open market, either because of unfamiliarity with the program or an actual shortage of mortgage money.

Third. A fourth amendment would apply to the existing section 223 covering disposition of Government owned housing projects. The amendment would make it possible for cooperative groups of tenants of those projects to use the cooperative mortgage provisions of the act to purchase the Government-owned projects on a cooperative basis.

Fourth. Would provide for a reduction of the percentage of veteran participation in cooperative projects from 65 percent to 50 percent. This would allow the maximum available mortgage for such projects and give a broader group of home purchasers in multifamily projects and give a broader group of home purchasers in multifamily projects the kind of liberal mortgage already provided for single family home purchasers under section 203.

Fifth. The sixth amendment would lift the ceilings on mortgages for cooperative projects from the present $5 million limitation to $30 million for any single project. This would apply particularly in the larger cities where it is often advisable for economic reasons to build larger projects than were envisaged at the time the Congress fixed the $5 million ceiling.

To summarize: The purpose of these proposed amendments is to enable the cooperative housing program to recover its prior position of importance by restoring replacement cost instead of the value concept in mortgage insurance; and to allow for the eventual enlargement of the program so that it can serve a great many more American middle-income families by strengthening the existing legislation.

RESOLUTION FOR STUDY OF FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting a copy of a resolution I introduced yesterday for the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House at the request of the chairman, the Honorable BRENT SPENCE, of Kentucky.

The resolution will authorize studies, investigations, and inquiries of the operation and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve System. This 12-man committee, consisting of the 7 governors of the Federal Reserve Board and 5 presidents of Federal Reserve Banks, determines the monetary policy of the United States, and, in this capacity, exercises a direct influence upon the availability of credit for business, agriculture, home buyers, and the general consumer; the rate of interest charged for such borrowings; the market price of Government bonds; the investment policies of banks, insurance companies and other large investors; the cost and character of the national debt, the general price level and employment in American industries and businesses. The operations and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee have not been the subject of inquiry by a legislative committee of the Congress since it was established by Congress in 1933.

Since the Federal Open Market Committee exercises its credit influence principally by its purchases and sales of Government securities, or by being inactive in the market, the resolution would authorize a broad inquiry into Government security issues, including the various kinds of securities, the manner and purpose of issue, method of payment, character of investor, and the amount and degree of speculation therein. Of special importance in this respect is the question of whether the public interest is served by sporadic issue of long-term issues carrying high interest rates which must necessarily go to a premium in view of the large amount of outstanding long-term debt at substantially lower interest costs. The degree of speculation, which may be permitted by the manner in which such long-term securities are issued, would also be a subject of inquiry under the resolution.

Several programs have been proposed recently which envisioned Federal financial assistance and places primary reliance upon bank financing, yet would be outside the Federal debt limit. The programs in the field of highways and school construction especially propose a radical departure from normal methods of Government financing. Counter proposals in these fields have been proposed by banks which would reopen financing participations denied banks since 1933 following the 1929 crash in which bank assets were horribly dissipated through speculation investments promoted by investment companies with which they were affiliated. Considerable pressure is being brought to bear to permit banks to engage in underwriting and dealing in revenue obligations and to use depositors' money for these purposes. Other proposals would authorize banks to purchase stock in investment companies. A real study should be made of these various proposals to properly assess their significance and their purposes.

COPY OF THE RESOLUTION

Mr. PATMAN submitted the following resolution, which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

"House Resolution 210

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, is authorized and directed to conduct full and complete studies and investigations and make inquiries with respect to any matter or matters concerning (1) the composition, operation, and activities of the Federal Open Market Committee; (2) the fluctuation in rates of interest and prices of securities issued by the United States and the effect of such fluctuations on the public debt, general price level, employment, the cost of State and municipal financing, and other segments of the national economy; (3) the various types of Government securities, manner of issue, method of payment, maturities, character of investors, and amount and degree of speculation therein; and (4) the various proposals for Federal assistance (other than grants) in the financing of State, county, and municipal (or instrumentalities thereof), highway, and school programs. The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any matter which is under active investigation by another committee of the House.

"The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

"For the purposes of carrying out this resolution, the committee or any subcommittee thereof is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the Continental United States, whether or not the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by such chairman, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses."

A PLEA FOR RIVER DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TRIMBLE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I am distressed, frustrated, and disgusted. It would be easier to quit, but I propose to fight. For several happy years I served on the Committee on Public Works of this House. It was my responsibility, along with my colleagues of that great committee, to recommend to this body for consideration sound public works on our rivers and streams looking toward the development of our country and the conservation of our water resources. I am grateful for and humbled by the

chance to serve on that committee and under its devoted leadership.

You have followed our recommendations and have appropriated money to study our river basins. You have authorized the construction of great multipurpose projects to provide flood control, irrigation, navigation, power, recreation, and water supply. You have followed through, where you thought wise, and have appropriated large sums of money for the construction and operation of dams, powerhouses, navigation, and irrigation canals. Upon our recommendations, you have turned over to the Corps of Engineers the job of making the field investigations of our great rivers to determine the facts upon which our committees and the Congress can act wisely. The Engineers have done a magnificent job. With the facts which they have developed we have begun a great program of construction, always keeping within our ability to pay, developing the best and most needed projects first.

Mr. Speaker, we thought we knew what we were doing. Apparently we were wrong. The Bureau of the Budget has set itself up as a sort of legislative usurper. No Government agency can come to the Congress requesting funds for any project until it has a password and a visa granted by that agency. We cannot even take a look at a project unless the Bureau of the Budget grants us permission. They are the chief high moguls of these river development programs. No project can get to Congress for appropriations unless the bureau approves. In order for the bureau to determine which thoroughbred, milk-fed, vitaminized project can get to us for consideration, it has to set up its own rules. These rules were issued December 31, 1952, and are known as Circular A–47.

Mr. Speaker, we never approved this Circular A–47. We never even saw it while it was being written nor afterwards for a long, long time. But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of this House, the real Committee on Public Works sits over in the Bureau of the Budget. They are not only determining policy for us on river development, but they are determining which projects and which river basins are to be given consideration by us. We are just errand boys and girls.

Mr. Speaker, are we going to abdicate our responsibility to a few men in the Bureau of the Budget? I hope not. I raise my voice not just for today but for tomorrow and for all the tomorrows. In behalf of our children and our children's children I raise it. I am distressed no end because I see the actions of the Bureau of the Budget stifling and choking our river developments, developments so essential to our continued strength in a troubled world. There is not a Member in this body whose district is not being affected by this decay in our river development program.

Let me pinpoint the problem by giving examples in our own State of Arkansas as follows:

Under the Flood Control Act of 1944 and acts prior to that, the Corps of Engineers used a formula charging certain amounts of the cost of such projects to electric energy. We were able to say, for example, that the Water Valley project in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], the Lone Rock and Gilbert projects in my own district on the White River, the Ozark Dam in my district on the Arkansas River, and the Dardanelle Dam on the Arkansas in the district of my colleague [Mr. HAYS] were all economically feasible. That is, they were economically feasible under the old formula before Circular A–47 was issued. This new formula of the Bureau of the Budget in simple language charges a great deal more of the cost of each project to power and assigns less benefits to power. The end result is to make the power come out of the project at such high prices with such low benefits that it completely changes the benefit-cost ratio. It makes Water Valley, Lone Rock, Gilbert, and Ozark completely out of the picture; and if Dardanelle is feasible at all, it is only by the skin of its teeth. The same situation is true with respect to the Beaver project on the White River in my district. Likewise, it will be true throughout the land where rivers need development programs.

My colleagues, this new directive does not stop at power projects per se. Many flood control, navigation, and irrigation projects which depend upon power for their feasibility will not be built if formula A–47 is to stand. So the policy of the Bureau of the Budget will affect not only power but flood control, navigation, recreation, irrigation, and all of the other purposes of these projects. I do not know what the intent of the Bureau of the Budget was, but if it intended to curtail and practically stop building of hydroelectric projects, it could not have done it better than by this new formula. It is rumored that something else is being considered which will be even more stringent. Let us hope the report is erroneous.

Mr. Speaker, the two principal factors in Circular A–47 damaging to the economic feasibility of multipurpose projects are, first, value of power; and, second, cost allocations.

First, value of power in A–47 is measured by the cost of the cheapest alternative source of power, whether private, Federal, or any other. Before Circular A–47, the test of value was the cost of privately developed and privately financed steam electric power in the area. If Federal hydropower could be produced at cost less than private steam electric power, it was economically feasible. Now A–47 requires that Federal hydropower must be compared with steam electric power produced and financed by the Federal Government. In other words, before Federal hydropower can be justified, it must be the cheapest power that can be produced by any method of generation and by any producer, even the Federal Government itself. The requirement of this Federal test is very severe and will be drastic enough to throw out many projects which heretofore were feasible.

For example, a memorandum of the Federal Power Commission, prepared in 1953 for its staff use, shows that the annual fixed charges of interest, depreciation, replacements, insurance, and taxes of privately financed electric plants would amount to 11.7 percent of the investment, whereas the same cost in federally financed steam electric plants would be 5.7 percent of the investment.

Assuming an investment of $125 per kilowatt of installed capacity, the following comparison of the annual fixed costs per kilowatt of steam generation is obtained:

Privately financed	$14.63
Federally financed	7.50
Difference	7.13

The application of this new test of A–47 would reduce the value of power at Greers Ferry by $456,000 a year; at Water Valley by $242,000; at Beaver by $613,000; and Gilbert and Lone Rock combined by $820,000 annually. It is evident that such great losses of value or benefits of power due to this test would throw out nearly all, if not all, of the projects in the Southwest. In addition to this loss, more of the cost of the whole project is charged to power than before as we shall see later.

The Federal Government is not now engaged in building steam plants in the Southwest, and there is no indication that it is now about to launch a program of federally owned and financed steam plants. Therefore, it appears that the Bureau of the Budget is resorting to a nonexistent and fictitious test. It appears that it is jousting with windmills that just do not exist.

To try to simplify what I want to say, let us take, for example, a farmer growing hogs. Suppose the Bureau of the Budget said to that farmer, "Your hogs are not worth any more than what it would cost the Government to grow them." Then in addition, the Bureau would say to him, "Of course, most of your farm investment and operating expenses must be charged against your hogs before we start." Do you suppose the farmer would grow hogs? Certainly not. Neither would you. Your benefit to cost ratio on hogs would be so low you could not survive financially. That is what the Bureau of the Budget is saying to all agencies that come up with hydroelectric projects. The answer is the same for all—not feasible.

Gen. S. D. Sturgis, Chief of Engineers, in a letter dated February 19, 1954, to the Secretary of the Army, made the following statement which bears on this problem:

> The Greers Ferry and Beaver projects are economically feasible in accordance with criteria normally used until recently, their overall benefits costs ratios being respectively 1.2 and 1.1. Since the completion of this report, however, new criteria of the Bureau of the Budget require such projects to be compared with the steam plants of comparable financing, i. e., Federal steam plants. This comparison indicates that the power to be produced by these multipurpose projects, although cheaper than the private steam alternatives currently developing to serve the region, would cost somewhat more than a Federal steam plant.
>
> If these projects are not to be built, there is no indication that Federal steam plants will actually be utilized to serve the market; in fact, it is almost certain that privately

owned generation will be built instead. The flood control and incidental benefits cannot be as economically provided by any other source.

You can see from this that Circular A–47 is a roadblock for the Corps of Engineers.

Second. Circular A–47 does not fix a specific method of making cost allocations, but it has led to the adoption of the separable costs-remaining benefits theory which allocates a higher percentage of cost to power than has heretofore been done. This method precludes the use of the incremental method of cost allocation although power may have been added to the project on an incremental basis. For instance, in authorizing Denison down in Texas and Norfork in Arkansas, the Congress stated that incremental methods should be used in allocating cost to power. According to formula A–47, Congress was wrong with respect to these two projects. The application of the separable costs-remaining benefits theory likewise results in higher annual operating and maintenance expenses being assessed against power because the allocation of these annual expenses follows the same pattern as in allocating investment costs between the multipurposes. This also helps to throw out projects. The Bureau of the Budget has not been consistent in the application of its Circular A–47. For example, it does not apply this formula to recreation, fish and wildlife, and pollution control abatement. All of these are given special treatment in A–47 and do not share in the joint costs of the projects. The result is that a greater part of the joint costs is assessed against power.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to point out again that this unrealistic formula of the Bureau of the Budget will stop practically all flood control, navigation, and soil-conservation projects on our rivers unless it is revised. We must remember that our thin crust of soil is our line of defense in the age-old battle between civilization and decay. The fertility of our soil is like integrity in man. When a man loses his integrity, he is lost. When a nation loses the fertility of its soil, the nation is lost.

Each muddy rivulet, creek, and river is an indictment of us of this generation and those who came before us. Next to our children, the good earth is the greatest asset God has given us. Yet for generations, we have abused, wasted, and exploited its fertility. Only in recent years have we begun to move from the exploitation of our soil to the conservation of it. This great program of conservation of the soil has many features, all good, including good farm practices, terraces, upstream check dams and water-control reservoirs, big flood control, navigation, and reclamation projects. It is upon these larger projects that Circular A–47 works devastation.

Some people think the small upstream projects will do the job alone. Others think that the big projects are all that is necessary. Still others think both programs are necessary. I happen to be in the latter group.

Our rivers are not manmade—they are nature's handiwork. By proper control, they become useful tools in the progress of mankind. Without proper control, they are destroyers. Since our rivers belong to all the people, the responsibility of their development, control, and use is a national problem. Through the years since the presidency of Theodore Roosevelt, this country has been gradually evolving a great river development program which has the Nation's blessing. That program, in my opinion, is at a standstill today because of Circular A–47 of the Bureau of the Budget.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress has the responsibility to spell out the formula to guide the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in their calculations of the cost benefit ratio in all these hydroelectric, flood control, and navigation projects and not leave it up to some executive agency such as the Bureau of the Budget to fix the policy. Our formula might include recreational benefits, municipal, and industrial water supply, and irrigation, which have never been figured by the Corps of Engineers in our projects in Arkansas so far as I know. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, that the Congress declare its independence.

I, therefore, plan to introduce appropriate legislation which has for its purpose the setting up of a definite criteria or formula to guide the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation in determining the benefits to cost ratio for the projects necessary to the development of our water resources. Let us return the control of our natural resources to the Congress where it belongs.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I also am frustrated regarding the Flood Control Act of 1944. In that act there were a number of projects for my area in the State of California. We have had only 1 or 2 of them completed, and we are trying desperately hard to get more of them completed. The ones I am thinking of particularly are the levee control projects on the lower San Joaquin River where we have lost almost $10 million by floods during the past 5 years. I hope we can find some way to make the Bureau of the Budget a little more liberal and generous in carrying out the laws which we pass and the projects which we authorized particularly in the law of 1944.

Also, I feel that the Budget Bureau should liberalize its criteria as suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas for his timely remarks on this subject, and to advise him that there are others who feel just as he does about the matter which he has brought to our attention.

The gentleman, as I remember, did not refer to the proposed order known as revised A–47. Has that been brought to your attention as yet?

Mr. TRIMBLE. No; it has not.

Mr. ASPINALL. The committee of which the gentleman from Colorado is honored to be a member has been questioning the authority and the assumed authority of the Bureau of the Budget in these matters, and especially in its issuance of A–47. For some time it was brought to the attention of the members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which handles reclamation legislation that there was in the making a new formula known as revised A–47. So, during the last few weeks we have had before our committee the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Honorable Rowland Hughes, and asked of him just how they considered the use of A–47, and whether or not there was to be a revised A–47. We suggested to him that we were aware of the contents of this proposed new order.

We were advised, as I remember the conversation which took place, that A–47 is to be used more or less as a measuring stick. It is not an exact criterion whatsoever, but as the Bureau of the Budget brings out the different projects upon which it must pass judgment it uses A–47 to see whether or not such project or projects measure up to what the Bureau considers to be a uniform policy.

On the other hand, their holdings under A–47 are not binding and should not be held to be binding upon the Congress of the United States. Of course, if it is possible for the executive branch of the Government to establish policy in this particular the gentleman is perfectly right when he suggests that it is a usurpation of the authority and the prerogatives of the legislative department.

Again I thank the gentleman and suggest that his remarks are most timely in view of the necessity of protecting our natural resources and making their full development possible.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from Colorado; and may I say that I heard the rumor that another circular or formula was under study.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I wish to join the gentleman from Colorado in expressing appreciation to my good friend from Arkansas for the real contribution he has made to an understanding of what is going on in the field of reclamation and flood control when he opens up the discussion on the floor of the policies of the Bureau of the Budget, either actual or intended policies, which have recently come to the attention of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation was just discussing, that matter has been before the committee and it has been under very careful scrutiny of the very able chairman of the full committee. The gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] questioned the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at some length concerning just what the effect of the application of this revised Circular A–47 would be if it were actually placed in operation. I think in fairness to the Director of the Budget it should be stated

that he told the committee that this circular was in a preliminary stage or advisory stage at this time. But at the same time it is being widely circulated throughout the Government, and it is receiving the full authority which would accompany a directive of that kind from the Bureau of the Budget in the different Government departments. On questioning by the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] and other members of the committee, we sought information on the point as to whether the gentleman concerned with this policy could name any flood control or reclamation project in the United States—not just in the Southwest, mind you, but in the entire United States—which would qualify and receive the approval of the Bureau of the Budget under this new procedure set up under revised Circular A-47.

To the best of my recollection, they were able to name only one small project in the United States which they were satisfied would qualify under this new formula that is being set up on benefit-cost ratios. When they were questioned about specific projects which were of great importance in many States of the Union, they were unable to give us any instances, they were unable to give us any clear indication as to whether those projects would receive approval if the formula in Revised Circular A-47 would be adopted. Unless the Congress does assert its authority, unless the Congress steps in vigorously at this point, it is my apprehension that we are going to see the adoption of the formula in Revised Circular A-47, and it is going to throw a roadblock across the progress of the country in the field of reclamation. I think the gentleman will certainly do a service if he does introduce in the Congress a bill which will assure congressional control over this important question of the benefit-cost ratio on these important projects.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I wish to compliment my colleague for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and for the position he has taken on it. I am sorry that I did not get here earlier to hear all of the gentleman's remarks, but I would like to say to him that we had Mr. Hughes, Director of the Budget, before our committee to inquire of him with regard to the provisions of this Circular A-47. In the course of the questions with reference to this A-47 which establishes standards for the construction of irrigation and reclamation projects, Mr. Hughes was specifically asked whether or not there is any project in the United States presently under study for authorization and construction which would qualify under those standards. He said that he had not studied the effects of the circular in that way. Then I asked him whether or not any project ever authorized and built in the United States under the reclamation law would qualify. He said that he did not know.

I make the assertion that if these standards were applied, the Central Valley project would not have been built, 50 years of reclamation progress would not have occurred, there would not be a single reclamation project in the United States and not one single project including the Colorado River project which has been vigorously recommended by this administration, could qualify under the provisions of Circular A-47.

The gentleman is doing the Congress a real service by bringing this matter to the attention of the public and I hope that before the final form of A-47 is adopted it will be appropriately revised and that it will go in the opposite direction from which it goes now; that is, move in the direction of a more liberal construction of reclamation law rather than the reverse.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE] a question?

Mr. TRIMBLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Is it not a fact that the one project that was mentioned which possibly would qualify under these standards is the Ventura River project in California?

Mr. ENGLE. That is true. It was stated by Mr. Dexheimer, the Commissioner of Reclamation, there was possibly only one and that is a project in the district which the gentleman has the honor of representing and which he seeks to authorize now through a bill pending before our committee. The other, of course, would possibly be the Trinity River project, which is already authorized. Other than those we are all through so far as irrigation and reclamation is concerned, if the standards of the Budget Circular A-47 are enforced.

Mr. TRIMBLE. I thank the gentleman.

FATHER HAROLD W. RIGNEY, S. V. D.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's" is a statement made by Christ that has long been recognized by Christians as a divine direction to mankind to respect civil authority as well as divine authority.

A casual examination of the New Testament discloses that this God-given instruction is also, if not primarily, a command to political leaders, or would-be political leaders, not to interfere with God's will or his emissaries. History is replete with evidence of God's vengeance against pretended political leaders who have interfered with divine commandments or with God's emissaries.

Today marks the 25th anniversary of the ordination to the Roman Catholic priesthood of Rev. Harold W. Rigney. The 25th anniversary of a clergyman of any faith, including the Catholic faith, is ordinarily an occasion of great joy to the clergyman, his family, and his friends. Father Rigney is a humble Catholic missionary of the Order of Divine Word, who has devoted his priestly life to winning the mind and the souls of men to God. His life has been devoted with following and preaching the word of God.

This 25th anniversary of Father Rigney, although it may be a day of great spiritual consolation for him, will be a day of great physical sadness for Father Rigney, his family, his friends, and Roman Catholics everywhere, for Father Rigney is presently being imprisoned in China by a group which apparently has decided that the divine command of "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's" does not apply to them.

I would like to call attention to the Congress and to the world very briefly the facts concerning Father Rigney and his imprisonment.

Father Rigney was born on December 18, 1900, in Chicago, Ill. His family resided in the "back of the Yards" section of Chicago for some 26 years. The "back of the Yards" section of the city of Chicago has contributed to the Nation and the city of Chicago some of its greatest political, business, labor, and religious leaders.

Father Rigney, after attending parochial schools in Chicago, joined the Divine Word Missionaries at Techny, Ill., on August 31, 1918. He was ordained on April 19, 1930, by Bishop Weig, of China, and in the following years earned his master of science degree at the University of Chicago.

Father Rigney's first missionary assignment occurred in May 1939, when he was sent to the Gold Coast in West Africa. Four years later he joined the Army Air Force as a chaplain, holding the rank of captain. After 30 months' service, during which time he became chaplain for all Catholic American Air Corps personnel in Africa, he was discharged and was named by his order as rector of the Fu Jen University in Peiping. In July 1951 it was learned that Father Rigney had been arrested by Red authorities.

The background of Father Rigney's arrest and confinement, and the divine command to political leaders, creates a remarkable parallel. If you will recall the story in the New Testament, the Pharisees, pretended political leaders of their day, took counsel as to how they might entrap Christ in his talk. They sent emissaries with Herodious to ask Jesus of Nazareth this question "Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar?" Jesus replied, "Show me the coin of the tribute." Christ then asked them whose inscription and image the coin bore. They said to him, "Caesar." Then he issued the divine command "Render, therefore, to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's."

Information concerning Father Rigney's arrest and incarceration discloses that it occurred when new contracts for the school term of Peiping's Fu Jen University arose in June of 1950.

Father Rigney refused to accept the contracts, which called for salaries to be paid by the headquarters of the Society of the Divine Word, when five of the professors revealed that they were Communists and enemies of the church. Father Rigney informed the Communist president of the university that his order's $12,000 monthly subsidy would be stopped unless a new board of trustees was formed and the church would be allowed to select the faculty. He desired to have the five Communist teachers fired at once. Father Rigney was warned he would be held personally responsible for lack of cooperation by his order and was placed under custody while the authorities awaited the $12,000 monthly stipend. When it did not arrive, Father Rigney was arrested and placed in custody. Thus it appears that Father Rigney's incarceration is due to his refusal to "Render unto Caesar the things that belonged to God."

Information of Father Rigney was completely cut off from his family after his arrest and he became known as Chicago's "Forgotten Man." Until recently, through the intercession of representatives of friendly governments, the rigors of Father Rigney's incarceration have been somewhat relaxed and communications have been made with his family.

Today, many thousands of persons of all faiths in Chicago, particularly in the "back of the Yards" section are petitioning the President to do all in his power on Father Rigney's behalf.

I am happy to report that the Department of State is doing everything within its power to secure the release of Father Rigney. Father Rigney was one of those referred to in the stirring address made by our distinguished majority leader yesterday. The British and other friendly governments with representation at Peiping have endeavored to persuade the Chinese Communists to consider on humanitarian grounds the release of Father Rigney. Father Rigney's case has been included with others by United States representatives at the United Nations and by the American representatives at the United Nation's Economic and Social Council.

I appeal to the representatives of the various Asian and African countries in the conference which is now being conducted at Bandung on this 25th anniversary of Father Rigney's ordination to take up Father Rigney's cause and prevail upon Red China's leaders to release Father Rigney and other religious representatives, not only in a humanitarian interest, but also in order to avoid the vengeance that history has disclosed that God inflicts upon those who ignore the command given to the world to "Render unto God the things that are God's."

I am certain that Father Rigney on this day is praying that his captors are spared divine vengeance.

I would like to add my prayer to that of the relatives and friends of Father Rigney that his release and his return to his family and friends is near.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI], in whose district Father Rigney resided, may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 25th anniversary of the ordination of Rev. Harold W. Rigney to the priesthood. Father Rigney was born and raised in the "back of the Yards" community in Chicago, which I am privileged to represent.

Father Rigney is an Air Force chaplain. He has been imprisoned, without trial, by the Chinese Communists for the past 4 years. I have received hundreds of letters from individuals in my district urging that everything possible be done to effect his release.

I have contacted the Secretary of State and was advised that they will pursue diligently its efforts to effect his release.

The people from the "back of the Yards" district are commencing a letter-writing campaign to President Eisenhower urging he use the power of his great office to bring about the release of Father Rigney. I hope and pray this may soon become a reality so that he may celebrate his silver anniversay here in the United States in a fitting manner.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who so desire may extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD on the subject of the incarceration of Father Rigney.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOYLE. Mr. Speaker, yes, today, Father Harold W. Rigney, S. V. D., a Divine Word missionary, sitting in the confinement of a Chinese Communist prison, marks the 25th anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood.

Whether he will be able to celebrate that milestone in his vocational and religious life no one can ascertain.

This Chicagoan's present plight after 4 years in prison pleads passionately for his release. The record indicates our State Department is doing everything to effect his release. The case history of Father Rigney serves to remind us of the plight of the other five hundred and more similarly situated captive Americans.

It is a pleasure to join with Congressman MURRAY of Illinois and the other Members of Congress in his petition directed to the representatives of the various Asian and African conference to request their intercession on behalf of Father Rigney and at the same time to wish them well in their deliberations.

As we ask their assistance and help we are not unmindful of their many and varied problems. Theirs is no easy assignment, their acute capital shortages, primitive technologies, outmoded systems of land ownership, uneven natural resources, and tragic shortages of skilled personnel are not to be easily solved.

Their new found independence, dating from the end of World War II when western colonial governments were set aside, peacefully in India and Burma and through revolution in Indonesia and Indochina must be handled tenderly. In their rise to power native nationalist leaders cannot be faulted for their impatience with the leadership identified with colonialism. It is highly probable that in the excitement and exultation of newly won independence the resurgent nationalism of these south and southeast countries will construct an understandable barrier to progress.

Their population problem is magnified by their inadequate resources and rapid population growth. The rising level of living can only go higher and higher when production exceeds and increases faster than population.

The mere expulsion of colonial powers is not a surefire cureall and nation building is a slow and difficult process. Yes nation building is a matter of many years and even generations.

We feel confident that the leadership and people of Asia see their problem and will be able to effect its solution. In this task there is serious area for disillusionment. It would be shameful and sad to permit communism to exploit this ever present opportunity.

The free world must not only lend its assistance and knowhow to the economic development of south and southeast Asia, but also help these good people to see their problems in the light of reality.

The African-Asian conference gives testimony to the fact that the peoples of the less-developed parts of the world are aware of their common problems and aspirations. This new consciousness should be helpful in hastening worldwide advances in the standards of living, and promote and improve international understanding and reduce international tensions.

Our help and sympathy in helping them to understand and solve their problems has a direct bearing on our future and on the future, peace and prosperity of the entire world.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY], in this observance by the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of the 25th anniversary of the priesthood of Father Harold W. Rigney. Today in all the lands of the free world men and women of pure hearts are thinking of Father Rigney and from many lips prayers are ascending for his early release.

On April 19, 1930 Father Rigney donned the robes of priesthood. His life he dedicated to God and the service of God's creatures here on earth. Humbly he walked with God, asking only to serve Him and the divine purpose. In 1951 he was made captive by Red China. It had been hoped that his release could be effected so that he might return to us to join in the celebration of his 25th anniversary but while he is not with us in person he abides with us in spirit and on this day we are renewing the pledge of our determination to persevere until the happy answer to our prayers has come.

From my district, lying on the south shore of Lake Michigan in Chicago, have come hundreds of letters. Some have come from children, some from men and

women walking into the evening of life. All have reflected a universality of sentiment throughout the free world of admiration for the purity of the life, the faithfulness of the discharge of his priestly office and a burning indignation over the continuance in captivity of this man of God. These letters I have brought on several occasions to the attention of the Department of State. On April 1, 1955, I received a letter from the Honorable Thruston B. Morton, Assistant Secretary of State, in which he said:

The Department understands and sympathizes with the spirit which prompts Father Rigney's relatives and friends to seek special consideration of his case as the date approaches for the celebration of his silver jubilee. The Department, too, is most desirous of bringing comfort and relief to Father Rigney and of persuading the Chinese Communists to permit his return to the United States. A meeting has just been held between our consul at Geneva and the Chinese Communist representative there during which the United States renewed its demands for the release of Father Rigney and other American citizens in Communist China from their unwarranted detention.

Your constituents may be assured that we shall continue our efforts to bring about the release of Father Rigney and all the other American citizens forced to remain in Communist China against their will.

On April 5, 1955, I received the following reply to my letter to Secretary of State Dulles:

DEAR MR. O'HARA: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of March 30, 1955, in which you report the receipt of many letters urging that action be taken to effect the release of Father Harold W. Rigney, who is under arrest in Communist China.

The Department, too, has received several hundred letters from friends and relatives of Father Rigney who are understandably increasingly exercised over his plight as the date for the celebration of his silver jubilee draws near.

I hope that you will inform interested persons that the Department is also desirous of bringing comfort and relief to Father Rigney and of persuading the Chinese Communists to permit his return to the United States. You may be sure that it will pursue diligently its efforts to bring about his release. There is enclosed a copy of a press release describing the latest approach made to the problem by our consul at Geneva. Father Rigney is one of the prisoners concerning whom specific inquiry was made.

Sincerely yours,

ALLYN C. DONALDSON,
Director, Office of Special Consular Services
(For the Secretary of State).

I am hopeful, as I am prayerful, that in the very near future we will receive the happy word that Father Rigney with other Americans wrongfully imprisoned in Red China have been released. That I understand, is the present expectation. That, I have the faith to believe, is the divine purpose. My colleague, Mr. MURRAY, has made a large contribution by arranging this celebration here on the floor of this House of Father Rigney's priestly anniversary. It gives notice to Red China that there is within the hearts and souls of the American people a spirit to persevere in the cause of righteousness that cannot be stamped out by brutal force.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to associate myself with the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Chicago, Mr. MURRAY, in paying tribute to Father Rigney, whose 25th anniversary of ordination is being observed.

Father Rigney cannot participate in the usual ceremonies attendant to such an occasion because he is being held a prisoner by the Chinese Communists. As a humble Catholic missionary, Father Rigney refused to yield to the evil pressure of the Chinese Reds, and as a result he has joined the host of captives held in China.

This Catholic priest brought nothing but good to the China which is being defiled by the godless Reds. He has devoted his life to winning the minds and the souls of men to God. His sole operation in China was preaching the word of God.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURRAY] has explained the details of Father Rigney's arrest and imprisonment by the Communists.

I add my prayers to those of countless thousands in Father Rigney's native country and his home community of Chicago that his release and his return to his relatives and friends is not far off. And as we pray for him, I am certain Father Rigney at this moment is praying for the spiritual enlightenment of his Communist captors.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 752. An act to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois and to include an article.

Mr. LANE and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. SHORT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DIXON.

Mr. MCGREGOR and include a poll.

Mr. SCUDDER and include extraneous matter.

Mr. JENNINGS.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. PRIEST and include an address before the Civil Aviation Medicine Association.

Mr. MCCARTHY and to include a statement.

Mr. PHILBIN.

Mr. BROYHILL in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. PRIEST).

Mr. CANFIELD (at the request of Mr. ARENDS).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HÉBERT (at the request of Mr. BOGGS), for Tuesday and Wednesday, April 19 and 20, on account of official business—attending a meeting at Naval Academy Board of Visitation.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 1955, 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:

703. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Mines, Department of the Interior, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior on synthetic-liquid fuels for the calendar year 1954, pursuant to the Synthetic Liquid Fuels Act of 1944 (30 U. S. C. 321–325 as amended); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

704. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal the requirement for heads of departments and agencies to report to the Postmaster General the number of penalty envelopes and wrappers on hand at the close of each fiscal year"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

705. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter with reference to the case of Sabato Di Filippo alias Sam Phillips, A-2445124, involving suspension of deportation and requesting the case be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of the Justice Department; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

706. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting a letter with reference to the case of Koshiro Mukoyama, A-6153080, involving suspension of deportation and requesting the case be withdrawn from those before the Congress and returned to the jurisdiction of this Service; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

707. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (1)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

708. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to section 244 (a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (8 U. S. C. 1254 (a) (5)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

709. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to Public Law 863, 80th Congress, amending subsection (c) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C. 155 (c)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

710. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report on the audit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954, pursuant to the Government Corporation Control Act (31 U. S. C. 841) (H. Doc. No. 143); to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed.

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. SMITH of Virginia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 211. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 4644, a bill to increase the rates of basic salary of postmasters, officers, supervisors, and employees in the postal field service, to eliminate certain salary inequities, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 423). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DURHAM: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 5645. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; without amendment (Rept. No. 424). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 2107. A bill to amend the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950 to provide for additional facilities necessary for the administration and training of units of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 425). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANNON: Committee of conference. H. R. 4903. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1955, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 426). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DURHAM:

H. R. 5645. A bill to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to construct a modern office building in or near the District of Columbia to serve as its principal office; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BETTS:

H. R. 5646. A bill to eliminate the 15-acre requirement for voting in any national wheat referendum; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 5647. A bill to repeal the manufacturers' excise tax on motorcycles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON:

H. R. 5648. A bill to authorize the Surgeon General to provide traineeships for graduate nurses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 5649. A bill to amend section 2254 of title 28 of the United States Code in reference to applications for writs of habeas corpus by persons in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5650. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of military personnel and civilian employees of the Federal Government for damage to, or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of, personal property occurring incident to their service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5651. A bill to provide for the burial near the Marine Corps War Memorial at the northern end of Arlington National Cemetery of the participants in the famous flag raising at Iwo Jima; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H. R. 5652. A bill to provide for the relief of certain members of the Army and Air Force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5653. A bill relating to the appointment, compensation, and powers of baliffs in the district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. R. 5654. A bill to provide for two judicial districts and the appointment of an additional Federal judge for the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIXON:

H. R. 5655. A bill providing for the designation of a highway between Echo Junction, Utah, and Ogden, Utah, as a part of the National System of Interstate Highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DORN of South Carolina:

H. R. 5656. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the tax on the transportation of property shall not apply to the transportation of certain farm commodities and livestock from farm to market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H. R. 5657. A bill to allow the use of certain property in Volusia County, Fla., for civil defense purposes without payment of compensation to the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 5658. A bill to amend title X of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of income which an individual may earn while receiving aid to the blind thereunder, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOX:

H. R. 5659. 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 Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRUEGER:

H. R. 5660. A bill to revise the boundaries of the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park, in the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 5661. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to increase the annuities of widows under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5662. A bill to provide for the purchase by the Federal Government, for distribution to the States, of a supply of the Salk vaccine for the prevention of poliomyelitis; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 5663. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to stimulate the development and construction of cooperative housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. R. 5664. A bill to amend section 203 (a) of the Army and Air Force Vitalization and Retirement Equalization Act of 1948; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 5665. A bill to establish that it is a crime for citizens or nationals of foreign nations to participate in undeclared wars against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H. R. 5666. A bill to provide relief to farmers and farmworkers suffering crop losses or loss of employment because of damage to crops caused by drought, flood, hail, frost, freeze, wind, insect infestation, plant disease, or other natural causes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SILER:

H. R. 5667. A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to provide that persons who are awarded the Purple Heart shall be deemed to have a 10-percent service-connected disability; to the Committe on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H. R. 5668. A bill to provide that where an injured employee is required, under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, to submit to a physical examination, he shall be furnished with a copy of the physician's report; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 5669. A bill to provide for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BURDICK:

H. J. Res. 282. Joint resolution proposing an amendment of the Constitution of the United States to prevent interference with, and to eliminate limitations upon, the power of the States to regulate health, morals, education, domestic relations, all property rights, transportation wholly within their borders, the election laws, with the limitations contained in this proposed amendment, and good order therein, to authorize the various States to change any action taken in respect to the proposed ratification of amendments thereto, until final action has been taken thereon, and to authorize the various States to contest the validity of any law or treaty made, or which shall be made by or under the authority of the United States or this Constitution, and the validity of the adoption, ratification, or promulgation of any amendment thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H. J. Res. 283. Joint resolution providing for a Congressional Medal for Distinguished Civilian Achievement to be awarded to Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. J. Res. 284. Joint resolution to provide for the coinage of a medal in recognition of the distinguished contribution to medicine made by Dr. Jonas Salk; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. Con. Res. 112. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 23 as United States Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRIEST:

H. Con. Res. 113. Concurrent resolution requesting the American people to join in observing National Hospital Week; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Miss THOMPSON of Michigan:

H. Con. Res. 114. Concurrent resolution establishing an academy for page boys; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Con. Res. 115. Concurrent resolution providing for placing of statue of late Chief Justice Edward Douglass White in the United States Capitol and for ceremonies of unveiling; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By Mrs. CHURCH: Senate Resolution No. 34 of the 69th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, urging the Congress of the United States to pass a resolution that it is the

sense of the Congress of the United States that the people of Slovakia are entitled to and should no longer be denied the right of national self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Mississippi, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation limiting the appellate jurisdiction of the United States Supreme Court and the jurisdiction of other Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H. R. 5670. A bill for the relief of John Baltrusaitis (Baltrusaitieni); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

H. R. 5671. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the District Court for the Territory of Alaska to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Paul Alton Boyle, of Fairbanks, Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELCHER:

H. R. 5672. A bill for the relief of Mohammed Akbar Ashraf; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAGUE:

H. R. 5673. A bill for the relief of Margarete Wanda Hockenberry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEVEREUX (by request):

H. R. 5674. A bill for the relief of Maria del Carmen Intriago Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. R. 5675. A bill for the relief of Maj. Charles T. Root; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H. R. 5676. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands by the United States to Taylor Cole; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HIESTAND:

H. R. 5677. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Vincenza Donato Vaio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORAN:

H. R. 5678. A bill for the relief of Rouhollah Amir Rouhi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H. R. 5679. A bill for the relief of Helena Lubke, also known at Helena Liibke; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5680. A bill for the relief of Monica Jackson Young; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5681. A bill for the relief of John Tong Cheng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5682. A bill for the relief of Tam Chung Fay and Tam Fay Hing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H. R. 5683. A bill for the relief of Andonios Demetrios Dilbois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. R. 5684. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Edith Gerda Mayer Durkovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H. R. 5685. A bill for the relief of Robert Nai-Hsin Chang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 5686. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Yvette J. B. Levin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 5687. A bill to express the appreciation of the people of the United States to Dr. Jonas E. Salk, discoverer of polio vaccine, and to honor Dr. Salk by awarding him a gratuity of $10,000 a year for life; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROOSEVELT:

H. R. 5688. A bill for the relief of Fernando Galvan-Cruz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 5689. A bill for the relief of Kam Man Leung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHERER:

H. R. 5690. A bill for the relief of Camp Kooch-i-ching; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 5691. A bill for the relief of P. R. Markley, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H. R. 5692. A bill for the relief of Slobadan N. Stefanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WITHROW:

H. R. 5693. A bill for the relief of John F. Biba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

203. By Mr. WATTS: Petition of various citizens of Lexington and Georgetown, Ky., in support of legislation prohibiting the advertising of alcoholic beverages on radio and television; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

204. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the president, Chamber of Commerce, Salt Lake City, Utah, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to urging Congress 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 and gatherers of natural gas, including sale by them of natural gas in interstate commerce for resale; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Internal Security and Constitutional Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an outstanding address recently delivered by my able colleague, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], before the Chicago Law Club.

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

A LAWYER LOOKS AT INTERNAL SECURITY AND CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

(Address by Senator HENNINGS)

I am grateful for the opportunity to speak to you tonight—to submit for your consideration some legal and political questions in matters that are increasingly on my mind, and I know upon yours, as citizens and as lawyers.

For a long time now I have been troubled by the unmistakable fact that civil rights—which are the cornerstone of our national life—are under attack and in danger of abridgement. And I am sure the uneasiness I feel is not just the result of vague impressions. Unfortunately, it is based on facts some of which I shall mention later on in the course of my remarks.

Yet, before I turn to the matter at hand, may I say, that I come before you in order to formulate questions rather than to offer conclusions. And I also come with a request that you, as distinguished members of the bar, should help our country find the answers that will preserve our civil liberties.

I believe we all agree that the erosion of civil rights, if true, is a paramount question of our political life and spells dangers of unforeseeable gravity. History, however, teaches us that civil rights are seldom lost solely by conscious deliberate action. More often than not the loss is, in great part, the result of an absent-minded, unconscious drift. When the citizens do not see the threat and when constituted legislative, executive, and judicial authorities do not realize the consequences of their acts, civil liberties are in danger of loss by default. As I see it, the trend that is now taking place in our country is just of this nature. There is, of course, no suggestion of repealing the Bill of Rights, but steadily, in unrealized stages, the rights guaranteed by the bill are invaded and in danger of becoming nugatory.

The birth of our Nation was a momentous fact in the development of mankind. An entirely new state entered the community of nations. Economically, politically, and legally it had no precedent. Economically it was free of the restraining shackles of feudal economy—a land where property was held in free and common socage and where there was unhampered internal trade and freedom of occupation for its citizens, with equal opportunity for all. Politically and legally it was a country with a written constitution that embodied the experiences of a protracted fight against inherited privilege and tyranny. This Constitution happily united practical considerations with deep theoretical insights. The student of our past is impressed by its closeness to political and social realities of American life. At the same time, the sociologist and the legal scholar realize how closely it materialized the theoretical formulations of Montesquieu on the separation of powers. These, may I say, "Un-American" ideas born in old Europe became not only an integral part of our political life but found in our country their first, true and only application. How new and how revolutionary all this had been becomes particularly clear when, for the sake of comparison, we look at the other parts of the American and European Continents at that time.

The Constitution formulated by the Founding Fathers is philosophically a complex document. It is at once optimistic and trustful—and pessimistic, skeptical, and suspicious. It is a supreme expression of the mistrust in political power; it splits the governmental authority into its component executive, legislative, and judicial parts, and it enumerates its powers. On the other hand, it is an equally strong expression of a supreme trust in man as the source of cul-

tural and political activity—the spiritual substance of all life.

We often recall and frequently mention that our Constitution is based on the principle of checks and balances in government. I am impressed by the further thought, however, that the principle of checks and balances permeates not only the governmental structure of our country. I am afraid we often forget that the framers of the Constitution knew that this principle lies at the root of societal life itself. They have visualized our country as a social construct where the freedom of the people as a whole and that of the individual are balanced against the state and its coercive powers. Neither the people nor the state has the upper hand. This relationship, however, is not coincidental or artificial. It is founded on the recognition that man, in his rights and freedoms, is secure only within the framework of society—the state.

The creative activity of man prospers best in conditions of security and peace of mind. Any invasion of human rights has a disastrous effect on the cultural and economic success of human endeavor and is justified, of course, only when the exercise of individual rights, in its turn, invades the concurrent rights of others.

The trust in the free activity of man and the care of safeguarding it faces us in all the basic provisions of the Constitution. I have mentioned the splitting of governmental powers as a proof of this trust. The right to vote does not even require mention. More in point, is the injunction against the passage of bills of attainder—the legislative means by which the English Parliament used to punish dissidents without trial and under accusations having no basis in the criminal law of the land. Article 1, section 9, clause 3 of our Constitution enjoins the Federal legislature from passing such bills and article 1, section 10, clause 1 extends this injunction to State legislatures. It is clear from these injunctions that we have here a fundamental provision prefiguring the Bill of Rights.

In this connection I want to mention that the opponents of the first 10 amendments in the first Congress based their opposition not on any objections to the rights to be secured but on the idea that these rights were already secured by the Constitution itself. But Jefferson and his followers carried the day and the Bill of Rights was adopted as an explicit statement of faith in individual freedom.

This faith, I dare say, never faltered. And the adoption of the 13th and 14th amendments was its forceful reaffirmation in the 19th century.

All these provisions, if observed, constitute a mighty bulwark which securely protects the individual against government interference as well as against invasions on the part of fellow citizens.

We know that legal propositions are not disjoined statements but constitute a contextual entity. Only within their context are they truly interpretable. Only by the token of this context do they find their proper place within the entire structure and exhibit their relative values. When from this point of view we look now at the Bill of Rights, I am inclined to believe, that the first amendment stands out as the cornerstone of the entire protective edifice. It is this amendment which, in protecting the freedom of his thought, of his beliefs, and of his speech, secures man in the exercise of those gifts which distinguish him from animals.

The language of the first amendment is unequivocal and all-embracing. It is a truly revolutionary declaration that democracy as established by our Constitution is alien to the idea of orthodoxy as a test of human rights. Therefore, no matter how unorthodox or unpopular the opinions held by the individual, he must be protected from persecution both on the part of governmental agencies and on the part of other individuals. And that is why I believe that second in importance stands out the due process clause of the 5th and the 14th amendments.

These remarks, I hope, truthfully describe the nature of American democracy and represent views traditionally held. We discern them at the cradle of our Constitution * * * And in this connection, permit me to quote to you from the Virginia Statute on Religious Freedom, written by Thomas Jefferson and regarded by him as his greatest achievement next to the Declaration of Independence.

The statute enunciates these propositions: "that the opinions of men are not the object of civil government, nor under its jurisdiction; that to suffer the civil magistrate to intrude his powers into the field of opinion and to restrain the profession or propagation of principles on supposition of their ill tendency is a dangerous fallacy * * * because he being of course judge of that tendency will make his opinions the rule of judgment and approve or condemn the sentiments of others only as they shall square with or differ from his own; that it is time enough for the rightful purposes of civil government for its officers to interfere when principles break out into overt acts against peace and good order; and finally, that truth is great and will prevail if left to herself; that she is the proper and sufficient antagonist to error, and has nothing to fear from the conflict unless by human interposition disarmed of her natural weapons, free argument and debate; errors ceasing to be dangerous when it is permitted freely to contradict them."

Now how does our 20th century practice square with our political-democratic tradition? Do we adhere to the precept that opinions and beliefs are within the sovereign domain of man as the builder of cultural values and that the State should intervene only when opinions and beliefs pass into overt acts in contravention of constitutional procedures? Or do we say, "We have changed all that," as the fake doctor in Moliere did when it was pointed out to him that traditionally the heart is on the left and the liver on the right side, and not vice versa?

Certain facts make me doubtful as to the answer.

The Smith Act, for instance, makes it a crime to teach and advocate (please note these words)—no matter how abstractly and philosophically—any ideas of overthrowing the constituted Government by force and violence. The wording of the statute seems, on the face of it, to contradict the first amendment and I am not convinced that the decision of the Supreme Court with its negative answer settles this question (*Dennis* v. *United States*, 341 U. S. 494). The decision was not unanimous and we know that dissenting opinions have in more than one instance become the law of the future.

It would be well for us to keep in mind the prophetic words of Mr. Justice Black in his dissenting opinion in the Dennis case. He said: "Public opinion being what it now is, few will protest the conviction of these Communist petitioners. There is hope, however, that in calmer times, when present pressures, passions, and fears subside, this or some later Court will restore the first amendment liberties to the high preferred place where they belong in a free society."

It would also be well for us to recall that Jefferson on his accession to the Presidency in the exercise of his Presidential powers pardoned all persons convicted under the Alien and Sedition Acts and thereby in effect invalidated these laws as they applied to those convicted. Jefferson, in a letter he wrote to Mrs. John Adams in 1804, explained the basis for his action in granting these wholesale pardons. In his letter he said: "I do not know who was the particular wretch alluded to, but I discharged every person under punishment or prosecution under the sedition law, because I considered, and now consider, that law to be a nullity, as absolute and as palatable as if Congress had ordered us to fall down and worship a golden image, and that it was as much my duty to arrest its execution in every stage, as it would have been to have rescued from the fiery furnace those who should have been cast into it for refusing to worship the image. It was, accordingly, done in every instance, without asking what the offenders had done, or against whom they had offended, but whether the pains they were suffering were inflicted under the pretended sedition law."

If Jefferson were alive today he would be a determined and bitter opponent of communism and the Communist Party and he would do all in his power to wipe out espionage and treason, whether practiced by domestic Communists or others. We may also be sure, however, that he would insist on acting against Communists in conformity with the Bill of Rights and its historic principles.

In addition to the Smith Act we have the Internal Security Act of 1950 aimed at registering and branding Communists and members of various ill-defined organizations solely on the ground that the mere holding of certain ideas deprives such persons of first class citizenship. I will be frank with you that this legislation aroused in me grave doubts as to its constitutional validity. I found it alarming that there should be a statute in the United States which would deprive individuals of their rights without due process of law, and limit, in such drastic manner, the right to hold opinions. For this reason, last year I voted to outlaw the Communist Party. Only in this way, some of us thought, could an abnormal situation be clarified, a situation in which we heretofore claimed that it was legal for people to hold Communist ideas and belong to the Communist Party and nevertheless forced such people to register, ostracized them, starved them economically, and yet refused to give them a trial in a court of law. I thought that if we do these things, we must do them honestly. If Communists are to be stripped of full citizenship, let us do so directly by a law making it illegal to be one. Then we can bring them to trial and they can test in the courts the constitutionality of our action. We owe this to our Constitution and to our democratic tradition.

The third example I would like to submit is the provision of the Taft-Hartley Act regarding the anti-Communist oath. In passing on its constitutionality, Justice Vinson, speaking for the majority of the Court, said: "The Government's interest here is not in preventing the dissemination of Communist doctrine or the holding of past beliefs because it is feared that unlawful action will result therefrom if free speech is practiced. Its interest is in protecting the free flow of commerce from what Congress considers to be substantial evils of conduct. Section 9 (h), the anti-Communist oath provision, does not interfere with speech because Congress fears the consequence of speech; it regulates harmful conduct which Congress has determined is carried on by persons who may be identified by their political affiliations and beliefs."

I am not unaware that the commerce clause of the Constitution played an important part in the determinations of the Supreme Court. And I am far from criticizing this trend of our law. Yet we must not forget that the Court itself, speaking through some of its members, on occasions expressed doubts as to the desirability and interpretative fruitfulness of overworking the commerce clause. I refer to the forceful concurring opinions of Justices Douglas and

Jackson in *Edwards* v. *California* (314 U. S. 160). This was a case dealing with a California statute restricting the entry of indigent citizens of other States into California. The majority of the Court invalidated the statute as a restriction of interstate commerce, while the minority, concurring in the result, strongly urged a decision on the basis of the immunities and privileges clause of the 14th Amendment. Thus Justice Douglas said: "But I am of the opinion that the right of persons to move freely from State to State occupies a more protected position in our constitutional system than does the movement of cattle, fruit, steel, and coal across State lines."

I think the reference here to the relative constitutional depth of the two provisions is significant and should, I feel, never be lost sight of. Yet in this case there was no contradiction between the alternative grounds of the decision. In the quoted opinion of Justice Vinson, however, such contradiction not only exists, but it is even explicitly admitted. Are we not justified then in insisting that the validity of the oath provision be tested in the light of the First Amendment—the soul of the Bill of Rights? The right of Congress to legislate in a particular field can be justified on the basis of any applicable constitutional provision, but can Federal legislation be considered valid when its substance violates a fundamental right guaranteed by the Constitution?

Of course we know that all this raises difficult questions—perhaps questions which go to the very root of our entire cultural and political life. They are difficult not only objectively but also subjectively. For my part I decidedly disagree with communism—its doctrines and its practices. I should say more: I abhor them. It requires a great effort on my part to discuss anti-Communist legislation in terms of the democratic philosophy to which we adhere by tradition and by conviction. But the inner ideological core of our Constitution is involved and the faith in that type of world which lies at its foundation.

For us Americans the Constitution of the United States is not a passing document. It is the embodiment of our existence. Like any embodiment it is inseparable from the things it embodies. Our adherence to its provisions is not a half-hearted acceptance. It is a belief—an unshakable belief—in its wisdom. Once it was a prophecy and our history has shown that it came true. For these reasons, I feel, it is the essence of our life's task to live up to the precepts of our Constitution. And even when we think of amending it, we must beware lest we destroy that pessimistic-optimistic spirit which I mentioned in the beginning. We should shun amendments that would impair this spirit. I am convinced for instance that the Bricker amendment would do just this.

The way of life that the Constitution helped to create made our country, in the words of our anthem, "the land of the free and the home of the brave." And you will understand that, considering the way I feel, it would be insufferable to me to think of defending our Constitution by unconstitutional or even constitutionally doubtful means.

Now, I fully realize the stresses and trials of the tense international situation where the issue of communism plays such an important part. I know the temptations and I understand how the fainthearted feel, but our faith must be stronger than any doubts. And may we pray in the words of the Lord's Prayer: "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." Let us remember that the Constitution is a living thing tested in the vicissitudes of history and let us not forget that doctrines come and go but that the Constitution is and must be always with us.

When I survey the program of our anti-Communist legislation, I am not convinced that it is always in accord with the principles and beliefs just expressed. In part, I regret to say, it is the result of doubts in the soundness of our social organization and in part it must be ascribed to dullness of mind and preference for conformity where initiative is required.

Recently the papers reported that there was a question whether a piano tuner who invoked the fifth amendment in declining to answer whether he was a Communist should be licensed. As I understand it, he was finally given a license, but consider what the raising of such question implies. Assuming that he was actually a Communist, how can the tuning of pianos by a Communist endanger our security. Is it not a clear case of persecution for holding unpopular views, a position inconsistent with the First Amendment? This case, to be sure, was favorably resolved. But we know that similar cases arise constantly. Would you not say that we tread here on dangerous ground?

I pass now to the loyalty-security program as a whole, and shall begin with the statement of some general propositions. I think that the following persons cannot hold positions in government agencies:

1. A traitor.
2. A spy.
3. A person whose opinions would prevent him from following established policy relevant to his tasks.

Treason and espionage are crimes, and criminals are subject to trials and, if convicted, to punishment. A person, however, who holds an opinion which prevents him from fulfilling his duties is not a criminal but an inappropriate public servant. I suggest that the reason for his dismissal or nonemployment is the lack of necessary qualifications. It seems that our difficulties with the loyalty-security program arise because we confuse these basically different situations and, also, because we disregard the cases where the opinions of an employee are irrelevant.

In stating these views, I do not close my eyes to the question of seditious conspiracy which must be considered when we deal with members of the Communist Party. I suggest, however, that it is inconsistent with the principles of democracy to imply the knowledge of criminal conspiratorial aims or to decide these matters by means of administrative determination. As a confirmed Jeffersonian, I personally feel that, in general, the scope of administrative law should not be unduly enlarged. In this instance, however, my reluctance has still another reason. The questions of guilt arising from participation in a criminal conspiracy traditionally belong in the domain of criminal law and its procedures. It does not require elaboration that according to the system of our law a person charged with a criminal offense has the right to be tried and to be convicted or acquitted by the verdict of his peers. This principle is universal, and I entertain the gravest doubts that questions of guilt raised by the loyalty-security program should be decided outside the established procedures of adjudication. To do so seems a violation of the due process clause. The crimes implied by the loyalty-security program are heinous crimes, and I do not think that persons whose very honor and economic existence is under threat can be deprived of a fair trial in the accepted Anglo-Saxon tradition.

In this question, I fully identify myself with the following words of Harry P. Cain, former Senator from Washington and now a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board:

"In other periods, we have abused the meaning of the Bill of Rights. We are so abusing some of its meaning today. This must not dishearten us because until the amendments have been repealed, and this prospect is not in sight, nor is it likely to be, men and women possessed of reason can prevail upon others to understand that the amendments constitute our American way of life, and with courage these same citizens can prevail upon authorities to live in accordance with every one of them.

"What I have just recited about the letter of the Bill of Rights means just this: Had you chosen recently between being indicted for a capital or infamous crime or being held to be a loyalty or security risk, there would have been no choice to make. From the indictment, you would have been found guilty or acquitted; sentenced or released through language and methods everyone can understand. From the allegation that you were a loyalty or security risk, you might have long wallowed in the wilderness of despair and mental torment without determining what the charges were all about, or where they came from."

The idea of allowing one accused to face his accuser is indeed not new. In St. Paul's day the Romans observed this rule.

In chapter 25 of the Book of Acts, verses 12 to 16, we find the following passage.

"Festus laid Paul's case before the king, saying: There is a certain man left a prisoner by Felix; about whom, when I was at Jerusalem, the chief priests and elders of the Jews informed me, asking for sentence against him. To whom I answered that it is not the custom of the Romans to give up any man, before that the accused have the accusers face to face, and have had the opportunity to make his defense concerning the matter laid against him."

When I think of the Federal loyalty-security program, I cannot escape the conclusion that a still further confusion prevents us from reaching calm and judicious decisions. The same, I believe, applies to congressional investigations. We seem to confuse mere advocacy of ideas with propagation of ideas by coercion. If anybody doubts this let him read the memoranda from the FBI and the Army and Navy intelligence services which were submitted to President Truman's Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty and which dictated the original loyalty program set up on the basis of the Commission's recommendations. Copious extracts from these memoranda have been published in Miss Eleanor Bontacou's recent book on the Federal loyalty-security program. These memoranda make amazing reading. They tell us that disloyal and subversive persons—they are never once defined—are dangerous for two reasons. They are dangerous, first, because they are potential spies. And they are also dangerous—and I quote—"because of the propaganda they disseminate." The Director of the Office of Naval Intelligence tells us that—and I quote—"because it has its roots in humanitarian principles based on the rights of man, our democracy is particularly susceptible to subversive attack. It is easy to masquerade as protectors of civil liberties, or promoters of the interest of individuals whose level of economy is declared to be substandard. Making an emotional appeal for the downtrodden such groups loudly demand rights for particular groups, but usually fail to point out the corresponding duty which logically arises from any social contract."

A Jefferson would have regarded the rights of man as constituting the strongest foundation of our democracy, but here this is presented as its greatest weakness. A Lincoln would have said that you cannot fool the people very often, but here the people are pictured as the great gullible who needs a policeman to keep the Communists from subverting him.

Now, I have tried to stress that, if we want to preserve democracy the fight for the integrity of our institutions must be carried on by means approved by the Constitution itself. Any abridgement of rights which it guarantees would defeat the very purpose of

the fight. I have also pointed out that, in my view, we have gone far afield in stretching the limits of the permissible scope of action. At the same time, I indicated some of the political reasons for the present trends: I mentioned the emotional tensions of the cold war with Soviet Russia and the resulting fears lest our Nation be destroyed. It remains to point out some of the reasons which are anchored in home politics.

Indeed, I am troubled by the fact that when we speak of Communists, we are rather vague in stating what a Communist is. It is a matter of everyday occurrence that people of liberal views are called Communists. There is also evidence that such confusion is not limited to "neighborly" relations but tends to affect the Federal clearance procedures. In studying these attitudes, I feel that we have here a situation which threatens the integrity of our institutions and our way of life. As every other work of human endeavor, our country is not perfect. Only a steady process of improvement can prevent society from decay or revolution. We believe that the best way to bring about beneficial changes is the democratic process established by the Constitution.

The essence of liberalism is a keen feeling for the necessity of change when the existing state of affairs exhibits social and economic injustice or traits of a lifeless and trammeling past. Liberalism, therefore, is a structural element of the democratic process. To suggest that liberals are traitors or to intimate this covertly, represents a direct danger to our society.

Of late, the fight against liberals has been carried out under the slogans of the fight against treason. This new slogan came to supplement the older pretext that the liberals in our country had advocated "un-American" ideas.

Representative MARTIN DIES who was the principal proponent of the resolution creating the Committee on Unamerican Activities and its first chairman only last Monday issued a statement strongly urging fair hearings for persons accused as security risks. He said: "I know the accused ought to be confronted with witnesses * * * he ought to have a bill of particulars in advance, and he ought to know the criteria for judging—the rules on what constitutes guilt." He stated further: "When the committee started in 1938, I warned in my opening statement that such a probe could go to excess. I pledged if it did, that I would take the lead in correcting it and defending innocent people. So I felt a moral obligation. * * * I never wanted this to become an emotional, hysterical thing." Representative DIES indicated that he became alarmed concerning the Federal loyalty-security program in the process of representing a Federal employee, Dr. Edward Elliot, charged with disloyalty. This man Representative DIES had cleared before the Un-American Activities Committee back in 1942. In regard to this case, Representative DIES said: "I believe that in back of this thing was violent opposition to Dr. Elliott's views. He had liberal ideas, but we're not supposed to punish men for their ideas, it made me feel we were getting back to the star chamber. It frightened me, because it seemed so contrary to what I always believed was fundamental American fair play * * * I want to do something. I am trying to accomplish the purpose of keeping security from being used for oppression or political purpose."

I believe that the time has come to raise the question as to the place of the liberals in our society urgently and openly. The liberal must be restored in his constitutional rights and given the place which, in the spirit of the Constitution, he must hold in our democratic society. And, too, the liberal must be protected from unfounded politically inspired accusations of treason, communism and subversion.

At present the position of the liberal has become particularly difficult, not only because he has been placed in a state of general mistrust, but also because every one of his ideas or suggestions for the improvement of conditions in our country is immediately challenged in some political quarters as Communist inspired. In a certain historical situation there are only a limited number of measures for improvement and it is not surprising that men of different philosophies of life may in practice follow a similar train of thought. This coincidence of detail, however, does not justify the conclusion that similar solutions necessarily presuppose identity of political philosophies.

For example, John Foster Dulles has written at length how the Communists have adopted in their propaganda many basic tenents of the Christian religion. Mr. Dulles' inference was clear that an ardent Christian cannot be called a Communist because some of his social attitudes coincide with some of the views of Communists.

Do we not agree that this unworthy challenge should not be made a test of loyalty? I believe it is alarming that we are presently forced to fight for the right of the liberals to exist and to act in our society. This disturbing trend that we are forced to fight clearly shows that the questions discussed tonight bear directly on our entire future.

It is our tragic lot to live in the shadow of a possible new global war and we know that, if war should come, it is of little importance how we plan to shape our lives. With the new weapons and their devastating power civilization will hardly survive. But we all hope that mankind will succeed in avoiding this terrible end. We trust that reason will prevail and that it will be given to us to bequeath to our children the democratic heritage as unimpaired as we have received it from the hands of our fathers. This is a difficult task to fulfill. Only a firm belief in the social values of democracy, only intellectual integrity, thoughtful vigilance, and selfless dedication to serve our fellowmen can help us to prevail.

From an old past, from a different country comes to us an admonition. The scene is Rome. The time—a moment of grave danger to the Roman Republic. The speaker—Marcus Porcius Cato, the statesman and the patriot. At the Roman magistrates he threw his challenge:

"Caveant consules ne quid detrimenti res publica capiat!" * * * "Consuls, beware, lest disaster befall the Republic."

These words are always in my mind. They do not let me rest.

The People's Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if the American people, in a truly democratic fashion, could choose the military service they want to guarantee United States defense, there is no doubt what their choice would be. They believe in air power, and they know that only air power can guarantee our security. They know that the United States Air Force, with its intercontinental bombers, and its record of performance in World War II and in Korea, is the best bet for victory in world war III, if it comes, and for keeping the peace, in hopes of avoiding it.

A recent Gallup poll has proved this decisively. When asked which branch of the Armed Forces they thought would be most important in the event of another war, more than 70 percent of the people questioned reaffirmed, as they did in a similar poll in 1949, that they thought the Air Force would be the most important.

Comments the director of the Gallup poll:

Military experts may be startled to note how extremely one sided the vote continues to be on the Air Force—how much the drama and color of the Air Force has fired the popular imagination.

The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. Persons who have attended college feel the same way about the relative position of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as those who attended only high school or grade school.

It is not that the Air Force is the most popular of the services in general esteem, however. The point is, Mr. Speaker, that the Air Force must play the top role in the next war, if we are to win it; and that is what the American people know, and what we must keep in mind in our consideration of the defense budget.

I ask the consent of my colleagues to extend my remarks and insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the figures assembled by Mr. George Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, bearing on this inescapable fact. The news release containing this significant information follows:

THE GALLUP POLL—TOP ROLE FOR AIR FORCE IN NEXT WAR FORECAST

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

PRINCETON, N. J., March 31.—If another world war comes, the average American today has one idea fixed firmly in his mind: the United States Air Force would play a much more important part in it than either the Army or the Navy.

More than 7 out of every 10 persons, or 71 percent, questioned in the latest institute survey think the Air Force would be most important, compared to 5 percent who say the Navy and 4 percent who think the Army would be most important.

About 1 person in 5, or 19 percent, believes all 3 branches will be equally important. This is an increase, however, over the opinion reflected by a similar question in 1949.

This is clearly shown in the results of interviews with a cross section of adults across the country, who were asked this question by institute reporters:

"In the event of another world war, which branch of the Armed Forces do you think will be most important—the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force?"

The vote today and that of a similar survey in October 1949:

	Today	1949
	Percent	*Percent*
Army	4	6
Navy	5	4
Air Force	71	74
All three equally important	19	9
Don't know	3	7

Today's table adds to more than 100 percent because some persons named two branches which they said would be equally important.

Military experts may be startled to note how extremely one sided the vote continues to be on the Air Force, how much the drama and color of the Air Force has fired the popular imagination.

The great popular appeal of the Air Force affects all walks of life. Persons who have attended college feel the same way about the relative position of the Army, Navy, and Air Force as those who attended only high school or grade school.

The same situation prevails by age levels, as shown in the following tables:

By education

	College	High school	Grade school
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Army	6	3	6
Navy	4	4	6
Air Force	71	71	70
All three	19	21	16
Don't know	2	2	5

By age

	21-29 years	30-49 years	50 and over
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
Army	7	4	3
Navy	3	5	5
Air Force	70	69	75
All three	19	21	17
Don't know	2	3	3

Ike Strong in Minshall Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the results of a poll taken by my colleague, WILLIAM E. MINSHALL, who represents the 23d District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure you join with me when I say that some of us who have been here for several terms look with pride upon the endeavors and accomplishments of some of the freshmen or new Members of Congress. I have that pride when I see the services being performed by Congressman MINSHALL, of Ohio. It was my privilege to serve with Congressman MINSHALL back in the Ohio Legislature. He is bringing to Congress the same excellent service and unceasing efforts on behalf of the people he represents. His endeavors to keep in contact with his constituents by means of many visits and polls certainly is commendable. In my opinion, we need have no fear of the future when the American people send to Congress young men with vision, integrity, honesty, and a willingness to work as exemplified by some of the new Members of this great legislative body, including the capable Member from the 23d District of Ohio.

IKE STRONG IN MINSHALL POLL

Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL today released the final tabulation of returns to his opinion poll which was mailed to a cross section of approximately 25,000 23d Congressional District residents in March.

The final tabulation of nearly 4,000 returns produced unmistakable evidence that President Eisenhower and his program are extremely popular with 23d District voters. Eighty-three and seven-tenths percent of those people answering the poll answered "Yes" to the question, "Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?"

This 83.7-percent support is an increase of almost 15 percent over the Eisenhower vote in 1952 when the President received 69.4 percent of the total vote cast for that office in the 23d Congressional District.

The largest number of "Yes" answers was in response to the question "Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy in private enterprise?" Ninety-three and one-tenth percent of the answers favored this portion of President Eisenhower's program. Another portion of the Eisenhower program heavily favored by 23d Congressional District voters was the 89.4 percent support of the President's Armed Forces Reserve program.

Twenty-third District residents registered their greatest disapproval against the admission of Red China to the United Nations. Almost as great a disapproval was registered against the further lowering of taxes when 84 percent of those polled answered "No" to the question "Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later?" In this regard, a near majority, 49.3 percent, would even approve higher Federal taxes if needed to balance the budget.

Thirty-one and five-tenths percent of the people polled had no opinion on the Bricker amendment and 27.2 percent had no opinion on the reciprocal trade-agreements program, the two largest percentages in the "no opinion" column.

Congressman MINSHALL expressed his appreciation for the prompt and amazing response to his opinion poll and stated: "The results evidenced such a sincere and genuine interest in Government operations that future polls will be a regular part of my representing the people of the 23d Congressional District."

The final tabulation follows:

Final tabulation, Congressman William E. Minshall's opinion poll

Question	Answer in percentages		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor continued military assistance to Asia?	69.7	21.5	8.8
Do you favor continued economic assistance to Asia?	70.1	21.6	8.3
Do you favor continued military assistance to Europe?	72.4	21.3	6.3
Do you favor continued economic assistance to Europe?	56.2	37.5	6.3
Should nuclear weapons be used against Communist aggression?	73.7	17.7	8.6
Do you feel the United Nations deserves our continued support?	80.6	13.3	6.1
Do you favor admitting Red China to the United Nations?	11.9	82.4	5.7
Are you in agreement with the Eisenhower-Dulles foreign policy?	74.3	11.9	13.8
Would you favor reductions in defense spending?	28.0	67.7	4.3
Do you favor wage and price "standby" controls for use in case of emergency?	79.3	13.7	7.0
Do you believe that the civil defense program is adequate?	34.2	52.3	13.5
Do you favor congressional investigations of Un-American activities?	75.2	19.7	5.1
Do you favor granting immunity from criminal prosecution and forcing people to testify who use the defense of the fifth amendment?	39.1	47.9	13.0
Do you favor the use in Federal courts of evidence gained by or developed from wire tapping in cases involving national security?	81.7	14.0	4.3
Do you favor an Armed Forces Reserve program to build and maintain powerful civilian reserves?	89.4	6.6	4.0
Do you favor universal military training?	76.8	19.3	3.9
Do you believe that we should cut taxes first and balance the budget later?	12.3	84.0	3.7
Would you approve higher Federal taxes if needed to balance the budget?	49.3	46.3	4.4
Would you favor increasing present old age and survivorship benefits under the Social Security Act?	56.5	36.3	7.2
Should the Taft-Hartley Act be amended?	34.9	49.7	15.4
Do you approve of Federal aid to education to assist States in providing more public school classrooms?	64.4	30.3	5.3
Do you approve of statehood for Hawaii?	76.4	10.2	13.4
Do you approve of statehood for Alaska?	73.6	15.6	10.8
Do you approve of the reciprocal trade agreements program?	65.5	7.3	27.2
Do you favor the administration's farm program of flexible price supports?	66.8	19.7	13.5
Do you favor the Bricker amendment?	35.6	32.9	31.5
Do you favor raising postal rates to reduce the deficit in the Post Office Department?	71.4	23.2	5.4
Should 18-year-olds be given the right to vote?	40.9	53.6	5.5
Should the present 75 cents an hour minimum wage law be increased to 90 cents an hour?	56.6	32.6	10.8
Do you favor a salary increase for Federal employees?	51.8	29.1	19.1
Do you believe that Congress should authorize 35,000 additional public housing units in each of the next 2 years?	32.8	43.8	18.0
Do you believe that the Small Business Administration which assists and encourages small-business enterprises should be continued?	81.7	10.8	7.5
Are you in favor of the administration's expanded Federal interstate highway program?	84.2	8.6	7.2
Do you favor a Federal health reinsurance program to encourage voluntary participation in health-insurance programs?	38.5	44.0	17.5
Do you favor the development and use of atomic energy in private enterprise?	93.1	4.1	2.8
Is the Eisenhower administration doing a good job?	83.7	5.1	11.2

Background on Parcel Post Size and Weight Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the parcel post service was created by act of Congress in 1912, and went into operation on January 1, 1913. It was recognized in the Congress at that time that the establishment of a parcel-post system would bring about some dislocations in the transportation business. Proof is found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 13, 1912, where this statement is found:

> The proposed measure will benefit all classes of the people except those carriers now engaged in the business of transporting small wares. While the patronage of these will be lessened, it will have the effect to limit their business to the more weighty freight, which is distinctly the business of such carriers.

That statement also belies some allegations that the parcel-post establishment was for the principal benefit of rural residents in that it says the enactment would benefit all classes of people.

The impermanence of the original 11-pound, 72-inch limit on parcel post is pointed up by the Senate committee report of 1912, which said:

When the parcel-post service has once been inaugurated, details, such as insurance, collect on delivery, reduction in rates, increased weight limits, and so forth, can be rapidly added as experience indicates the character of the new service that should be provided.

The wants of the American public were quickly made known, and the first increase in parcels allowable in the mails was made in August 1913—just 8 months after the service began. Other increases were made periodically until 1931, when the 70-pound, 100-inch limit was reached. This was apparently the optimum, as it remained in effect for more than 20 years, half the life of the parcel-post system, until Public Law 199 was enacted in 1951.

During this 20-year period, the Railway Express Agency was making acquisitions to become a monopoly in its field, the final acquisition being made in 1938. During this 20-year period, the express agency enjoyed its greatest period of prosperity. During the latter part of this 20-year period, there began an upsurge in the businesses of motor carriers and freight forwarders.

In an economic period, when nearly all business was prospering, the early years after World War II, the business of the express agency declined. Rising costs of doing business forced railway-express rates up 123 percent, while parcel-post rates were increasing 125 percent. During this period, there was a 25-percent decline in railway-express shipments and a 50-percent decline in railroad less-than-carload shipments. At the same time, however, there was taking place a 180-percent increase in freight-forwarder activity, a 260-percent rise in over-the-road carriage—motor carriers, and a 7,251-percent increase in air freight. During this same period, the growth of the parcel-post service only paralleled the growth of business in the other three classifications of mail.

The express agency, supported by its parent-company railroads, found a convenient whipping boy in the parcel-post system. Apparently they felt that it would be easier to wreck this valuable service in an effort to recoup its losses than it would be to cope with their true competitors—the freight forwarders, motor carriers, and air transport.

They sold their case well to the Congress. The employee unions of the railroads and the express agency were mobilized, and the rank-and-file employees were recruited to write emotional letters to the Congress, and fallacious reasoning was employed so effectively that the Congress was persuaded to enact Public Law 199 in 1951, to become effective January 1, 1952.

That law says:

I. Packages moving between first-class post offices in the first and second postal zones can measure no more than 72 inches, length and girth combined, and can weigh up to 40 pounds.

II. Packages moving between first-class post offices in the third through eighth postal zones can measure 72 inches, length and girth combined, but can weigh no more than 20 pounds.

III. Parcels moving to or from a second-, third-, or fourth-class post office could still adhere to the 70-pound, 100-inch limit formerly available to all postal patrons.

The effect of this law was to provide a Government small-parcel delivery service to the least populous sections of the country; a parcel-delivery service of the most expensive kind to the areas of the country which by reason of their lack of development contributed least to the support of the cost of the service. But at the same time, the citizens of the more densely populated areas, from whom comes the major financial support to the Government, are being denied all but a small part of the parcel-post service.

The law was enacted over the protest of the shipping public who stood ready to pay any necessary cost of the parcel-post service commensurate with efficient operation; a shipping public which knew there could be no substitute for the parcel-post system, which reaches into every town, village, and hamlet of the United States.

The proponents of Public Law 199 had as their watchword "Get the freight out of the parcel-post service." While Webster's International Unabridged Dictionary provides no definitive dimensions for freight, traffic experts recognize freight as being only those shipments in excess of 100 pounds.

The effects of the law have been these:

Contrary to the claim that enactment of the law would increase Railway Express employment, the number of employees of that agency has continued to decline until now there are fewer employees than in 1940, and 1,155 fewer employees than when the law went into effect.

According to information filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, Express Agency net profit has fallen from $556,000 in 1951, the last year before Public Law 199 became operative, to only $11,624 for the first 10 months of 1954.

Packaging costs of commercial users of parcel post have increased greatly due to the necessity of breaking packages formerly acceptable in parcel post into two or more packages in order to meet the restrictions of Public Law 199. This also has the effect of increasing operating expenses in the Post Office Department by reason of increasing the number of packages handled in moving a volume of weight formerly acceptable in the mail in a single package.

The private patron of the parcel-post system has met with utter confusion under the act. In many instances the son or daughter in college can no longer send their laundry home; food boxes from home are smaller. New patterns are being sent in Christmas gifts going through the mails in order to avoid the freight classification spelled out in Public Law 199. A lady's winter coat, when properly packaged for mailing, is now barred from the mails because it often falls into the category of freight.

Rural patrons of the Post Office Department, who were exempted from the restrictions of Public Law 199, were not able to escape the 36-percent increase in parcel-post rates, which is said by postal officials to be an increase nearly 60 percent greater than would have been necessary without Public Law 199.

The fiscal condition of the Post Office Department, in behalf of which the proponents of Public Law 199 assumed to speak at length, is said by postal officials to be around $70 million worse off than would be the case without Public Law 199.

But the efforts of the opponents to this law to get it repealed have not yet been successful.

Principal reasons for this lack of success to date are:

The proponents of the law are most adept at twisting statistics to picture conditions as favorable to their cause when such is not the case. They take the Post Office Department reports and interpret them to mean something entirely different from what was intended by that office. They quote statements out of context, and use different figures of their own to portray whatever picture best suits their need at the moment.

An outstanding example of the latter is this:

The express agency, when seeking ICC approval for increased minimum charges, said they had captured only 20 percent of the business lost to the Post Office Department by reason of Public Law 199. But, a few weeks later, when they went before the St. George subcommittee in the House of Representatives in January 1954 to urge retention of that law, they said they had gained 57 percent of the business lost to the post office by reason of Public Law 199. In the same connection, the agency often claims that competition from the Post Office Department had caused the layoff of 40,000 railway express employees. However, when they appeared before the ICC to get a rate increase, they presented information to show that 1,941 employees had been returned to their jobs. They told the congressional committee that about 4,000 had been returned to their jobs. Now, if they had recovered 20 percent of the business they claimed the parcel-post system had taken from them before Public Law 199, it would seem that 8,000 people would have been returned to their jobs. If they had recaptured 57 percent of the traffic driven out of the parcel-post system by Public Law 199, would not more than 22,000 people have been returned to their jobs? Yet, according to most recent employment figures available, there are 1,155 fewer employees in the agency now than when Public Law 199 went into effect. That leaves us completely in the dark as to just how has the parcel-post system affected railway express employment and profits? Indeed, is there any relationship at all? Was the parcel-post system ever competitive with the Railway Express Agency? The business on which the motor carriers, air carriers, and freight forwarders are prospering certainly did not come from the parcel-post system. Proof of this lies in the difficulties experienced when a shipper asks for the pickup of a shipment weighing less than 100 pounds. The prosperity of these carriers cannot

all be attributed to movement of merchandise that just never moved before. It had to come from some other carrier, and there is ample evidence to indicate that much of it came from the railroads and from the Railway Express Agency.

But the railroads and the express agency have the political strength to continue to convince the Congress that its competitor is the parcel-post system; they have "sold" the Congress that its losses were due to the dozen shirts, the fishing rod, the card table, the lamp shade, and any number of similar items formerly carried by the parcel-post system, but which, because of a strange act of Congress, are now classified as "freight," and, as such, are barred from the mails.

It is to be hoped that Congress will soon realize that interests of 160 million Americans—all potential users of the parcel-post system—are to be considered ahead of the interests of a single monopoly that cannot rightly tell who its real competitors are. When the Congress reaches such a realization, or when the true facts of the parcel post controversy are evaluated, there can be only one result: repeal of Public Law 199.

International Educational Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY ALDOUS DIXON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM—GRANTS FOR FOREIGN STUDENTS TO STUDY AT INSTITUTIONS IN OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The report of the House Appropriation Committee on the international educational exchange activities of the State Department includes a statement to the effect that the committee "doubts that it was ever the intent of the Congress to pay the cost of sending foreign students from their country to study at a university of another foreign country." This statement read in connection with the hearings on this activity seems to reflect some concern over the fact that $220,155 in foreign currency equivalents, out of a total of $22 million requested for this activity, would be spent on grants to enable foreigners to attend American educational institutions in other foreign countries.

I should like to point out that the hearings indicate that the Department does not propose to spend this modest sum for studies in universities of other foreign countries but rather for studies in American colleges, American schools, and American institutes situated in foreign countries, and mostly in the countries of which the proposed students are citizens. It is true that to a limited extent some of these students would study in other foreign countries.

The information submitted by the Department and included in the report of the hearings (p. 334), however, indicates that something less than 16 percent of the local overseas grants or a total of $35,154 in foreign currency equivalents would be devoted to such studies in so-called "third countries." That information indicates that this small sum would enable two students from Iraq to study at the American University of Beirut and that less than 220 out of the 1,354 of these local overseas grantees would study for short periods of time at the well-known Salzburg Seminar in American Studies in Salzburg, Austria, and at American institutes modeled after it in Norway and Holland.

As I understand it, the authority for such grants is to be found in the Fulbright act. That act provides, among other things, for the expenditure of foreign currencies for "financing studies, research, instruction and other educational activities * * * of the citizens of such foreign country in the American schools and institutions of higher learning located outside the continental United States" and its territories "including transportation, tuition, maintenance, and other expenses incident to scholastic activities." I understand that this provision was intended to extend the benefits of educational exchange to a few foreign grantees, too many of whom could not come to this country and for whom such contact with American education and American educators would be the next best thing.

Pursuant to that provision, grants have been made for attendance at such American centers of American influence as Roberts College at Istanbul, the American University of Beirut and the American Farm School at Salonika and other such institutions. As the program has progressed, other additional institutions have been qualified to participate in this phase of the program by the Board of Foreign Scholarships, the Board appointed by the President of the United States and consisting primarily of nongovernmental educators "for the purpose of selecting students and educational institutions qualified to participate in this program, and to supervise the exchange program authorized herein."

The hearings in the report would indicate that the committee was concerned primarily with the attendance of these foreign nationals at such American institutes abroad as the Salzburg Seminar in American Studies at Salzburg, Austria, and similar American institutes which have been established with the Salzburg Seminar as a model. I understand also that the focus of study in such institutes or seminars is American institutions and American studies, and that in most cases the students who receive these small grants are, in fact, teachers and mature people in positions where they can pass on what they have learned about American institutions in an influential way to their students, their associates, and their fellow citizens at home.

The hearings themselves contain a full description of the Salzburg Seminar which points out the fact that the Seminar is a private American institution which has received gifts from many private respectable American sources. The purpose of the Seminar is to enable Europeans to understand more fully the United States, its institutions, culture and way of life, and insofar as possible to correct the misconceptions concerning the United States which exist in Europe today. I call attention especially to the statement of the United States High Commissioner to Austria in 1951, which is quoted in the hearings: "Never before has it been so necessary for freemen to meet together in groups dedicated to better understanding and support of our free institutions."

I understand that the Salzburg Seminar and others like it also utilize fully American professors sent abroad under the FULBRIGHT program thereby expanding greatly the audiences for these spokesmen on American life and institutions. In view of all these facts, I would hope that nothing in the committee report would convey the impression that these seminars or institutes are universities of another foreign country. Rather, they are American centers abroad which, like the earlier and better known institutions like Roberts College, are islands of American influence and understanding overseas. I hope that this kind of activity can be continued on its current modest scale.

Will We Have To Ration Doctors?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a copy of my radio broadcast on Saturday, April 16, 1955, over WMEX, Boston, Mass.:

The health standards of the United States are rising.

More people recognize the importance of good health and want to protect it.

With our increasing population, however, there are not enough doctors, dentists, and nurses to go around.

The question "Will we have to ration doctors?" is intended to point up the shortage and to get us thinking about remedies for this malnutrition in the medical profession itself.

The Health Resources Advisory Committee, which includes distinguished doctors, has just made a report of its findings to the Office of Defense Mobilization of the United States Government.

Their diagnosis should be given careful consideration in the treatment of aid-to-medical-schools bills which are now before the Congress. Generally speaking, these bills intend to provide $250 to $300 million in direct-grant aid to medical schools on a matching basis for the construction of new facilities.

Why is this necessary?

To help meet the $330 million construction of new facilities by medical schools that was needed as far back as 1947–48.

Based on the estimate of 75 out of 79 medical schools that they urgently need additional or improved space.

The increase in the number of physicians is falling behind the more rapid increase in our population.

The gross ratio of physicians to population is now 1.32 per 1,000, and the net ratio (active physicans only) is now 1.18, both slightly lower than just before World War II.

By 1960 the United States will have a total of 177 million people who will, at some time or another, need medical care.

At the rate we are going in medical education there will be fewer physicians percentagewise in 1960 than we had in 1950.

As the committee summarizes, "We have a tight supply situation in the three major health professions—medicine, dentistry, and nursing. The supply, both of physicians and dentists, has not increased as fast as the population, in the period since the beginning of World War II. The supply of nurses has increased more rapidly, but there are still many unmet demands for graduate nurses. There is little prospect for improvement in the total situation in this decade."

The medical schools are finding it hard to maintain adequate staffs with money problems and the shortage of qualified health manpower exerting heavy pressures.

Most medical schools reply upon part-time personnel, especially for instruction in clinical subjects. In the 1951 survey, medical faculties included 3,933 members with full-time, and 11,630 members with part-time appointments. Many of the 11,630 part-time faculty members were able to devote little time to teaching, the average being less than 300 hours per year.

Only 21 of the 72 4-year medical schools reported staffing which was up to the standard recommended by the Joint Committee on Medical Education.

The most specific report on this subject is found in the 1953 Education Number of the American Medical Association which states that for the school year 1953, the number of unfilled fulltime positions in the instructional staffs of medical schools was 283.

A significant change in the pattern of medical education and practice in recent years, is the growth of hospital internship, and residency training programs. Hospitals and practicing physicians have come increasingly to rely on these "house staffs." The result is that the demand by hospitals has, for some time, been greater than the supply of potential trainees, and hospitals vie with one another for their services.

In spite of the rapid increase in the number of physicians in training, the opportunities for training have continued to increase faster than the number of applicants. In 1952–53, 28 percent of internships and 24 percent of the residencies in hospitals were unfilled.

An important aspect of the hospital staffing picture has been the increase in the number of aliens on house staffs. Alien physicians comprise over a quarter of the house staffs of general nonteaching and of tuberculosis hospitals, and almost a quarter of the staffs of mental hospitals. Without their services, the shortage would be acute.

Concerning physicians in private practice, the very long workweek reported, 60 hours on the average, shows that there is little reserve of professional time and skill in today's pattern of provision for medical care.

Although there has been a rapid growth of public health services in this country, at least 30 million people live in areas without organized health departments. As of 1951, budgeted vacancies in the existing State and local public health departments amounted to 20 percent for physicians, 21 percent for dentists, 14 percent for sanitary engineers, 6 percent for sanitarians, 10 percent for veterinarians, and 9 percent for public health nurses. Even without the threat of atomic attack, or biological warfare, a shortage of this size is serious. With these threats existing, the shortage might threaten preventable disaster.

Bear in mind that this whole report was on the subject of "Mobilization and Health Manpower" and was submitted to the Office of Defense Mobilization where you hear this conclusion, and I quote:

"The physician-population ratio has become essentially stabilized. There are unmet demands today in medical education, public health, mental and tuberculosis hospitals, industry and rehabilitation, to name only a few areas. Many rural areas and small towns are in need of practicing physicians. Hospitals in increasing numbers are using alien physicians for house staffs.

"If the threat of attack on the cities of this country were to materialize in any of the presently predicted forms, the combined effect of civilian casualties and casualties in the health professions would place a considerably heavier burden on the population than did the last war, when the civilian population suffered neither military attack nor such an occurrence as the influenza pandemic of the First World War. A civilian disaster of the magnitude possible today could put an incredible load on the civilian health personnel."

Concerning the overall question: "Is there adequate medical training in the United States?" a few of the following facts will help us to reach an answer.

There are 74 approved medical schools, and 6 approved schools of basic medical sciences in the United States, including 1 approved medical school in Puerto Rico.

Twenty-seven thousand six hundred and five students were enrolled in the country's medical schools and 438 students in schools of basic sciences in 1953–54, making a total of 28,043 persons now preparing to fill the Nation's need for doctors.

Six thousand eight hundred and sixteen students graduated from medical schools in the United States during the year ending June 30, 1954. However, it is estimated that about 4,000 doctors are lost each year through death and retirement, so that the actual net increase of doctors was only 2,816.

Fourteen thousand six hundred and seventy-eight individuals applied for admission to American medical schools for the college year 1953–54.

Forty-three percent of these applicants came from 6 States (New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Texas, Illinois, and California).

Applicants from the following 7 States (Delaware, Maine, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Vermont, and Wyoming) represented only 1.4 percent of all persons submitting applications for admission to our medical schools. Only one of this number, Vermont, has an approved medical school.

By contrast, 2 years previously more than 20,000 applied for admission. The drop for 1953–54 reflects three factors.

1. The increasing cost of medical school tuition is pricing thousands of potential medical school students out of the market. New York University recently raised its medical school tuition to $1,000 per year.

2. The end of eligibility under the GI bill of rights.

3. A general feeling among college graduates that it is just too tough to get into medical schools.

Only 53 percent of the applicants were admitted as freshmen to the medical colleges in the United States in 1953–54.

Large numbers of qualified applicants are unable to gain admittance because of geographical restrictions. Thirty-eight percent of the State and municipally owned medical colleges (15 out of 39) restrict enrollment of first-year students to residents of the State in which the school is located. Twenty-three schools limit the number of out-of-State residents to less than 10 percent of the positions in the entering class. Only 22 schools admit out-of-State residents in numbers equal to more than 50 percent of the openings. As a result of these restrictions, some medical schools are forced to take nearly everyone who applies, while others can accept only 1 out of every 10 or 15 applicants.

The basic barrier to increasing the number of physicians is actually the limited capacity of our medical schools. This means that the proportion of students who enter medical school has remained almost constant for the past 20 years whereas the proportion who receive a college education has more than quadrupled, and the proportion entering engineering has increased sixfold.

By 1960, the shortage of nurses for this country as a whole may exceed 50,000.

There are almost 300,000 auxiliary nursing workers in hospitals, and perhaps another 100,000 elsewhere. The need in 1960 for these workers is estimated at more than 450,000.

The technician shortage is a serious bottleneck in the provision of medical service. Hospitals in the United States recently reported about 18,000 vacant positions for workers in 7 major fields allied to medicine—laboratory technicians, therapists of all kinds, X-ray technicians, hospital administrators, clinical psychologists, etc. In another 5 years, 35,000 will be needed.

In a nationwide survey conducted by the New York Times in 1952, it was found that "30 percent of the Nation's medical schools report that they are unable to get sufficient funds to meet their operating budgets." Of the $3,000 to $4,500 a year it costs the medical school to educate a medical student, the average student pays $600 to $900 a year in tuition, or only one-fifth of the cost.

In contrast to the $93 million to be spent for medical education in the academic year 1954–55, the American public spent in 1953 $5,300,000,000 for tobacco products and smoking supplies, $377 million for parimutuel net receipts, $105 million for make-up bases, face powder, and lipsticks.

From this comparison, it would seem that the Congress would be justified in making a modest appropriation to keep our medical schools alive.

Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech given by me commemorating the 212th anniversary of the birth of Jefferson, under the auspices of the Sons of the American Revolution held at Jefferson Memorial, April 13, 1955:

My fellow Americans, today, in an atmosphere befitting the occasion, we assemble to do honor to a great American. Standing here at the memorial he so richly deserves, we gaze upon the outskirts of Washington, a city which represents the capital of a nation he helped to mold. Lawyer, rebel legislator, Governor, Ambassador, Secretary of State, Vice President, and President, Thomas Jefferson perhaps more than any other man charted the course and served at the helm of a ship of state which has become through the years the envy of the entire world.

Though his capacities were many in service of his country, his greatest attainment was as an architect. He visioned and built Monticello. He visioned and built the University of Virginia. But, best of all, he visioned and built a Federal Constitution that guaranteed freedom to live the life of one's own choosing; to worship as our conscience dictates; to speak our own minds without fear; to participate in the affairs of our Government; to preserve our own dignity as God intended that it be preserved.

He made another major contribution to America and the entire universe. He was the architect of a political philosophy which is as rich and as right today as when he put it into words nearly 200 years ago. The philosophy of Thomas Jefferson has been a beacon light to guard America's future against dangerous adventures and false Old World philosophies which would compromise or destroy our birthright.

Indeed, dangerous times came about when prophets of socialism in other guises sought to belittle and brush aside the advice of the Sage of Monticello. And in these times our Nation ventured into strange waters which brought a degree of regimentation of the people; of peacetime controls over the economy; of inflation and unbalanced budgets.

Jefferson had warned that when we tell the farmer what to sow and what to reap we would soon want bread. He was so right when he said:

"My God. How little do my countrymen know what precious blessings they are in possession of, and which no other people on earth enjoy."

And yet despite our previous misadventures and experiments away from the American form of government, there are still a number of national legislators backed up by a strong and vociferous minority who believe there is something wrong with the way we do things; that we can borrow parts of socialism and integrate them into our philosophy of government. My good friends, freedom and socialism are as compatible as a cat and dog. If we want to destroy freedom we have only to adopt socialism. Extreme danger exists even if we flirt with it as some of our nearsighted people suggest.

Thomas Jefferson had another architectual accomplishment. It was through his efforts that the great Democratic Party came into being. Throughout the years until the early 1930's, his political philosophy dictated the action of that party. But then the party began to depart from Jeffersonian teachings and direction.

But after a period of this transgression the American people became alarmed and through the voice that Jefferson gave them returned the Nation to the course decreed by our forefathers. In so doing, they reaffirmed their belief in and adherence to the principles on which America was founded and grew to greatness.

Today the political party Thomas Jefferson brought into being is content to team him with another patron saint—Andrew Jackson. That is somewhat of a shotgun wedding because Jefferson was a statesman with ideals that transcended political considerations and Jackson was a political and a very inept politician at that. He does not belong in the same company with Jefferson.

Jefferson is not a patron saint of the Democratic Party only. He is also a patron saint of the Republican Party. He was also the founder of the Jeffersonian Republican Party. And throughout the years the Republican Party has more consistently embraced and advanced Jeffersonian philosophy than has the Democratic Party. The critics of that philosophy and those who expound it say that we are behind the times; that we live in a forgotten age; that tradition mars our vision; that the world is passing us by.

If keeping step with a world of communism and socialism is necessary to progress; if following in the footsteps of Bevan and Stalin are essential to America's future then indeed we are a decadent nation and a decadent people. But I, for one, prefer to be decadent; I prefer that the world march by without us. I prefer to live in a forgotten age—an age that gave me cherished and inalienable rights; I prefer to have my vision clouded by tradition.

Of course we are not out of step with the world. By following the principles of Jefferson and others like him we are so far ahead of the world in government philosophy, in spiritual and material greatness that the world will never catch up with us. Those who advocate a departure from our course are either terribly misguided or they are purposely seeking to destroy our way of life. We shall not fall into their trap. We shall not guide our ship of state into dangerous shoals.

We most certainly would not forsake the American way for that of Russia or her satellites. We would certainly not lower our standards to those of England whose previous socialistic experiments have made it a nation of "have nots." Of France, Jefferson wrote and I quote:

"Indeed it is difficult to conceive how so good a people, so fertile a soil, so genial a climate, should be rendered so ineffectual for producing human happiness by one single curse—that of a bad form of government. * * * Of 20 millions of people supposed to be in France, I am of the opinion there are 19 millions more wretched, more accursed in every circumstance of human existence than the most conspicuously wretched individual of the whole United States." Jefferson wrote this appraisal in 1785. It still stands good. France is now floundering because of unstable government. Her standard of living cannot be remotely compared with ours. Do we want to keep in step with France? The answer is a thundering "no."

Name any nation, compare it with these United States, and you will quickly count your blessings. America became that way because of farsighted men like Thomas Jefferson. And America is going to stay that way by rededicating itself to the principles of Thomas Jefferson. These principles are given himself in what might be called a credo to a Democrat. In a letter written to Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, in January 1799, Jefferson said, and I quote:

"I am for preserving to the States the powers not yielded by them to the Union * * * and I am not for transferring all the powers of the States to the Federal Government.

"I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all of the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and for increasing, by every device, the public debt on the principle of it's being a public blessing.

"I am for free commerce with all nations; political connection with none. And I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe; entering the fields of slaughter to preserve their balance, or joining in the confederacy of kings to war against the principles of liberty.

"I am for freedom of religion and against all maneuvers to bring about a legal ascendancy of one sect over another; for freedom of the press and against all violations of the Constitution to silence by force and not by reason the complaints or criticisms, just or unjust, of our citizens against the conduct of their agents. * * * The first object of my heart is my own country. In that is embarked my family, my fortune, and my own existence. I have not one farthing of interest, nor one fibre of attachment out of it, nor one single motive of preference of any one nation to another, but in proportion as they are more or less friendly to us."

Those are the words of Thomas Jefferson and instead of the "credo of a Democrat," they should be the "credo of an American." Many have sought to tag Jefferson with the label of an isolationist. But harken to his words which I just quoted and which I now repeat. Said he: "I have not one farthing of interest, nor one fiber of attachment out of it, nor one single motive of preference of any one nation to another but in proportion as they are more or less friendly to us." "More or less friendly to us." This phrase, in my opinion, gives Jeffersonian sanction to the mutual defense alliances between the free nations against the spread and aggression of communism. Indeed, communism would destroy all Jefferson worked and labored for and were he living today he would be one of its most vigorous opponents.

The Sage of Monticello was a doer. His accomplishments in behalf of his country were their own reward. His labors brought him satisfaction and a measure of contentment. He was essentially a family man and it was his regret that he could not spend more time with those dear to him. The great love of his life came to an untimely end with the death of his Martha, who gave him six children. On the white marble tombstone Jefferson inscribed a verse of such tenderness that, to shelter his emotions from the public gaze, he had it chiseled in Greek. Translated it reads:

"If in the melancholy shades below,
The flames of friends and lovers cease to glow,
Yet mine shall sacred last; mine undecayed
Burn on through death and animate my shade."

And though he had lost his most precious possession the great man found momentary relief in the unselfish service of the Nation he helped create. And in this process of service and eventual retirement his affections were transferred to his daughter, Martha Randolph.

When, after perhaps the most useful life of any American citizen, Thomas Jefferson himself saw the approach of his own death, it was to Mary Randolph he penned a private and deeply moving farewell. It was a little poem and he handed it to her in a little casket. It read, and I quote:

"Life's visions are vanished, its dreams are no more,
Dear friends of my bosom, why bathed in tears?
I go to my fathers; I welcome the shore
Which crowns all my hopes or which buries my cares.
Then farewell, my dear, my lov'd daughter, adieu!
The last pang of life is in parting from you!
Two seraphs await me long shrouded in death;
I will bear them your love on my last parting breath."

Death came to him, as it must to all of us, on July 4, 1826, just 50 years to the day after the Declaration of Independence.

Thomas Jefferson had lived triumphantly a full and rich life, the fruit of which will feed and inspire countless generations of Americans to come. Said James Madison: "* * * he lives and will live in the memory and gratitude of the wise and good, as a luminary of science, as a votary of liberty, as a model of patriotism, and as a benefactor of human kind."

To pay homage to this great man today is an honor and a privilege. Like Washington, he is "first in the hearts of his countrymen."

Studying Our National Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the job we have of studying national problems and enacting appropriate legislation is indeed a complex one. No longer are we in the slow-moving age of the horse and carriage, an age in which the great issues of the day are relatively simple, the day in which legislative problems can be resolved as matters of national policy with comparative ease.

That day is past, Mr. Speaker, and we now live in a most complex era, the atomic era, an era geared to rapid transportation and high-speed communications of all sorts. Our population is nearing 165 million. Our great system of transportation has reduced the size of the Nation in which we have overnight communication by mail from coast

to coast. We live in an age of pressure, tension, and speed.

And these many problems, I am certain my colleagues will agree, have greatly complicated our mission of legislating for our fellow Americans. And by no means the least of our problems is the task of enacting laws which will assure fair and equitable treatment for our public servants—the great army of men and women who do the Government's work at every level of endeavor.

Every member of this body does his conscientious best to see that fairness and equity are dispensed legislatively and administratively. There are wide differences of opinion, differences which are by no means alined to political disagreements, but differences on philosophy and interpretation of what should be done.

In our endeavors in the House we must by the necessity of things depend upon those who speak for substantial number of public servants. In depending on these representatives we thereby are able to see, through the eyes of the workers themselves, the problems of salary and working conditions. And in this task we meet many fine men and women, people who are dedicating their efforts, their time and talents to improving the lot of their fellow citizens whom they represent. I would like, Mr. Speaker, to refer to one of these representatives, a man who is an outstanding leader in his chosen field—a leader as the representative of a great association of workers and a leader as a public-spirited citizen. I refer to one who most of the Members of this body know, some who may have acquaintanceship which antedates my own—I refer to William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

I would like here and now to spell out some of the facts about the activities of Bill Doherty, some of which even some of his closest friends and associates may be unaware. Bill Doherty needs no praise from me, but I would like, as a matter of public record, to spell out some of the facts about this rather extraordinary American, for I am sure they will be praise enough. I would like to point out some of the salient activities of Mr. Doherty, as a labor leader and as a citizen—the man Fortune magazine this month calls the most important leader of Government unions.

Mr. Doherty began in the postal service in 1923 and was active in branch No. 43 of the National Association of Letter Carriers, and 3 years later he became financial secretary. From 1928–31 he served as branch president and was elected the following year as president of the Ohio State Association. During that same year, 1932, he was elected to the national board of officers of his organization, and in 1935 became a member of the executive board. In 1941 Mr. Doherty was elected national president, and at each succeeding convention he has been reelected to head the National Association of Letter Carriers.

Most of the members of this House who have served during the last 10 or 12 years will be familiar with the fine work Mr. Doherty has done in behalf of the membership in Washington. He has been an eloquent and persistent spokesman for his people and for all Government employes. He was a founder and organizer of the Government Employees' Council in 1945, an association of more than a half million Government workers.

Not only has Doherty been a strong and able leader in behalf of the postal workers and Government workers, he has served with distinction as a member of the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, a post he has held since 1943. As an AFL council member, he has given strong support to efforts of the last few years to effecting a unity in the ranks of labor and is a member of the unity committee of the AFL and CIO which brought to a conclusion plans to merge the two great confederations of American workers. The unity committee is continuing in developing proper and smooth-working procedures for bringing to a successful consolidation the forces of the AFL and CIO. He has also served on AFL jurisdictional committees, helping to iron out some of the vexing problems caused by differences in interpretations of lines of authority known as jurisdictional disputes.

A bright chapter in the career of Bill Doherty is the many contributions he has made in the field of international labor relations. Mr. Doherty is an anti-Communist from way back. He fought the old World Federation of Trade Unions, a group dominated by the Soviets, and he was a founder of the anti-Communist International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. He has been a delegate to the world conventions of this group and has served on important committees.

Mr. Doherty is an executive member of the Postal Telephone and Telegraph International, Berne, Switzerland, and has addressed world meetings of the group from time to time. He has carried his campaign against communism into the camp of the enemy through Radio Berlin where he spelled out the differences between free labor and slave labor. And speaking of slave labor, Mr. Doherty turned over to a Member of this House who was a delegate at the conference founding the United Nations 10 years ago this month data on Soviet slave labor. This data was shown to a delegate from the U. S. S. R.—and this was at a time when it was not popular to discuss such topics with the Russians.

Not only has Mr. Doherty served in the international field abroad, he has been host to numerous visiting delegations of exchange labor leaders, students, and others coming to America under the auspices of the Marshall plan and other groups. The Letter Carriers has been singled out as a fine example of a Government union.

The public service of Bill Doherty includes service as a citizen and as a soldier. He served in Siberia in World War I with the American Expeditionary Forces as a telegraph operator in the Signal Corps on the Chinese Eastern-Transsiberian Railroad. After service there he was chief radio operator on Corregidor. And 4 of his 5 sons have seen foreign military service and a fifth son is nearing military age.

Mr. Doherty originated the first National Flag Day program in the Nation's Capital a few years ago. His union, under his leadership, directed the muscular dystrophy national drive 2 years ago and the record of Doherty's union in war-bond drives and other humanitarian crusades such as the Red Cross, March of Dimes, and other efforts is too well known to require further comment. He has taken a strong interest as a citizen in civil defense, in labor-management problems and in civil service and he has served on citizens' advisory groups in each of these areas.

There is more that I could say on the work and activities of this leader, but I think the facts that I have listed spell out better than words of praise a tribute to the leadership, energy, resourcefulness, and great ability of this man. I am proud to call him my friend—and that is a sentiment I am certain is shared by a great many in this body. In the current problems of Government and postal pay, Mr. Doherty has shown characteristic energy and understanding—in forwarding the cause of those whom he represents and the cause of all public workers. His work and the results achieved are his best tribute and the few words I have added here merely point up the highlights of the career of this man.

"Thanks, Mr. Sam"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. PAT JENNINGS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a summation of the thoughts I have had as a freshman Member of the House about the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, who has been Speaker of the House longer than any other man in the history of the United States.

Speaker RAYBURN was honored by the members of his party last weekend, and these honors, plus the fact that I have had great respect for our beloved Speaker over the past several years, have moved me to write down some observations which I occasionally pass along to constituents in conversation and by letter.

As a young man in southwest Virginia, which borders east Tennessee where our Speaker was born, I often heard of "Mr. Sam" from the Honorable John W. Flannagan, who served the Virginia Ninth District for many years in the House, and later from the Honorable Tom B. Fugate, who followed Mr. Flannagan as the Ninth District representative. They spoke of "Mr. Sam" with praise in every respect.

Later, when I started my campaign for Congress, numerous citizens came to me and said, in essence, "You see 'Mr.

Sam" when you get to Congress and he will help you out." Those friends of mine, who had followed our Speaker's illustrious career through the years, were absolutely correct in their advice.

Even before I was elected, "Mr. Sam" came to my district and made a speech, met many of the citizens who have been his supporters over the past years, and discussed with them the phases of government which were of interest.

I have found in the short time that I have been a Member of this great representative assembly that our Speaker serves in his high position with dignity, calmness, and ability in every respect. He is a statesman with the qualifications of wisdom, patriotism, and devotion to duty. He uses wisely and effectively the powers of the high and honorable office he occupies.

I have already learned to love and respect him as one of the greatest Americans I have ever known.

This brief but sincere tribute cannot be ended without mention of his help and fatherly advice which he readily gives to the newcomer to Congress. On several occasions I, as I am certain many other freshmen have in the past, turned to him for counsel and guidance. He has never been too busy to discuss problems with me nor to give me the benefit of his many years of experience in the House.

So, "Mr. Sam," I say, "thank you" for your aid in the past. I express the wishes of hundreds of my constituents when I wish for you many more years of service in the House. You have our love, our respect, and our heartfelt thanks for your great contributions to the welfare of this Nation through the past years.

Footnotes on the 1956 Olympic Games

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in a historic speech delivered at the National Press Club in Washington, D. C., on February 28, 1955, William Randolph Hearst, Jr., after his Russian trip, said that the western program of building armed strength should be widened into a more flexible and imaginative strategy for competitive coexistence with the Communists in every field and on every front. While in Moscow he gained the impression that communism was moving ahead in many fields which the present western strategy overlooks. The arms race, he said, was not the only area in which they are competing with us. They have taken sports and culture and the impressionable years of youth and transformed them into arenas of the cold war. By inviting to Russia picked delegations from the satellite countries and the neutrals they strive to convey the impression that Soviet life is superior to that in the West.

Sports are a front on which the commissars are moving ahead full speed. The United States is likely to have a tough time at the 1956 Olympic games in Melbourne, when Soviet Russia enters a team which even now is being prepared for the big test, he warned.

America has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It has also been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people. How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?

Of course, these Russian athletes are not really amateurs. They are professionals. They are trained under government guidance, with government help. They receive bonuses and money prizes.

"We should find some way," he said, "of making sure that our Olympic contenders get everything they need in the way of training opportunities."

Mr. Hearst went on to say that—

> The lively arts are another field wherein the commissars are operating with the professed intention of proving to the young people of the world that Russian achievements far surpass the West. Ballet, the theater, literature all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination. Top artists know they are not only expected to perform, but give their services at clinics where the plastic minds of youthful visitors can be influenced.
>
> From Moscow radiate troupes of athletes and artists, circulating through the Soviet world and the satellites, venturing into countries like Red China and India with their gospel of communism. It stands to reason that such extensive wooing of impressionable minds is likely to pay dividends—unless we compete vigorously with the Communist effort and even surpass it. We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor.
>
> But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete. Nor is it enough for our leaders to advocate and appropriate large sums for foreign military and economic aid and think they have met the challenge.
>
> Money is not enough. I came away from Russia convinced that only deep thought and long-range planning would suffice to prevail over communism in the conflict of coexistence. Money spent on foreign aid will not get the most effective results unless it is thoughtfully expended in those fields where it will do the most good.
>
> We should seek to convey to the world—to our allies, to the uncommitted countries especially, and to the Russians if possible—the idea that America is not only proud of its motor cars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements. I believe that any cultural exchange between Russia and the United States is certain to develop in our favor. Within limits, I think such exchanges should be encouraged.

Mr. Hearst advocated the establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate a strategy on all fronts for meeting the challenge of competitive coexistence with the Communists. This board should be scrupulously nonpartisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available, both in public and private life. It should survey the whole global scene and develop plans for getting the peoples of the world on our side. "Sports, the theater, educational exchanges—no field should be neglected in this competition of the two conflicting systems," Mr. Hearst said and added: "Who can doubt that America would emerge on top in any such competition?"

I have introduced several bills which are specifically designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals made by Mr. Hearst. One bill, to establish a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital, has been reported favorably to the House District of Columbia Committee and action is expected to be taken on it shortly. A second measure, H. R. 5040, would "establish a program of cultural interchange with foreign countries to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence with communism, establish a Federal Advisory Commission to advise the Federal Government on ways to encourage artistic and cultural endeavor and appreciation, and provide awards of merit." This bill makes a specific finding that communism cannot be overcome by armed strength alone, and that competitive coexistence must extend to every field and every front. It also takes note of Communist material achievements, and the extent to which cultural and artistic programs are used to spread Communist doctrine, and approves the President's recommendations to the Congress on the fine arts in his message on the state of the Union.

A third bill, H. R. 4109, would establish an advisory group, made up of the Nation's leading sports organizations, to assist the Federal commission created by the joint resolution of December 20, 1944, in establishing a national stadium for Olympic games as a memorial to the heroes of World War I, World War II, and the Korean hostilities.

I hope that a number of my colleagues from both sides of the House will join with me in sponsoring these measures, and I am very pleased that all of the Hearst newspapers have carried supporting articles on my measures similar to the following, which appeared in the Chicago American on March 19, 1955:

HOUSE GETS DETAILS—HEARST AIMS TO CONGRESS

(By David Sentner)

WASHINGTON, March 19.—The warning by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., that preparedness alone will not win for us the battle of coexistence with Communist Russia was recorded before Congress today by Representative THOMPSON, Democrat, of New Jersey.

In detailing on the floor of the House the "trenchant observations" made by the editor in chief of the Hearst newspapers in his recent speech before the National Press Club, THOMPSON explained he and congressional colleagues have introduced several bills "which are specifically designed to put into legislative form the excellent proposals made by Hearst."

THOMPSON pointed out that one bill, to establish a civic and cultural center in the Nation's Capital, has been reported favorably to the House District of Columbia Committee after testimony from the country's leading cultural and business groups.

A second bill, THOMPSON continued, would establish an advisory group, made up of the Nation's leading sports organizations, to assist a proposed Federal commission in establishing a national stadium for Olympic

games as a memorial to the heroes of World Wars I and II and the Korean conflict. THOMPSON added:

"The third measure would provide, in the field of culture, the kind of flexible and imaginative strategy called for by Mr. Hearst as well as the kind of program which will show that America is not only proud of its motorcars, its bathtubs, and other material benefits, but also of its cultural achievements and its creative artists."

In illustrating before the House how he was attempting to tailor the proposed legislation to fit the suggestions contained in the Hearst speech, THOMPSON paraphrased or quoted directly from the publisher's address, as follows:

"Mr. Speaker, the strength and ultimate survival of the free world's system, based on human freedom, the dignity of the individual, and private initiative, is being challenged by the Communists throughout the world.

"America has dominated the Olympic games since their inception. It also has been a source of prestige throughout the world, especially with sport-conscious young people. How will the youth of the world feel, especially in doubtful areas, if the Russian team ends America's long sway at Melbourne in 1956?

"The lively arts are another field wherein the U. S. S. R. is operating with the professed intention of proving to the young people of the world that Russian achievements far surpass the West.

"Ballet, the theater, literature—all are shaped toward aiding communism's long-range scheme of world domination.

"We have so much more to offer than the Communists that any comparison must show up in our favor. But it is not enough to sit complacently by while the Soviet Union throws its smaller resources into the scales and makes its weight felt because we do not choose to compete."

I am including, also, an article by Ray Hasson which appeared in the Trentonian, of Trenton, N. J., on April 14, 1955, telling of the work which one of my constituents is doing at the local level and with his own means to spike the Russian plans to capture the 1956 Olympics. Michael (Mike) Dertouzos is hoping to launch a local campaign to raise funds for the Olympics committee. He is looking for the cooperation of all groups in this job that now goes beyond the limits of mere athletic competition and is one of the major battles being fought in the cold war.

As Ray Hasson fittingly points out—

The ancient Greeks developed the basis of our free, democratic civilization. They also founded many of the athletic contests in the Olympics, which have been called the Greek Games.

It seems fitting that Mike, who springs from those freedom-loving people, should be a warrior in the battle to preserve that concept of civilization, and strike a blow in the cold war by helping America win the Olympics.

The Trentonian article follows:

TRENTONIAN TOPICS

(By Ray Hasson)

Around Trenton: The boys in the Kremlin don't know it, but their grandiose scheme to strike a major propaganda victory next year may be spiked by guys all over the country like Trenton's Mike Dertouzos.

It's Mike's idea that the cause of freedom—and winning world opinion to our side in the cold war—will be dealt more good if the free nations win next year's Olympics in Australia than all the mouthings of the striped pants set.

The Russians are straining to prove their alleged superiority in all things, sports particularly. And they have been subsidizing their Olympic athletes and training them to win next year's competition.

ANOTHER HOOK

If they come out tops, it will give them another hook on which to hang their claim that their way of life is superior to ours. It could be effective on the world's uncommitted peoples.

America is the only country that doesn't subsidize its athletes. It's nip and tuck whether the National Olympics Committee will get up enough scratch to pay for costs of training, coaching, feeding, transporting our athletes to Australia.

If we don't get our best athletes in the games, we stand a good chance of ending up second best.

Mike is hoping to launch a local campaign to raise funds for the Olympics Committee. He's looking for the cooperation of all groups in this job that now goes beyond the limits of mere athletic competition. It's a battle in the cold war.

"We have to prove to the world that we have the best way of life because the world looks to us for leadership, not only in diplomacy, but sports, as well," Mike says.

AAU BACKER

Mike, who owns the Famous Restaurant, is no stranger to sports. He's been active for years in promoting amateur sports events through the American Athletic Union. Last year he was president of the State AAU and is a member of its national executive and foreign relations committees.

He started the hard way—picking up dimes. Born on the Greek island of Andros, 60 miles from Athens, he shipped out as a passenger liner seaman.

In 1919 he landed in New York with two bucks in his pocket. After a job on Vincent Astor's yacht folded, he came to Trenton and became a waiter. He took boxing lessons at night. Then he started a luncheonette. It interfered with his boxing, so he sold it.

In 1937, he started his present restaurant. He had a gym upstairs where he taught boxing to kids and sponsored other athletic events.

A lot of top Trenton amateur athletics were aided by Mike. Many worthy causes picked up the entire box office receipts from athletic events he staged.

The ancient Greeks developed the basis of our free, democratic civilization. They also founded many of the athletic contests in the Olympics, which have been called the Greek Games.

It seems fitting that Mike, who springs from those freedom-loving people, should be a warrior in the battle to preserve that concept of civilization, and strike a blow in the cold war by helping America win the Olympics.

John Garner: A Tribute to a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, when it was reported recently that former Vice President John Nance Garner might attend the dinner on Saturday night honoring Speaker SAM RAYBURN, the news was widely received with enthusiasm. And when the news came that because of a foot ailment Mr. Garner, upon the advice of his physician, would not be able to make the trip, there seemed to be universal regret and disappointment.

This evidence of interest in "Cactus Jack" Garner, after an absence of 14 years from Washington, is itself a tribute to a great American who as a dedicated apostle of good government over a period of nearly half a century contributed so much to the perpetuity of our institutions.

Perhaps it is appropriate that we pause in this busy life to pay tribute to that great individualist who perhaps more than any other living American typifies the rugged character and unyielding devotion to principle which actuated so many of the great men in our history. Let us hope his type will never vanish from the American scene. Today we can profit from the lessons which the public life and record of John Garner have taught.

As I think of Mr. Garner today I am reminded of the story of an incident that is said to have occurred one time at Boston. The story goes that an old man there had served for a lifetime directing ships through narrow channels in the harbor area. He had become a sort of institution, a symbol of safety and dependability. But, the story goes, there was a change in the city government and the new regime was cleaning house. It was decided that the old sea dog had served his time and that it was time to replace him. He was given a hearing, at which his capacity to do his job well was questioned.

At the hearing a critic asked the old man: "Do you claim to know where in the bottom of the harbor area all of the snares, rocks, and other obstructions are located?"

The old gentleman thought for a moment and finally replied, measuring his words carefully: "No, I can't say that I know where all the harbor obstructions are. But I know where they ain't."

And so as the ship of state was moored along turbulent seas, in and out of safe and unsafe harbors, during the first 4 decades of this century, John Garner's wisdom and guidance were of a man who may not have known where all the pitfalls were but who knew where they were not—and along such courses he chose to lead and direct.

Let us look for a moment at the life and career of this man whose judgment and counsel were so useful to America and to its progress. His grandmother brought 6 fatherless children in a covered wagon 600 miles over uncharted roads from the State of Tennessee, to seek a home in the prairie land of northeast Texas. There, in a log cabin built by his pioneer grandmother, near Blossom Prairie in Red River County, John Nance Garner was born—the first child from the marriage of Sarah Guest and John Nance Garner, the third.

General Grant had just been elected President. The Vice President was Schuyler Colfax, of Indiana, with whom the infant born in the Texas log cabin on November 22, 1869, was to share the distinction of being the only man to serve as both Speaker of the House of

Representatives and Vice President of the United States.

As was common in those days, John Garner was exposed to the rigors and hard work of a country youth. When old enough he began the study of law. He was admitted to the bar, then moved to southwest Texas. He became county judge of Uvalde County, then a member of the State legislature, and in 1902 was elected to Congress. Elected and reelected 15 consecutive times, he served continuously for 30 years. He became minority leader of the Democratic Party and in 1931 climaxed his congressional career by being elected Speaker. His final 8 years in public office were spent presiding over the Senate as Vice President of the United States.

John Garner's whole political life was devoted to quiet and unselfish service. During World War I President Wilson called on him twice weekly as confidential adviser. His keen insight into political problems and judgment of men, coupled with his modest yet frank and unassuming demeanor, often caused him to be sought for confidential duties of utmost importance—duties which he performed with characteristic statesmanship, fidelity and success, but without general public knowledge.

During the early days of the depression, shortly after a White House conference with President Hoover, Mr. Garner was asked by reporters what his party intended to do about some of the proposals of the President. He made this significant statement: "Politics will be a secondary consideration. Country should always come ahead of party, and now the country should be the sole thought of everyone."

I shall not take the time here to recount some of Mr. Garner's dramatic actions as he led, with tact and wisdom, the stormy sessions of the House of Representatives that occurred during those critical, depression-burdened days of the early 1930's. Those were days when all sorts of panaceas were offered to restore prosperity; when scores of inflationary and printing-press schemes were advocated. It was a difficult time in which to exercise calm judgment, restraint and decorum, and not be washed to sea with the tide. On occasions members of both parties broke ranks to join with those offering crackpot schemes for miraculous recovery. It was, indeed, a time that called for statesmanship in leadership. And John Garner was equal to that occasion. Although effective solutions to many problems were not found, many unsound and fantastic proposals were exposed and avoided.

There have been many times when we would have done well to have followed the philosophy of this wise man from Uvalde, when his words of wisdom and restraint should have been heeded—his advice to make haste slowly, to avoid regrettable errors. He is and was a practical man and has always believed that government, like individuals, should strive to live within its income; that all governmental action should be within the framework of the Constitution and with proper regard for law. As H. I. Phillips remarked, Mr. Garner and his compatriots believed in—

Sticking to what he's learned in school
And what he's been raised to believe * * *
Things like simple arithmetic * * *
Old-fashioned bookkeeping and squarin'
Accounts on Saturday nights * * *
Dependin' on a budget, never spendin'
More than he had; being orful keerful
'Bout not making promises he couldn't keep,
An' things like that.

Research in Civil Aviation Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. PERCY PRIEST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I desire to include here the text of an address I delivered recently before the Civil Aviation Medicine Association.

The address follows:

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will feel that I speak very sincerely when I say that it is a real pleasure and privilege to be with you on this occasion.

I am happy to be here because of my own personal interest in aviation and in research in general, but particularly in the field of medical science.

Among the legislative achievements in which I take most pride as a Member of the House of Representatives are the bills which I introduced and piloted through the House to establish the National Mental Health Institute, the Hospital Survey and Construction Act, the research program in neurological and metabolical diseases, and the National Science Foundation.

I want to express to you my personal appreciation for the very fact that you have such an organization as this. That fact in itself is a long step forward in progress toward still more far-reaching results.

It is my own opinion that there should be established some sort of institute devoted primarily to research in civil aviation medicine. As a matter of fact, I think it is becoming more and more imperative that this be done.

The time is not far distant when we shall cross the threshold into the era of jet-propulsion in civil aviation. In my opinion the time is not more than 5 years away. And I do not need to tell you who know even better than I, the problems of aviation affecting human beings will be greatly increased.

Aviation medicine is not concerned with fighting viruses or hunting microbes. Its foe is not the general diseases of mankind, but forces man meets for the first time only as he goes out of his natural environment. Aviation medicine is concerned with the medical effects of human flight.

Nature designed man's body for a life on earth, never more than tree-top distance from the earth's surface. In the upper reaches of the atmosphere or in the airless space beyond, man is as much out of his element as a fish trying to swim across a desert. But unlike the fish, man has the capability of altering his environment—if not himself. To alter that environment, or to make it possible for man to survive and to function in it, is the task of aviation medicine.

The goal of aviation medicine is to help man adjust himself to the new world of height and of supersonic speed that the airplane has opened to him, the area that has been intelligently called "the vertical frontier." Aviation medicine helps man to meet the challenge of two of his own accomplishments, to fly high and to fly fast. Today's technology produces planes capable of carrying men at speeds and to altitudes that the human body cannot tolerate. Aviation medicine quite literally seeks to take man out of his element, and to help him to reach the stars.

In the United States Air Force one man—Maj. Arthur Murray—has already flown up to 90,000 feet—17 miles above the surface of the earth.

Another Air Force pilot—Maj. Charles Yeager—has flown at a speed of 1,650 miles per hour—almost 2½ times the speed of sound.

Still another Air Force officer—Lt. Col. John Stapp—has ridden a sled projected along the ground at 632 miles an hour to test the effects of deceleration and wind blast on the human body.

Air Force rockets have gone up to 250 miles of altitude at speeds up to 3,600 miles per hour, and two rhesus monkeys—named Pat and Mike—have been rocketed to 190,080 feet, and survived.

Finding out the limits of human endurance and developing ways of keeping men—not animals, but men—alive and protected in the unnatural environment man has begun to explore, is the problem of aviation medicine. The problem is the problem of survival in a new world man has never penetrated before our own generation.

There are three main fields of activity in the investigation of human factors in aviation.

1. Human resources is a field concerned with problems of man's reaction to his environment, matters of psychology, aptitudes, training, etc.

2. Human engineering is charged with determining design characteristics of equipment, and man-machine relationships, so that an operator can use that equipment with the greatest accuracy and efficiency.

3. The aero-medical sciences—which are the chief concern of this discussion.

The aeromedical sciences are concerned with the biomedical, physiological, and psychological reactions of the individual to the wide range of situations and factors involved in aviation. Within the Air Force, for example, the chief research and development agencies are the School of Aviation Medicine at the Air University and the Aero-Medical Laboratory at the Wright Air Development Center of the Air Material Command. The first, which has the unique distinction of being the oldest organization in the Air Force that has operated continuously, without any essential change of function, does background and applied research in the basic life sciences and clinical sciences, as they affect the Air Force. Using the information developed at the School of Aviation Medicine, the Aero-Medical Laboratory develops information needed by aeronautical engineers to design aircraft without surpassing the physiological and psychological limitations of the air crew. It also develops the aero-medical protective equipment to offset man's physical limitations—equipment such as "G" suits, restraining devices, protective clothing, and escape equipment.

Frequent conferences and information exchanges are arranged with other organizations, such as the United States Navy Aeronautical Medical Equipment Laboratory, the Navy Electronics Laboratory, the Army Medical Research Laboratory, and the Johns Hopkins Operations Research Office (the latter an Army activity). Meetings of the Armed Forces-National Research Council Committees on Vision and on Hearing and Bio-Acoustics, provide additional opportunities for valuable interservice contacts.

The primary problem of aviation medical research is to find out in detail what happens to the human body during an ascent, and why. The problem is intensified as man learns to build machines that go higher and

faster, but the problem is still one of altitude.

As most people know, a man can ascend to about 8,000 feet with no ill effects, if the ascent is gradual, as in driving up a mountain, but above 8,000 feet, things begin to happen to man. As man flies even higher, the field of vision narrows. Breathing becomes extremely difficult because of the lack of oxygen. Delusions can develop. Consciousness can be lost. Gases trapped in the intestines begin to expand. At 50,000 feet altitude, the heart—unprotected by devices or equipment of any sort—would probably cease to function.

To counteract these changes in man's normal body functioning, the whole body must be kept under pressure, in either a suit or a cabin. The pressurized cabin was developed during World War II. The pressurized suit for the individual flyer is a more recent development. But neither alone solves all the problems of survival at high altitude. Man must eat, man must relieve himself of body wastes, and man must combat fatigue and boredom.

Next in importance to the problem of altitude is the problem of gravity. Every time the human body is subjected to acceleration or deceleration, it feels the pull or push of gravity, or "G" forces. A jackrabbit start of a hotrod sports car can throw a passenger against the seat back. In an airplane, the whole crew is affected by any quick burst of speed or abrupt change in direction of flight. And these movements of the plane can cause internal movements in the body: blood flows from head to feet, and organs of the abdomen are pushed down to the pelvis. If the turn is sharp enough or fast enough to develop forces double the ordinary force of gravity, or more, the drainage of blood from the head and heart may cause a "blackout," that is, a loss of consciousness.

The human body's ability to withstand "G" forces varies enormously, depending largely on what part of the body's surface takes the brunt of the shock.

Research in aviation medicine, which has produced such diverse products as Aeroplast, a new spray-on surgical dressing for treating burns; the nylon pressure suit; the anti-G suit; and new inflight meals takes equally varied approaches to its problems. It may be performed by means of rockets, loaded with delicate instruments, and shot many miles above the surface of the earth; it may take place in an anechoic room, where quiet reigns supreme, which is used to study the effects of intense sound on animals and human beings. One of the most dramatic, and most publicized, research facilities is the sled at Holloman Air Force Base on which Lt. Col. John P. Stapp has traveled 632 miles an hour.

Colonel Stapp, who holds a civilian degree of doctor of medicine, and is also a graduate of the Air Force's School of Aviation Medicine and a flight surgeon, has been described both as a human guinea pig and as the fastest man on earth. He is merely an able scientist who has made his most important experiments on himself. His most publicized research has been in connection with deceleration. In his research he makes use of a sled which hurtles him along a railroad-like track at 460 miles an hour, then slams him into a braking area with a bone-jarring jolt. Every time he rides his machine he suffers the same shock that's experienced in the abrupt stop of a crashing airplane.

In the course of his research program, Stapp has several times sustained shocks greater than those incurred in fatal plane crashes. His maximum jolt was equivalent to driving an auto at 120 miles an hour into a brick wall. On three other occasions, the shock was equal to braking from 60 miles an hour to a complete stop in only 3 feet. Last December, with the windshield removed from his sled he made a supersonic run on the ground, to find out what happens to a pilot who bails out at supersonic speed at low altitudes. Without protection from the violent wind blast such a speed will generate, and wearing no special protection except a plastic headgear and a special nylon harness, he withstood a force of 35 G's and a wind pressure of 2 tons, and suffered no lasting ill effects.

Information already developed in Stapp's deceleration experiments to find out just how much slow-down shock the human body can take will be used to redesign aircraft seats and safety belting, so that pilots and passengers will have greater protection against abrupt jolts in emergencies. The same information also can be applied to making automobiles safer. Information developed in the wind-blast experiment will be used in developing bail-out equipment.

Scientists working on the problems of aviation medicine do not hope ever basically to change man's earthbound nature. But they know that in the machine age, man has managed to adapt himself to conditions that seemed "inhuman" and "impossible" as recently as 50 years ago. To ease his adaptation to space and speed, scientists are continuously studying examples of such adaptations in nature.

Other scientists meanwhile are studying the problem of inventing machines or gadgets to take over functions previously performed only by man. The real question that the jet age poses is whether man-as-flier is being made obsolete by the lag between what his brain can invent and his body can perform. In fact, planes are rapidly approaching a point where they are penalized rather than aided by the presence of a human pilot.

One important result of research in aviation medicine is the discovery that the human body can endure a great deal more physical and mental stress than was once thought possible. The answers to the problems of flight in tomorrow's jets and rocket aircraft may be found in the human research now being done in the field of aviation medicine rather than in loading the planes with heavy and expensive equipment.

So the planning brain must continue, as now, to seek new ways and ever more ingenious devices to adjust the strains to the tolerances of the body.

And so I conclude as I began by reemphasizing the need of research in the field of civil-aviation medicine.

After I have had an opportunity to give some additional study to the form of the legislation, it is my intention to introduce a bill calling for the establishment of an Institute of Civil Aviation Medicine.

And once again I express my appreciation for the contribution your association has made in the field of air safety, and for the objectives you seek.

Independent Natural Gas Producers Fail To Testify on Harris Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, during the months of March and April, I attended most of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee hearings on the Harris bill and other related legislation to release the so-called independent producers of natural gas from Federal regulation. I will endeavor to summarize the statements before the House committee.

During some 21 days of hearings, the committee heard slightly over 100 witnesses from various groups. Among the witnesses who testified for the Harris bill were the chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Mr. Jerome K. Kuykendall; Mr. Ernest O. Thompson, of the Texas Railroad Commission; Mr. David T. Searles, of Houston, Tex., who represented some pipelines and some so-called independent producers; Dr. John W. Boatwright, of the Standard Oil Company of Indiana; Mr. R. G. Laughton, president of the Laughton Oil Corp.; Mr. Russell B. Brown, general counsel of the Independent Petroleum Association of America; Mr. Clarence T. Smith, member of the Illinois Oil and Gas Association; Mr. J. P. Jones, director of production of the Pengrade Crude Oil Association, of Pennsylvania; Mr. John F. Marion, president of the Independent Natural Gas Association of America and also president of the Northern Natural Gas Co., of Omaha, Nebr., also representing some interstate pipelines; Mr. William Jackman, president of the Investors League of New York City; Mr. Lloyd C. Halverson, self-styled economist; Mr. H. B. Fell of the Chamber of Commerce; Mr. J. Taylor of Amarillo, Tex., and president of the National American Cattlemen's Association; and Mr. Ray Willoughby, past president of the National Wool Growers Association.

The chairman of the Federal Power Commission testified for the Harris bill, and it is the first time I ever heard a public official in a so-called regulatory agency publicly ask the legislative body to give him less work to do and perhaps eliminate the necessity of the Commission itself.

I would hardly call the Standard Oil Company of Indiana an independent producer of either natural gas or oil. It would be difficult to believe that the Pennsylvania Pengrade Crude Oil Association is particularly interested in natural gas reaching northern homes at fair and reasonable prices. It would hardly be expected that the representatives of the interstate pipelines would be vitally concerned in the cost of gas to the homeowners of New York, Akron, or Chicago. It is not surprising to find the Investors League zealously interested in the Harris bill because through it the investors in oil and gas stocks stand a pretty good chance of a $5 billion windfall if the Harris bill becomes law.

The president of the cattlemen's association testified for the Harris bill—and I can well understand that. Some of the large oil and gas ranches raise cattle as a mere sideline. And I can understand the testimony of the former president of the Wool Growers Association. As gas becomes more expensive for the folks in the northern cities, they will have to keep their thermostats down and their blood pressures up and go back to wearing woolen underwear.

On the other hand, over 80 witnesses testified against the Harris bill, representing cities, consumer groups, public utility officials and distributing companies. The distribution companies are concerned with the possibility of issuing

increasingly higher gas bills to the consumers and are therefore on the firing line.

Throughout the hearings, I tried to determine just how many independent producers of natural gas there were. The Federal Power Commission reported to me that they did not know how many there were prior to 1953 because they were not required to determine that under the law. However, they report that in 1953 there were 4,545. The Standard Oil Company of Indiana in a letter to its stockholders stated on March 16, 1955, that there were 5,000 independent producers of natural gas while its neighbor, the Standard Oil Company of Ohio told all of its stockholders in a publication supporting the Harris bill that there were more than 4,000 producers. During the committee hearings I heard some testimony to the effect that there may be 6,000 to 8,000 independent producers. How can the committee intelligently arrive at a solution of this problem without knowing how many independent producers of natural gas there really are and what percentage of the natural gas they produce?

It may be entirely coincidental but it is interesting to note that the powerful gas and oil lobby with its one million and a half dollar plush campaign fund forgot the elementary requisite of bringing a single so-called independent producer of natural gas to the cross-examination of committee members. The simple fact is that there was not a single person present at the House committee hearings who looked as though he had ever been covered with drill dust or oil spray—at least not for a long period of time.

From these hearings and from the record, it appears to me that the so-called independent producers of natural gas are ghost riders in the sky created and dancing to the music of the oil companies of America and groups of investors in oil stocks and natural gas pipelines whose fundamental interest, whose basic desire is profit—pure and selfish profit—free from Federal regulation, free from Federal scrutiny and free from public calculation. Their interest is certainly incompatible and contrary to that of the great body of consumers of natural gas who can make no selection as to the source of their gas supply and who have very little to say about the price they must pay for it. These so-called independent producers—these ghost riders in the sky—are ghost riding against the public interest in the Harris bill.

Public Opinion Poll in First Congressional District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my custom to poll public opinion in the First Congressional District. I arbitrarily sent a copy of this questionnaire to every fifth name in my card index. In addition the questionnaire was printed in over 20 weekly newspapers. Over 6,000 answers of one kind or another on the identical questions were computed.

Question No. 1 was the same as the first question of last year's poll. It is extraordinary to note that the percentages were identical. If all those who answered "No opinion" on question No. 3 had answered "Yes," which is more probable than not, we find an unusual change in basic American thinking. The overwhelming support of President Eisenhower's UMT and lower reciprocal tariff programs was particularly illuminating.

	Yes	No	No opinion
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*
1. Should nuclear weapons be used to stop clear-cut Communist aggression?	(73)	(18)	(9) 1
2. Do you think it possible for the free world to live in peace with Communist nations?	(39)	(52)	(9) 2
3. Should Communist nations be destroyed by "preventive" war?	(27)	(55)	(18) 3
4. Do you favor President Eisenhower's permanent manpower defense program (UMT)?	(83)	(12)	(5) 4
5. Do you approve of President Eisenhower's "Trade not Aid," lower reciprocal tariff program?	(83)	(10)	(7) 5
6. Do you favor the entry of the Federal Government into the field of education in the form of school construction grants?	(54)	(42)	(4) 6
7. Should the minimum wage be raised to 90 cents per hour?	(71)	(21)	(8) 7
8. Do you feel postal rates should be increased to reduce the postal deficit (now running $1 million a day)?	(75)	(21)	(4) 8
9. Should statehood for Alaska and Hawaii be considered separately?	(60)	(26)	(14) 9
10. President Eisenhower said, "The transition to a peacetime economy is largely behind us. The economic outlook is good." Do you agree?	(68)	(19)	(13) 10
11. Should the United Nations be abolished?	(25)	(68)	(7) 11

Cruel Betrayal of the Polish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, March 28 marked the 10th anniversary of the treacherous betrayal of 16 Polish underground leaders whom the Soviet authorities in Poland arbitrarily apprehended, flew to Moscow and imprisoned and sentenced without due process of law in June 1945.

So far as we are able to ascertain, four of these Polish leaders are still detained in Soviet prisons and it seems appropriate and urgent at this time that our Government and the United Nations should demand their release.

A short summary of the background and developments in these cases will be helpful in understanding the monstrous unfairness and injustice of their plight. So far as I have been able to ascertain, the following is a factual account of the events leading up to their imprisonment and long confinement against the terms of the Yalta agreement and contrary to every rule of good faith that should obtain between nations.

In accordance with the Yalta agreement, the Moscow-sponsored provisional government of Poland had to be reorganized on a broader basis with the inclusion of leaders "from Poland itself and from Poles abroad."

Mr. Molotov and the Ambassadors of the United States and Great Britain, residing in Moscow, were entrusted with the task to cooperate in the forming of a new government along the above lines.

It was assumed from the very beginning by the American and British Governments that the most prominent leaders of the Polish underground, at that time hiding in Poland, would eventually enter the coalition. During the war they had fought, in close cooperation with the Polish Government in London, a bitter struggle against the Nazi occupants and thus had largely contributed to the Allied war effort.

At the request of the British Secretary of State, the Polish Government in London disclosed for transmission to the committee in Moscow the names and whereabouts of the Polish Vice Premier and government delegate for the homeland, and of the three members of the Home Council of Ministers. The Allied government gave assurance that they would do everything possible to insure the safety of the Polish underground leaders.

A short time after the Polish Vice Premier, Mr. Jankowski, and the last commander of the disbanded home army, General Okulicki, were approached by Colonel Pimenov, of the Soviet NKWD, with a request to attend a meeting with Colonel General Ivanov, a representative of the high command of the White Russian front. This invitation was confirmed by letter, on March 10, to Mr. Jankowski and General Okulicki. The purpose of the meeting, in Colonel Pimenov's own words, was "the clarification of the atmosphere and the coming into the open of the democratic Polish parties in order that they may take part in the general current of the democratic forces of independent Poland." Although absolute personal safety was granted by the Soviet representative, the 16 Polish underground leaders, when they arrived on March 28, 1945, at the meeting place, were arrested and flown to Moscow and imprisoned there.

The Soviets committed in cold blood another act of shameless felony. It was only on May 5, 1945 that the official Soviet agency Tass announced the arrest of the Polish leaders. This happened during the San Francisco Conference, and Molotov himself confirmed the news.

The British and United States Secretaries of State expressed grave concern to Mr. Molotov, and asked for full explanation. Their intervention remained nevertheless without response, and on

June 18, 1945, a trial of the Polish leaders was held in Moscow by the military colleagium of the Supreme Court of the U. S. S. R.

Following sentences were passed:

First. Maj. Gen. Leopold Okulicki, born 1898, commander of the Polish Home Army succeeding Gen. T. Bor-Komorowski, after the Warsaw rising—10 years prison.

Second. Jan Staniskaw Jankowski, born 1882, member of the Christian Labor Party and Vice Premier of the Polish Government in London, appointed delegate in Poland—8 years prison.

Third. Adam Bien, born 1899, member of the underground government, Peasant Party—5 years prison.

Fourth. Staniskaw Jasyukowicz, born 1882, National Party, member of underground government—5 years prison.

Fifth. Kazimierz Puzak, born 1883, leader of Socialist Party and speaker of underground parliament—18 months prison.

Sixth. Alexander Zwierzynski, born 1880, National Party, deputy speaker—8 months prison.

Seventh. Kazimierz Daginski, born 1890, Peasant Party, deputy speaker—6 months prison.

Eighth. Staniskaw Nyerzva, born 1905, Peasant Party—4 months prison.

Ninth. Zbigniow Stkpuzkowski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party—4 months.

Tenth. Eugoniusz Czarnovski, born 1904, leader of Democratic Party—4 months prison.

Eleventh. Jösef Chacinski, born 1889, leader of Christian Labor Party—4 months prison.

Twelfth. Francissek Urbanski, born 1891, secretary of underground parliament, Christian Labor Party—4 months prison.

Thirteenth. Staniskaw Michalowski, born 1903, Democratic Party, proved innocent.

Fourteenth. Kazimierz Kobylanski, born 1892, National Party, proved innocent.

Fifteenth. Jösef Stemler Dabski, born 1892, interpreter of Polish delegation, proved innocent.

Sixteenth. Antoni Pajdak, member of Socialist Party and of underground parliament was not tried in public, and the sentence, in his case, was not disclosed.

It is to be noted that in accordance with Soviet procedure the penal sentence is counted as from the day of arrest.

General Okulicki, Jankowski, Jasiukowicz, and Pajdak did not yet return to Poland. Okulicki should be released on March 28, 1955. Jankowski should have been freed on March 28, 1953, and Jasiukowski on March 28, 1950. According to information, Pajdak was sentenced by administrative decree to 5 years, and if so, had to be freed on March 28, 1950. It should be stressed that the fate of these four prisoners remaining in Soviet Russia is still unknown.

The remaining leaders were brought back to Poland after the period of their detention in Soviet jails had elapsed. Puzak and Mierswa were rearrested in Poland, sentenced, and Puzak died in prison. Czarnowski, Urbanski, and Chacinski died in Poland; the fate of Bien is not known, as well as of Zwiorsyoki and Stemlor-Dabski. Michazowski and Kobylatski acquitted during the Moscow trial, were again arrested in Poland, and are detained in prison. Stypuskowski is in England and H. Bagisaki lives in the United States of America.

In connection with the 10th anniversary of this shameless act perpetrated on March 28, 1945, against the 16 Polish underground leaders steps should be taken to, first, ask for full information as to the fate and whereabouts of these 4 leaders still kept in Soviet Russia; second, demand their release from prison; third, insist on the liberation of the underground leaders who have been submitted to new ordeals by the Moscow-sponsored regime in Poland after their return from Russia.

I urge, therefore, and sincerely request the State Department to make appropriate inquiries and efforts in these tragic cases.

Petaluma Chamber of Commerce Endorses Trinity River Power Development by Private Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I desire to include a letter from the Petaluma (Calif.) Chamber of Commerce endorsing development of power on the Trinity River by private enterprise.

By their April 5 action this organization has alined itself with many others in my congressional district and in other parts of northern California in support of the proposal to allow private enterprise to develop and operate power facilities on the Trinity River. The advantages lie in less construction costs to taxpayers, and in the return of millions of dollars in tax revenue to Federal, State, and local governments.

In appearing before a subcommittee of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee last week, I urged power development by private enterprise be adopted. This would serve the best interests of all concerned and, in support of that position, I submit the following:

PETALUMA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Petaluma, Calif., April 6, 1955.

Upon completion of an intensive study of the Trinity project, this chamber of commerce has taken the following action at their regular meeting April 5, 1955:

The Petaluma Chamber of Commerce board of directors urge that should the Trinity project proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation be accepted our legislators give full consideration to the P. G. & E. Trinity partnership plan before any Government operation of powerplants is considered.

We consider the above proposal a decided advantage to the Federal Government.

Cordially,

CLAUDE D. BRADFORD,
Manager.

An About Face From War to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following abstract of remarks by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY before University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, April 1, 1955.

AN ABOUT FACE FROM WAR TO PEACE

At a time when strength and unity of purpose is urgently needed, America's leadership in our critically troubled world is fumbling and faltering.

In recent weeks the objective of our international relations has been lost in the twisting and turning of Presidential, State Department, and senatorial pronouncements and actions.

Let's look at the record:

Our ally on Formosa, Chiang Kai-shek, insists we are committed to the defense of the offshore islands. The Secretary of State, carrying out the policy of the President, says maybe we are and maybe we are not; possibly we will and possibly we will not. All add to the general confusion in a time of crisis.

The President and the Secretary of State informed us a week ago that we may very well use precision atomic weapons if the Chinese Communists attack the offshore islands. But on Wednesday, March 23, the President in his press conference states categorically that atomic weapons will be used only in case of a major war and not in police actions.

The chairman of the Senate Republican Policy Committee, Senator BRIDGES, persists, however, in stating that our national policy is to defend the offshore islands by dropping atom bombs on the mainland.

American policy runs hot and cold, uncertain and confused. Surely if these policies are indefinite and uncertain to the American people, they must be even more so to our allies and enemies.

On Monday, March 14, the official custodian of the Yalta papers in the State Department said their publication would adversely affect the Nation's security and our relations with our allies. On Wednesday, the Secretary of State, after conferring with Senate Republican leaders, expressed his astonishment at the revelation that the Yalta documents were in the hands of one of America's leading newspapers. On Wednesday night the documents were ordered released to the Nation's press. The White House expressed no knowledge of the release of the papers, and in fact the Presidential press secretary stated the President was not aware of their release.

This series of events reveals an unbelievable lack of coordination between the President and the State Department, and a degree of irresponsibility that exposes our Nation before the eyes of the world as erratic, unpredictable, and politically immature. Regretfully, this same degree of uncertainty and confusion prevailed concerning the proposal of Senator GEORGE, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, in suggesting a meeting of the heads of state of the United States, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, and France.

For at least 2 days the State Department clearly stated that Senator GEORGE's proposal was in line with the foreign policy of this Nation. The President, at least through Monday and Tuesday of the last week, felt such a conference was premature. On

Wednesday, March 23, the White House and the Department of State double checked their signals, and came to the conclusion that in due time such a conference would be desirable. Since then, at a recent press conference, the President seemed to qualify his earlier approval.

These policy gyrations and conflicting statements can only add to the feeling of uncertainty and indecision as to American policy.

Perhaps we need a thoughtful reappraisal of what we are now doing—and what we should be doing.

Instead of alienating our friends through diplomatic blunders geared to domestic political expediency, now more than ever we should be seeking to strengthen our ties of unity and solidarity with our allies, to maintain a common front for preservation of the free world.

Instead of Presidential appointees deliberately stirring up the fires of domestic political controversy, now more than ever they should be devoting their attention to achieving some semblance of unity within their own party and within the Nation on vital foreign policy issues that affect the destiny of our Nation.

Instead of playing right into the hands of Red China's propaganda and helping turn Asians against us by our publicly brandishing a big club in threats to use atomic warfare, now more than ever we should be bending every effort to convince Asia our purpose is peace, not war—development, not exploitation.

Instead of letting the Communists choose their own grounds for a new international "showdown" where we may be forced to stand alone, now more than ever we should be taking the initiative in diversionary moves of our own to put the Kremlin on the defensive and upset its carefully calculated timetable of Pacific strategy.

The Yalta papers, internationally:

What kind of reckless diplomacy is it to needlessly insult your friends when you have nothing to gain and everything to lose? What possible constructive purpose could release of these documents against the wishes of England have in the present tense state of international affairs? As a result of this colossal diplomatic blunder, the free world's efforts for peace have been given a distinct setback rather than been advanced. Hereafter, frankness and candor will be ruled out of international negotiations. Diplomats of friendly countries will be as cautious as diplomats from unfriendly countries in dealing with the United States—and the cause of peace will suffer.

The Yalta papers, domestically:

Appeasement has never gained us any ground internationally, and it will not gain President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles any ground trying to appease opposition forces within their own party. Trying to turn the clock back 10 years might divert America's needed attention from problems and failures of today, but it cannot divert the consequences of those problems and failures. High sounding comments of the President against political exploitation of these documents cannot erase the responsibility of his own Cabinet appointee for releasing them for no purpose other than political exploitation. The President and his Secretary of State must accept responsibility for an apparent willingness to toss bipartisan foreign policy out the window, and risk playing deliberate politics with our country's future security.

About A-bomb threats:

Threats of A-bomb attacks might create caution in a country responsive to the fears and the will of its people, but have just the opposite effect on a country or a government holding human life cheap, unresponsive to any fears of its own people, and deliberately conniving to tag the label "warmonger" on the United States.

Nothing could serve the Kremlin better than to jockey the United States into a position of first using A-weapons against Asians, so that it can beat the drums of world opinion against us.

One American atomic weapon used on Red China would do more to turn Asia solidly against us, than all the propaganda the Communists have been able to contrive, and to them be well worth the price in human life it might entail.

Quemoy and Matsu:

The responsible leaders of our Nation are today in the process of making what may well be the most crucial and important decision of foreign policy since the beginning of World War II.

The issue is what should be American policy concerning the offshore islands from the Chinese mainland, namely and most important, the islands of Quemoy and Matsu. What do we do in light of our commitments to the defense of Formosa if the Chinese Communists attack these islands?

Yes; we are in a period of self-examination, of self-questioning, and this is as it should be. There is still time for thoughtful consideration and for careful planning. The time is short; the urgency of the situation cannot be overestimated, and the necessity for clear thought and definite policy is evident to everyone.

This decision rests with the President of the United States who is, under the Constitution, the Commander in Chief, and the chief spokesman of our Nation in foreign affairs.

Prior to the passage of the so-called Formosa resolution, the President stated to the Congress that he alone would make the decision as to American policy with respect to the so-called related positions and off-shore islands. Our President, during the past weeks and today, has been and is seeking guidance and sound advice. This is no time for partisan prejudices or political expediency. The issue of peace and war is in the balance. The relationships between ourselves and our allies is involved in our decision over the off-shore islands. Our whole position in the Far East has been brought into sharp focus. Our strategy in meeting the challenge of Communist aggression is subject to intensive evaluation. We cannot afford to make a mistake.

Powerful weapons of mass destruction are in the hands of both ourselves and the Soviet Union. Huge armies have been trained to combat effectiveness. The whole world awaits the decision. It is not right nor true to say that what may happen in the Far East is in the hands of the Communists. We have a part in this decision—we and our allies. And we must always remember that if we take upon ourselves the sole responsibility for making a crucial decision, we are not only involving our own Nation but, due to the dynamics of modern warfare and the terrible tensions that exist in the world, we are involving all people everywhere.

The outbreak of hostilities today in any part of the world could be the spark that ignites a world-wide conflagration. We cannot safely assume that hostilities involving the off-shore islands will be limited to that area. We cannot safely assume that the Soviet Union will not honor her treaty of mutual assistance with Communist China. Nor can we assume that because of our great assistance to the other nations and our alliances in Europe and the Far East that our allies will stand with us on this issue.

It is true that the President yesterday expressed his belief that the Rusisans would not enter should war break out in the Formosa Straits. But look at the position we would be in should such a war occur. We would be thoroughly and endlessly engaged with our forces in Asia, while the real center of world communism—the Soviet Union—would be unleased to grab the prize, Europe—the core of world strength.

Therefore, with prayerful thought and the highest degree of statesmanship that we as a nation and our leaders can bring to bear, we must patiently, carefully, and objectively arrive at a decision, and do it within a matter of days.

These things we know: The Communist Chinese have declared to the world that they will take the off-shore islands. These offshore islands have historically been under the dominion and jurisdiction of the government of the mainland. Presently, these islands are under the control of the Republic of China and heavily garrisoned. There has been sporadic fighting in and around these islands for the past 6 months. These are acknowledged facts.

There are those who feel that if the islands are to be lost to Red China this would be a stunning blow to the morale of the free Chinese forces on Formosa. Commanders are split as to how much American support it would take to hold these islands against Communist attack—or if it is possible to hold them. The Navy and the Air Force have stated openly that these islands can be held with just naval and air support, plus the Chinese Nationalist troops. The Chief of Staff of the United States Army has testified before committees of the Congress that to hold these islands would require American ground forces. No member of the Chiefs of Staff has testified that the islands are essential to the defense of Formosa. They are essential only if there is to be an invasion of the mainland of China.

But, I, for one, have been led to believe by our President and the Secretary of State that our Government will not engage in any military action designed for the retaking of the mainland.

The question may very well be asked then—why is it that the defense of Quemoy and Matsu is so much more important than the defense of the islands to the north of Formosa, which were evacuated, particularly if there is to be no invasion of the mainland. It has been stated by our military commanders that these islands are not essential to the defense of Formosa—and it is to the defense of Formosa that we have pledged American strength and resources.

Our declaration of defense for Formosa has not disrupted our relationships with our allies. The British agree with us on this, and there has been no protest from other friendly powers. The legal and historical position of Formosa as to a government on the Chinese mainland is entirely different from that relation to the offshore islands. The final disposition of Formosa has never been arrived at. It is one of the byproducts of World War II yet unsettled. The offshore islands, on the other hand, represent a land area involved in the Chinese civil war. There can be no doubt about that.

From the point of view of international law, Formosa occupies a different position. Therefore, our declaration of defense of Formosa against Chinese Communist aggression is in the interests of international law and order; is in the interests of the United Nations; and is a proper and honorable policy. Quemoy and Matsu are not in the same legal or moral position.

I respectfully suggest that with respect to the offshore islands, before any decision is made we carefully and frankly discuss this matter with our friends and allies. For example, what does the Japanese Government think about American participation in the defense of Quemoy and Matsu? What about our main ally, the British? The Canadian Government has made its position clear and has frankly stated we will have to go it alone. This should cause us to pause and think. Canada is like a brother to the United States. A more firm and noble ally we have never had. And yet, the responsible leadership of Canada has notified our Government, and

notified its own people, that Canada will stand aside and not be a partner with us in any military operations concerning the offshore islands.

Have we consulted with the south Asian powers? What about President Magsaysay of the Philippines—a leader that represents the spirit of the new Asia, a stanch friend of the United States—what does he have to say?

The Secretary of State and the President owe it to the American people and to themselves to know exactly where these nations stand, and to seek their advice and counsel, before rushing headlong into conflict.

Our decision pertaining to the offshore islands likewise must take into consideration our future relationships with such countries as Indonesia, Burma, India, Pakistan, Ceylon, Thailand, and the other south and southeast Asian countries. It is fair to say that our relationship with many of these nations already is strained. The Prime Minister of India has spoken out forcefully against our policies relating to the offshore islands, and even to Formosa. We must keep in mind constantly that what we do now may very well determine what we ever will be able to do in Asia. I am sure that the men of the Kremlin and their partners in Communist China sense that in this crucial decision concerning the offshore islands they may well have discovered the Achilles heel in American Far East policy. It would be nothing short of tragic if a decision to defend the offshore islands should lead to a complete break between ourselves and the free Asian nations. It is ridiculous to assume that the defense of these islands is more important than a cooperative and effective relationship between the hundreds of millions of people of the free nations of south and southeast Asia.

These are some of the questions that appear on the international political scene. The answer is not easy, nor can anyone ever be sure that whatever decision we may arrive at will be the right one. Nor can we predict the future. All we can do, or should seek to do, is that which is right, which is legal, and which is honorable. Above all, whatever decision we make must be in concert with others. We must not stand alone in this area, nor can we condone statements by responsible political leaders to the effect that no white troops will be used if we should defend the offshore islands. Statements such as these do us irreparable damage in the Far East.

BIG POWER CONFERENCE

We are giving consideration to the desirability of a big power conference in an attempt to ease the world's tensions. If we are to participate in such a conference, it is absolutely essential that we go there in full agreement with our allies, with no major questions unsettled, in our friendly family of free nations. We must remember at all times that the Soviet will use any international conference to drive a wedge between us and our European and Asian friends. We must be absolutely certain, before going to the conference table with the Soviet, that the United States, Great Britain, and France have come to a meeting of the minds, not only on the unsolved questions in Europe, but equally so on the problems and questions in Asia.

The decision about American policy concerning the offshore islands is the single more dramatic problem that faces us today. Unless we can reconcile our point of view on this limited but crucial matter, a big-power conference would only lead to further differences and confusion among the Allied Powers. The leaders in the Kremlin know that so long as the free world remains united, so long as we are able to reconcile our differences, so long as we are able to agree on fundamental and basic policies, the Communist conspiracy cannot succeed. The immediate and long range objective of Soviet strategy and diplomacy is to divide us, to split us apart, and above all to isolate the United States from our major allies in Europe and the Far East. This we must not permit to happen.

In the months ahead our Nation will be faced with many more critical decisions and difficult challenges. If we are to have a big-power conference then every conceivable effort must be made to go there from a position of strength—I mean strength based on cooperation and understanding between ourselves and our allies. I mean strength derived from a positive and constructive policy for the Far East as well as for Europe. I mean strength that is based on scrupulous adherence to the principles of international law. Yes, strength that comes from doing what is right, not doing what may be politically expedient.

And also the issue has an effect on our talk of disarmament. Our President has appointed a special adviser in the field of disarmament. We are now participating in the United Nations Disarmament Conference. What could be more tragic in view of all of these future challenges and present problems, than for the United States of America to become involved in hostilities, standing alone without friends or allies. All we hope for could go down the drain. A war with Red China over the offshore islands would not be conducive to a big-power meeting. A war with Red China over the offshore islands surely does not lead to disarmament. Such a war would not serve the purpose of integrating West Germany into the great NATO organization. It is abundantly clear to me that the diabolical plan of the Soviet Union is to force our hand in the Far East, if we permit it to be forced, over an area that is questionable as to its importance and that involves us with grave differences of policy with our allies. If the Soviet is successful in this tactic and strategy, we may well have forfeited our leadership, both in Europe and the Far East. It is not improbable to assume that in case of hostilities over the offshore islands, that the Soviet may well threaten every ally we have if they should accede to American pressure to intervene and join with us, the war may be extended and enlarged. I do not say this will happen—but I do say we must take these eventualities into account.

Such is the world we live in today. On that scene, other nations are troubled and looking for solutions.

Bandung Conference:

We are nearing the date of one of the most significant conferences in the world's history—the African-Asian Conference next month from which white people are excluded. Have we no better bid for support of this vital block of the world's people than the threat of atomic warfare? Where is any positive, constructive policy to be offered these people as evidences of our goodwill and peaceful intent, evidence of our understanding of their own aspirations and our willingness to cooperate in their own progress and development?

A positive program for peace: Let me advance a suggestion.

Let us get away from the negative and move to the positive. Let's show the Asian peoples we recognize their importance under the sun by taking the lead in proposing India for a seat on the permanent Security Council of the United Nations.

Instead of just saying "No" alone to Red China on admission to the United Nations—and it is a "No" I have always supported—let us counter with a suggestion of our own that would give recognition to Asia without letting Communist power blackmail its way into the family of nations.

It is a reflection of a very rapidly disappearing past for the United Nations to continue to seat China as a permanent member of the Security Council. China at the end of World War II was a powerful ally. The Communist China of today is an enemy. The Nationalist China of today on Formosa is weak and not representative of the new Asia. Neither of these Chinas deserves a seat as a permanent member of the Security Council.

Our Nation should instead call for a revision of the United Nations Charter so as to give India the seat now held by China. Such a dramatic move would attract the attention and support of our friends all over the world. If the Soviet Union opposes this suggestion, our position in Asia would be strengthened. If our suggestion is accepted, we would have a strong, democratic Asian nation sitting in its rightful place of leadership in the councils of the world. Let us not forget that India was our ally during World War II. That India was one of the few nations making a contribution to the Korean conflict by providing ambulances and medical assistance. That India is a democratically elected nation committed to the principle of freedom. The only major defeat inflicted on the Communists in Asia in the last year was inflicted by Nehru against the Communists in India.

Such a bid to India—even evidences of our interest in creating such a bid—could have a powerful impact in our behalf at the African-Asian Conference.

Then let us strengthen our friends in that conference with our assurances of a positive, constructive development program for underprivileged nations—assurances of economic aid, technical assistance, an expanded exchange program to better understand each others' cultures.

On the economic front we have wasted valuable time in meeting the challenge of Communist infiltration due to economic distress, particularly in Asia. It is in this area where our participation through the United Nations, in technical assistance, in health and education programs, can check and push back the inroads of Communist political and economic aggression. Then, too, we must more boldly and meaningfully outline to the Asians the extent and degree of our own economic assistance to them, with particular emphasis upon long-term loans at low rates of interest for capital improvement projects. The development of new instrumentalities of international financing is a challenge to our political and economic statesmanship.

And let us strengthen them in that conference with assurances to the now neutral people of the world that this democracy will never start an atomic war but will stand firm on our resolve to swiftly retaliate in force against a nation that does risk starting one.

ABOUT CHOOSING THE GROUNDS FOR A SHOWDOWN

The time is long past when we can afford to back away from threats of Red aggression. But the time and place of any showdown need not be at Red choosing. It should be obvious that Soviet strategy now calls for forcing our hand at Matsu and Quemoy, in the hope of making us attack the Chinese mainland—a move which they could interpret as intervening in a China civil war, and a move which they know we might be compelled to make without the support of our allies.

What is to prevent us from taking the intiative ourselves by shifting the scene of decision to Korea, where international law is solidly on our side in view of Red China's violation of cease-fire agreements? What is to prevent us from calling the Kremlin's hand on such violations by calling on our Korean allies, through the United Nations, to enforce the Korean truce? Is it not reasonable to assume that a sudden buildup of our forces in Korea would do more to upset Red China's calculations about Formosa than

anything we do about Matsu or Quemoy? Moving of our bomber squadrons into Korea, where they would be in ready striking distance of both Red China and Moscow itself, would give the Kremlin more cause for concern than any threat to use A-weapons on the Chinese people.

At the same time, our Nation should assume the initiative in an attempt to resolve the issue of Quemoy and Matsu peacefully, we should propose the neutralization and demilitarization of those islands. We can propose that the Formosa troops be withdrawn from Quemoy and Matsu if Communist China agrees not to occupy those islands. They can then be placed under the supervision of neutral Asian countries or the United Nations itself. Such a suggestion places us in a peace-seeking, rather than warlike, posture, and would give our allies in Asia an opportunity to seek a constructive solution which will secure our national security in Asia.

Gen. Peyton Conway March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEWEY SHORT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 19, 1955

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, in 1898, a fews days before the Battle of Manila Bay, I was born in the Ozarks of Missouri, when most proud parents named their horses, cats, dogs, and kids after Admiral Dewey. I suffered that common fate by being named after the Admiral at the very time that Peyton Conway March saw action in the assault and capture of Manila.

By the time I was able to read I learned not only about Admiral Dewey, but became interested in Peyton March, who had seen action with the admiral and became interested in him not only as a great military leader, but also as a human being.

At that time, as a youngster, I little realized that it would ever become my privilege to meet and know Peyton March personally. That time, however, came.

For 15 years, Mrs. Short and I lived only 2 or 3 blocks from him and his beloved wife Cora, and I count it one of the greatest privileges and rarest opportunities of my life to have become not only well acquainted with him but to know him and to love him. To really know Peyton March—and not too many people ever did—was to love him. Underneath his tough skin was a warm and friendly heart, a courteous, kindly, and gallant gentleman.

Yesterday we buried one of America's greatest soldiers, patriots, and citizens of all time. The outpouring of both military and civilian people was an attest to his goodness and greatness. Even those who disagreed with him in life were present to pay their sincere and genuine respect and admiration to an outstanding leader.

Peyton C. March was a man of steel. He possessed an iron will and uncompromising conscience, an inflexible devotion to duty and boundless energy. Forever he will remain the epitome of the true soldier. He was a stern and strict disciplinarian—but he never made demands on others that he did not make upon himself. He drove himself hard and he drove everbody around him hard. At times he may have seemed petulant, impatient, irascible, and ruthless, but always he acted in the high manner which he felt was best for his country.

Stiff and straight as a ramrod unto death at 90 years of age, he refused to be pushed around by anybody. At times he was defiant. Presidents, Secretaries, and Congresses did not frighten him.

Peyton March was a man of unconquerable courage, indefatigable energy, and utter devotion. He was not perfect, but he always strived for perfection. Nothing but the best would ever satisfy him. Duty and service to God, country, and his fellowman were the watchwords of his life.

In the dark hours of World War I it was his brilliant intellect, his organizing genius, his administrative ability, his unfailing faith and tireless labors that transported more than 2 million men to France—when our methods of transportation were much fewer and slower than they are today. It was an incredible accomplishment which seemed next to impossible in those days. He cut through Government redtape without hoping to make friends, and realizing at the time that he would make some enemies, in order to get a great and important job done.

General Pershing, my fellow Missourian, could never have accomplished what he did on the battlefield without the drudging efforts that General March put forth on the home front.

The glamorous and spectacular publicity and boxcar headlines never appealed to Peyton March as much as doing his job well without pomp and public acclaim.

Mr. Speaker, General March had a fine family. His father was a great scholar who taught at Lafayette College and bequeathed to his illustrious son many of his scholarly instincts and talents. Peyton March himself was a great scholar and an avid student of history. His impatience with those less fortunately endowed should be forgiven because of his rare accomplishments. His two lovely daughters are married to two distinguished and outstanding retired generals of the United States Army, Lieutenant General Joseph Swing, now Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Major General John Milliken. These generals won their own spurs in their own rights and never depended upon General March for personal advancement. General March's present and second wife Cora, a brilliant woman and a devoted wife, all but worshiped him. Their life together was most happy and successful. To her and to all the members of his family we all extend our deepest appreciation and sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I might say something to assuage the sorrow of these dear ones and the many friends who mourn the passing of General March. All of us can take comfort and inspiration from the noble life, rugged character, and unselfish service which Peyton C. March rendered undyingly to his country.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following newspaper articles that fairly, but inadequately speak of this great American—scholar, soldier, patriot, servant of his God, his country, and all mankind. Following these articles is the 91st Psalm, the passage of Holy Scripture which General March loved best and cherished most:

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 14, 1955]

GENERAL PEYTON MARCH IS DEAD HERE AT 90

Gen. Peyton Conway March, Army Chief of Staff in World War I and America's oldest general, died at 5 p. m. yesterday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 90 years old last December 27.

Death came peacefully to the tough, outspoken, loyal military leader in his third-floor suite overlooking the formal gardens of the hospital where he had been confined to a bed or wheelchair since he broke his hip 14 months ago.

His attending physician said he died of a degenerative condition of old age. His wife, Cora, was at his bedside.

The general amazed the Germans in 1918 by achieving the almost incredible task of ferrying more than a million doughboys to Europe to crush the foe. Later he won the Distinguished Service Cross for leading a charge on enemy breastworks in France.

CLASHED WITH PERSHING

The dynamic militarist was, however, overshadowed in World War I by his bitterest rival, Gen. John J. Pershing, who headed the Allied Expeditionary Force.

His verbal clashes with Pershing broiled on after the war ended. In 1921, after he lost his title of full general, being relegated to major general, he slipped into retirement. He continued to live a vigorous life, making his home in a spacious apartment with his wife at 1870 Wyoming Avenue NW.

But he avoided the public spotlight and was soon to be known as the forgotten soldier. In his vesper years, however, words of sage advice again came from his lips. At the outset of World War II, he advocated a cross-channel invasion with an Allied army of 3 million. He took sharp issue with Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In 1930, General March regained his full rank, and in 1948, upon the death of "Black Jack" Pershing, he became the highest ranking officer of World War I.

General March's peppery temper and outspoken criticism did not gain him many implacable enemies. Among his fellow officers he had always enjoyed the reputation of being a brilliant military officer, organizer and strategist.

Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson said in a statement last night that "the long and distinguished career of Peyton C. March is a lasting inspiration to the people of our country he served so long and faithfully. The Nation has lost a great American, whose military career will be long remembered."

Secretary of the Army Robert T. Stevens said:

"General March had a distinguished military career, spanning 33 years during which his leadership was an inspiration for all with whom he served. Long after he retired in 1921 as Chief of Staff, his devotion to the Army caused him to serve as a valued adviser on military matters."

INSPIRING LEADERSHIP

Gen. Matthew B. Ridgway, Army Chief of Staff, said March's "military record reflects an inspiring leadership which contributed immeasurably to the firm foundation on which our Army stands today."

Gen. George C. Marshall, former Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, and World War II Army Chief of Staff, said March "was throughout his lifetime devoted to the interests and welfare of the Army." He said

March played "an important and difficult role" during World War I and that "his contribution to that conflict and studious development of plans for demobilization were of great significance."

Born in Easton, Pa., December 27, 1864, March graduated from the United States Military Academy June 11, 1888. Before he became Army Chief of Staff on May 29, 1918, he had served in France as artillery commander of the AEF.

MADE GENERAL IN 1918

March first saw active service in the Philippine Islands in 1898 when he participated in the assault and the capture of Manila. Later, he was detailed to Tokyo, in March, 1904, as military attaché on duty in the field with Japanese troops in the Russo-Japanese war.

When the United States entered World War I, he was a colonel on duty with the Second Division at Fort Bliss, Tex. He sailed for France in May of that year. The following year May 25, 1918, he was elevated to full general.

At his Wyoming Avenue apartment, which was studded with maps and files, March was an assiduous reader and had retained remarkable mental as well as physical agility.

His entire family was together with him last on December 27, where the rail-thin, goateed general observed his birthday with a quiet family party.

Beside his wife, he is survived by 2 daughters, both married to retired generals— Lt. Gen. Joseph M. Swing, Immigration Service Director, 3055 Foxhall Road NW., and Maj. Gen. John Millikin, 5915 Ramsgate Road, Woodacres, Md. Three grandchildren also survive.

Funeral arrangements were not completed last night.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of April 19, 1955]

ONE-MILE CORTEGE AT MARCH FUNERAL

Gen. Peyton Conway March, America's oldest general, was buried yesterday in Arlington Cemetery amid pomp and circumstance reserved only for the Nation's greatest military heroes.

The World War I Army Chief of Staff died Wednesday at Walter Reed Hospital. He was 90.

Top military, civilian, and foreign dignitaries headed a mile-long funeral cortege bearing the body from downtown Washington.

Included in the special honor guard following the caisson were Vice President Richard Nixon, Bernard Baruch, Marine Corps Commandant, Gen. Lemuel C. Shepherd, Jr., Army Gen. John E. Hull, Army Lt. Gen. Robert L. Eichelberger, and Representative Dewey Short, Republican, of Missouri.

Baruch was chairman of the World War I War Industries Board while General March was Chief of Staff.

A 400-man cadet battalion from the United States Military Academy, the United States Army Band, and the Third (Old Guard) Infantry Regiment led units of all the armed services in the hour-long march from 15th Street and Constitution Avenue NW.

Tanks from the Third Armored Cavalry, Fort Meade, Md., and an airborne field artillery battery from Fort Bragg, N. C., made up part of the procession down Constitution Avenue NW., across Memorial Bridge to the memorial entrance to the cemetery.

The general's body, borne in state on a caisson drawn by six white horses, was followed by a riderless black horse with stirrups turned backward in the traditional military service.

On a hilltop overlooking the Potomac, Brig. Gen. Frank A. Tobey, Army Deputy Chief of Chaplains, conducted Presbyterian graveside services.

The service, in a grove of maple trees under a cold, gray sky, began as the band sounded Ruffles and Flourishes, then broke into a medley of hymns. General Tobey read the service and led in prayer as soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen held the American flag taut over the coffin.

The flag was folded and presented to General March's widow, who stood with Lieutenant Gen. Stanley Embick and other comrades of the late general near the coffin.

The military units presented arms and a 17-gun salute from one of eight 105-millimeter howitzers in the cortege echoed over the hills.

General March was born in Easton, Pa., and was graduated from the military academy in 1888. He saw action in the assault and capture of Manila in 1898. He became Chief of Staff in 1918 after organizing the movement and supply of the American Expeditionary Force in Europe. He retired in 1921.

[From the Washington Evening Star of April 16, 1955]

GENERAL MARCH

Gen. Peyton C. March was the beau ideal professional soldier. His whole life—90 years of it—added up to make a great military career. An honor graduate of West Point, he commanded the Astor Battery in the Philippines in 1898 and returned to the islands to work under Arthur MacArthur in the guerrilla campaigns which resulted in the capture of Aguinaldo in 1901. With the Japanese he saw the Russians beaten at Yalu and Liaoyang in 1904—terrible battles which taught him the importance, in war, of "force, force to the utmost."

This was the philosophy General March put into practice in World War I. The first of his missions in that struggle was to organize the artillery in France. Secretary of War Newton Baker called him home to be Chief of Staff and to weld the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the National Army into a single fighting power. The story of how 2 million men were carried over the Atlantic to smash the Kaiser's mailed-fist defenses and compel his surrender and abdication has been told repeatedly. It may be summarized in the words which General March himself used: "We did it."

But the principal architect of the institutional side of the victory was not the rough, tough, hard, sharp, sarcastic, provocative mechanician some critics supposed. Washingtonians who were his neighbors found him, instead, a courteous, kindly, friendly, modestly chivalrous person. He had his own ideas, his own fashion of getting things accomplished, and he did not like to be crossed. Yet it also was true that he could pull in harness, was a skilled cooperator, and in hundreds of instances a faithful friend of fellow officers. Above all, General March was a patriot. He loved his country and its people.

PSALM 91

He that dwelleth in the secret place of the most high shall abide under the shadow of the Almighty.

2. I will say of the Lord, He is my refuge and my fortress: my God; in Him will I trust.

3. Surely He shall deliver thee from the snare of the fowler, and from the noisome pestilence.

4. He shall cover thee with His feathers, and under His wings shalt thou trust; His truth shall be thy shield and buckler.

5. Thou shall not be afraid for the terror by night; nor for the arrow that flieth by day;

6. Nor for the pestilence that walketh in darkness; nor for the destruction that wasteth at noonday.

7. A thousand shall fall at thy side, and 10,000 at thy right hand; but it shall not come nigh thee.

8. Only with thine eyes shalt thou behold and see the reward of the wicked.

9. Because thou has made the Lord, which is my refuge, even the most High, thy habitation;

10. There shall no evil befall thee, neither shall any plague come nigh thy dwelling.

11. For He shall give His Angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12. They shall bear thee up in their hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

13. Thou shalt tread upon the lion and adder: the young lion and the dragon shalt thou trample under feet.

14. Because He hath set His love upon me, therefore will I deliver Him: I will set Him on high, because He hath known my name.

15. He shall call upon me, and I will answer Him: I will be with Him in trouble, I will deliver Him, and honor Him.

16. With long life will I satisfy Him, and shew Him my salvation.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1955

(Legislative day of Monday, April 18, 1955)

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

Rev. F. Norman Van Brunt, associate pastor, Foundry Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou from whom to be turned away is to fall, to whom to be turned is to rise, and in whom to abide is to stand fast forever: We look to Thee knowing that Thou wilt give us in all our duties Thy help, in all our perplexities Thy guidance, and in all our weakness Thy strength.

We stand poised on the edge of this new day aware of its tremendous opportunities. As we launch out into its depths, may we be conscious of the wisdom in the investment of our time, our talents, and our lives for the betterment of our people and all the people who dwell upon the earth.

Let the zeal for right and truth burn within us and through us, and may there be an indelible mark of goodness upon our time. To this end we dedicate this day of service. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 19, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its